99210

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

99210

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

SECOND SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

55-56 VICTORIÆ, 1892.

VOL. XXXV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TENTH DAY OF MAY TO THE NINTH DAY OF JULY, INCLUSIVE.



OTTAWA.
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1892

House of Commons Debates.

SECOND SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 10th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Chignecto Transport Railway Company, Limited.—(Mr. Dickey.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Increased accommodation at Halifax. .$152,000

Mr. HAGGART. At the last meeting of the committee, I promised that the next time you took the Chair I would make a statement as succinctly as possible of the changes proposed to be made in the running of the Intercolonial Railway, for the purpose of restoring as nearly as possible an equilibrium between the receipts and expenditure of this road. You are all aware that the railway is divided into two subdivisions, one of 1,145 miles in length, of which 322 miles are in Quebec, 368 in New Brunswick and 455 in Nova Scotia, and another branch consisting of 211 miles in Prince Edward Island. The Intercolonial Railway in 1889-90 was united with what was called the Eastern Extension, and with that portion of the railway which was afterwards completed in Cape Breton. That increased the mileage from what it was before 1889, 971 miles, to 1,145 miles. The maximum earnings of the road were in the year that that Act was passed, in 1889-90, when the total length of the road was 971 miles, the earnings that year amounted to $3,012,739.87. In the same year the railway connecting Montreal with the Intercolonial system—what was called the Short Line *vid* Mattawamkeag to St. John—was completed. That road was built for the purpose of giving increased facilities to the people of the Maritime Provinces to reach the western provinces and give a shorter line to our seaboard or our eastern ports from this section of the country than we had previously. When that road was finished, on account of the energetic management of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the shorter distance by their line, no doubt a great portion of the traffic was diverted from our line, which was a longer line as it went down the St. Lawrence and took a turn around the coast, having been built more for military purposes than commercial purposes. It thus diverted a considerable portion of the traffic by the Canadian Pacific Railway to St. John and other portions of the Maritime Provinces. Perhaps the most valuable portion of the traffic we had was diverted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they carefully avoided the carriage of articles which were not paying, such as grain, coal, stones and other heavy articles, leaving these to be carried at a loss by the Intercolonial Railway. These reasons, however, do not entirely explain the deficit which has happened on the Intercolonial Railway for a number of years past. We have been running a number of trains in excess of the requirements of the freight carried in that country. We have been carrying local freight at a lower tariff than that at which freight is carried upon any other Canadian road, and we have been carrying coal, flour, grain, stone, &c., at a rate which does not pay. Also, our regular passenger trains which we have been running do not have sufficient traffic to pay expenses, and not as much passenger traffic as is customary on other roads in Canada. Then another reason for the Intercolonial Railway not paying is on account of the northern portion of the railway running through a portion of country in which snow storms are much more severe than they are in other portions of Canada, and consequently the cost of ploughing the snow and keeping the track open in winter is greatly in excess of the cost on other roads in Canada. To these causes is to be added, as I stated before, the disturbance of the traffic caused by the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway *vid* Mattawamkeag to St. John, and the taking away of the most valuable part of the traffic which it had hitherto carried. Another source of loss is

the employment of men on the road who are not suitable for the purpose, and who think, unfortunately, that because it is a Government railway they do not need to render the services and to exhibit the energy that are usually shown by men on other Canadian railways. For these and other reasons which are explained by my officials on the Intercolonial Railway, the receipts are far short of the expenditure. I may state that in 1889-90, when there was a mileage of only 971 miles, the receipts were $3,012,739; in 1890-91, notwithstanding that 123 miles was added to the mileage of the road, the receipts were less by $35,344.49; and now with a further additional 51 miles, there has been a further decrease in nine months, compared with the corresponding period of last year, of $50,922.67.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman give us the expenditure?

Mr. HAGGART. I will give you afterwards the total receipts and expenditures for the last six or seven years. There has been a falling off during the past 21 months of $82,266, in spite of the additional 174 miles that were added to the road. This circumstance, taken together with the enormous extra expenditure which is incurred for running freight trains and other trains over this additional section of the road, shows, to a considerable extent, the reason of the difference between the receipts and the expenditure. In 1890-91 the difference between the receipts and the expenditure was $684,946, and we are threatened with a larger deficit during the current year. For the purpose of remedying these things and of establishing an equilibrium as nearly as possible between the expenditure and the earnings, I have decided upon making a reduction in several directions. First of all, I may state that the number of employés on the Intercolonial Railway is 4,181, and I purpose making dismissals to the number of 210. These will consist of machinists, painters and men of all the different employments which are followed on the staff of a large railway, including telegraph operators, train despatchers, &c. I also intend to reduce the train service, erasing from the time-table one of the fast express trains between Halifax and St. John, several mixed and freight trains, and the fast freight train between Moncton and Chaudière Junction. This will give us a reduction in the train mileage, on the fast express, of 172,000 train miles; on the fast freight, of 308,000 train miles; on the mixed freight, of 127,000 train miles; and on the ordinary freight, of 180,000 train miles, causing an annual reduction of 787,000 train miles. Taking the average wages of the men at $1.50 a day, this change will enable me to make a reduction of $95,000 in the cost of the staff; and estimating the train mileage of the fast express at $1 per mile, and of the other trains at 40 cents per mile, this will enable me to make a reduction of $418,000 in the running expenses, or a total reduction of $513,000. I propose to treat the Prince Edward Island Railway in a similar manner. The staff on that railway numbers 292. I propose to reduce the number of employés by 20, and reduce the train service by 3,756 miles; taking off a train between Summerside and Charlottetown, and making the train on the Cape Traverse Branch tri-weekly instead of daily. This reduction of 20 in the staff, as I stated before, will make a saving of $9,200, which, taken together with the reduction of the cost in the train service of $9,300, makes a total reduction in the expenditure of $18,500. The traffic on this road is very light. There is a steamer express between Charlottetown and Summerside carrying very few passengers, but scarcely any freight. In autumn the freight cars upon the Island are pretty fully employed, but in other parts of the year they are not much employed. Since the establishment of the road in 1875-76, the average loss has been $80,607 per annum, and I think it will be very difficult to reduce this loss materially. The heaviest loss occurred in 1882-83, amounting to $106,637.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I notice that the reduction of men on the main line is 5 per cent., and on the Island Railway 10 per cent. Perhaps the Minister can explain how there is a larger percentage on the Island road?

Mr. HAGGART. I can hardly go into the percentage. The number of the staff on the Island Railway is 292, and the reduction is 20. The average earnings of this road are only $144,865, and the average working expenses $225,472. As I have stated before, the maximum earnings on this road were in 1890-91, when they reached $174,258, and the maximum working expenses were in 1889-90, when they amounted to $266,485. The amount of working expenses which I calculate my reductions in the freight service and the staff will save on that road will be in the neighbourhood of $18,500.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The only Island railway change is taking off one train between Charlottetown and Summerside, and making the train on the Cape Traverse Branch tri-weekly instead of weekly?

Mr. HAGGART. Taking off one train from Summerside to Charlottetown and making the train on the Cape Traverse Branch tri-weekly. I had better read the memorandum of the changes in the train service on the Intercolonial Railway. It is as follows:—Fast express train each way—St. John and Halifax. Freight train each way—Moncton and St. John. Fast freight train each way—Moncton and Chaudière. Freight train each way—Moncton to Campbellton. Accommodation train each way—Campbellton to Rivière du Loup. Accommodation train each way—Stellarton and Pictou. Freight train each way—Stellarton and Pictou. Mileage of daily reduction of fast express, 550; ditto freight trains, 576; ditto fast freight trains, 986; ditto accommodation trains, 406. The memorandum of trains taken off the Island railway shows the accommodation train between Charlottetown and Summerside each day, and the accommodation every other day between Emerald Junction and Cape Traverse. A large item appears in the Estimates for the purpose of giving increased accommodations at Halifax. Ever since the road was built, the accommodation has not been such as to meet the requirements of the city. Three plans are proposed, for the purpose of affording better

accommodation. One of these is the plan proposed by the city council, which is the expropriation of all that block of property between Cornwallis street and the station.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is taking a block of 7½ acres.

Mr. HAGGART. 18 acres. The city council propose to give the Government a guarantee that the expropriation by the Government of that particular piece of ground will not cost more than $400,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) For the 18 acres?

Mr. HAGGART. For the 18 acres.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The statement was made last year that $400,000 would be required for 7½ acres.

Mr. HAGGART. The land I speak of covers two blocks between Cornwallis street and the station. The assessed value of the property is $450,000. A portion of it will be required by the city for the purpose of widening the street, which at present runs up to Halifax station, and which the council intends to pay for themselves. If we expropriated the property ourselves the probabilities are that the amount we would be obliged to pay would be largely in excess of the sum for which the city offers to purchase it. There are two other propositions. One is to acquire the land passing in front of this block and along the end of the docks, until we reach the ordnance property in the centre of the city, and to build a station there. The third plan is the expropriation of the whole of the rear of the dock property to an extent equal to that proposed to be acquired from Cornwallis street to the station. One of the plans proposed is advocated by the board of trade, the first one I mentioned is advocated by the city council; and the expenditure on either of the three plans, so far as my officers can judge, will be about the same. The expenditure for the purpose of securing either of these accommodations proposed will be, including improvements such as grading, laying of tracks and the erection of the necessary buildings for the transaction of business, in the neighbourhood of $595,000. I may state that the requirements for railway purposes would not extend to the full limits of the property proposed to be expropriated from Cornwallis street to the station, but I am assured by my officers that the property required for station purposes and for extra accommodation might cost us, if the Government went to expropriate about one-fourth of the property from Cornwallis street to the station, as much as we would be called upon to pay under the arrangement which it is possible to make with the city, that is to say, $400,000. I cannot say that I approve of any plans, or that I am favourable to any one at present; but, judging from the map and from the information I have derived from my officers, I am inclined to the proposition of the city council, that is, to take the property between Cornwallis street and the station. At all events, I am not inclined to make any expropriation or expenditure for the purpose of building this large increased accommodation and incurring this large expenditure, for it is a large expenditure, taking into consideration the amount already made on terminal facilities at Halifax, without further enquiring into the matter, having a plan fully made and giving the subject more consideration than I have been able to give it at present. There is another item which appears in the Estimates for the purpose of affording terminal facilities at St. John. We took an appropriation last year and purchased a large amount of property for the purpose of affording terminal facilities, the Harris property, at an expenditure of $200,000. The money voted last year, I think $80,000, was applied towards that purchase. We are asking, Mr. Chairman, for a sum to supplement that for the purpose of paying for this property. That, also, is a property which my officers say is in excess of the requirements of the road at present, but the arrangements which we have been able to make for the purchase of that property are so favourable that the parties who were valuing the property considered that the land which we would absolutely require for improved facilities at that terminus, would cost us, if we were only to take the portion that we required, very nearly the amount that we have been able by arrangement to get the whole property for. A detailed statement of the valuation of the different arbitrators of the triangle which was absolutely necessary for the requirements of the increased traffic there, and on account of the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, will show that the amount which we were required to pay for the small portion needed was nearly equal to the amount which we have been able to get the whole property for. There is another small expenditure for the purpose of continuing the railway along the water front in order to reach some wharves in front of the city, so as to give greater accommodation than we have at present. We have an arrangement with the city council by which we will be required to build no more than the actual track and the laying of the road, as all other expenses are borne, and all other claims for damages are prevented by a guarantee from the city. We ask, for the purpose of completing that track, $14,000, but the estimated expenditure is in the neighbourhood of $25,000, and for which we will require a supplementary vote. There is nothing more important that I know of in the Intercolonial Railway estimates; but if something should develop in the course of the debate, I will only be too glad to give the fullest information which any members of the House may require. I promised to make enquiries as to the expenditure on printing and advertising for the Intercolonial Railway, because a statement was made by one of the members of the House that the expenditure for printing, stationery, and advertising on the Intercolonial Railway was far in excess of the expenditure of some of the leading roads of the country which had a great deal more business. I got my officer to enquire from the Grand Trunk Railway with reference to their expenditure in this direction, and to have a comparison made between it and the Intercolonial Railway. I find, instead of the expenditure being eight or ten times the amount on the Intercolonial Railway that it is on the Grand Trunk, that the expenditure is only one-half on the Intercolonial Railway that it is on the Grand Trunk Railway. I will read the figures:

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Stationery and printing, Intercolonial Railway, for the year ending 30th June, 1891	$ 50,089 17
Advertising, Intercolonial Railway, 1891	17,956 16
Total	$ 68,045 33

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Stationery and printing, Grand Trunk Railway	$127,817 47
Advertising	18,438 57
Total	$146,256 04

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Could the hon. gentleman say how many miles of Grand Trunk Railway?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know, but I gave the number of the Intercolonial Railway. I may state further, Mr. Chairman, that I intend immediately after the session is over to take a trip over the Intercolonial Railway, and if any other expenditure or any other decrease can be made, while at the same time maintaining the efficiency of the road and the accommodation which the people of the Maritime Provinces are justly entitled to, if decreases can be made in the expenditure, for train service or the operation of the road, I intend to make them, besides those which I have mentioned already. But I intend to do nothing which will impair in any way the efficiency of the accommodation which the people of the Maritime Provinces claim, and which I think they are justly entitled to claim by the terms of Confederation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the Minister, before he sits down, say how many of the 4,181 employés are engaged in workshops, and how many in the actual work or operation of the road?

Mr. HAGGART. My officer cannot tell at present.

Mr. FRASER. Could the Minister tell what proportion of these employés are employed in each province? He has given the mileage in each of the provinces, and I ask him can he give us the number of employés in each?

Mr. HAGGART. Not just now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not observe that the Minister said anything on the question of freight rates, as to whether he proposed to alter these?

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot say to what extent, if any, they may be altered. All I can say is that at present a great deal of the freight carried by the road is carried at non-paying rates.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a few words in reply to the statement the Minister of Railways has presented to the House. I am sure that we are all very pleased to learn that it is his intention to apply the pruning-knife, and I only regret that it has not been applied long ago. The country has been losing a very large sum annually in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, and I was pleased to hear the Minister admit that it was carrying local freight at a very much less rate than it should carry it at, as compared with the charges of other lines. I well remember that last year, or the year before, when we charged hon. gentlemen opposite with utilizing the Intercolonial Railway for the purpose of serving the interests of certain parties in the Maritime Provinces, it was declared that the rates which were then charged were in proportion to the rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. The hon. Minister has presented to the House a comparative statement for printing and advertising on the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. I think I will be able to show the House, from figures that I have compiled from reports of the Grand Trunk Railway, that the statement of the hon. gentleman will not bear investigation. If he will take the report that was published by the Grand Trunk Railway themselves——

Mr. HAGGART. The figures I gave were furnished to-day from Mr. Seargeant to my deputy.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can say this, that I have been furnished, also, from Mr. Seargeant the half-yearly report of the Grand Trunk Railway, and from the figures gleaned from the report, as well as the figures gleaned from the latest Railway Statistics which is to be found in the Library, and can easily be obtained by any member in this House, I think I shall be able to show that the hon. gentleman's statement with regard to printing and advertising is incorrect. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I think it is well that we should make an investigation as to the comparative expenditure of the three important lines in this country. It is as follows:—

—	Grand Trunk Railway.	Canadian Pacific Railway.	Government Railway.
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
No. of miles operated	3,122	5,085	1,181
	$	$	$
Cost of maintenance	2,506,371	2,006,237	1,148,094
do per mile of line	802	394.59	972
Working expenses of engines	4,372,979	3,314,817	1,226,438
do per mile of line	1,401	652	1,028
do & repair of cars	1,328,134	542,822	521,823
do per mile of line	425	102	460
General operating expenses	4,634,169	3,581,287	875,175
do per mile of line	1,484	704	741
Total expenses per mile of line	4,113	1,853	3,211

In regard to advertising and printing the hon. Minister of Railways said that the Grand Trunk had expended $146,000 last year under this head. If he will take the last two half-yearly returns of the Grand Trunk, he will find that the gross amount expended for printing and advertising by the Grand Trunk in the year was $122,810. The gross amount expended by the Canadian Pacific Railway is not given, because it is included in other items from which it cannot be extracted. The expenditure for the same items on the Intercolonial Railway during the same time is shown by the Auditor General's Report to be $121,339.10 or $136.50 per mile against only $31.00 per mile by the Grand Trunk.

Mr. HAGGART. All I can say is that my officer says that he took from the Auditor General's Report the amount I read to the House; and the total amount stated by the hon. gentleman is not

in that report, but must be supplemented by some items that do not appear there.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would say in reply that I have carefully gleaned from the Auditor General's Report the items connected with printing, advertising and stationery, which the hon. gentleman must include, because it is included in the report of the Grand Trunk.

Mr. HAGGART. I did include it.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman will remember that in order to ascertain the entire amount expended for printing, advertising and stationery, I put a question across the House to him some time ago, and if he will add the amount stated in his answer for stationery to the amount given in the Auditor General's Report for printing and advertising, he will find my statement to be correct. Now, the earnings of the three railways for 1890 were as follows :—

—	Grand Trunk Railway.	Canadian Pacific Railway.	Government Railways
	$	$	$
Gross earnings	18,300,606	15,572,985	3,173,711
do per mile of line	5,861	3,062	2,687
Freight earnings per mile of line	3,893	1,845	1,725
Passenger earnings per mile of line	1,736	899	816
Mails and express freight per mile of line	233	333	144
Gross tons carried	7,909,708	3,006,684	1,420,423
Tons carried per mile	2,213	591	1,203
Passengers carried per mile	1,881	528	1,145
Net earnings per mile	1,310	1,238	.....
Net loss, about	.....	.....	600

Now, with regard to maintenance, the Grand Trunk Railway cost $802 per mile, the Canadian Pacific Railway $394.50, and the Intercolonial Railway $972, so that it cost double as much to maintain the Intercolonial Railway as the Canadian Pacific Railway per mile, and over $172 more per mile than it cost the Grand Trunk Railway. Then, with regard to working expenses, it cost the Grand Trunk Railway $1,401 per mile, the Canadian Pacific Railway $652, and the Intercolonial Railway $1,038 per mile. Working and repairs of cars cost the Grand Trunk Railway $425 per mile, the Canadian Pacific Railway $102.60, and the Intercolonial Railway $460. General operating expenses per mile cost the Grand Trunk Railway $1,484, the Canadian Pacific Railway $704.25, and the Intercolonial Railway $741. The total expenses per mile, as I have already said, are $4,113 for the Grand Trunk Railway, $1,853,55 for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and $3,211 for Government railways. I have already given the committee the cost of printing and advertising. When we come to examine these facts and figures, we find it is quite clear that the management of the Intercolonial Railway is in that condition that for several years past it has imperatively demanded investigation. The operation of the line has been far in excess of what it cost to operate the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway. Any person who knows anything about railways, should know that in proportion as the earnings of a road increase, the operating expenses should increase; but when we compare the operating expenses of the Intercolonial Railway with other lines of the Dominion, you will find it cost considerably more per mile to operate the Intercolonial Railway than the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Minister of Railways shakes his head. We must surely give some credit to the reports of railways which were submitted to the directors, such as the reports of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when we compare these reports with the Government report of expenses connected with the Intercolonial Railway, we are justified in coming to the conclusion I have given. If the Minister will investigate these reports, he will find that the statement I have made is correct.

Mr. HAGGART. I have them all and will read them afterwards.

Committee rose, and the Speaker took the Chair.

ROYAL ASS'NT TO BILLS.

A Message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows :—

Mr. SPEAKER,—
His Honour, Mr. JUSTICE STRONG, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :—

An Act to incorporate W. C. Edwards and Company.
An Act to amend "The Pilotage Act."
An Act to amend an Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey.
An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.
An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.
An Act respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.
An Act to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting aid by United States Wreckers in Canadian Waters.
An Act to authorize the conveyance to the Corporation of the City of Toronto of certain Ordnance lands in that city.
An Act respecting the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada.
An Act respecting the Nova Scotia Steel and Forge Company (Limited).
An Act respecting the *Globe* Printing Company.
An Act respecting the Montreal Board of Trade.
An Act to incorporate the Women's Baptist Missionary Union of the Maritime Provinces.
An Act respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.
An Act respecting the St. John and Maine Railway Company and the New Brunswick Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.
An Act respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.
An Act respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.
An Act respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States.
An Act further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. I had been drawing the attention of the committee, before the message came

from the Deputy Governor, to the very large figures in connection with the operating expenses of the Intercolonial Railway. It is clear that extravagance has marked the operation of that line for years past. When you take up the figures for working and repairs of cars alone on the Grand Trunk Railway, with a traffic nearly three times that of the Intercolonial Railway, you will find it costs only $425 per mile; you will find also that the same item costs the Canadian Pacific Railway only $102.60 per mile, while it costs the Intercolonial Railway $460 per mile. I think that proves clearly that there must be extravagance in connection with the operation of the Government railway. It proves that there have been more hands employed in connection with the workshops than necessary, as otherwise the very absurd showing this statement presents would not appear. The cost of working expenses per mile of the line is another indication that there has been a considerable number of hands employed beyond what is at all necessary. When you take the enormous traffic over the Grand Trunk Railway and compare it with the limited amount over the Intercolonial Railway, you find that the Intercolonial Railway spends $1,038 per mile in operating expenses. Compare that with the Canadian Pacific Railway, whose operating expense per mile is only $652, and you find that the Intercolonial Railway spends very nearly $400 per mile more for operating expenses, that is for hands, track men, station agents, baggagemen and so on; and you find that the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway is within but a very small amount of that on the Grand Trunk Railway. Then compare the maintenance. We find it costs the Grand Trunk Railway $802 per mile for maintenance. Compare that with the Intercolonial Railway, where there are iron bridges and a road built in first-class order, and where there are snow sheds of iron put up which have been charged to capital account. Sir Charles Tupper, some years ago, when Minister of Railways, said that where the Government put up iron snow sheds to replace the old wooden ones, the cost was charged to capital account. We know that the Grand Trunk Railway does not do that, nor does the Canadian Pacific Railway. They charge those items to operating expenses. Taking that into account, we find that the Government railways spent $972 per mile for maintenance and the Canadian Pacific Railway $394.50 and the Grand Trunk Railway $802. Thus the Intercolonial Railway has spent $170 per mile more for maintenance than what is spent by any other road in the Dominion, clearly showing that there has been looseness and extravagance connected with the management and operation of the line from beginning to end. Now take the results. The Grand Trunk Railway paid its owners for the half year ending 30th June, 1891, $1,730,445, or at the rate of $3,460,890 per annum, leaving a net revenue balance for the half year of $131,468, or for the year of $262,936. Then take the Canadian Pacific Railway. That company paid a dividend of 1 per cent each on the 17th August, 1890, and the 17th February, 1891, amounting to $1,300,000, it paid all the working expenses, and had a surplus carried forward of $2,656,432. At the same time the Intercolonial Railway not only did not pay running expenses, but paid $684,000 less than running expenses. So, when you compare the net results of the operation of these three lines, any person who will glance an eye for a few moments over the figures I have submitted will see that this line has been operated most extravagantly, that money has been squandered, that hundreds of men have been kept on who have not been required. The Minister stated that they had to keep men to shovel snow. I understood that they had purchased a very efficient snowplough, one or two, a few years ago, costing a large amount of money. I understand that the snowplough is now lying at one of the stations and has not been utilized. I understand that it was sanctioned by the engineer in charge, but it never performed any work and is quite useless, and the department have been compelled to hire men to shovel the snow off. This is an evidence of want of knowledge or want of efficiency, or want of ability on the part of some one. Certainly, the Grand Trunk Railway Company have sections to keep open, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have sections to keep open worse than those on the Intercolonial Railway, and the whole operating of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific is included in the statement they have presented to their directors. That proves that there must have been an enormous amount of extravagance in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. I shall not further detain the committee. I am glad to notice that the Minister of Railways has announced his intention to pay a visit along the line with a view to cutting down expenses. It is a pity that the pruning knife was not applied years before. There is one thing I find fault with, and it is that Ministers knew at the time of the inception of the Short Line road, now owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the Intercolonial Railway was not paying running expenses. Notwithstanding that, they not only encouraged the construction of a cut-throat line, but they gave the money of the people of this country to help in its construction. If the Canadian Pacific Railway thought it necessary in their own interests to build a railway of that kind through the State of Maine, it would not be prudent to do anything to prevent it, but, after spending fifty millions of the people's money on the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, to contribute largely to the construction of a cut-throat line to ruin the Intercolonial Railway was an action on the part of hon. gentlemen which the country should not endorse. Our experience shows that the statements made at the time on this side of the House are verified. We pointed out that this would be a ruinous competition to the Intercolonial Railway. Hon. gentlemen did not admit that. They thought there would be sufficient work for the two lines. Sir Charles Tupper, who was here at that time, spoke in glowing terms of the work which would be required from both these lines; he referred to the 640,000,000 of bushels of grain which would tax both these lines to carry, coming from the North-West, with which these lines would have to deal in the future. Hon. gentlemen were so elated with the bright prospect in the future held out to them by the then Minister of Railways that they gave their consent to contribute to the construction of that line which was to be a competitor with the Intercolonial Railway. But the predictions which were then made on this side of the House have been fully realized. We stated that it would mean financial ruin to the Inter-

colonial Railway, and to-day we have a confession from the Minister of Railways that we are losing nearly $100,000 a month on this line. Last year the deficit amounted to $680,000, and this year, if the economies which he projected were not carried out, he thinks the country would lose not less than $1,000,000 on working expenses, besides the interest on $50,000,000 which has been sunk in that line, and which must amount to at least $2,000,000, so that the country is losing $3,000,000 annually on the Intercolonial Railway, which pays nothing in return. This is only one evidence of the extravagance which has characterized many of the works undertaken in this country, and in many cases operated at an enormous loss. It is earnestly to be hoped that we are approaching the end of the era of extravagance. We have now the first indication given to us by the Minister of Railways of an attempt to inaugurate a system of economy, and I hope he will keep on with this until he finds the earnings of this road are brought about equal with the expenditure at least.

Mr. PERRY. It is a very good thing to exercise economy, but I think the Minister is commencing to economize in the wrong direction. He is making a sad mistake in thinking it is good policy to cut short the railway accommodation for the people of Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman must bear in mind that the railway of Prince Edward Island was paid for by the people of Prince Edward Island, and the people of Canada have no claim on it. It was built by the people of Prince Edward Island and made a present to Canada, and now, if Canada is not able to work that road to the satisfaction of the people, there must be mismanagement somewhere. I am not surprised at that. The Department of Railways has gone begging for nearly two years. There has been no regular head to that department for about two years. Now we find a Minister at the head of that department, and he is showing his authority pretty well as far as the Island is concerned. He proposes to take off an accommodation train between Summerside and Charlottetown, and between Charlottetown and Summerside once a day, which is probably the best paying train on the Prince Edward Island Railway. For want of that train, the last week or two, they have had to put on special trains in order to carry the freight. Let him show me anywhere in Canada 1,250,000 acres of land that are more productive than the lands of Prince Edward Island. And what do we do with our products? We do not throw them overboard, we take them to the markets. I know that farming is not paying very well on the Island on account of the evil policy of the Government. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes to punish the people between Charlottetown and Tignish with all his might, he is going to throw the whole of his vengeance upon those people. But the people on the east who are represented by two Government supporters are not to be meddled with; I am glad of it, they are deserving. Is it because Prince County and Queen's County are represented by members of the Opposition that they are to be deprived of their rightful railway facilities? Is that the way justice is to be meted out in this Parliament? Is that the way the hon. gentleman intends to conduct the business of his department? How many canals in this country will the hon. gentleman show me that are paying? Take any of the canals; take the Tay Canal, for instance, and show me how many thousand dollars revenue has been derived out of that canal this last year? Does it pay working expenses? Does it pay interest on capital it cost to build it? And just, forsooth, because this canal happens to be in the constituency represented by the Minister of Railways, it must be petted, it must be maintained at the public expense, and if the whole truth was known perhaps there is something else in it beyond the public good. But, as I said before, I am doubtful whether there is one canal in the whole Dominion of Canada that is paying. We must bear in mind that the tax-payers of Prince Edward Island are taxed one-fortieth part of the millions that these canals have cost to build, including the Tay Canal. And because we are far removed, because we are isolated from the main land, because we are a law-abiding people and pay our taxes, because we are struggling against the iniquitous laws imposed upon us by this Government, we must be further punished by this unpatriotic Government, and more particularly by this unpatriotic Minister at the head of the Railway Department. Well, if he thinks he is going to attract support to his Government from the electors of that province, he is very much mistaken. He will only case-harden them. That department has tried that game before; they have not succeeded; and the only way now that is left to them, apparently, is by the present gerrymander Bill which has been hatched by hon. gentlemen opposite, and a pretty object it is. Well, Sir, I cannot believe for a moment that the hon. gentleman intends to carry out this scheme. I believe he will reconsider it, and I believe he will leave trains on. I may say that if it was on the eve of an election, there would be no talk about taking off these trains. The hon. gentleman may have railroads on the Island which are not required; I do not know; but I know that on the eve of an election these train hands are badly needed. Every man who is inclined to give a vote for the Government is sure to get a berth on that railway; he is sure to be furnished with a shovel to shovel away snow where there is no snow to be shovelled. I know that 1891 was a bad year, we had a good deal of snow, we had a good many storms, political as well as snow storms, and during these storms men were lavishly employed. I suppose they are retained yet. It may be possible that the hon. gentleman can lessen his staff of employés on that road, but he ought not to interfere with the accommodation that is required by the people of Prince Edward Island to carry their surplus products from one place to another. If they are cut short of this accommodation, the hon. gentleman might as well close up the road altogether. I am doubtful if a majority of the honest members in this House will be satisfied with the treatment the people of Prince Edward Island are to receive in this respect. Now, I understand, also, that the branch of the main line to Cape Traverse is to be interfered with, and the daily train is to be reduced to a tri-weekly train. We know very well that the Government have in contemplation to establish a daily route across the channel; I know they are building heavy works on the Cape Tormentine side, at an expenditure of $300,000 or $400,000. We know, also, that there are new works on the Island side, a

pier for the purpose, I suppose, of accommodating the tunnel, if ever a tunnel is built. In winter when the iceboats cross, this train runs daily from Cape Traverse to Cape Tormentine. It is only about nine or ten miles distant, between Emerald Junction and Cape Traverse, and although running only three times a week, the same staff of employés must remain there. What is the Government going to do with them? They are not going to drive them from Cape Traverse to Tignish to spend their vacation, or to Charlottetown, or anywhere else. They must keep them there, and while they remain there they must be idle. These men are supposed to be idle half the time, and pay their board. As I said before, I do not believe the hon. gentleman is sincere in what he says, and that he is going to take off these trains from the line, that he is going to punish Summerside and Charlottetown just because these two places return four Liberal members. The east end of the Island has as much right to be treated in the same way as the west end, but because it sends two Conservative members here, it is to be left in the enjoyment of what it is entitled to have, and what I am glad to say they are going to have. But I claim the same justice for my side, I claim the same justice for my constituents. My constituents pay their taxes, they are part and parcel of the five million people of this Dominion, and they have a right to be represented, they have a right to their share of the public patronage, they have a right to justice, and I say if they are treated in this way they are not getting justice. Now, I hope and trust that the Minister of Railways will not carry out this scheme, that he is not going to act as the Tzar of Russia, that he will, in his cooler moments, come to the conclusion that if he carries out this scheme the people of Prince Edward Island will be wrongly dealt with. I will be proud to find that perhaps to-morrow, or some other day, we may be told in this House that the old regulations which are required by the people, are to be maintained. Now, if so many hundred thousand dollars have been sunk on the Intercolonial Railway, as has been shown by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I suppose there has been some mismanagement somewhere. It has been shown that the country has been called upon to pay money to build railways to compete with Government railways, that public money has been expended to build railways to compete with the people's road. This is an unfair and wrong policy. The question now is what the Government are going to do with respect to the Government railways. Are they going to close them up, and declare that the country is not willing to maintain them? The country is willing to pay for the running of those roads, which have been built by the people. If any other policy is pursued the people will rise up *en masse*. At Charlottetown last Friday a great meeting was held at which resolutions were passed condemning the action of the Government for curtailing the accommodation on the Island railway. I believe a deputation will arrive here in a few days to wait on the Government. I think one gentleman is already here as a deputation from Summerside, with a view to prevent the Government imposing their impositions. But another deputation will come here from Charlottetown to ask the Minister not to take the action proposed, and I may tell him that the monster meeting at Charlottetown was composed of members of both sides of politics, Conservatives as well as Liberals, and I believe every section of the Island was represented. I have before me the resolutions passed at that meeting, and they are worded in the strongest possible language, condemning the action of the Government in the management of the Island road. I suppose the returns quoted by the Minister in regard to the deficiency on the Island Railway are correct. But where are public works in Canada that prove remunerative or pay their working expenses: where is there a canal which is paying to-day? The hon. Minister may have a horse and buggy worth a thousand dollars, but that will not bring a revenue. The Island railway is in the same position. I know the people of Canada have sympathy for the smallest province, the finest, the most prolific province, and the pride of the Dominion, and they do not desire that justice should be withheld from us. I know the Minister of Railways is a man of strong determination, but I tell him that this is an injustice to the people of the province, a part of which I represent in this House. All the people of the Island, including his own supporters, will tell him that he has no right to reduce the accommodation on the Island railway, and that he should not attempt to carry out these new regulations. Even supposing the revenue is not equal to the expenditure, that is no reason why the railway should be closed, and I contend that it will be partially closed by the new regulations. The hon. Minister says there is a line of steamers running between Charlottetown and Summerside. There is no such line running. A boat goes down once a week on Saturday, and there is no regular line between the points named. We have a railway instead of steamer accommodation, but the hon. gentleman proposes to take that railway accommodation from the people. He proposes that the train shall wait all day at Summerside, instead of running to Tignish and back to Summerside in time to meet passengers by the boat from Point du Chêne. There is no reason why the train should not run to Tignish, instead of stopping at Summerside and allowing the train men to walk round the streets enjoying themselves, the people, in the meantime, suffering from want of accommodation. I have been further told that the express between Summerside and Tignish is not to be put on before 1st July. This is a new departure, for we have been in a habit of getting a special train about 1st June. I fail to understand why these new regulations are needed, and the only reason for imposing them appears to be that the people must be punished because they will not send Tory members here. It will be noticed that the county that sends two Tory members has not been meddled with, and the people are to have the same accommodation as before. I do not think they had too much, and I hope they will get more accommodation. I saw in a Prince Edward Island paper, which receives $1,800 a year from the Government for publishing, I dare say nothing, makes no secret of the statement that this action is taken against the Counties of Queen's and Prince because they are not represented in the Dominion Parliament by Conservatives; but King's would not be meddled with because it was ably represented by two Conservative members. It is difficult for a man with any spirit to stand such a charge as that. Is it possible that we have come to this position, that law-abiding

men in Canada must be Conservatives and Tories, or else they cannot get justice? It looks very much like it, and although I tried to persuade myself to the contrary, I am almost convinced it is the case; in fact, I have almost come to the conclusion that, because we are Liberals, we cannot get justice. I hope the Minister, in his cooler moments, and after taking a sound sleep, will come up to the office in the morning convinced that he will not commit an injustice to Prince Edward Island, and that the first order he will give will be that the people of Prince County shall have that railway accommodation to which they are entitled.

Mr. McALISTER. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just taken his seat has made the statement that the County of Queen's, P.E.I., was cut off from railway accommodation because it was represented by members in opposition to the Government. I must say that the changes in the train service and in the railway accommodation have affected my county as much, and perhaps more than any other constituency in the Maritime Provinces through which the Intercolonial Railway passes. Below Campbellton for a distance of 40 or 50 miles all the business of the district is transacted in Dalhousie and in Campbellton, and under the present arrangement a person doing business in these towns would have to leave his home in the evening, and lose that evening, and the next day, and the next night; whereas under the previous arrangement he could leave in the morning, transact his business and return at night. The present system is therefore a great inconvenience. Two freight trains between Moncton and Campbellton have been taken off, and instead of a freight train coming up in the morning and another in the evening, the only trains now coming up are two in the evening: an accommodation, called a mixed train, and a freight train which arrive in Campbellton within an hour or an hour and a half of each other. They arrive so late that any person coming or transacting business in this place has to remain over night, transact his business the next day, and as there is no evening train as heretofore, he has to remain the second night and can only get away the following morning. I am informed, I do not know how true it may be, that only a very small number of the special freights which have been put on would be required if the regular freight trains had been continued. These regular freight trains carried passengers while the special freights do not, and if the regular freights were continued and the others discontinued, they would not only serve the purpose of carrying the freight as well, but they would also afford accommodation to people doing business along the line. The fast express running between St. John and Chaudière, and Halifax and Chaudière affords no local accommodation at all. For a distance of 185 miles between Moncton and Campbellton, the fast express only stops in five or six places, and between Bathurst and Campbellton, a distance of 62 miles, it only stops at two places, which are within 4 or 5 miles of each other. I may say in this connection that the reduction of the train service is very unfair and, I think, unjust to the people of the northern counties of New Brunswick. Unlike the County of Prince, the representative of which has just spoken, we are supporters of the Government, and I regret very much to have to criticise their action in connection with this service. At the same time, knowing the injurious manner in which it affects my constituents, I feel it my duty to get up in the House and disapprove of the arrangements made by the Government in this train service. Now as to the reduction of the number of employés. The town of Campbellton, has, I think, more railway men employed than any other place between Montreal and Quebec, except perhaps Rivière du Loup. I reside in Campbellton, and during the 10 or 11 years I have been there I never saw any man employed on the railway idle when he should be on duty. Every man seemed to me to have as much work as he could do. In fact the complaint was that they could not attend to all the work that fell to them, but had to labour sometimes during extra hours. I think, instead of making such a sweeping reduction at once, it would have been more advisable had the Government made the reduction gradually.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman refer to the proposed dismissal of 210 out of the 4,500 employés?

Mr. McALISTER. The 210 are not dismissed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I just wish to know if the hon. gentleman spoke of that as a sweeping reduction.

Mr. McALISTER. I think it is a sweeping reduction to be made at once. We know very well that railway men leave sometimes of their own accord, and a number are disabled, and a number die, and I think it would have been a better policy if no new employés were engaged to take the places of those who left the service. I think in this way, the reduction could be made and the economy accomplished without dismissing any men at the present time. Railway men as a rule live up to their income; in fact their income is not sufficient to support them and they have hard times to make both ends meet, so that when they are dimissed on short notice they have nothing to fall back upon. Most of them are men of large families, and perhaps are not capable of doing other work, and when they have to seek employment elsewhere, it entails great hardship on them and their families. I therefore believe it would be a great deal better if the dismissals had not been made as they are. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) stated that hundreds of men were employed on the Intercolonial Railway who were not required. I do not think that is the case. So far as I know, I believe every man employed there was required, and I am informed now by railway men who seem to understand their business that the number of employés retained after the dismissals will not be sufficient for the work to be done on that road, and that in a very short time it will be found that other men will have to be employed in their places. I would suggest to the Minister that the two fast freight trains which formerly ran between Moncton and Campbellton, and the trains between Campbellton and Rivière du Loup, be placed on again, and that the special freights which take no passengers be discontinued or their number reduced so far as possible. I may give an instance of the inconvenience experienced under the present train arrangement, where a doctor was called on to go a distance of 20 miles from home. A special train was going out at the time he was

called, but he was unable to get on it and had to drive the 20 miles. Just as he got there the patient was dead, and I am told that the chances were that had he gone on a train which would bring him in 20 or 30 minutes he could have saved the life of the patient. That may not be, but that was his opinion, and I think, therefore, that doctors and clergymen should be allowed to travel on these special freights. The people in the northern counties of New Brunswick have less railway accommodation than have the people in any other part of the Dominion. In most places where trains are running two or three times a day, persons can go backwards and forwards during the day, but in Campbellton and in the County of Restigouche under the present arrangement they can only travel, I may say, once a day. If they go by the express which stops at Campbellton and runs each way once a day, and if they want to go a distance of 40 miles, they have to go to Bathurst and come by another train. If they come from Bathurst to Jacquet River, which is a distance of 20 miles, they have to go to Campbellton, because this express train will not let them off at their regular station. I think the present arrangement is very inconvenient, and I would ask the Minister of Railways to reconsider the matter with a view to having the train service restored to what it was before this reduction was made.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) gave a great many interesting statistics which I thought would have called for some comment if not reply from the hon. Minister of Railways, and I think the item should not be passed until he has addressed the committee on the points raised.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that the statement I gave in reference to printing I have verified since, and I find that my figures in reference to the cost of stationery and printing of the Grand Trunk Railway were strictly accurate. This is my authority for the statement:

"MONTREAL, 9th May, 1892.

"COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER, Esq., Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to your telegram received to-day, it is not customary to make a division of expenses into stationery, advertising, and printing respectively; but I have a statement for the whole year from which I quote for your information as desired: stationery and printing, $127,817.47; advertising, $18,438.57; total, $146,256.04. This will be found to compare accurately with the printed reports for the two half-years, allowing for the fact that some items are included under expenses of agencies, &c., &c.

"Yours truly,

"L. G. SEARGEANT,

"*General Manager*."

In reply to the statement of the hon. gentleman in reference to the cost per mile of running trains on the Intercolonial Railway, I may be permitted, though it will take a little time, to give some statements in reference to the earnings and working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway as compared with other railways in Canada. I have a statement from 1876-77 down to 1890-91 which it may not, perhaps, sufficiently interest the House for me to read in full, as the details may be found printed in the Public Accounts. The total loss is $4,120,550.99. The profit during the same period was $29,763.83, making a net loss of $4,090,787.16. I will give a statement of the earnings and working expenses per mile of the railway for the year 1890-91. We had 1,094 miles of railway in operation; the earnings per mile were $2,721.55; the working expenses per mile were $3,576.50, a loss per mile of $855.05. Now, the proper test of the economic running of a railway is the expenditure per train mile. In 1890-91 the earnings per train mile were 59·21 cents, and the working expenses 72·84 cents, or a loss of 13·63 cents per train mile.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman give the committee the earnings per train mile on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway?

Mr. HAGGART. I will give a comparison with a dozen railways on the continent. The earnings of the Intercolonial Railway from passengers, freight and mails in 1890-91 were as follows:—

Passengers	$ 962,316 88
Freight	1,854,629 88
Mails	160,448 62
Total	$ 2,977,395 38

The expenses for locomotive power, car expenses, station expenses and general expenses, maintenance and car mileage for 1891 were as follows;—

Locomotive power	$1,281,800 32
Car expenses	808,212 35
Station expenses	396,320 22
General charges	197,006 56
Maintenance of way and works	955,293 68

Engine mileage	6,080,791 miles.
Train mileage	5,027,791 "
Car mileage	56,492,801 "

What the hon. gentleman wants is a comparison between the cost per mile of the running of trains on the Intercolonial Railway with the cost on the other railways in Canada of over 100 miles in length. I will give a table showing the cost of operation and maintenance of the various railways in Canada for the year ending the 30th of June, 1891:—

—	Mileage.	Train mileage.	Working expenses.	Cost per ton per mile.
			$	cts.
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.	174	284,265	242,692	85·37
Canada Atlantic	138	428,816	337,753	78·76
Canada Eastern	127	169,603	64,396	37·96
Canada Southern	379	3,254,270	3,178,036	97·65
Intercolonial	1094	5,027,791	3,662,341	72·84
Prince Edward Island Ry.	210	265,666	257,990	97·11
Canadian Pacific Railway	5537	13,754,014	11,538,133	83·89
Central Ontario	104	110,000	91,588	83·26
Grand Trunk Railway	3143	16,482,207	12,621,478	76·57

Then there is the Manitoba and South-Western, run at a cost of $1.40 per train mile; then there is the Northern Pacific, 86 cents per train mile; the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake, 77 cents per train mile; the Quebec and Lake St. John, 72 cents per train mile, the same as the Intercolonial Railway; the Quebec Central, 67 cents; the South-Eastern, 91 cents; and the Windsor and Annapolis, 93 cents per train mile. I will give a table of the earnings per train mile for the year ending 30th of June, 1891, which will show how very cheaply we carry material over the Intercolonial Railway. The Alberta Coal Company, with 174 miles of road in operation, and a train mileage of 284,265, earns

$290,115, showing earnings per train mile of $1.02; the Canada Atlantic, 138 miles of road, in operation, train mileage 428,816, earnings $558,-831, or $1.30. I need not give the mileage, as I have already given it, but will just give the names of the roads and their earnings and the amount per train mile. The Canada Southern earns $4,408,964, or $1.35 per train mile; the Intercolonial Railway, 1,094 miles, $2,977,395, and the earnings per train mile only 59 cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You stated the expenses at 72 cents.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, a loss on every train mile of 13 cents. The Prince Edward Island, 210 miles, total amount earned $174,258 at the end of June, dian Pacific Railway, 5,537 miles, earnings $18,-1891, which gives 65 cents per train mile; the Cana-672,174, or $1.35 per train mile; the Central Ontario, 104 miles, earnings $87,925, giving 80 cents. per train mile; the Grand Trunk Railway, 3,143 miles, earnings $17,423,860, earnings per train mile $1.05; the Kingston and Pembroke, 76 cents per train mile; the Manitoba and South-Western, $1.62 per train mile; the North Pacific and Manitoba, $1.03 per train mile; the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake, 73 cents per train mile; the Quebec and Lake St. John, 74 cents per train mile; the Quebec Central, 96 cents per train mile; the South Eastern, $1 per train mile; the Windsor and Annapolis, $1.41.

Mr. BORDEN. I did not catch the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. Mileage, 5,537, train miles run 13,754,014, earnings $18,672,174, earnings per train mile $1.35. Then I have a table showing the total tonnage of coal carried and the total tonnage of ocean-borne freight *viâ* Halifax, and the amount of grain received at Halifax for export in each of the following years:—From 1876 to 1881-82 there was nothing. In 1882 there was 31,000 bushels; in 1883, 73,000 bushels; in 1884, 300,000 bushels; in 1885, 389,000; in 1886, 575,000; in 1887, 69,000; in 1888, 129,000; in 1889, 502,000; in 1890-91, 218,000. This year I believe the amount will exceed 1,000,000 bushels—in fact about 1,300,000 bushels. Then there is the quantity of raw and refined sugar carried.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the quantity increases very much, it will kill you outright.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, the more we carry the worse off we are in most of these articles. There is a statement here of the quantity of fresh and salt fish carried, and the earnings and working expenses for the eight months ending 29th February, 1892. Amount of mileage in operation, 1,145; earnings, $1,947,211.17; working expenses, $2,613,265.50; and the loss on the eight months is $666,054.33 up to the 1st of March. From the 1st of March up to the present, I think the loss will be nothing.

Mr. GIBSON. Upon what class of freight do they make the greatest loss? I see the loss is 13·63 per ton per mile.

Mr. HAGGART. The greatest loss has been on the carrying of coal, the carrying of stone, and the carrying of wheat.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. Minister of Railways in his statement has told us, and has now repeated in reply to the hon. gentleman who just put the question across the House, that one of the causes of the deficit in the management of the Intercolonial Railway, which, of course, we all regret, is that we are carrying certain products of the country at exceptionally low rates, and he instanced the rates charged on coal, flour and grain. We know that coal is carried over the Intercolonial Railway at the rate of $\frac{3}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile. If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to look at the report of the Department of Railways, they will find that in the years 1889 and 1890 we have carried 294,879 tons of coal. That is all the coal which has been carried west of Chaudière over the Intercolonial Railway in those years. The value of that I estimate to be about $589,758.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman take in the two years?

Mr. KENNY. I do, 1889 and 1890. During these two years the Intercolonial Railway has carried 2,129,169 barrels of flour, and 5,501,123 bushels of grain. Of course all that traffic came from west of Chaudière. The weight of that flour in tons would be 212,916 tons, and the weight of the grain would be 137,528 tons, or a gross weight of flour and grain amounting to 350,444 tons. Therefore, if there has been a loss in the transportation of these articles at an exceptionally low rate, it is due more to the fact that we are carrying flour and grain than to the fact that we have carried coal, because we have carried a great deal more flour and grain than we have coal. Then, look at the value of the articles that have been so carried. The coal, as I have already said, is worth about $589,758. The flour would amount in value to $9,581,260. The 5,000,000 bushels of grain I estimate to be worth $2,-750,561, making a total value of flour and grain of $12,331,821. Now, I desire to show the committee and certain hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are very fond of saying here and elsewhere that this great tax of the Intercolonial Railway is borne by the people of Canada solely in the interest of the Maritime Provinces. It is thus evident that the quantity of flour and grain which the Intercolonial Railway carries at exceptionally low rates—as low, if not lower, than the coal is carried—is immensely in excess in value over the coal which is carried west of Chaudière. The value of the coal does not amount to $600,000, whereas the flour and grain is valued at more than $12,-000,000.

Mr. MULOCK. Where do the flour and grain go?

Mr. KENNY. No doubt much of it is shipped out of the country, and a large portion is consumed in the Maritime Provinces. The hon. member must know that nearly every barrel of flour that is consumed by the people of the Maritime Provinces comes from Ontario, and we are glad to know that we can buy it cheaper and of as good quality from Ontario than we can get it from the United States. Our desire should be to encourage as much as possible this interprovincial traffic. I am not finding any fault with the rates at which these western productions are carried. I think it is in the interest of Canada that we should preserve this traffic for our own railways and our own means of transportation, because there is a possibility that, if we do not do so, the traffic would be carried over American railroads and by steamers at as low a rate.

Mr. MULOCK. What would be the effect on the price of flour to the consumers in the Maritime Provinces, if there was a slight increase in the freight charges from the west to the east and from the east to the west?

Mr. KENNY. I think the hon. gentleman must have been in the House some years ago when this question was discussed before, and when it was pointed out that this all-rail rate on flour is a competitive rate, and that, if it was not transported by the Intercolonial Railway, or the Grand Trunk Railway, or the Canadian Pacific Railway, the flour would be carried by American railways to Boston or Portland, and would thence be transhipped by water at as low a through rate as is now charged over the Intercolonial Railway. But my contention is that it is better for Canadian labour that we should endeavour to keep this transportation within our own country. I have further to say that, if we could obtain positive information from the Intercolonial Railway returns, as to the quantity and the value of manufactured articles which are carried from points west of Chaudière to and from the Maritime Provinces, we would see that for every $100 in value of the produce or export of the Maritime Provinces that go west of Chaudière, we receive at least $1,000 from the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, showing that the Intercolonial is more beneficial to the manufacturers and millers of Ontario and Quebec than to the people of the Maritime Provinces. In regard to the quantity also, I am sure that, if we had an exact statement of the quantity of freight from the Maritime Provinces carried west of Chaudière, and the quantity carried from the part of the country west of the Chaudière to the Maritime Provinces, it would be shown that the amount carried from the west to the east exceeded very largely in quantity as well as in value the amount carried in the opposite direction. I am not inclined to find fault with this condition of things, nor, I believe, are the other hon. gentlemen who represent the Maritime Provinces. I make this statement in contradiction to the assertion very boldly made, that the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway is incurred solely for the benefit of the people of the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) referred to the fact that Canada has spent on this Intercolonial Railway something like $53,000,000. Well, the hon. gentleman might have told us, too, that Canada has spent $55,000,000 in constructing canals, not one mile of which is in the Maritime Provinces. I am proud to say here, as a member of this House, and as a Canadian, that I have never heard in this House or on the public platform in the Maritime Provinces, a representative or a public man find fault with that expenditure. Very recently we devoted a whole evening to the consideration of canal matters, and estimates were passed involving the expenditure of a very large amount of public money, and it was voted without complaint from the members of the Maritime Provinces, because we recognize that in the development of this new country of ours, it is necessary, it is wise and expedient, that we should encourage the development and improvement of the watercourses. I say that hon. gentlemen from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec should treat this Intercolonial Railway expenditure in the same way as the people of the Maritime Provinces deal with the expenditure upon canals. I share the general sentiment that every reasonable and proper effort should be made to the reduction of this deficit. The hon. Minister of Railways in the course of his remarks, has given us certain reasons which he thinks explain the cause of this deficit. Of course, he is entirely guided by his officers, because the hon. gentleman, since he has assumed the duties of administering the Department of Railways, has not had an opportunity of visiting the Intercolonial Railway, and, therefore, he does not speak of his own personal knowledge; but he has given certain reasons as the causes of the deficit. I will take the liberty to point out to him that there may be another reason to which, if I followed him correctly, he has not made reference, and that is the position of the Intercolonial Railway between the Atlantic on the one side, and the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway on the other side. A very small amount of the through freight which the Intercolonial Railway carries, initiates in the Maritime Provinces. The larger quantity of the through freight is from west to east, and the contract initiates with the Canadian Pacific Railway or with the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Intercolonial Railway is obliged to take such rates as these railways may in their wisdom think desirable, and very often it is a low one, it is a competitive rate. The Intercolonial Railway is allowed a mileage rate, but if the Intercolonial Railway should consider that it was in its interest to make a contract for certain freights from east to west at low rates, I am given to understand that these railways, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, refuse to carry it at a mileage rate. Therefore, the Intercolonial Railway, with the Atlantic on one side and these railways on the other, is literally between two devils and the deep sea. I think that another cause of the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway is due to this fact, that before we had an Intercolonial Railway, before we had even the Short Line, emasculated as it is, before we had any railway connection between the Provinces of Ontario or Quebec and the Maritime Provinces—I mean before Confederation—the old provinces of Canada had an arrangement for the transportation of their mail service during the winter months by way of the foreign port of Portland, and that still continues. The transatlantic steamship companies which have subsidies from the Canadian Government during the winter months carry their cargoes to the foreign port of Portland, to the immense advantage, of course, of that port, but to the detriment of our own Canadian seaports, and to the detriment of the Intercolonial Railway, which would otherwise have the transportation of this European freight if our own winter port were utilized. It would really seem as if this Parliament imagined that Canada had no outlet to the sea except the St. Lawrence, and I think that the sooner we wake up to the fact that we have, in the Maritime Provinces, ports which are open all the year round, and which have railway connection with the rest of Canada, the better it will be for the country, for the extension of our national sentiment, and for the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. Minister of Railways in giving us his programme of proposed changes, told us that the deficit of last year amounted to something like $680,000. I am told—I have not had time to

examine the matter myself—that the deficit on our canals last year amounts to something like $300,000. I am not here to find any fault with the expenditure on our canals. I assume that the administration of that department has been economical and that the people of Canada have derived great benefit from the canals. We know that we have had our merchandize transported at low rates through our canals; but we must remember that we have had a deficit on our canals as well as on our Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman contemplates the reduction of 5 per cent of the number of the employés on that road. I am not a railway man, and I have no knowledge of railway matters, but in all that pertains to the Intercolonial Railway, as it is the iron bond of union between the provinces, I have always taken an interest. It would, perhaps, be unbecoming in me, as I am not an expert in railway matters, to express any positive view, but I have held the opinion, it is my belief, that the mechanical department of the Intercolonial Railway is not efficiently administered. As regards the road itself, there is not a better road on the continent of America, and I must say that there is no extravagance in the salaries which are paid the clerical staff. I do not think there is a railway in America that pays as small salaries to its employés, or that has any more loyal servants. As far as my knowledge goes, the traffic department and the freight department of the Intercolonial Railway are economically administered. If I am not misinformed, if there is any extravagance it has been largely in the mechanical department, and it would seem to me that instead of abruptly dismissing a number of mechanics, some of whom have been, perhaps, a long time employed on the railway, it would be better for the Minister to wait until he has had an opportunity of personally examining the matter himself and satisfying himself that those in charge of the mechanical department are administering it efficiently. As regards the reduction in the train service, I understood the Minister to say that he would take care that the efficiency of the road was preserved. I hope he will be able to accomplish the difficult task of retaining the efficiency of the road and reducing the train service. I have referred in previous Parliaments to the amount which still stands in the Estimates for improving the facilities at Halifax. The hon. Minister must allow me to point out to him that I think he is mistaken when he says that three propositions in connection with this matter have been suggested by any person resident in Halifax. I have only heard of two, the first being that which is known as the Cornwallis street extension: and the second was the suggestion of carrying the railway track along the water frontage. This question of the inadequacy of the railway facilities at Halifax has been before Parliament since 1887, five years, and it is quite time that the department was in possession of sufficient evidence which would warrant it in coming to some conclusion on this matter. I had several interviews with the late lamented Mr. Pope, when he was Minister of Railways in 1887, on this subject. He recognized then the necessity for more space and greater storage accommodation being provided at Halifax; this necessity was recognized at that date by his officers, and it has been recorded in the report of this year. The Hon. Mr. Pope knowing there were two rival proposals before him as to the best manner in which this accommodation could be provided. Both these proposals came from Halifax and both having merits of their own, Mr. Pope decided that he would ask Parliament for a vote of $150,000, but he would not undertake any expenditure until he had had an opportunity of investigating the matter. This subject has been referred to in this House every year since and has been revoted each year. In 1890, when the late Sir John Macdonald was administering the Department of Railways, he made a very positive statement that either of the plans, either the extension of the tracks along the wharves, or the acquisition of the Cornwallis street property would be adopted; and last year—I was not in the House when the matter was debated,—the Acting Minister of Railways, the present Minister of Militia, stated very emphatically that he intended this vote for the acquisition of the property between North street and Cornwallis street.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When was the statement made?

Mr. KENNY. On referring to the *Hansard*, the hon. gentleman will find that it was made last year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No. The Acting Minister said he had not made up his mind one way or the other.

Mr. KENNY. I have not the *Hansard* by me.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I refreshed my memory with the report.

Mr. KENNY. I think the hon. gentleman will find he is in error. If he will look at the explanation given by the Acting Minister when the vote was passed, he will find that my statement is correct; and not only so, but that the Acting Minister actually stated to the House that the expenditure would amount to $620,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If carried out.

Mr. KENNY. I think he said that he wanted the money for the Cornwallis street extension, and if the Minister so stated, I presume he meant to carry it out. I find the Acting Minister said:

"It is proposed to procure a block of land, bounded on the north by North street, and on the east by Water street, on the south by Cornwallis street and on the west by Lockman street. This block of land is about 2,500 by 330 feet. I may state that the assessed value of this property is about $450,000, much higher that the sum we are taking at present. The tracks and buildings are estimated to cost about $175,000, making a total cost, with the land, if it is all purchased, of about $625,000. Of the sum now being voted, about $2,000 is intended to provide additional machinery in the shops at Halifax. The accommodation in the city is too small for the business done there, and it is deemed not only advisable, but absolutely necessary to procure more land."

The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is correct that later on in the debate the Acting Minister of Railways referred to the fact that there were two schemes or suggestions which had been placed before his notice.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman allow me to mention, in order to justify my interference, that the Acting Minister of Railways further went on to say:

"The Government is in no way pledged to either the one scheme or the other."

This shows that no arrangement was arrived at.

Mr. KENNY. At the same time I was warranted in stating that the Acting Minister said that

the amount placed in the Estimates was to provide increased freight accommodation.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and of the committee to the agreement which, as I understand, was entered into between the Dominion Government and the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, and which agreement provides and stipulates that the Dominion Government was to give to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway the same facilities for the distribution of its freight as the Intercolonial Railway enjoyed. To the great injustice of the people of western Nova Scotia and of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, and to the great injustice and inconvenience of the citizens of Halifax also, that agreement has never been carried out by the Dominion Government, and, Sir, I fear it never can be and never will be carried into effect until the Government secures increased terminal facilities at the city of Halifax. This is one reason which I give, and which I have advanced before in this House, to urge on the Department of Railways to speedily complete their terminal facilities at Halifax. There is the further reason that, at present, the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company is connected with the Western Counties, and we have now through railway communication from the extreme western point of Nova Scotia to the city of Halifax. I may say, Sir, that as regards these terminal facilities at Halifax and the arrangements which should be entered into, when the late Minister of Railways appealed to me in the House, I expressed the opinion that it would be in the interests of the railway that the department should secure and obtain the best possible expert opinion upon the matter. I have no views of my own to advance on this question. I realize that it is a matter which must be considered from the standpoint of the Intercolonial Railway, and I am satisfied that what is best for that railway will be best for the city of Halifax. I am cautious in expressing my opinion, because I realize that a great mistake had been made by the late Government as regards the Intercolonial Railway terminus in Halifax. The present station there was built by the Mackenzie Government. It is entirely inadequate to the trade of the place; the selection of the site was a very unfortunate one, and it would seem to me to have been constructed by hon. gentlemen who thought that the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway and the trade of Halifax could never possibly increase. I referred to the volume of the trade on the Intercolonial Railway before recess, but I desire again to call attention to the fact that a large amount of interprovincial trade has been developed by the Intercolonial Railway, as a glance at the Railway Report will show. If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to examine the last annual report of the Department of Railways they will find that in the years 1879-1880 these returns stated that the tons of freight per mile which were carried over the Intercolonial Railway were 677, and that ten years later, 1889 to 1890, the quantity had more than doubled, and in the latter years 1,409 tons were carried. The passenger traffic shows a like increase. From 1879 to 1880, the number of passengers per mile was 700, and from 1889 to 1890 the number of passengers per mile was 1,255, showing conclusively that the Intercolonial Railway has to a large extent fulfilled its mission in developing an interprovincial trade, and in binding these scattered provinces of Canada more closely together. In dealing with these Intercolonial Railway matters I am sometimes surprised at the wild and reckless statements which hon. gentlemen opposite often make, and I observe from *Hansard*, that when this matter was under discussion a few evenings ago, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stated that the advertising and printing expenses on the Intercolonial Railway were eight or ten times as much as those of the Grand Trunk.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Per mile.

Mr. KENNY. In proportion per mile, but I do not know that the *Hansard* states, "per mile." Perhaps that is what the hon. gentleman meant, but I think that is not what he said. As *Hansard* reads, he stated positively that the expenditure was eight or ten times as much as that of any of the other railways of Canada. Now, Sir, if I correctly understood the Minister of Railways this afternoon the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was entirely mistaken, but I will not pass judgment upon the hon. gentleman, and no doubt before the debate closes he will have an opportunity of verifying his statement. As it appears to me now he is labouring under a mistake. With reference to the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway I believe, and I am informed, that within the last few years the Government of Canada has spent a large amount in purchasing steel rails, and that that large sum has been charged to the operating expenses of the road which would to some extent account for this deficiency. The hon. Minister of Railways will be able to correct me if I am mistaken in these figures. During the debate reference was made to the deficit on the Prince Edward Island Railway, but we must not forget that it was part of our agreement when Prince Edward Island joined the Dominion of Canada, that we should operate that railway with all due economy and efficiency. We must not forget, of course, that the people of Prince Edward Island have had to pay their share for the canal system and the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway out of which they can derive no immediate benefit, and that they have contributed that cheerfully, so that it falls with bad grace from gentlemen in this House to assail Prince Edward Island for the deficiency which may arise on the railway in that province. I will take the liberty of making a suggestion to the Minister of Railways, on the management of the Intercolonial Railway. Hitherto the Intercolonial Railway has been managed from Ottawa, and if a freight agent or a passenger agent at distant points like Halifax or St. John, N.B., nearly a thousand miles from the capital, had an opportunity of making any special arrangement for freight or for passengers he could not do so until he had communicated

first with Moncton, and then the officer in charge of the department at Moncton had to communicate with Ottawa. Hon. members in this House, many of whom are practical business men, will recognize that in these days of keen competition such a system cannot be conducted satisfactorily or successfully; and I would respectfully suggest to the Minister of Railways that the business management of the Intercolonial Railway should be placed in the hands of competent officers at Moncton, which is the centre of the Intercolonial Railway system. At all events, it is worth while making the experiment, for we must all admit that hitherto the management of the Intercolonial Railway has not been a success. I am afraid, as regards economy, that very much cannot be accomplished by dismissing a few mechanics at different points scattered over the railway. The hon. Minister has announced his intention of reducing the staff by about 200, largely, I understand, from the mechanical department. I think it would be in the interest of the railway—and I know that the hon. Minister is very anxious to make his department a success—that he should personally examine into the administration of the mechanical branch of the Intercolonial Railway. If he does, I think he will discover that perhaps that department requires remodelling; in that department a little more energy and ability thrown into it will result advantageously to the railway; and that if that is done, perhaps it might not be necessary for him to dismiss so many mechanics, who are working industriously for a dollar and a half or two dollars as he now thinks it necessary to do. I realize the difficulties which surround the administration of a railway the head office of which is at such a distance as the Department of Railways is from the Intercolonial Railway; but I do believe that the Intercolonial has to a very great extent fulfilled the mission for which it was built, of binding the provinces of Canada together and of developing our interprovincial trade.

Mr. BORDEN. I agree with some of the things which the hon. gentleman has said, and I am compelled to disagree with some others. He has referred to the fact that the Intercolonial Railway was constructed with a view of binding together the various provinces of this Dominion, and not for commercial purposes; and he has reminded our friends from Ontario on this side of the House—and I think he might with equal force have reminded his friends from Ontario on that side—that while the Intercolonial Railway has cost between forty and fifty millions of money, the canal system of this country has cost more. At the same time, I do not agree that we should place one work against the other, and justify on that account an extravagant or improvident or reckless management of the Intercolonial Railway. I do not think that the people of the Maritime Provinces will thank my hon. friend for presenting an argument of that kind to this House. The canal system must stand upon its own merits and be criticised on its own merits; and the management of the Intercolonial Railway must stand on its merits or demerits and be criticised by itself. I do not approve of the policy of setting off one of these great public works against the other except this far, that our friends from Ontario must recognize the fact that it was not expected when this road was constructed that it would be a profitable enterprise, and it was built to some extent at the suggestion of the mother country and in order to fulfil the agreement entered into between the provinces at the time of Confederation. Now, while I do not think that at the present time it would be possible to manage the Intercolonial Railway in such a way as to show a profit from its operation, I do believe, having given some careful study to the subject, that the annual deficit from the working of that road could be very largely reduced, and possibly within a few years made to disappear altogether. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has referred to some difficulties which stand in the way of the success of the Intercolonial as a commercial undertaking. He pointed to the fact that on one side of it we have the Atlantic as a rival, with the shipping along the St. Lawrence, and on the other side a great rival in the Canadian Pacific Railway; and he used the illustration, more or less fortunate perhaps, that the Intercolonial was between the devil and the deep sea. He indicated the deep sea, which is the Atlantic, and there can be no doubt as to whom he intended to designate as the devil. Now, I must remind my hon. friend that he is one of those who has had a hand in calling up this evil spirit which is interfering with the success of our railway. I must remind him that the Government which he supports so loyally was the Government which insisted on subsidizing to the extent of millions of the money of this country, a line of railway through a foreign country which was to cut the throat of our own Intercolonial Railway system. He has referred to the fact that a great deal of the freight passing from this country, which should go over our own railway and be shipped at Halifax, now goes to Portland, which he said was a great detriment to Halifax. But I must point out to my hon. friend that the only portion of the system proposed as the short line between Montreal and Halifax which would have been of any special advantage to Halifax, was just the portion which has not been built, namely, that portion through New Brunswick meeting the Intercolonial at or near Moncton—a piece of road which if built would have brought to the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton or Salisbury a large amount of profitable traffic. It seemed as if at one time my hon. friend was going to approach that great and interesting topic known as the winter port and fast line question, which has been discussed so many times in Halifax. I do not propose to introduce it here further than to remind the hon. gentleman that before he can expect to make Halifax what it was promised it should be before the Short Line was constructed, we must have a railway by the shortest possible distance between Montreal and Halifax, and have from Halifax a line of steamers sailing between Nova Scotia and Great Britain. Now, my hon. friend referred to the fact that it had been charged against the management of the Intercolonial Railway that a great deal of money was lost in carrying coal below cost from Nova Scotia to Montreal, and he said, while that might be true, on the other hand—and I agree with him in this—there was a large amount of freight coming from the upper provinces over the railway, such as flour and grain, and if the coal were being carried at a loss, so was the flour and grain, so that if it were an advantage to certain portions of the Maritime Provinces to have the coal

carried below cost, it was equally of advantage to the Province of Ontario and the west to have these large quantities of flour and grain carried at a loss. I do not, however, believe it is any real advantage to the Maritime Provinces or to Ontario either to have coal and flour carried at a loss. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. member for Halifax knows it as well as I, that a very large portion of the flour which comes from the Maritime Provinces comes by Boston now, and I cannot see what advantage it is to this country in any respect to have flour carried over the railway, if the people have to put their hands into their pockets and subscribe towards carrying it, when it can be carried over other roads just as cheaply or cheaper. The hon. gentleman said this was far better for Canada. I point out to the hon. gentleman that when flour goes by way of Boston, our own schooners are always either at Boston or ready to go there to bring that flour to the different parts of the Maritime Provinces; and I would point out to him that this gives profitable employment to shipping and the large number of men engaged in that industry. It seems to me that there is no good reason why the people of Canada should pay taxes to enable the Government to carry flour over the Intercolonial Railway below cost. In the same way with reference to grain, what possible advantage can it be to have grain carried over this railway below cost? The hon. gentleman has referred to the management of this railway. I listened in vain to hear from the Minister of Railways what the future policy of the Government was going to be in this matter. The only indication he gave us of any policy was that he intended to dismiss some two hundred officials. I do not understand what his policy is to be with reference to rates of freight, whether he intends to increase the freight rate or diminish it. I did not understand him to give us any information as to what saving he expected to effect by the removal of these two hundred officials, and it seems to me this House should be placed in possession of the intentions of the Government and its policy with reference to the management of this railway in the future. The hon. member for Halifax referred also to the proposed expenditure at Halifax for the purpose of increasing terminal facilities there; and in connection with that he referred to the difficulties under which the western part of Nova Scotia laboured in getting its freight into Halifax and the difficulty under which the Halifax merchants find themselves with reference to shipping freight from Halifax to the west, and to the fact that the Intercolonial Railway authorities had failed to keep the agreement, solemnly entered into some twenty years ago between the Government and the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, to give that railway the same facilities at Halifax as the Intercolonial Railway itself has. In that agreement the word "extension" was particularly referred to, and that agreement was entered into before the extension was made, under Mr. Mackenzie, from Richmond into the present station. An extension has been made to the wharves since then; and I have contended many times in this House that the Government should give to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway that which they had undertaken to give them. But the hon. member for Halifax says that the agreement never can be kept until these increased facilities are given. Well, if that be true, certainly there is additional argument in favour of giving these increased facilities to Halifax. But it seems to me that there could be no difficulty now in the way of giving this increased accommodation. This is what happens: A car load of freight coming in from the eastern part of Nova Scotia over the Intercolonial Railway is allowed to go in over this extension of the railway to the wharves for a charge of $1 a car load, whereas a car load of freight going in from the western part of Nova Scotia is charged $2.50. That may not be the case at this moment, but it was the case for many years. Well, I have always contended that if accommodation could be furnished at $2.50, I could not see why it should not be furnished at $1 to freight from the western as well as from the eastern. It is clear if they could admit a car over the extension at $2.50, they could equally well do it at $1. My hon. friend could not sit down without finding some fault with the administration of the late Mr. Mackenzie. He said that Government was to blame for the inadequate accommodation which now existed at the station at Halifax. Well, if they are to blame for the inadequate accommodation there, they deserve credit for at least what accommodation is there, because before that time, as the hon. gentleman knows, the terminus was at Richmond, out of sight altogether, and the accommodations there were wretched, simply disgraceful. I believe the Government of Mr. Mackenzie made every effort in their power at that time to extend the road far into the city; and finding it impossible to do so, they did the next best thing and fixed the terminus where it is at present. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that this railway has built up interprovincial trade. Well, surely we would expect some increase in trade, as a result, among these provinces, when, as everybody admits, and as the deficit shows, freight has been carried at an enormous loss. But I would point out to the hon. gentleman the fact that in the last annual report of the Department of Railways, the statement is made that the coal traffic over the Intercolonial Railway does not tend to expansion, there having been a decrease of about 20,000 tons each year since 1887, when the maximum quantity carried was 192,000 tons. I further call attention to the fact that there has been a decrease in the quantity of flour carried during the past year and a decrease in the quantity of lumber carried, and this report points out that in five years there has been a gradual decrease in the quantity of coal carried over the railway, so that, if interprovincial trade was stimulated for a time, the tide seems to have turned, and in many respects there must be less interprovincial trade than there was five years ago. The hon. gentleman referred to the increase in the passenger traffic. I would like to call the attention of the House to this passenger traffic. The total number of passengers carried last year over the railway was about one and a quarter millions. The gross earnings of the road last year amounted to about $3,000,000. I find that the earnings from the passenger traffic would represent about 33 per cent of the total earnings, say $900,000, which would give an average received for each passenger of 75 cents per head. Now, when you come to consider that we have 1,100 or 1,200 miles of railways, that the distance from Point Lévis to Halifax is 670 miles, and from Halifax to St. John nearly 300

miles, and that the charge from Point Lévis to Halifax is about $14, and from Halifax to St. John about $6, and the average amount paid by passengers is only 75 cents, it does not look as if many of them took the through trip. It simply goes to show that these passengers travel short distances of ten or fifteen or twenty miles within their own provinces. The hon. gentleman's statement that the passenger traffic has enormously increased is not borne out as to passengers from the western to the eastern part of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman referred to the expenses of printing, and he talks about the expense per mile. I have not made it up in that way.

Mr. KENNY. I did not institute any comparison as to the expense per mile, but I referred to the statements of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) who said that the expenditure for printing on the Intercolonial Railway was eight or ten times greater than on any other railway in Canada.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) made a statement to-day in reference to the cost of printing, to which the Minister of Railways took exception, though not very positively.

Mr. HAGGART. Very positively.

Mr. BORDEN. I will show how that statement was made up. On the 6th of April the Minister of Railways stated to this House that the amount of stationery used by the Intercolonial Railway during the last year ending the 30th June, 1891, amounted to $57,855.45. I find by consulting the Auditor General's Report that there was $3,590.57 of stationery used here at the head office.

Mr. BOWELL. Was that exclusively for the railway?

Mr. BORDEN. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. Railways and canals.

Mr. BORDEN. I thought it was railways because I found it in the index. Then I find the amount of $17,756.16 for advertising, and $47,327.38 for printing and lithographing, making a total of $124,029.

Mr. HAGGART. That statement includes the printing and lithographing, amounting to $45,427. The amount of stationery furnished to the Intercolonial Railway, according to a statement which I got from the Auditor General himself, when I sent an officer of my department over to him, is betweeen $5,000 and $6,000.

Mr. BORDEN. What I want to get at is, what the item mentioned by the Minister on the 6th April referred to. Does it include the amounts mentioned by the hon. gentleman in his answer?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, if you add these together and the $5,000 besides, you will find exactly what the amount is.

Mr. BORDEN. It seems, in looking over the report and listening to the statement of the Minister of Railways that, as this railway has increased its mileage, the loss of operating it has increased; that as its mileage increases the quantity of freight carried over the road decreases and the cost of working the road increases. I desire to point out to the committee one portion of this Intercolonial Railway system which pays. I am sure it will be a relief to hon. members to be told of one section of the Intercolonial Railway which shows a profit. That portion is known as the Windsor Branch, and it is the only portion of the Intercolonial Railway which is operated by a company. That portion is about 32 miles in length, and is operated by the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company under a lease of twenty-one years which is nearly terminated, and that branch last year showed a profit of $1,303.42, and this, mark you, after having made an expenditure in renewals of four miles of rail. In the last report of the Minister we find this:

"The way and works have been well maintained, a considerable sum having been expended in renewing 4 miles of rails (the new rails being 56-pound steel and the old ones iron rails of the same weight), and the replacing of seven spans of a wooden bridge over the Jordan River by seven spans of steel. The road is in efficient running condition."

Now, all these expenditures, the renewals of rails and the new steel bridge, are charged to current expenses, and notwithstanding that, this branch shows a profit of $1,300, which, if it had not been necessary to provide for these expenditures, would no doubt, have amounted to at least $10,000. In connection with that, I desire to refer to a statement made by the Minister of Railways this afternoon showing the earning power and cost per train mile of operating different railways throughout the country. The Intercolonial Railway, in this table that the hon. gentleman gave the House, shows a loss of a little over 13¼ cents per train mile, whereas the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, a road which is operating the Windsor branch to which I have referred as showing a profit, shows a profit per train mile of nearly 50 cents. Now, I contend that so far as a large portion of the Intercolonial Railway is concerned, that portion between the city of St. John and the city of Halifax, and probably that portion extending to Pictou, and perhaps including the Eastern Extension, it ought to pay just as well as the Windsor and Annapolis Railway. I have not the number of miles of that portion of the railway, but it is something like one-half the total mileage of the Intercolonial Railway. That portion of the Intercolonial Railway between Halifax and St. John, and Halifax and Pictou, including the Eastern Extension, should pay as well as the Windsor and Annapolis system in the west, which is paying $1.41¾ per train mile, and as the cost of operating is 93 cents, there is a profit of 50 cents. Now, if that is the case, I think it should be an indication to the Government that there is something radically wrong in the management of this Intercolonial Railway. If, in the western part of Nova Scotia, a road of a hundred miles in length can be operated at an enormous profit (according to this table, it is one of the most profitable roads in this country), surely in the eastern part of Nova Scotia and in New Brunswick, a road with better opportunities for profitable traffic, should show equally good results. I believe that if the Intercolonial Railway between Halifax and St. John, and to Pictou, including the Eastern Extension, were managed as the Windsor and Annapolis Railway is managed, there would be an enormous profit. I go further, and I say if that road were managed in that way, there would be sufficient profit over that portion of the road to pay all the losses which must inevitably result, I admit, from operating that portion of the line between Moncton and Point Levis, and the branches thereof.

Mr. HAZEN. Is there anything to show in the way the books are kept, that that portion of the

road between Halifax and St. John does not pay now?

Mr. BORDEN. I have tried to ascertain that, but there is nothing in the reports from which I could get any information. Last year the Eastern Extension account was kept separate, and that shows a slight profit; this year it does not appear by itself, and I have not been able to ascertain. I think it would be very instructive if the Minister would make, if he can, a statement to this House, showing the earnings and cost of running the different sections of this railway. Now, in this connection, I wish, also, to call attention to a fact which, perhaps, may not concern every section of the country, but it is a fact which concerns specially the people living in the western part of Nova Scotia. It is a fact that freight from the west over the lines in the western part of Nova Scotia, is carried at profitable rates. As I have said, a company is operating the road there and making money, and the people are paying these rates. They have to compete in Halifax and St. John, particularly in Halifax, with goods coming in over the Intercolonial Railway from the eastern part of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which are paying much lower rates; and these people in the western part of the province are not only paying high rates—I do not say they are too high—but they are paying business rates upon their goods; they are not only doing that, but they are contributing to make up the deficit which results from the charging of too low rates in the other parts of the province.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount they contribute in that manner?

Mr. BORDEN. I cannot tell, I have no means of finding out.

Mr. HAGGART. $1,306 a year.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not see how the hon. gentleman has ascertained that.

Mr. HAGGART. In 1890-91, on the Windsor branch, 32 miles, one-third of the earnings, $30,238.13; maintenance and expenditure, $28,931.71; leaving a profit to the Government of $1,306.42.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has not apprehended my point. I am not speaking simply of the Windsor Branch, I am speaking of the whole system of railways in the western part of Nova Scotia which are operated by companies and are operated at an immense profit; and I say that the people in the western part of the province are paying rates which enable the companies owning these roads to make a large profit; and at the same time they are competing in other markets with goods brought in over the Intercolonial Railway at lower rates; and while they are paying these higher rates to the companies, they are called upon to make up a portion of the deficit of $600,000 or $800,000 which results from the operation of the Intercolonial Railway; that is the point I was trying to make. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the hon. Minister, who, I must say, has shown a greater disposition to investigate this matter than some of his predecessors, will look carefully into the whole question in the line I have pointed out to him. While I do not say that this road should at once be operated in such a way that the two sides of the account will balance, I do say that I have no doubt whatever that within a very short space of time, if the road were operated economically and entirely free from political influence, operated with a single eye to getting the best results out of it, within a very few years the road will not only pay expenses but show a balance on the right side. If the hon. gentleman thinks he is going to accomplish this by turning out a couple of hundred employés, he will find that he will come very far short. I am not an expert in these matters, but it is my opinion that he should add another cipher, and that he should get rid of 2,000 instead of 200, and he would be coming nearer to the mark if he put in their place skilled men. I venture to say that if that road were operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway, instead of 4,000 odd employés being retained, the whole line could be worked with very nearly one-half that number.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say as an Ontario man, that the opinion has been prevalent for some time that a strong effort should be made to have the Intercolonial Railway run in such a way as to make it self-sustaining. I do not think it was contemplated, when we agreed to build the Intercolonial Railway as part of the conditions of Confederation, that it should ever be run at a loss, as it has been run since it was built. I believe if it had been known then that it was going to be run for so many years with the annual deficit which has attended the operations of that road, the Government of the day would never have entered into any such engagement. I do not know what the cause is for the loss in running the road. It may be partially due to the lack of that stringent economy which private railway companies always exercise in running their railways, or it may be due to lower rates being charged than are charged by other companies, or it may be due to lack of skilled management in some direction. My own opinion is, judging from the figures given by the Minister of Railways to-day, that the road is operated at as low a rate per mile as any other railway in the country. I, therefore, assume that the loss is not due to that cause. But, on the other hand, I think it is largely due to carrying freight at lower rates than it should be carried. A discussion took place in this House some years ago, and a comparison was made between the cost of carrying freight over the Intercolonial Railway, one thousand pounds per mile, and other roads, and if my memory serves me aright, it was much lower over the Intercolonial Railway than over other roads. Therefore, there must be a loss in that direction. Some hon. members have contended, especially the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), that because we have built canals from which we received no profit annually, but which are a source of loss every year, to carry on the trade of the country, therefore we are equally justified in operating railways on the same principles. I do not think that we are. It is argued that because these canals are largely in the Upper Provinces, we Ontario people should not grumble if the railways in the Maritime Provinces are operated at a loss, when the benefit largely results to the people of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. KENNY. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me, but he evidently misunderstood my argument. I said the

people of the Maritime Provinces have never complained of the way in which the canals have been worked.

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly I have no disposition to misrepresent the hon. gentleman. The inference I drew from his remarks was, that as the Maritime Province people did not complain because the canals were operated at a loss, therefore Ontario people should not rise and complain of the Intercolonial loss. But the hon. gentleman was kind enough to tell us that when the railway was being run at a loss and the country was paying the additional expense required, over and above its earnings, it was not alone the Maritime Provinces which benefited, but the people of the other provinces as well: in proportion as freight came from the Upper to the Lower Provinces, just in proportion did the people of the Upper Provinces benefit by the road. Then he went on to show that the amount of freight carried from the Maritime Provinces, largely coal, is very small in proportion to the freight carried from the Upper Provinces. If that is correct, I presume the hon. gentleman and his friends would not complain if some means were adopted, as by raising freight rates, to make the road self-sustaining, because, if his argument is sound and logical, and it seems reasonable, the people of the other provinces will sustain the loss, if loss there is, in proportion to the freight carried over the road from those provinces. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) said that it appeared that this road loses in proportion as we extended the length of it; in other words, the loss is in proportion to the length of the road. For the last year of the Mackenzie Government, 1877 or 1878, there was a deficit on the road of between $600,000 and $700,000, pretty much the same as to-day; it may be a little larger to-day, but I do not think the increase is in proportion to the length of the road. Therefore, in some respects the road must be better managed to-day, or more paying freight must be carried over it than at that time. I do not refer to this matter for the purpose of endeavouring to prove that mismanagement, if mismanagement there is, was confined to the Mackenzie regime. I believe there was an honest effort made to run that road, and make it a paying road for the country, as I believe such an effort is made to-day. I have always held that a Government can never run a railway as economically as a private corporation, or put up the freight rates in order to make it pay, as a private corporation will do; but because the road has been run at a loss for so many years, an impression has been created in the country that it might be desirable to give away the road to some company and let them run it, if the Government cannot run it except at a loss. The result would be the same as occurred when a private corporation takes over a non-paying road. They would set about to inaugurate a better and more enterprising system; they would engage men better calculated to run the road successfully, but the most important part of their duty would lie in increasing freight rates so as to make the road pay. That would be the course taken by any company that would take over a road. Why should not the Government do that to-day? Why should we allow the road to be run at lower local and through rates than is charged on any other railway in the other provinces? It seems that it is run as economically as the other roads, but freight rates are not charged as on other roads. The Government should take this matter into their consideration. I am sure the Minister of Railways has shown a commendable desire to make himself acquainted with the condition of affairs on the road, and if possible make it more profitable in the future than in the past. He has taken a step in the right direction. Some hon. gentlemen complain because he proposed to dismiss a few hundred employés; but I was glad to hear the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) say that if he dismissed a few thousand men, if their services could be dispensed with, it would be all the better. Every member from the Maritime Provinces, instead of opposing the hon. Minister's proposal should support it, because every man not needed on the road should be dismissed. When this has been done the Minister should go further and raise the freight rate to the same rates as are charged on the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and other railways in the country, and if he will do that he will find in a short time that the Intercolonial Railway will, like other railways in Canada, become self-supporting.

Mr. FRASER. I am glad this discussion has taken such a wide range, and I naturally feel considerable interest in it, coming as I do from Nova Scotia. Two or three matters have been made very plain from the statement of the Minister. First, he has shown clearly that there should be no dismissals; and second, that there should be no decrease in the trade. He has shown most conclusively, if his figures are correct, that, according to its mileage, the Intercolonial Railway is the cheapest road operated in Canada. I see no reason, that being the case, why men should be dismissed, and why the train service we have now should not be curtailed. We cannot help it if there is not a trade—we were promised a trade; and I see no reason, if the road is run cheaply, as the Minister has attempted to show—I will come later to the statement published by the Government which shows that the hon. gentleman is not correct—why men should be dismissed, if they are necessary, and why we should have less accommodation. I do not agree with the last speaker that this road must be tested on purely business principles. The length of the road, the variety of climate through which it passes, and the articles which must be carried, make it impossible to bring it down to business principles.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the same with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. FRASER. The Grand Trunk Railway built their own road, and the Canadian Pacific Railway built their road with the assistance of the Government. This road was built to connect the provinces together, with the full understanding, not that it was to be a paying business, but that it would be of advantage to connect the provinces forming the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. It was never contemplated to be run at a loss.

Mr. FRASER. If it was not in the mind of the hon. member, it was certainly in the minds of those who carried out Confederation, and the

Lower Provinces would never have entered into a union, even those who were most strongly in favour of it, except on condition that the Government would give assistance in completing and running the Intercolonial Railway. I am not going to say by any means that the road is well run, because the hon. gentleman has demonstrated himself whether it is or not. He says that the men employed were not suitable, and it seems to me somewhat extraordinary that his predecessor in office did not know that. It is also strange that the gentleman who has a large salary at the head of that railway should employ men who are not suitable. I had always supposed that Mr. Schreiber was a man of some ability and that he knew a good railway man from a bad railway man, but now the Minister himself says that the men he employed are not suitable. I do not know that any member of the Opposition could have used harsher language than that in describing the manner in which the Intercolonial Railway has been conducted. Is the Minister discriminating now that he is dismissing these men among the suitable and unsuitable employés? Has he passed them through an examination, or taken their past record, and just dismissed these men who are not suitable? That would be a question worthy of some little investigation I think. His predecessor did not seem to have any idea of the suitability of the men engaged except from a political point of view; who was suitable to work upon the railway was not the question, but it was, whether he suited the particular person who wanted him appointed. I submit that this is just the weakness of the Intercolonial Railway, and as a representative of the Lower Provinces I regret this, because it brings us at once in conflict with our friends in Ontario, who say that this road is being used for political purposes, and who claim that it should be run on business principles. If the Minister is correct in the statement that the men are not suitable on the Intercolonial Railway, I can understand why he is applying the pruning knife, but if his complaint is that too many men have been employed, then it is a different matter altogether. I cannot understand the figures given by the hon. Minister when I compare them with the figures furnished by the Agriculture Department in the Canadian Statistical Year Book. The figures there are not all like those given by the Minister of Railways. I find here that the expenditure of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway is just 65 per cent of its income.

Mr. McALISTER. Does that include the whole of the railway?

Mr. FRASER. Yes, and they declare dividends. Now, I find on page 388 of that book, that on the Canada Atlantic system the earnings per mile were $4,110, whereas the expense per mile is only $2,479; of course there may be some little difference in the method of calculation, but I take this as correct. I find that on the Canada Southern the earnings per mile were $12,272, and the expenditure only $7,835.

Mr. HAGGART. I was giving you the train mileage.

Mr. FRASER. Surely the train mileage cannot be a sure test in investigating the truth as to what a railway costs?

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, yes.

Mr. FRASER. Does the method of calculation pursued by the Minster show that really the earnings in one case are greater or less than the earnings per mile given here, as compared with the expenses?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman may see that on a road 100 miles long there may be only one train a day, if there are 100 trains a day the earnings per mile may be 100 times as much.

Mr. FRASER. I can understand that.

Mr. HAGGART. And that the actual test, and the only one as to the efficiency of management or otherwise of the road, is the train mileage.

Mr. FRASER. Is it not as expensive in proportion when two trains run a day as if one train runs? I take it that this method of calculation is the better, and I find here that the Intercolonial Railway is the only railway in which its earnings per mile is not in excess of its expenses per mile. Be that as it may, to return to what I said. If the Minister of Railways is correct, he has demonstrated clearly that if this is a cheap road, he is all wrong in taking away any of these men unless they are unfit for the service or in stopping any of the rights that the people of the Lower Provinces now have in regard to the running of the trains. Let me ask why have these men been employed, if it is now necessary to discharge them, because the Minister knows that it is always difficult to deprive people of their situations once you employ them. It may be a small matter with the Minister of Railways, to dismiss 100 or 200, or 300 employés, but it would not seem to me a less serious affair than expending an immense sum of money for one single property in St. John, and expending $400,000 for a station at Halifax. The Minister has not attempted to say that these men were unnecessary, but he says that they are not suitable, and that is the only reason he gives.

Mr. HAGGART. Did the hon. gentleman not hear me say that I had already reduced the number of trains, and if you have less trains won't you require less men?

Mr. FRASER. Decidedly, when the number of trains is reduced.

Mr. HAGGART. I have done that.

Mr. FRASER. I understood from the hon. gentleman that this is what he was going to do, but if he has done so, let me ask him if the number of men dismissed is proportionate to the number of trains that are stopped? Has he dismissed exactly the number of men that would be necessary to work the extra trains which were formerly run and which he now has stopped? Is that the gauge which the Minister has applied to the dismissal of these men? If so I could understand it. He has, he says, taken off the train from Halifax to St. John, I understand that that train cost about $60,000 a year, but if I am wrong the Minister will correct me.

Mr. HAGGART. A good deal more, you are well within the mark.

Mr. FRASER. Well, let me say $80,000. He has also taken off another train in Nova Scotia from Stellarton to Pictou, and I will place that at $20,000. This is a saving of $100,000 a year in Nova Scotia, but the Minister says he is going to save nearly $500,000. Therefore, the other $400,-

000, which he will save is not in the Province of Nova Scotia, but in some other part in which the Intercolonial Railway runs. It has been running behind elsewhere than in Nova Scotia. I do not know whether that is in New Brunswick or not, or whether it is in Quebec or not, and no doubt some part is due to the Prince Edward Island Railway, but at all events there is only $100,000 of it in Nova Scotia. There is another thing that the hon. Minister said in connection with the character of some of the men who were not suitable. I believe that there were some men put on there who were not suitable. I moved for a return a few days ago about Port Mulgrave; and in order to make it appear that as much work was being done there now with twice the number of men as was done before, they had to add to the tickets sold at Port Mulgrave the tickets sold elsewhere. As a matter of fact the expenditure at that point is about twice as much as it was before, while the work is not any larger. I am glad that the hon. Minister is taking the high ground that he took to-day. I am bound to say that the Intercolonial Railway, so far at least as certain portions of it are concerned, is not run on business principles. I do not want it run on business principles purely and simply, like any other railway, because I do not think we entered into the Union with that idea. But we want it so run that only men who will do good work will be employed, and when that is done the people of this country must look after the deficit. I do not think the deficit need be so large as it is. The hon. Minister in showing how little was spent in advertising, said that while we paid $5,400 for our advertising, had we paid at the same rate as the Grand Trunk we should have paid $68,000. It is very easy, for example, to show that a man who does a business of $100,000 annually should have heavier expenses than the man who does a business of $40,000; but you must compare the mileage of the two railways, and the hon. Minister at that point said that he did not know anything at all about the mileage of the Grand Trunk. Last year, it was stated here that the method by which the advertising bills were made out was very peculiar. The acting Minister of Railways, assisted by the Superintendent of Government Railways, said that the bill was not left to the paper at all, but that they simply sent the advertisement to the paper, and then made out the bill themselves, saying: "We will give you so much for this advertisement." If the Government did business in that way, nobody else in the world ever did.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman had any knowledge of printing, he would know that that is constantly done in private commercial transactions, particularly with large corporations.

Mr. FRASER. That is the case where there is competition.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. FRASER. That is just the point. There is no competition here, because the Opposition paper does not get the advertisement, it only goes to the Government paper. Whoever heard of a person sending an advertisement to a newspaper and to no other, and saying we will give you so much? That is not the way men do business. I could understand that being done where three or four people were competing with each other, but no man does that when there is only one place, especially when the amount he gives is ten times as much as it ought to be. These are things that might be enquired into. Now, a great deal has been said in the country as to whether the Intercolonial should be run by a company. I know that the people of the Maritime Provinces do not want the railway run by a company if they can help themselves, though it may be that the very methods pursued by the Government will bring about that result. I do not say that the foundation is being laid with a full understanding that that is going to happen, but for myself I say, if ever there should come a time when the Intercolonial will be run by a company, let it be a competing company. I would press that consideration very strongly. We want competition in the Maritime Provinces as well as other parts of the Dominion. If year by year the Intercolonial were run as it ought to be run, that is without Government favouritism and with the best men employed, we should not have the pitiful spectacle presented to this House of the Minister saying that the men who were dismissed were not suitable, and saying subsequently that the men were dismissed because the trains stopped and they were not needed. The two explanations will not do; and the hon. gentleman can accept which he likes. When he said that the men were not suitable, he did an injustice to them.

Mr. HAGGART. I never made the statement that any man on the road was dismissed on account of his being unsuitable.

Mr. FRASER. Decidedly not. The statement the hon. Minister made was that they were dismissed because he stopped the trains; but he did say that the men employed on the railway were not suitable, and that that caused the deficit. Now, were they suitable men that he dismissed? If so, he should apply the pruning knife and cut off those who are not suitable. He can take either horn of the dilemma that he likes. That being the case, the hon. gentleman will have some difficulty in finding out who are suitable. There is one thing certain, he cannot hurt the friends of any of us on this side; any who are dismissed must be his own party friends, because there are no others on the railway. Perhaps that is the reason he said they were not suitable to run a railway.

Mr. McLEOD. There are plenty at St. John.

Mr. FRASER. Who should not be on? I do not know about that.

Mr. McLEOD. I did not say that. I said that there are plenty of men belonging to the Liberal party who have been employed on the railway at St. John for many years.

Mr. FRASER. Precisely so, and they are the best men. It is only the later ones who are not suitable. I thank you for the suggestion; I did not think of it at the time. Now, coming to the serious question, while we must criticise the management of the Intercolonial and find out where the wrong is, we must also consider that railway as part of a compact. I am not going to say a word about canals. I suppose if the investigation were made, it would be found that there are just as many men who are not fit on the canals as there are on the Intercolonial Railway. The experience of the Government seems to be the same everywhere. I noticed at Welland the other day that

the same thing prevailed there. On the Intercolonial Railway, just about election times, men are put on and afterwards kept on, and, perhaps, these are the unsuitable men. The same may be the case with the canals, but I am not going to attack the canals for that. They are necessary and the Intercolonial is necessary. Now, I want to say broadly that so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, every dollar spent at Halifax is put down to Nova Scotia as so much received from the Central Government. Now, whether or not that amount may be necessary in Halifax is a moot question. Last year it was seven or eight acres, and this year it is more than double that; and I fear not to make the statement here now, which I made last year with reference to the seven or eight acres, that for the next 500 years eighteen acres will not be required in the city of Halifax for railway purposes. There is not a city in the Lower Provinces which will require eighteen acres for railway depot accommodation. Is there any railway which has eighteen acres in any city for its station? Has the Canadian Pacific Railway eighteen acres in the city of Montreal in connection with its works? An hon. gentleman behind me says it has, but I would like to know if he made the investigation. I am referring now to station buildings, and I say that eighteen acres is more than is required for this purpose. As coming from the eastern part of the province, I think this $400,000 could be much better spent in building railways where there are none, and that the people of Halifax could do without this proposed accommodation, or do something for themselves. The Government have done a good deal for them. Take the county from which I come, with the exception of a little corner, there is not a mile of railway in it, but there is a company willing to build a railway there now; and would it not be better that we should have railway accommodation with this money than have fine buildings in Halifax? I think so. This may be a selfish discussion, but we are all selfish; and I want to see railway accommodation in every part of the province more than I want to see larger buildings and better accommodation in the city of Halifax. Of course our friends from Halifax think that is just the point where money should be spent, just as hon. members from St. John think that that city is the whole of New Brunswick. Hon. members from these two cities seem to think that each of them extends over the whole province. I am glad that the business acuteness of the Minister and his Scotch wariness have prevented him tumbling to this too quickly before investigating it, and I hope he will investigate it carefully. I invite the hon. Minister to come over the province and see the places which have no railways, and I promise him I will do my best to make his visit comfortable and profitable; and when he sees the places that have not railway facilities, he will, I am sure, come to the conclusion that he could do much better by spending the public money in giving these conveniences to travel and freight than in putting up public buildings in Halifax. Much can be done in the way of economy in the management of the Intercolonial Railway. When I am satisfied that everything has been judiciously done which should be; when I am satisfied that no man not suitable for railway work is employed on the line; when the Government do the best they can only to employ men who are necessary and choose the best men; and when they run the railway as much on business principles as possible, always allowing for the margin we must allow them, to do, in the interests of party, what is not in accord with business principles—when these things are done, I for one will say nothing if the deficit is not too large. I believe the deficit, if not too large, ought to be paid by the country. The hon. gentleman spoke of the deficit in 1878, but it must be remembered that that was occasioned by charging to the yearly account large sums which at present are, and for the last ten years have been, charged to capital account. I am glad the Minister proposes to investigate into this business, and I hope he will do so with his own eyes, and not with the political eyes which will be given him by his friends when he comes down there. I hope he will apply to the investigation his own methods of business; and I am sure when he does that, he will find many excrescences on that road which may be cut off. But I trust at the same time, while he may take this and that train off, it will not be forgotten that when we entered this Union we did so with the understanding that we should have this road. One word more before I sit down with regard to the hon. member for Halifax. I hope he will not again press the argument that the Province of Ontario was receiving the benefit of this expenditure. I want to stand fairly by this matter. I take the broader ground that the Province of Ontario and this whole Dominion ought to contribute to the deficit, if it is not any larger than it should be, just because that was the agreement when we entered Confederation. So far as our friends from Ontario are concerned, anything they sent us they send in their own interests; and if the people in the Lower Provinces did not want to buy what the Western Provinces have to sell, our friends from Ontario would not ship us their goods. I think trade is mutually advantageous; and more, I think that the Government have no right, in the interests of the Maritime Provinces, to do that which they would not do upon business principles in carrying out this agreement. Of course the distance will always necessitate that the trade will not be as extensive as it is on the other lines; and I am very sorry that the Minister of Railways has had to admit that the great deficit this year is largely occasioned by the competition of the Canadian Pacific Railway. A few days ago I asked a question about the agents of the Intercolonial Railway, and I found that some twenty or thirty of them are also agents of the Canadian Pacific Railway at the various stations of the Canadian Pacific Railway at New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. Now any man knows very well that when an agent's salary, be he ever so honest, is assured by the Government, and he has the opportunity of selling tickets for the Canadian Pacific Railway, for which he receives some remuneration from that company, he is going to sell the ticket on the Canadian Pacific Railway every time, because it adds to his salary, and I think the Government should at once prevent their agents from acting as agents for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Both lines are now practically competing out of the funds of the same party, the people of this country, and I think nothing should be done to help the one to the disadvantage of the other. I think it is not in keeping with this Governnent to have agents at their

various stations who are bound to ask passengers whether or not they are going on the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Intercolonial Railway. Why should a man who is the agent of the Government be compelled to do this? Being a salaried officer of the Government, he should first and last do everything possible for the line of which he is the agent, and not ask people to go over any other line. I say nothing against the enterprise of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They are wise in their generation, but that the Government should lend them that assistance is not in the interests of our railway, nor should it be encouraged, and I hope the Minister of Railways will at once issue orders that no agent of the Intercolonial Railway can act as agent either for the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other company. Any Government agent acting in that dual capacity is bound to make something out of the tickets he sells for other companies and thus help to draw away from the legitimate business of the Government railway. I hope the assurances the Minister has made will be realized. He will pardon me if I say I do not think he has stated sufficiently to lead me to think he is going to save $500,000 next year; but if he should do so, I shall be the first to congratulate him. But certainly, to my mind, all he has said does not indicate that he is going to save that amount. If he shall do so, without impairing, as he said, because he put both things together, the service to the Lower Province he will have performed a feat which will entitle him, whatever his other shortcomings may be on account of his connection with the party to which he belongs, to the gratitude of this country.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I will not detain the House very long, but wish to make a few observations while this item is under discussion. I may say, at the outset, I am very glad to have observed the temper in which this question is being discussed at the present time. It is a very decided contrast to many of the discussions we have had on the Intercolonial Railway matters when they have been brought up before the House on former occasions. We have gentlemen on the other side of the House who have discussed the question, I think, very fairly, and I think the Government and their supporters regret as much as they do the present condition financially of the Intercolonial Railway, and would gladly receive suggestions from hon. gentlemen opposite. My object in speaking at all is to remove some of the misapprehensions which appear to exist in the minds of some hon. members of this House in regard to the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. member for East Grey, in the short address he gave us a few moments ago, told us that the Intercolonial Railway would never have been constructed if it had been known that it would have been operated afterwards at a loss. The hon. gentleman who followed him corrected him on that point, and I would emphasize the fact that it is well known that the Intercolonial Railway was not built simply as a commercial enterprise. It is well known that that was one of the smallest considerations at the time. The Intercolonial Railway was one of the bonds to unite the provinces together, it was built also partly from military considerations, and, if any hon. gentleman will refer to the debates which took place after Confederation, and the remarks which were made previous to Confederation by those who were favouring the union of the provinces, he will find that the opinion was expressed and was generally felt at that time that this road never could pay. Indeed, this opinion was expressed not only by public men on this side of the Atlantic but by public men on the other side of the Atlantic as well. It is well known that during the first few years after the road was finished, it was very far from paying expenses. In fact the results to-day have far exceeded any expectations that were formed at that time. In the years 1881, 1882, 1883 and 1884, under the able management of the present High Commissioner, this road paid its own expenses and left a small margin of profit. It is to be regretted that this condition of affairs does not prevail to-day, but if we look fairly at the condition of things to-day and compare that with the condition of things at that time, the cause will be very readily discovered. I would like to refer very briefly to the figures which have been presented to the House by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and I was very sorry indeed to hear the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) to some extent endorse the line of reasoning which was adopted by that hon. gentleman. The whole tenor of that hon. gentleman's remarks was to show that the management of the Intercolonial Railway was very extravagant when compared with the two other great railway systems, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and the hon. gentleman endeavoured to establish that by comparing the cost per mile of the operations of these three lines of railway. I think any hon. gentleman in this House, whether he be an expert in railway matters or not, will see after a moment's reflection that such a comparison is utterly worthless. The cost of operating a railway on the mileage basis depends upon the number of trains run and the amount of passenger and freight traffic carried over the road. If there are fifty trains under the same condition, the cost per mile of operating the road will be nearly fifty times as much as if there were only one, and the receipts would be in the same proportion. The hon. gentleman seemed to answer his own argument by the figures he presented to the House. As I have them, the whole cost of operating the Grand Trunk amounted to $4,100 a mile, while the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway is about $1,853 a mile. No one would argue from this that there is greater extravagance in the management of the Grand Trunk than in the mangement of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It only shows that the Canadian Pacific has a greater length of line, and a smaller number of trains running over the greater portion of that line, while the Grand Trunk Railway, which passes through a thickly settled portion of country, has a larger number of trains in proportion to its mileage. Thus the cost per mile on the Grand Trunk Railway is more than double that on the Canadian Pacific Railway. These figures must convince any one that this is a very unfair basis of comparison. The basis which the Minister gave us was the train mileage basis, and he stated that that was the fairest basis on which we could compare the cost of operating different lines of railway. I quite agree with him in that, and that is the opinion held by railway experts

generally. I am not prepared to say that this is a very correct test, or an absolutely correct test. Very much must depend upon the mode in which the accounts are kept, and here let me say that I regret very much that before this discussion took place we had not before us the return which was moved for a few days ago. I am informed that a great deal of the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway in the last few years has been charged to operating expenses which might very fairly have been charged to capital account. I refer to such items as the cost of changing the rails and putting the 67-pound rails which are now on the road in place of the 56-pound rails which were formerly on the road; also the improvements which have been made in the station buildings; the difference between the cost of the iron bridges which have been substituted for the wooden bridges previously used, and the improvements in the cars. It is known to every one familiar with railway matters that in very many railway companies in the United States, at all events, these items are always charged to capital account and are termed "betterments." They are never charged to operating expenses. The difference between operating expenses and the earnings of the road is divided among the stockholders, and the stockholders in those companies do not permit such items as these to be charged to operating expenses, and thus lessen the dividends to which they feel they are fairly entitled. I am not aware whether this system is pursued upon the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway; but this shows that any basis of comparison that you may take, may not be absolutely correct. However, railway experts all agree that, in making comparisons, the train mileage basis is the fairest basis which can be adopted. As I do not wish to weary the House, I shall merely refer in the comparison I make to the two lines of railway referred to by the hon. member for North Wellington, and I will make my comparisons upon a train mileage basis. The cost of the Grand Trunk Railway upon this basis is 75·6 cents per mile; the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway is 84 cents per mile; while the cost of the Intercolonial Railway last year, although these items to which I have referred have been charged to operating expenses, is less than 73 cents per mile. These figures show that the loss upon the Intercolonial Railway is not due to extravagance in the management, at all events no large part of it can be due to that cause. The whole cost of the operation of this road upon this basis compares very favourably with the cost of operating these other two great lines of railway, which every one will admit are well managed. I took the trouble to-day to compare, upon this basis, the operations of the Intercolonial Railway during the last year with its operations in 1883, the year when the most satisfactory results were shown, when, instead of having a deficit, we had a fair balance to the credit of the account. I find that in the interval between those years the mileage has been increased by 254 miles. I will not trouble the House with the figures, I will only give the percentages. The engine mileage has increased 38 per cent, the passenger train mileage, 52 per cent, freight train mileage, 38 per cent. The passengers that have travelled have increased 47½ per cent, and the ton of freight, 34 per cent. But when we come to the receipts, I find that the total increase has only been a little over 25 per cent. Now, it may be said that this is an unsatisfactory showing; it is unsatisfactory in one sense, but I think when the causes are fairly looked at, it will not be so unsatisfactory as it at first appears. The cause of the relative disproportion between the receipts and the expenditure during the last two or three years is no doubt due to the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway Short Line Railway. The hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden) referred to the receipts for passengers upon the Intercolonial Railway. The average receipts per passenger for the last year was 74 cents; the receipts in 1883 were nearly 83 cents. We find the same comparison from the receipts from freight traffic. The receipts per ton last year were $1.42, while in 1883 they were $1.50. These figures show, as that hon. gentleman very properly pointed out, that while the number of passengers has increased, and the number of tons of freight carried has increased, the average distance which these passengers have travelled is less than it was ten years ago, and the same applies to the freight traffic. This simply shows that the opening of the Short Line Railway has drawn away from the Intercolonial Railway a very large portion of the through traffic which it formerly had. Now, Mr. Chairman, one of the speakers who addressed the House—I do not remember now which one—condemned the present Government in subsidizing the Short Line Railway, and by their action in that regard, opening a competing line with the Intercolonial Railway. The fact that the opening of that line has decreased the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway, I think, is no ground for justifying that remark. The fact that we had the Intercolonial Railway is no reason why the people of the Maritime Provinces should not have the best commercial intercourse available with their friends in the west. The very fact that this Short Line Railway is able to compete successfully with the Intercolonial Railway and draw freight away from it, although the latter carries freight at the mere cost of operating the road, the very fact that under these circumstances the Short Line Railway is able to draw away a very considerable portion of its traffic, shows that the Short Line Railway was built on commercial principles, and I think that fact justifies the policy of the Government in subsidizing this line to secure its construction. Now, several gentlemen who have spoken have criticised the policy which the hon. Minister has proposed with regard to the management of this railway, and I merely want to say one word upon that subject. We have, at the present time, a large deficit. While those of us who represent the Maritime Provinces feel that it should not be expected, that it never was expected, that this road should be a source of revenue or profit to the country, yet we are anxious on this side as well as on that side of the House, to have the two sides of the account balance, or come as near as possible to balancing. At the present time the deficiency is very large. There appears to me to be but two modes of bringing the expenditure and the receipts together. One would be the mode which was suggested incidentally by the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that of increasing the local rates. The other mode is that suggested by the Minister of Railways, that of lessening the train service and reducing, to some extent, the number of employés. I can see no other way of bringing about the result which both sides of this

House desire to see accomplished. If it is a choice between these two methods, I have no hesitation in saying—and I believe the people of the Maritime Provinces will endorse my statement in this regard—that I, for one, approve of the policy outlined by the Minister of Railways. If at the present time there are more trains than are required for the traffic of the road, it is much better that the numbes of trains should be reduced and that a few employés should be discharged than that the local rates in the Maritime Provinces should be raised. It will be admitted that the through rates cannot be raised, and here let me make one observation with regard to the remarks of the Minister of Railways that the freight rates upon coal, stone, and I think he said wheat and flour, were not sufficient to pay actual operating expenses. I feel very much like joining issue with the Minister on that point. I have not the data here to prove that his statement in that regard is absolutely incorrect, but I think if we look at the question in this light, that we have the railway built, that a certain portion of the cost of operating the railway is what are called fixed charges, that they have to be paid under any circumstances, that the additional cost of carrying traffic which the Minister referred to is the actual cost of carrying that particular traffic and the wear and tear of the road which results in consequence, it is not clear to my mind that this traffic can be said to be an actual loss to the road. The history of other roads, roads which are operated by private companies, I believe justify this statement, for, if my memory is not at fault, the figures presented to the House during the debate last session by the hon. member for Cumberland show that other railways under similar circumstances would carry freight at rates quite as low as those of the Intercolonial Railway rather than not to carry it at all. I believe the people of the Maritime Provinces will generally endorse the proposals of the Minister of Railways rather than the proposition of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to increase the freight rates upon the road. I believe that those of us who support the Government on this side of the House will endorse the Minister's action in regard to the dismissal of employés. I at all events have urged on the Minister, and I believe the action of other members from the Maritime Provinces has been in the same direction, that the changes made in regard to employés should not be too general, too sudden, or too sweeping. I think it is a wiser course to pursue that these discharges should be made gradually. If new men are not employed, the number of employés will naturally diminish from natural causes, from death, from the discharge of those who violate the rules and those who wander away for a change of employment, or to better their position. The member for King's (Mr. Borden) stated that he thought that the number of dismissals should be increased, that he would have applauded the Minister if, instead of dismissing 200 he dismissed 2,000 of the employés. I take issue with the hon. gentleman on that point. I think these dismissals, which the Minister proposes, are quite sufficient to meet the case. I take issue, too, with the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who said that because the road was operated as cheaply as any other road, there should be no dismissals. I think the argument I have presented to the House, that the condition of things necessitates the reduction of the train service and consequently the number of employés, is the correct one. I have only one more remark to make, and that is to press on the attention of the Minister a matter which I have endeavoured already to press upon him, and I should like to impress it not only upon him, but on the members of the Government and members of the House. As every one knows, a large number of employés of the Intercolonial Railway reside in the city of Moncton. There will, no doubt, be some discharges there; I hope they will not be any more general than is absolutely necessary; but in making those discharges, the point I wish to impress on the Minister is this, that he should have regard to those men who have settled there, who have been employed on the railway for years, who have purchased property there, for if they are discharged from the road it will be a very serious loss and inconvenience, in fact it will mean ruin to very many of them. Of this class of people, those who are sufficiently strong and possess sufficient skill to discharge their duties should, under any circumstances, be retained in the service; and the discharges should be made from the young men who have not families depending on them, and others who would not feel the loss and would not be inconvenienced from being thrown out of employment.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). I quite agree with the observations made by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) and other members from the Maritime Provinces in support of the proposition of the Minister for the reduction of the train service and dispensing with such hands as are not required for the service of the Intercolonial Railway in preference to making any addition to the freight rates on traffic passing over the road. I do not rise for the purpose of criticising the reductions which are proposed. The justification of the change will be found in the reduction in the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway last year as compared with those for the previous year, while there was an increased mileage of 200 miles. I have listened very attentively to the arguments which have been presented this evening in regard to the Intercolonial Railway and the causes to which the deficits on the line are due. I have come to the conclusion that those deficits are due largely to the high character of the service which is being performed by that railway, and the efficiency of the rolling stock and road-bed and all the equipments of the line, together with the methods of book-keeping which have been employed in keeping the accounts of the working expenses of the road. I think one fact has been very clearly demonstrated during this discussion, and that is, that the operating expenses of the Intercolonial Railway are not by any means extravagant, as compared with the operating expenses of other railways in Canada or in other portions of this continent. The figures quoted with respect to the operating of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, show that the cost of operating, based on the train mileage, is less on the Intercolonial Railway than on either of the two great railways in Canada, and that the deficits arise from a lack of revenue from the train service. The train service is of a better character than on any other line, while the population is much more sparse than along the line of the Grand Trunk and some portions of the Canadian Pacific

Railway. If, as the hon. Minister of Railways promises, the efficiency of the road will not be impaired by the changes which he proposes on this occasion, I think he will be sustained by the public sentiment of the country, in his attempt to establish an equilibrium as far as possible between the working expenses and the revenue of the Intercolonial Railway. Some criticisms have been made in the course of this debate which hardly show in a fair light the operations of the Intercolonial Railway as compared with other railways in Canada, because no fair basis of comparison is available that can be applied to the operations of these lines, as I shall endeavour to show before I sit down. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) took, as a basis of comparison, the expenditure per mile of certain railways, forgetting altogether, as has been very plainly put forward by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), that the expenditure will depend upon the efficiency of the service and the number of trains which are run on the railway, and that any system based on the expenditure per mile is not a fair comparison by any means. With regard to the statement that I made that there is no fair basis of comparison for testing the working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway with those of the other railways in Canada, I wish to call attention to the manner in which the accounts of this railway have been kept since it was started, both under the former Government and under the present Administration. I regret that we have not available the return which was moved for a short time ago, showing the amount expended out of the earnings of the road in improvements and betterments. It will be remembered that there are two classes of votes submitted to this Parliament in connection with the Intercolonial Railway; one for payments out of capital and another chargeable to revenue. All the expenses in connection with the Intercolonial Railway that are paid out of revenue are classified as working expenses, and these payments include very many charges which, on other railways in Canada and the United States are charged to capital account, as will be apparent from reports of officials of this railway and from other documents which I shall be able to show to this committee. Going as far back as 1877, Mr. Brydges, who was the manager of the railway in that year, called attention to the character of the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway. Mr. Brydges was at one time the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, and he had some knowledge of the methods in which the accounts were kept so that he could institute a comparison. The system on the Intercolonial Railway of keeping the accounts in that regard has not been changed from 1878 down to the present time, so far as it relates to the expenditure of the vote under the head of charges of revenue. In his report of 1877, Mr. Brydges says:

"I have already stated that all the outlay heretofore and usually charged to capital on the old lines, has been included in working expenses for the past year. These various items include ballasting to bring the old line up to the standard of the new one, costing about $30,000; taking down and rebuilding decayed masonry principally in Nova Scotia and replacing worn-out bridges about $12,000; new and enlarged station buildings about $8,000; additional sidings about $3,000; and various other items making a total of upwards of $65,000."

In 1878 Mr. Brydges reports:

"As already stated the outlay for ballasting and increased facilities in the shape of sidings, station and other buildings, improved water supply, &c., has all been included in the working cost.

"This includes the following principal items:

Ballasting	$ 52,000
Additional sidings	20,000
Semaphore signals	3,500
Additional station buildings	4,500
Increased water supply, fencing, car shops, machinery and sundry works.	25,000
Total	$105,000

"These items are usually charged to capital by railway companies and have therefore to that extent increased the charges for the working of the traffic of this railway during the past year."

Chief Superintendent Pottinger in his report for 1882, says:

"Ten miles of new sidings were laid at different parts of the line to accommodate the increased traffic.

"A combined passenger and freight station was erected at Derby and also a similar building at Eel River. A dwelling house for the station master was built at Causapscal and also at Jacquet River and at Painsec. At Au Lac and at Sackville extensive repairs and improvements were made to the station houses.

"The cost of these repairs and improvements and of others which I have not specified forms part of the working expenses."

Chief Superintendent Pottinger reports in 1885:

"Although the loss in the year's operation of the Government railways exceeds that of the preceding year by $41,402.82, this result may be regarded as not unsatisfactory in view of the heavy expenditures for additions and improvements, which in the case of most railway companies are charged to capital, but which swell the working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway. These include additional new sidings freight and station houses, semaphores, snow and ordinary fencing, the raising of several bridges and their approaches, increased water service &c.

"While the completion of the new general offices at Moncton also added to the cost of operation."

Chief Superintendent Pottinger reports in 1886:

"The following is a summary of expenditure on improvements:

New sidings	$14,000
New buildings and semaphores	7,000
New fences	8,000
Increased water supply	23,000
Iron bridges	6,000
Improvement to permanent way in rails and ties	37,000
Improvements in locomotives and cars	20,000
Total	$115,000

"This expenditure was made in addition to the maintenance and renewal of existing works, and was for improvements to the property, but it is all charged to working expenses and against the earnings for the year."

Chief Superintendent Pottinger reports in 1890:

(Under working Expenses.)

"100 miles of the track were rebalasted; 42 sidings were put in at various points to accommodate the traffic: 125 miles of the main track were relaid with heavier steel rails.

"This was an improvement very desirable on account of the heavier locomotives and cars now used, but it increased the working expenses for this year $200,000 over those of last year.

"The work of strengthening the bridges was continued. The bridge over the Tantramar River near Sackville and that over the Restigouche were strengthened at a cost exceeding $26,000. Five other smaller bridges were also strengthened by lateral bracing.

"Eight large bridges were provided with new and improved floors and iron guards rails to increase the safety of trains.

"And fifty small wooden bridges of 10 to 20 feet span each were replaced by iron bridges."

Mr. Schreiber in 1886 reported:

"Though the loss on operation amounts to $106,000 it should be observed that no less than $115,000 has been charged against the earnings of the year for improvements of a character generally charged to capital and respecting works over and above ordinary maintenance and renewal."

In another report Mr. Schreiber says :

"Many improvements, extensions and additions have been made all along the line, the cost of which has entered into the accounts for operation, but which are certainly not works of ordinary maintenance."

Then I observe the following criticism in reference to the Intercolonial Railway :—

"What sense is there, for instance, in charging against working expenses the difference in cost, say $90,000, between the old and the new general offices or in so charging the cost of an iron bridge replacing a wooden one or a 67-lb. rail substituted for a 56-lb. one? No railway company does this sort of thing—why should the Intercolonial?

"To show how this works turn to the report of '91, and it will be found that 13,125 tons of 67-lb. rails were used to replace 56-lb. rails. This means an increase of about 2,600 tons at say $24 a ton, or over $60,000. The property is better and worth more by so much, but the charge is against the running expenses of the year and wrongly becomes part of the deficit. The like is true of betterments in respect of freight cars, locomotives, buildings, &c."

Now, in the operation of the Intercolonial for the ten years ending the 30th June last I find that there has been a deficit, according to the reports, of about $2,300,000, or an average of $230,000 a year. If the accounts of the railway were kept in the same way as the accounts of railway corporations in the United States, and as I am informed the accounts of railway corporations in this country are kept, I think that deficit would entirely disappear as a result of not charging against working expenses such items as additions, improvements and betterments which have been included in the working expenses of the Intercolonial as they are kept and have been kept since 1875. For the four years ending the 30th of June, 1878, the deficiency in the operation of the railway under the former Government amounted to $1,465,029, taking the accounts in the same way as they have been kept since that period. That sum includes of course several items which were placed in a supense account. For instance, in 1876, there is an item of $215,289 for renewals not put in the balance; there is in 1877 another item of $200,000 not charged to capital but carried to the suspense account, and in 1878 a similar item of $200,000 not charged to capital but carried to suspense account. If all these items were charged to the working expense the deficit would have been, as I have stated, $1,465,029. I do not mention this by way of making a comparison in the expense of management of the railway as carried on under the former Government and as carried on under this Government, but for the purpose of showing that if the items in both accounts which have been charged to Collection of Revenue had been classified as they are on other railways, the deficit on Working Account would to a great extent disappear.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he finds in any of the accounts submitted to this House that some have been charged to maintenance which should be charged to capital, and if there are any, would he kindly point out what they are?

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). A few days ago I gave notice of a motion which was moved by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) in these words :

"Order of the House for a return containing a statement of expenditure out of income made for permanent improvements, extensions, additions and betterments, exclusive of works of ordinary maintenance and renewals on account of the Intercolonial Railway from 30th June, 1881, to 1st of July, 1891. The return to show such expenditure in summary form for each branch of service as can be conveniently ascertained from the accounts."

A return has just been placed in my hands, as follows :—

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY..

STATEMENT of Expenditure out of Revenue for additions or Betterments between 1st July, 1881, and 1st July, 1891.

Class of Work.	Particulars.	Amount.
		$ cts.
Ballasting.....	Additional ballasting....	160,284 00
Buildings and platforms.	New buildings or additions and improvements to old.	183,999 68
Bridges.....	Difference in cost between iron and wood : difference in cost between standard and originals floors strengthening old bridges.	234,495 48
Fencing	Difference in cost between wood and wire fences, and new fences where none existed.	201,417 60
Land and land damages.	Additional land for stations, snow fences, &c.	30,802 20
Rails and fastenings.	Difference in cost between 56-lb. rail and 67-lb. rail, including nut locks and tie plates.	262,439 60
Sidings	New sidings and extension of old sidings, grading, &c.	246,537 60
Ties	New ties to change spacing from 2½ ft. to 2 ft.	168,191 64
Signals	New additional signals and improvements to old ones.	37,098 00
Miscellaneous.....	Additional track scales hoisting crane, dredging plant, hand cars, coal waggons, &c.	86,404 15
Raising bridges and snow sheds.	Raising bridges and snow sheds to comply with the law.	16,500 00
Locomotives.....	30 new locomotives, average cost $10,000, if replaced by the same kind cost would be $7,000, 30 at $3,000.	90,000 00
do	4 new locomotives, increasing the stock.	43,759 00
Improvements to locomotives.	Improvements to 44 locomotives.	40,000 00
Improvements to passenger cars.	Improvements to 90 passenger cars.	45,000 00
Improvements to express, baggage, postal and smoking cars.	Improvements to 14 express and baggage, and postal and smoking cars	7,000 00
Improvements to freight cars.	Improvements to 2,600 freight cars.	137,700 00
Improvements to snow ploughs.	Improvements to 8 snow ploughs and 4 wing ploughs.	12,000 00
Air brakes.....	Putting the Westinghouse automatic air brake on the passenger trains.	30,600 00
New tools and improvements in work shops.	New tools and improvements in work shops.	20,000 00
Improvements in water supply.	Improvements in the water supply for locomotives.	92,183 10
	Total.....	2,531,001 85

This shows the additions and betterments during these ten years to have cost $2,531,001.85, while the deficit during those years has been $2,300,000; in other words, the deficit should be wiped out and a

balance of over $200,000 carried to the right side. Now, my object in rising on this occasion was to show that owing to the method in which the accounts were kept, the condition of the Intercolonial Railway was represented as much worse than it actually is. Of course, this does not take away the fact that a large addition has been made to the capital of the Intercolonial Railway by these expenditures. That is true, but it is right that we should know that the operating expenses of the railway are accounted for, and that its operations during the last ten years have not resulted in a deficit, but in a small surplus. I think that during the current year, the operations will not show so favourably, as a falling off appears in the revenue; although there is a much greater mileage, and that as I said before, is a justification of the Government in applying the pruning knife to these services which will best stand the strain. In further proof of the statement that the accounts of the Intercolonial are not kept in the same way as the accounts of other railways, I will cite an authority on railway book-keeping, Marshall Kirkman, whose system is adopted I understand, by all the leading railway lines in the United States:

"IMPROVEMENTS.—This heading is intended to embrace the disbursements having for their object the betterment of the original plant of the company, where a portion of the charges for the accounts to be opened under it belong to operating expenses, and a portion to construction.

"For instance: Suppose it be determined to replace the shingle roof on blank passenger station with a slate roof. This would be improving the property, and the amount the slate roof cost in excess of what the shingle roof cost, when it was new, is a proper charge to construction.

"The value of an improvement, without reference to the relative cost, also comes properly under construction.

"All disbursements for works of the foregoing character should be charged up on the distribution books under the head of 'improvements,' but for obvious reasons, painstaking caution should be exercised to prevent any unjust or questionable charges being made to this account.

"The word 'construction' in railway accounts is intended to describe the original or first cost of the property of the company:

"Something original and new.

"The cost of all improvements that add value and increased stability to the property of the company, over the original value, are properly chargeable to construction.

"Construction properly embraces the total cost of any extension of the company's lines;

"The cost of right of way, increased facilities and grounds, and the expense incidental thereto;

"The cost of new side tracks, less the cost of side tracks taken up:

"The cost of viaducts and road bridges (where none before existed):

"The difference in value between temporary or cheap bridges and culverts, and bridges and culverts replacing such, constructed in a permanent manner, of iron or stone:

"The cost of additional telegraph lines and facilities:

"The value of steel rails over iron rails, when the former are substituted for the latter:

"The difference in value between iron laid in track of a heavier grade than that which it replaces;

"The cost of additions or improvements in the fixtures appertaining to track;

"The cost of remedying any defects in track rendered necessary in consequence of its not having been constructed in a first class manner originally;

"The cost of additional buildings including the machinery and appurtenances belonging thereto."

I may say in addition to this, that at the conference of railway proprietors held at Saratoga a few years ago, and known as the Saratoga conference, the principle adopted for the keeping of accounts was that all additions and betterments, described as they are by Mr. Kirkman, who is an authority on railway questions, were directed to be charged to capital account, and not entered under the classification of working expenses. I have a whole series of railway reports from the United States showing this to be the custom, and I could quote them until morning, but do not intend to abuse the indulgence of the committee in that direction. It will suffice to take one as a sample of the whole. It is the report made in 1882 by the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railway Company. Among the items charged to construction, and which in a great many instances are charged to working expenses in the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway, are such items as those: New side tracks, $87,688; ballasting and improving tracks, $20,382; land and right of way, $128,660; new buildings and waterworks; new fencing; new telegraph lines. I have also the report of the New York Central and Hudson River Railway, in which the same classification is adopted; and the details given show that the additions and betterments made during the year have been added to the capital account, and these include such items as the following:—Superstructure including ties, land and fence; passenger and freight stations and several others in the same direction. Reference has been made to the cost of the Intercolonial Railway and the circumstances under which it was constructed, and I think it would not be amiss to quote the section of the British North America Act in which the construction of that railway was guaranteed, and to ascertain from that what is implied with regard to the operation of that railway. It stands as a public work, owned by the Dominion, in a different light from any other public work of the country. It is part of the terms under which the lower provinces consented to enter the Dominion and to be built prior to Confederation, while all the other works of magnitude have been built after the provinces came together and stand on a different footing. There is no desire to disparage the utility of the canal system of this country. We are all proud to contribute our share in opening up the great highways so essential to the life and commerce of our country; and in dealing with the Intercolonial Railway, we ask nothing more than to apply the same principle which is being applied to the operation of the canals of the country. We find, although these works were constructed after the union of the provinces, no attempt was made, nor is it desirable any attempt should be made, to convert these works into a direct source of revenue to this country. They were built on other grounds entirely, and their operations in the past few years have been directed, not with a view to revenue, but with the view of cheapening the facilities of commerce throughout the country, and they have not been operated at a profit but at a slight loss during the past few years. If the same method of accounting had been applied to the Intercolonial Railway, which has been applied to the canals, the same results would show; that is with regard to what may be termed working expenses, although the capital account would show very large, there would be small loss in operating account. Section 45 of the British North America Act reads as follows:—

"Inasmuch as the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have joined in a declaration that the construction of the Intercolonial Railway is essential to the consolidation of the Union of British North America, and to the assent thereto of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and have consequently agreed that provision should be made for its immediate construction by the Government of Canada: Therefore in order to give effect to that agreement, it shall be the duty of the Government and

Parliament of Canada to provide for the commencement, within six months after the Union, of a railway connecting the River St. Lawrence with the city of Halifax in Nova Scotia, and for the construction thereof without intermission, and the completion thereof with all praticable speed."

I think it must be conceded that the construction of the Intercolonial Railway had for its object the development of the interprovincial trade and the maintenance of an efficient line of communication between the Eastern Provinces and the west. Some objection has been made to the enormous capital required to carry out this enterprise, but the Intercolonial Railway, as I have observed, stands on a different footing from any other public work owned by the Dominion of Canada. In its construction it was diverged a very long way out for military purposes. It is expensive in operation on account of climatic difficulties such as frost and heavy snow-falls, and there is, along a portion of this line, a very small population to give local traffic. I will conclude by quoting from the railway authority I have already quoted with reference to this matter, Mr. Kirkman, of Chicago, the author of several valuable works on railway subjects and an eminent authority in such matters. In a pamphlet on division of railway expenses and earnings, he said:

"It is owing, largely to the imperfect method of keeping the account of railway expenses and the dissemination of false information in consequence thereof, that much of the misunderstanding in regard to the capitalization of these properties has arisen. Upon a minute examination we discover that many charges under the head of operating expenses do not belong there at all, but should be charged to construction as a part of the permanent plant. This is brought about in several ways: sometimes from the conservatism of managers and owners anxious to improve their property without increasing its obligations and more desirous of bettering outstanding obligations than of incurring new ones. This is, of course, laudable, but it should be understood, in many cases the securities of a company as far below par from the inability of the property to earn a profit on the cost already capitalized, or the market price fluctuates wildly under the slightest pressure or excitement, in dictating lack of stability and confidence in the enterprise. To the owners of such properties it seems absurd to make further charges against capital until a stable footing has been established. This is the genius of common sense, the acumen of business men, the dictate of prudence. This is one explanation why construction in frequently charged as a current operating expense. Some portion of these disbursements are embraced in the expense account, however, in consequence of the difficulty in separating the two classes of charges in the accounts. While it is our habit to look upon railways in operation (especially those long in use) as finished, these properties, as a matter of fact, are never completed. They are ever in a state of change, of evolution, of betterment. Sometimes this transformation is so rapid, or of such magnitude, as to attract attention and require explanation, perhaps provision. This is so in reference to additions such as the building of great elevators and warehouses, and extending sidings, or large additions to the equipment. Great outlays of this nature are singled out and embraced in the returns under the head of construction. In some instances they are capitalized. This is supposed to be the measure of a railway company's construction, the extent of its right to add to its capital. As a matter of fact, however, the great additions to railway property do not occur in this way at all, but are made up of myriads of petty improvements so small as to escape attention or not to be thought worthy of notice. The driving of two nails where only one has been charged to construction is an improvement and affords the basis of further capitalization to the extent of the additional outlay. Railways derive continual improvement from the adding of new ballast; from being raised to grade; from the widening of cuts and the opening of ditches; from better alignment and the improvement of bridges and culverts; in the improvement of the quality and weight of rails and other track fixtures and appurtenances; in added facilities connected with offices, machine shops and other buildings; in the filling up of yards and the accumulation of personal property: and finally in the substitution of equipment of a high order in the place of that of an inferior grade, worn out or destroyed. Under the operation of these silent and unobserved forces great properties develop."

Mr. HAZEN. The question which we have had under consideration in this House during the whole afternoon and evening cannot be said to be new, because I think, if you turn to the pages of *Hansard* since the building of the Intercolonial Railway, you will find no more frequent subject of discussion in this House than the management of that railway and the best way of getting rid of the deficit which has been staring us in the face year after year. From the time this road was constructed and operated, down to 1873, it was operated at a loss. In 1873 there was a change in the management of the Railway Department. Hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, and under their management, the deficits did not decrease, but went on increasing, and during one of those years the deficit reached a sum of nearly $700,000. In 1878 after the Conservative Government came back into power, Sir Charles Tupper took the Department of Railways and applied the pruning knife to the management of the Intercolonial Railway with a very unsparing hand. The result was that for a few years he made the receipts equal to expenditures, but the pruning knife had been so closely applied that it was found that expenditures had again to be made to bring the road up to what it should be, and thus the expenditures became very much the same and the deficits again occurred. Since the Canadian Pacific Railway has become a competitor for the through passenger traffic and freight traffic from the west, the deficits have gone on increasing, until this year probably they will reach the high water mark in the history of the road. In considering the question of the deficits—and it is not at all a pleasant matter to speak of, because it involves an amount ranging from half a million to three quarters of a million a year—I think it is only fair to bear in mind what has been said by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) and has been enlarged upon by the junior member for the County of Pictou (Mr. McDougald). Both these gentlemen, and particularly the hon. member for Pictou, have pointed out that, if the same system of keeping accounts were adopted in regard to the Intercolonial Railway as are used by other railway companies in the Dominion, the deficits we have to face year after year would not be so large as they appear to be, because, as both those gentlemen have pointed out, that in the case of the "betterments," as they are called, which, when made by any other railway corporation, are charged to capital account, are on the Intercolonial Railway charged against the ordinary running expenses of the road. If I understood the statements of these hon. gentlemen aright, that was the state of the case, and for my part, speaking not as a railway man at all, I fail to see why, if a company took up 56-pound rails and replaced them with 67-pound rails, the difference in cost should not be charged to capital expenditure, and I cannot see that it is a fair charge against the ordinary expenditure of the road. It would not be fair to charge the whole cost of the new rails against the road, but the difference in the expenditure should be charged against capital account. That is not done, and the result has been that a large amount has been charged against the ordinary expenditure of the Intercolonial Railway

which should have been charged against capital expenditure just as much as the cost of laying the rails in the first instance was charged. Then, if the Intercolonial Railway take down a wooden bridge and put up an iron bridge in its place, I think the difference in the price ought to be charged to capital account. I think the argument advanced to the House by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) and by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald) should be fairly considered when we are considering the cost of the Intercolonial Railway, because as was pointed out by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald) when we deduct what ought to be charged to capital account the deficit is very much reduced. However, I am further prepared to say that, if the system of keeping the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway were similar to that in regard to the canals in the Province of Ontario, the deficits would appear very small indeed. I find that last year the total receipts of the canals were $345,000 charged to income, and $1,065,000 charged to capital account. I find that there was $204,000 for repairs, and $294,000 for the staff.

Mr. HAGGART. That is a mistake.

Mr. HAZEN. That is as I find it. I find that $204,000 for repairs in connection with the canals is charged to capital account. If such expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway were charged in the same way against capital account as these expenditures on the canals are charged in the Western Provinces, the amount of the deficit would be far less than it appears to be. However, the fact remains that we have a deficit on the Intercolonial Railway. It is true that it was never contemplated when the road was built, that it would pay the expenses of management for many years, and it was expected by those who advocated the confederation of the provinces, that it would be a means of communication between the different provinces and that, from a military standpoint, it would be a great benefit to the Empire. Yet though that is a fact, we have meeting us this session the fact that the deficit during the current year will probably be greater than during any previous year in the history of the Intercolonial Railway. This is a serious matter to face, and it is only fair that we should consider what means can be taken, without impairing the service of the Intercolonial Railway and without prejudice to the interests of the people, to make the revenue and expenditure more nearly balance than they do at the present time. Now, the Minister of Railways, I am pleased to know, has been giving a great deal of attention to this subject. I think that after the hon. gentleman goes over the Intercolonial Railway at the close of this session, as he promises to do, he being a practical man, will see many things that ought to be changed in the interest not only of economy but also in the interest of the efficiency of the road. The Minister of Railways has grappled with the subject, and has so far come to the conclusion which he has stated to the House that he intends, in the first place, to dispense with the services of 210 employés on the Intercolonial Railway, out of a total number of 4,181; and he hopes by this reduction to effect an annual saving of $95,000 a year. In the second place, he tells us that he has come to the conclusion that there are a number of trains on the Intercolonial Railway that can be dispensed without impairing the efficiency of the service, and he intends to cancel those trains. I think the Minister stated to the House that by so doing he will effect a saving of $418,000 a year, and adding to this amount the saving he expects to accomplish by the reduction of the staff, he expects to affect a saving altogether of $513,000 a year, which will go a long way towards meeting the deficit which we have on the Intercolonial Railway at the present time. Now, I do not think there is any member of this House who will say that the Minister is not justified in dispensing with the services of 210 officials, or more officials, if the service does not require them, and if the affairs of the road can be carried on quite as well without them. In the second place, I do not think there is a member of this House who would dispute for an instant that if there are trains upon the Intercolonial Railway that are being run at a loss, and that are not necessary for the public service, they should be cancelled. I think it is the feeling of all the members of this House, whether they come from the Maritime Provinces or from the Western Provinces, that the road should be managed prudently and economically, provided it is managed in such a way as shall not impair its efficiency nor diminish its usefulness. That is the plan the hon. member suggests for reducing a part of that expenditure. It is perfectly clear from evidence that was given before the Public Accounts Committee some days ago, that there are certain trains on the Intercolonial Railway that can be dispensed with just as well as not. It will be remembered that evidence was given before that committee as to a train that leaves the city of Halifax twenty minutes, I think, before the Canadian Pacific Railway train leaves in the afternoon which runs as far as Moncton. The result of that arrangement, it seems to me, cannot be attributed to anything else but bad management. The result is that the Intercolonial Railway train leaving twenty minutes before the Canadian Pacific Railway train which runs from Halifax to St. John, gets no passengers to take to Moncton at all; the passengers wait the extra twenty minutes and take the Canadian Pacific Railway train and go through by that. It appears that that train costs the country some $275 a day. By doing away with that train he will save the country about $80,000 a year. Now, with regard to the deficit upon the road, it appears from the statements of the Minister that the management of the Intercolonial Railway has not been extravagant. From personal observation and experience I can say that the salaries paid to most of the officials on that road are entirely too small, and much less than men employed in those positions would get had they given the same intelligence, and the same amount of attention, and the same amount of industry to a position in any other walk of life. The Minister has told us that the actual cost per train mile of the Intercolonial Railway is 72 cents. From the figures which he read of the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, I came to the conclusion that they compared favourably with the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and on many other roads in this country. That is clear evidence, I think, that the management of the Intercolonial Railway has not been extravagant. But the trouble appears to be on the other side of the sheet. We find the receipts per train mile on the Intercolonial Rail-

way is only 59 cents; the receipts on the Canadian Pacific Railway per train mile is $1.07, and on the Grand Trunk Railway it is about $1.30. I am speaking now only from recollection. So it appears to me that the trouble is not in the expense of running the road; the trouble seems to be in the receipts from passengers and freight. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) pointed out that he had made calculations as to the average amount paid by each passenger that travelled on the Intercolonial Railway, and he found it was only 75 cents, and he drew the conclusion that there could be very little other traffic between Halifax and Point Lévis, or else the average amount paid by each passenger would be much greater. It seems to me that the trouble with the Intercolonial Railway during the past two years has largely been that the railway management have not been alive to the fact that, during the last few years, they have had to meet competition with the Short Line Railway. We know that the Canadian Pacific Railway corporation is a most active corporation. We know that no man doing a commercial business can get business and keep it, unless he has his agents and representatives in all directions endeavouring to get business for the houses they represent. The same thing, in a great degree, is true of railway companies, and no railway corporation can hope at the present time to get business for their road unless they have their agents actively engaged in endeavouring to get business for their road and to divert it from other competing roads. I do not think that since the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in so far as I am able to judge, the management of the Intercolonial Railway have made that effort to secure business that they should have made, now that they are brought into competition with an active and energetic corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let me illustrate. I am told that the number of people who go direct from Halifax to the Upper Provinces now by way of the Intercolonial is very small: that the great majority of these people leave the Intercolonial Railway at St. John and go over the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Upper Provinces. I am told that is largely due to the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, when the English steamers and other vessels arrive at Halifax, have their agents at the wharf, active and energetic men, who offer superior inducements to the people to take the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the result is that that company are able to get these passengers and take them over their road to the Upper Provinces. It seems to me that from this time forward it is the plain duty of the Intercolonial Railway managers to take such means to secure business as do the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other live company, and with regard to English passengers coming to Halifax the Intercolonial Railway should have an agent on the ground to point out to them the advantage of going to the Upper Provinces by the Intercolonial Railway, that the scenery is finer than on any other road, that the cars and the service are quite as good as on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and by these means seek to get that trade over the Intercolonial Railway which to-day is being in a very large measure diverted to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Further than that, I would heartily endorse the suggestion which, I think, was made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) that in order to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway the Intercolonial Railway should have agents at St. John and Halifax who would be able to deal with the business men of those cities direct, give them terms for bringing or sending freight by the Intercolonial Railway, so that delays would not occur as at present from communication with Moncton, and in many cases from Moncton to the Minister of Railways, or the manager of Government Railways in Ottawa. I heartily hope the Minister of Railways will see his way clear to carry out the suggestion of the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. McAlister) with respect to the dismissals. Out of the 4,000 employés on the road only 210 are to be dismissed. That fact in itself is answer to the statement made that the Intercolonial Railway has been used for political purposes, and people have been crowded into positions by members of Parliament simply for political purposes and to give candidates political strength. If that were the case, now that the Minister is applying the pruning knife, instead of 210 men, there would be many more dismissed, for it must be borne in mind that by cancelling the trains proposed, a certain number of men will not be required who were needed when those trains were in operation, and the cancelling of those trains alone would account for the dismissal of nearly 210 people whom the Minister proposes to dismiss from the railway service. But the hon. member for Restigouche suggested that as the dismissals were only 5 per cent of the total employés of the road, only a very short time would elapse before there would be 210 vacancies caused by resignation, by death and by different reasons which lead men to leave the employment of the road. It was urged by the hon. gentleman that these dismissals should be made so gradually that as little hardship as possible should be imposed on the men employed, because in a very short time, without any dismissals, there will be 210 less people employed on the road than at present. I was particularly pleased that during the debate the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) should have called the attention of the House and the country to the fact, and he called attention to it in a way that cannot be answered, that the deficit from the Intercolonial Railway, if it is caused by carrying freight at too low a price as stated by the Minister, when he said that it was largely charged by carrying grain, flour, stone and coal at too small a rate, is not one which should be charged entirely, or in great part, against the Maritime Provinces, but in all fairness it should be charged equally against the Upper and Western Provinces. For instance, if the deficit is on the article of grain, that grain is carried from the west to ports in the Maritime Provinces to be shipped; it is not left there, but carried forward, more in the interests of the people of the west than in the interest of the people of the Maritime Provinces. Taking flour, for instance, it is a well-known fact that a large business is being opened up with the West Indies. This western flour passes through the Maritime Provinces for the West Indies, and the only benefit that we derive is the money spent on handling it and passing it on board a steamer which takes it to its market. That class of expenditure is in the interest of the west, and if the flour is carried at less price than it costs to forward it over the railway, the deficit to that extent should be

fairly charged against the people of the west and not against the Maritime Provinces. It is true an argument was advanced by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that, in consequence of the flour being carried down to the Maritime Provinces at a small freight rate, the people there obtain it at a less rate than they could obtain it if proper prices were charged on the Intercolonial Railway. In answer to that allegation, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) pointed out that if that was not done, the flour would come to the Maritime Provinces as cheaply by going over the Grand Trunk to Portland and thence by vessel to St. John and Halifax. But if it is carried to St. John and the Maritime Provinces at less than it costs the railway to carry it, then if it is in the interests of the Maritime Provinces that this should be done, it is also in the interest of the millers of Ontario. It is a benefit to a certain degree to both, and, therefore, if there is a deficit in consequence, it cannot be fairly charged against the Maritime Provinces alone. The same may be said of the coaling district. It may be advantageous to the people of Cumberland and other coal producing counties, to have coal carried by the Intercolonial Railway at a small loss, if there is a loss, though during the debate of last session I was not satisfied that it was always carried at a loss, but that it was carried at a loss only during the winter and during a season of heavy storms when the road was blocked for weeks at a time—but if it is to the interest of the coal miners of Nova Scotia, certainly it is no benefit to New Brunswick, it is to a certain extent applying the same argument as has been used in regard to flour, in the interest of the people of the Upper Provinces and especially the Province of Quebec, because they obtain coal cheaper than would otherwise be the case. It must be borne in mind concerning the Intercolonial Railway deficits in the past, that the railway gave to the people of the Upper Provinces, and especially to the importers and traders of Montreal and Toronto, a mode of access to the markets of the Lower Provinces, of which they were not slow to take advantage, and the Intercolonial Railway enabled them to compete with the importers of St. John and Halifax. It was of the greatest possible advantage to them, and last session I showed that on certain lines of hardware —I proved it by the way-bills — those articles were carried from Toronto by the Grand Trunk and Intercolonial Railway to Amherst and different parts of Nova Scotia at a lower average rate than the same class of goods could be sent from St. John to those points, although that city was 500 miles nearer. Yet the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk by an arrangement between them carried goods from the Upper to the Lower Provinces at such low rates that the city of St. John had no geographical advantage but was placed on the same footing as regards distance with Toronto. With respect to local rates, there is a general impression prevailing through the Maritime Provinces—it may be a just impression or not —that the policy of the Intercolonial Railway is too much in the direction of obtaining through freight and not enough in the direction of endeavouring to work up local business along the road. This statement is put forward, I know, by lumber operators on the North Shore of New Brunswick, who desire to ship lumber to St. John in winter, that they cannot do so, as they are unable to obtain from the Intercolonial Railway a rate which would enable them to send lumber over the road to that city, and therefore, St. John is shut out from that business during the winter season. It is true that the answer is made that the local rates on the Intercolonial Railway are too low. There is a general impression prevailing—I am not a railway man—that the Intercolonial pay no attention whatever to local freight, but that their whole desire seems to be to carry through freight from the Lower Provinces west, and to bring through freight back again. Every one who has anything to do with a railroad knows that this local freight along any line like the Intercolonial Railway, especially along the part referred to by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) between Halifax and St. John, could be made very profitable to the road. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) in the course of his speech referred to the fact that in his opinion, the road between Halifax and St. John, under proper management, ought to pay very handsomely. I would suggest to the Minister of Railways the importance, if it is possible, of keeping the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway in such a manner as will show the receipts and disbursements, on the different divisions of the road, because I am satisfied that at the present time the business between Halifax and St. John, and at intermediate points, is of such a character that it cannot help paying, and that the loss on the road is on the northern division, which at times in the winter is blocked with snow, and that a great portion of that loss is occasioned by running express trains at different seasons of the year to and from Halifax in order to connect with the steamers carrying the English mails. Let me say one word more concerning the question of salaries. In the earlier portion of my remarks I stated that the salaries paid to the officers of the Intercolonial Railway were in many cases, and I say it advisedly, a disgrace to the Government and to the Dominion of Canada. Let me give some instance which have come within my own notice. At the Intercolonial Railway station, in the city of St. John, the ticket agent there, a gentleman who handles, every year, about $200,000 in cash, and who is there from early morning until late at night and is there late at night on Sundays, receives, for his services, the pittance of $60 a month, and of that $60, $28 is paid back to the Government under an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway. This gentleman who handles over $160,000 on the Intercolonial Railway every year is actually only receiving from the Government of Canada $32 a month. The same thing is true of the gentleman, Mr. Rusk, who handles the freight business of the Intercolonial Railway in that city. This gentleman who comes in contact with every business man in St. John, who is an excellent man at his business, and a man who, if he were to leave the service tomorrow, the Government could not find one to do the work as well as he, because he has been there for years and knows it thoroughly, only receives $50 a month. If that gentleman were employed in any private corporation I venture to say that he would get twice or three times that amount. The same thing also is true of the cashier of the freight department, and of very many other clerks and employés. I repeat, that the salaries paid, in many

cases, on the Intercolonial Railway are a disgrace to the Government of Canada, and I trust that the hon. Minister of Railways, when he comes down to the Maritime Provinces and personally sees these matters, will consider the desirability and advisability of increasing the salaries in several directions there, not only in St. John, but in other places. I believe that he would be justified in doing so, if he can save half a million dollars a year by the changes which he contemplates. Further, I would say to the Minister of Railways, that I trust that all the saving on the road is not going to be effected by the dismissing of a few men who are mechanics or labourers, but if a saving is to be effected, I think it can be effected in some degree by also reducing the salaries of the highly-paid officials on the road, who in comparison with those in humble positions are receiving a very large salary, or rather perhaps the others are receiving too little. I was sorry that in this debate to-night, the question had not taken a broader range, as to what the policy of the Government in the future would be concerning the Intercolonial Railway. Some reference has been made to that subject briefly to-night, and it will be remembered that we discussed it at very considerable length last year. It seems to me that there are four policies which might be pursued and which are open for consideration in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. The first would be to continue as we are doing at present with the management in the city of Ottawa, the Minister of Railways, and the manager of the road being here, and attempting to reduce the deficit, as the Minister is attempting by applying the pruning knife here and there in the way of economy. Another line of policy that has been suggested to-night is that the Intercolonial might be sold to a private corporation, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway. That, I believe, should not be considered for a single instant. A third policy is the one that was put forward last year by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and that is, that the road should be placed in the hands of an independent commission appointed by the Government, who would be as independent as the judges of the land are, and who should manage that road and have their headquarters at a point along the Intercolonial Railway. The fourth idea that presents itself to my mind is, that the road might continue to be managed as at present, with the exception that the manager of the road should have his headquarters at a point along the line, for instance at the town of Moncton, which is the most central position for such an office. I desire to repeat what I said last year, that I do not believe that the management of the Intercolonial Railway, or of any other railroad for that matter, can possibly be satisfactory while the manager of the road is so far away from the scene of operations as the manager of the Intercolonial Railway is at the present time. I care not how able, or active, or anxious he is to advance the interests of the road, it cannot be run in the interests of the country if the manager is not stationed at a central point to see how things are conducted, and to promptly deal with any questions that may arise.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under the present system is not Mr. Pottinger there?

Mr. HAZEN. Mr. Pottinger is there, but Mr. Pottinger is not the manager, and he does not occupy the highest position on the road. There are two managers in the city of Ottawa, first the Minister of Railways, and then the manager of Government railroads.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You must have the Minister here and there is only the chief engineer in Ottawa in addition to him.

Mr. HAZEN. You must have the Minister here, except you put the road in the hands of a commission. I say that with the manager of the road armed with such powers as he has at present, the interests of the road would be much better served if his headquarters were at Moncton or some point on the road, than they can be served while he is living in Ottawa. Let me put a case in point before the hon. gentleman. A merchant in Halifax or St. John has some business with the road; he writes to Moncton to Mr. Pottinger; it may be of a nature that Mr. Pottinger does not like to deal with, and at the cost of much delay and inconvenience Mr. Pottinger writes to Ottawa to Mr. Schreiber, the manager of Government railways, and it may be three or four days or a week before an answer is obtained, when an answer should be given on such a matter within a few hours. Therefore, I say, as a general principle I do not believe that the management of any road can be entirely satisfactory when the manager is not on the ground himself to deal with people who have complaints to make, or who have business to transact in connection with the road. I think this is a matter for serious consideration by the Government, if they do not at the present moment desire seriously to consider the scheme for placing the road in the hands of the commission. My idea would be that for the proper management of the road it would be well for the Government to acquire the branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial Railway, and then place the whole system in the hands of a commission. That, I believe, would be in the interests of the whole Dominion and of the Maritimes Provinces as well.

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

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) said "Oh." The hon. gentleman should remember that some of these branch lines connected with the Intercolonial Railway, at the present moment, are paying their way, their revenue meeting the expenditure, and that if they were part of the Intercolonial Railway system, as I contend they ought to be, and if that system were properly managed; if it were managed for instance as the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway, if you had a first-class railway manager at say Moncton, with power to deal with cases as they arise, I believe the whole system would be managed in such a way that it would not entail any expense, or at the most but small expense, on the taxpayers of the country every year, and that it would be infinitely better in the interests of the public who use the road, and of the business people generally of the country, either in the west or in the east. If the Government do not seriously consider the question of adopting the course suggested last year by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), of placing the management of the road in the hands of an independent commission, I think it would be fair to consider whether it would not be better, in the interest both of the road and of the country, that the manager should be located at a central

point such as Moncton, where he would be accessible at all times to the business men of the country, and where he would have a more intimate and personal supervision of the road than he can have at the city of Ottawa; and if that course is adopted, I believe it will be in the interest of the country as well as in the interest of the section through which the road itself passes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before the item is carried, I want to say a word or two on this subject. I am sure the House will not regret the time that has been spent this afternoon in discussing this question which is of so much importance to the people of this Dominion. The fact that a railway which has cost the people of this Dominion some $50,000,000 of hard money is being run at a loss, amounting to over $640,000 last year, and which will reach $1,000,000 this year, certainly justifies the serious attention of this House. It has been stated that this road was never intended as a commercial enterprise, but that it was built rather to carry out the terms of Confederation, and as a military road, and not with the idea that it should pay its working expenses. Now, whatever ideas were at the time in the minds of those who undertook the construction of the road, I have only this to say, that if by running it on commercial principles it can be made to cover the running expenses, and instead of producing large deficits every year to return dividends to the Government, it certainly is in the interest of the people that it should be so run. But I have been very much amused to hear the reasons which have been advanced during the last few hours by the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House why a deficit exists. The hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) attributes its entirely to the fact that flour, wheat and coal are carried at too low a rate, and the natural inference would be that if we want to make the road pay, we must raise the rates of freight on these articles. This view of the case, however, does not suit the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) or the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald), or the hon member for St. John (Mr. Hazen). They do not want such a thing as that to occur. No: it would be a heinous thing for the Government to undertake to raise the rates of freight on these articles, knowing as they do that the effect would be to enhance their price to the people of the Maritime Provinces. Therefore they invent different causes for the deficit which annually occurs. The hon. member for Pictou attributes it to the fact that the road is in a very high state of efficiency, and also to the fact that owing to the peculiar method of book-keeping adopted on the road large sums are charged to the working expenses which ought to be charged to capital account. He makes out, if I understand him rightly, that during the last ten years some $2,000,000 had been charged to working expenses which ought to have been charged to capital account. If that is so, the road has not been run at an annual loss at all. The hon. member for St. John elucidated that point somewhat fully. Before he got through, however, he had to admit that a deficit did occur on the Intercolonial Railway, and the fact could hardly be denied. Considering the reports that are laid before the House, it would be foolish indeed for any man to attempt to prove that a deficit does not occur. But he finds great fault with the means that have been outlined by the hon. Minister of Railways for overcoming that deficit. He does not like the idea of discharging those 210 officials of the road. He thinks they should be left for death or other causes to create vacancies. He does not very much favour the idea of dispensing with any trains, fearing that the accommodation of the people will be impaired: and he also complains greatly that the salaries of the officials are not large enough. He mentioned some gentlemen in his own town, I presume very patriotic fellows, and no doubt very efficient and hard-working men, who have been for some time employed at $50 a month doing work for which he said they would be paid on any other railway two or three times as much. Now, it seems to me that these men are very foolish to remain there. I wonder that they do not quit the service of the Intercolonial Railway and go where they can get more money. He says the salaries paid on the railway are a disgrace to the Government of Canada. These are pretty strong words to come from an hon. gentleman who has in season and out of season been supporting the Government. I think, however, that his conclusions were not very good when he instanced the cases he did, because I believe that if there is a single man working on the Intercolonial or anywhere else for $50 a month who could get $75 or $100 elsewhere, he is a bigger fool than any I ever met if he does not step out. The fact that he remains there at $50 a month is conclusive proof to my mind that he cannot get any more. Now, I am not prepared to admit that the loss on the Intercolonial Railway is due to low rates on flour or wheat or coal. I say that the rate charged by the Intercolonial on flour is a good paying rate, which should yield the railway a good profit. I know something about the rate on flour on the Intercolonial, and I can state that the proportion now charged say from Point Lévis to Chatham, which is I presume about 450 miles, is over half a cent per ton per mile. It will amount to .53 of a cent per ton per mile. Then if you go on to Moncton, 510 miles, the rate charge on that is .47 of a cent per ton per mile; then to Truro, 610 miles, it is .39 of a cent per mile. If you take the longest haul on the Intercolonial Railway, that from Lévis to Halifax, you will find that the flour rate will average just one-third of a cent per ton per mile. Now, I say that that rate is as good a rate as is obtained by nearly any road in the country. The rate obtained by the Grand Trunk Railway, the proportion it gets on the flour from the west to Halifax will not, taken as a whole, be any higher, I believe, than what the Intercolonial Railway gets. The Intercolonial Railway carries a great deal of flour all along the line from Campbellton, Dalhousie, Chatham, Moncton, Amherst. They get the same proportion of rate as they do on the flour that goes to Halifax and there is where they make a large profit out of the rate on flour. I believe that the present proportion of the Intercolonial Railway is 37 per cent of the through rate, which will leave them a very good profit over the actual cost of hauling. Now, so far as flour and grain are concerned, I may say that there is not a single pound of freight carried over the Intercolonial Railway which does not yield a handsome return to the Government. One fault I find is that a great proportion of the flour consumed

in the Maritime Provinces is not carried over the Intercolonial Railway at all, notably the flour consumed in Prince Edward Island, hardly any of which ever goes to that Island over the Intercolonial Railway. I think that if the railway were properly managed, at points like Pictou and Point Dechene, the rates should be lower than to other points in order to enable us to compete with the water route by Boston and New York. I do not consider it is a good showing that every Saturday during the past season there should be two lines of steamers running from Boston to Halifax and Charlottetown and every steamer loaded down with Canadian flour which should have been carried over Canadian railways. I think, therefore, that when we take into consideration the rate obtained on flour, it is a good paying rate, far above the usual cost. I believe, on railways which is three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile, as the lowest possible rate that will pay running expenses. We find there is no flour carried over the Intercolonial Railway, even the longest haul they have does not yield them ⅓ of a cent per ton per mile. Therefore I think that the Intercolonial Railway was negligent. I think its managers were not as active as they should be when they allowed the large proportion of good paying traffic to be diverted from their line to steamers *viâ* Boston. The hon. member for St. John, drew a comparison between the Intercolonial Railway and our canal system. He thought the same arguments could be used as regards our canals, namely that the cost of work maintaining them is much larger than the receipts. I do not think that is a proper comparison to make. Railways and canals both stand on their own foundation. The fact that our canals do not pay is no reason why our Intercolonial Railway should not pay. The whole question is if the Intercolonial Railway can be made to pay, it is our bounden duty to ascertain how and bring that desirable consummation about. For my part, I have always thought that the Intercolonial Railway ought to pay running expenses, and that, if it was properly managed, there is no reason why it should not yield a dividend to the country. Take the Intercolonial Railway from St. John to Halifax and I do not believe there is any railway in this country which ought to pay better. Look at the large thriving towns and cities through which it runs. It runs through a good country and has no competitor. I do not believe that the road from the Baie des Chaleurs to Lévis could pay very well, but even it should pay running expenses, as the traffic on it is considerable and there is considerable local traffic along the line. Compare the Intercolonial Railway with the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway; take the Canadian Pacific Railway from Quebec to Winnipeg, and see the thousands of miles through which that road runs where it does not get one pound of freight or a single passenger, and then take the Canadian Pacific Railway west again and you will find long stretches where there is not a single passenger or a pound of freight furnished; and yet we find that the Canadian Pacific Railway is paying a good dividend, the stock is away up, the road is well managed. Why should not the Intercolonial Railway pay? There is no reason why. I believe that the amount of freight that must necessarily go down to the Maritime Provinces would, if that road were properly managed, more than pay running expenses, and the interests of the country would be as well served as they are. So far as carrying coal and iron is concerned, I am not in a position to say what the freight is, but I believe that while the coal to the west may be carried possibly at a small loss, the freight that is carried from one local point to another, is so much higher that taking the coal carriage as a whole you will find the receipts will, at all events, cover the expenses. So that I do not believe there is any loss in carrying coal, and I have shown that the carriage of wheat and flour must yield a handsome revenue. Then the question comes, if you do not make any loss in carrying freight, how does it occur? I cannot help thinking that the loss occurs through the number of unnecessary trains which are run. That point was brought up last year, and it was stated then that a special train was running from St. John to Halifax which cost the country at that time some $60,000 or $70,000 a year. That train was still continued for the whole year, although, as has been pointed out to-night by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) it left Halifax twenty minutes before the Canadian Pacific Railway train, and consequently no passengers took that train. The hon. members for Halifax and St. John allowed that state of affairs to go on without raising their voice to endeavour to remedy it. The cancelling of these unnecessary trains will save a large amount of money, and I think the Government and especially the members from the Maritime Provinces should receive the censure of this House for allowing such a state of affairs to exist so long. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) found fault with the management of the Intercolonial Railway for not having agents at St. John and Halifax to see that business men sent their freights over the Intercolonial Railway, and pointed out that the Canadian Pacific Railway had agents who, when the English steamships arrived, solicited their freight. If that is true, if we have no agents actively engaged in looking after the interests of the country, when we are paying them as station masters, road masters and solicitors of freight, if these men are not willing to look after the business, it is time that the Minister of Railways applied the pruning knife and put men in there who would look after the interest of the road and of the country. The Minister had good reasons to say there were many men employed on that road who were inefficient and not competent to perform their duty. I was sorry to hear from the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that there were 30 agents of the Intercolonial Railway who were also agents for the Canadian Pacific Railway. If that is the case, I think the Government should see that no man employed as an agent or station master on the Intercolonial Railway should solicit freight for the Canadian Pacific Railway. They have quite enough to do in looking after the interest of their own road without looking after the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not wonder that there is so little freight and that there are so few passengers going over the Intercolonial Railway when we find the agents in the employment of the Government allowed to largely increase their salaries by acting as agents for the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 11th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of James A. Lowell, Esq., for the Electoral District of Welland.

LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg to move:

That this House will, on Monday next, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider further Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.

I make this motion, believing that the House will, perhaps, be inclined to reconsider its hasty action on Monday night in refusing to grant even a consideration of the provisions of this Bill, and that in face of the fact that the leader of the Government had accepted one feature of the Bill, and had promised that it should be accepted by the Government. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, the summary action of the House was, in my opinion, unjustifiable, and I think we will stand in a better position towards the country if we at least grant to this Bill the courtesy of a consideration; and for that reason I move that it be reinstated on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to.

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether tenders for new works at Miminegash breakwater, P.E.I., have been asked for? If so, has the contract been let, to whom, and for what amount?

Mr. OUIMET. No contract has been let for the above-mentioned work.

Mr. PERRY. I ask if tenders were asked for?

Mr. OUIMET. No tenders have been asked for.

POSTMASTER AT STE. LOUISE (L'ISLET).

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether the Government have received the report of the enquiry held by the Deputy Inspector of Post Offices, Quebec, in the matter of H. Potvin, Postmaster of Ste. Louise, in the County of L'Islet; if so, what is the purport of the said report, and what do the Government propose doing in relation to the matter?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I have the honour to inform him that the report in question has just been received, and that it is now under consideration. In a day or two I will be able to tell my hon. friend what is to be done.

VISIT OF FARMERS' DELEGATES.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne) asked, Whether any and what sum was paid to Charles H. Cahan, Esq., in connection with the visit of the farmers' delegates in the Province of Nova Scotia? And did the said Charles H. Cahan make any charge for, or receive any remuneration, for his services?

Mr. CARLING. Two hundred dollars was advanced to Charles H. Cahan, Esq., in connection with the visit of the farmers' delegates to the Maritime Provinces. Of this sum $21.92 was refunded by him, $31.48 expended by him in telegrams, &c., and $126.60 paid by him to other parties for their travelling expenses—the balance, $20, remained with Mr. Cahan on account of his travelling expenses outside the Province of Nova Scotia.

REPORTS OF BRITISH FARM DELEGATES.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) moved for:

Copy of the reports of the British Farm Delegates, Messrs. McQueen and Davey, on the Maritime Provinces.

He said: In moving this motion I desire to say that it is only due to the people of the country and their representatives in this House that the reports of these delegates should be brought down and laid on the Table. I understand that the visit of these delegates was brought about by the Premier of Nova Scotia when visiting London and as a result of a conference with the High Commissioner, it being settled that these delegates should come out and examine into the capabilities of the Lower Provinces as a field for emigrants from the old country. I understand there have been some rather unpleasant feelings aroused from the time the delegates arrived in Nova Scotia. I think, if I am not misinformed, the High Commissioner sent a despatch to the Government of Nova Scotia to meet those gentlemen, to entertain them and show them around. But when they arrived it was found that the Government at Ottawa had sent an official and appointed gentlemen to take possession of the delegates, if we may so speak, and show them round the province, and in visiting many parts of the province they found that their arrival was unannounced. So the visit assumes more of a political aspect than it should have done. The Local Government were certainly the proper parties to take hold of these gentlemen and show them through the country. When delegates visited the western part of Ontario, word was sent to the different localities and preparations made that they should see the province thoroughly, ascertain its capabilities from different standpoints, and obtain the views of the different political parties, if there was any advantage to be obtained from them. I believe money was well spent in bringing out delegates to enquire into the condition of the country for emigration purposes. But it appears that the Government were not well satisfied in some respects with the reports of the delegates who visited the Lower Provinces, or we would have had them published and copies laid on the Table of the House before this time. I understand the Government object to delegates who are sent out to

examine into the condition of the country, investigating our fiscal policy, and the capabilities of this being a cheap country to producers and a cheap country to live in. But I hold that when delegates are sent here, either if they come out at their own expense or at the cost of the Government, they have a duty to perform to the people of the old country, and that duty is to report upon the whole condition of the Dominion, both with respect to its soil, its fertility, its crops, the fiscal policy of the Government, and whether or not the people have to pay a larger, an excessive amount for all the goods they require for the household and for the agricultural implements. For all those who intend to emigrate do so with a view to bettering their condition, and when delegates are sent out, it is their duty to report as to whether they believe the whole conditions are favourable to emigrants to this colony. There is a very keen contest going on between the different colonies of Great Britain, and in fact between the civilized nations of the earth for immigrants, and among the matters affecting their decision are the capabilities of the country to produce cheaply; but it matters not what are our capabilities as regards fertile soil and other conditions, if this is a dear country to the producer, it is not a favourable field for emigrants. I hold that these delegates would not have been doing their duty to the people of the old country if they had not reported both on the fiscal policy of the Government and the effect of that policy as regards the markets for our producers, and whether or not admission to our natural market, which is close to us, is prevented by the fiscal policy of the Government. I hold that these matters should have engaged the attention of these delegates, and it was their duty to report on them when they returned to the old country. It is stated that the report has been in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, but for some reason or other it has never been published and laid before the people. I hold we have a perfect right, after paying the expenses of these delegates, to know what reports they have sent in. If it is favourable, we have a right to know it; if it is unfavourable, we also have a right to know in what points it is unfavourable. We have had much discussion with regard to emigration, and this matter lies at the foundation of successful emigration, namely, what report the delegates visiting the Dominion make in respect to this country when they go back to the land from which they came. A rumour is afloat that these delegates have given utterance to their opinion of the fiscal policy of the Government, and that the Government consider they have nothing to do with that subject. I hold they have just as good a right to report on the fiscal policy of the Government and the effect it has on settlers, farmers and workingmen, as upon any other point which could engage their attention. I hold that if they have reported in regard to markets from which we are shut out, we have a right to know the fact, and we have a right to know the opinion of these strangers, who came here for the purpose of subsequently sending out people to settle among us. We have a perfect right to know what their views are, and whether there is any existing evil that prevents immigrants from coming here, in order that it may be remedied. I hold that the Government are not performing their duty by withholding the report of the farm delegates who visited the Lower Provinces. I understand they came at the request of the Nova Scotia Government, and subsequently visited Ontario and the North-West. If from their report it appears that the fiscal policy of the Government is preventing immigrants from coming here, I think it will be one of the best lessons the Government ever received with respect to the policy they have adopted. The Minister of Agriculture has a duty to perform, and that duty is, at the earliest possible date to lay these reports before the House. It has been rumoured that only one of the delegates sent in a report, and that the Minister has only seen one. I should like to know why the other delegates did not make reports, or whether such reports were of a character that would not be presented by the Government to the House and the country. We have a perfect right to know all these questions, whether they believe that this country is well fitted for the breeding of cattle for the old country, whether it is a good field for raising horses for the English market, and whether it is a land in which, in their opinion, agriculture can be profitably followed. In all likelihood the delegates have given their views of all these questions. They are gentlemen of intelligence and well acquainted with the agricultural capabilities of the British Isles, and no doubt they were well calculated to give a sound judgment on the condition of the Lower Provinces, as well as the localities visited in Ontario and the North-West. I think the Government made a mistake in policy in sending down a deputation from Ottawa to meet those gentlemen, especially when the meeting was brought about by the Premier of Nova Scotia in conjunction with the High Commissioner, and take charge of the delegates during the time they were visiting the Lower Provinces. It also appears that during the time they were in that province no persons in many of the localities they visited knew anything about their coming, except those who were delegated to attend them. When such delegates come to Canada the farmers all over the country in the different lines of agriculture ought to be notified, so that they can meet the delegates, discuss with them, show them their farms, explain their system of farming and stock raising, and as far as possible give them all the information in their power. As I understand it, quite the reverse of that was done in the Province of Nova Scotia, which was certainly an impolitic and improper course for the Government to pursue. I do hope the Minister of Agriculture will at the earliest possible moment lay these reports on the Table, so that we shall be able to judge for ourselves whether or not the statements which have gone abroad with respect to the views the delegates entertain is correct or incorrect. The Government could do no greater injury to themselves than to withhold this report, because we believe, to-day, that the views of the farmer delegates with regard to the fiscal policy of this country is one of the reasons why it has been withheld. Perhaps if we have the report before us, the reasons might not be so strong in this direction as we anticipate, so that the Government, in justice to themselves, in justice to the farm delegates, and in justice to the House of Commons, ought to let us know what these reports contain. The farmers all over this country ought to know whether or not these delegates reported favourably

upon the localities they visited. I trust that at an early date the Minister will lay these reports upon the Table of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, in the ordinary course I would have asked that this motion should stand for to-day, but I presumed that the hon. gentleman wished to make some observations upon it, and, for that reason, I thought it was more courteous to him that the House should hear him. I ask him now not to press the motion for adoption to-day. The reports of these farmer delegates, which he referred to, are not in Canada, and the Government has really no information as to what they contain. The report of Mr. Davey has never been in Canada and has never been submitted to the Government, the other report was in Canada under circumstances which the House debated the other evening, but both reports have been telegraphed for and they will probably be here within a few days. If the hon. gentleman, therefore, will let his motion stand until the reports arrive, I have no objection at all that the matter should then be taken up in advance of any other business. And we will consent at once to the motion being carried, provided we have no good reason to the contrary.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Can the Minister give any idea when the reports will be here?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Within the next week or ten days, perhaps. Unless I can give some reason to the House to the contrary, and I have no cause to anticipate any reason to that effect, the reports will be brought down at once when they arrive; but we would prefer to have an opportunity of seeing them before the Order carries. If the hon. gentleman will allow his motion to stand, it will meet the case, but failing that, I will move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. LAURIER. Could not the motion be carried now?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not want to be put in the position of disobeying the Order of the House and not have an opportunity of giving reasons.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure the hon. gentleman would not disobey the Order of the House, but I am sure also that if he did, he would communicate his reasons to the House. I can see no reason at all why these reports should not be before the House whatever may be their contents. They are the reports of gentlemen who were selected by Sir Charles Tupper on behalf of the Canadian Government. They are men of position, they visited this country, and whether their opinions be right or wrong, it seems to me there can be no reason why they should not be laid on the Table of this House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no reason that I am aware of at all. I merely ask an opportunity to see the reports in order to ascertain if there be any reason. If any reason exists, that will be submitted to the House, but otherwise the reports will be laid on the Table immediately. If the motion for the Order should carry now I would have no opportunity of making explanations to the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of Justice objects to the motion passing now, because some reason may occur to him, after seeing the reports, why they should not be submitted to the House. No constitutional reason can exist why these reports shall not be submitted to the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In that case they will be brought down.

Mr. CASEY. In that case, if the Minister admits my contention that there can be no constitutional reason against producing them, there is no reason on earth why he should not let the motion pass now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot admit it in advance.

Mr. CASEY. The general principle is that any document, not a confidential state paper, which this House orders to be produced, must be produced. The House has a perfect right to order the production of these reports, especially when we have paid for them by a vote of the House. The Minister knows well there can be no constitutional reason for not producing them. It may be that the Government after seeing the report may think they are prejudical to their trade policy. Even should that be so, it is no reason why they should not be brought down. It is evidently for that reason the motion is denied now, in spite of the peculiar roundabout way in which the Minister has chosen to come at the point, a way quite consistent with his ordinary method of handling such questions. Evidently that report, as the Minister says, was before the Government at one time, and was sent back, and not treated as it should have been. The whole treatment of these delegates has been detrimental to the immigration interests of Canada at large. In the first place the Government showed they were afraid to let them see for themselves how things were in the Maritime Provinces. They were afraid to trust them in the hands of the Local Government, and they sent down a man or a delegation from Ottawa to take them in charge. But after they had done so, after the delegates had seen what the Government wished them to see, after they had stated their opinions, the Government were afraid to allow them to be made public, and their reports have been suppressed. Now, this in the first place was distinctly unfair to the Maritime Provinces. There is no doubt whatever that those reports contain a great deal that is favourable to the Maritime Provinces. Those delegates could not look over the Maritime Provinces without reporting very favourably upon their natural resources, and it is distinctly unfair to the people of those provinces that this favourable report should not be laid before the people of Canada and the people of Great Britain. Representatives of those provinces, if they have any vestige of provincial feeling, or any notion of protecting the interests of their provinces, should protest against the suppression of this report. It is also unfair to the whole of Canada. Here are a number of delegates who have been sent out to report upon the capabilities of this country, and whose expenses have been paid by this country. A certain number of them have been allowed to report; another certain number have not been allowed to report, and it has been admitted that those two delegates were prevented from reporting because they chose to pass reflections upon the trade policy of the Government. Now, Sir, what is the impression that will go abroad in Great Britain in regard to the reports which have been

published? People will say, and they will be justified by appearances in saying: We cannot trust the reports of those delegates which we have seen in print, because we know that others which have cast reflections on your trade policy have not been allowed to be published; we believe that only those who reported what was favourable to the Government were allowed to report at all; and, therefore, we distrust the whole story. Therefore, I say the suppression of these reports is an injustice to the country at large. Now, the action of the Minister intensifies that bad impression. He refuses to permit this motion to pass at present, for the alleged reason that he wants to see the reports when they come, in order to judge whether they are fit for publication. He, therefore, admits that a Government censorship is to be exercised over the reports, which destroys the value of all the reports which have been published.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, the proposition made by the hon. leader of the House to have this debate adjourned, is equivalent to placing in the hands of the Government the power of using their discretion whether this report should be made public or not. Before this report will be received from England, the Government will have taken the days devoted to private business in this House, and this motion cannot be again reached in its order this session. Now, Sir, it is evident to me that there is a desire on the part of the Government to suppress this report, for I am informed that the Minister of Agriculture had an interview with those delegates, and if he failed to read the report which was submitted to him, I think it is a very significant circumstance that that report was sent back to England. From the conversations he had with those delegates, he must have been aware of the character of this report; and if it told against the policy of the Government, I deem it a high-handed act on the part of the Government to decline to make it public. These farmer delegates come to the country, having been appointed by the High Commissioner of Canada, in England, charged with the duty of investigating the agricultural resources of certain sections of this Dominion. That report was made for the purpose of being laid before English farmers, and securing if possible immigration to Canada. I presume, Sir, that the gentlemen selected for this purpose were men possessing some knowledge of their business; I presume that they travelled with their eyes open; and I think that the people of this country and of the world may learn something from the impressions which these gentlemen gathered in the course of their tour. If we are to have everything suppressed which does not accord with the views of the Government, if we are to have every utterance or opinion of a delegate or an employé of the Government suppressed because it tells against the policy of the Government, we might as well have a Star Chamber at once; we might as well have no investigation at all; and I denounce this as a high-handed act on the part of the Government, to decline to publish this report, upon the flimsy pretext that the Minister never read it before sending it to England. Sir, the Minister knew the character of that report, and there are men in Canada who know its character, and, if necessary, it could be given to the public without the consent of the Government. The Government suppress it because it asserts that the farmers of this Dominion require access to their natural market, with the 65,000,000 people to the south of us before they can secure prosperity, and the Government have deliberately suppressed that opinion, expressed by their own chosen servants who were sent to this country to investigate it as a field for immigration and who have had the honesty and uprightness to tell the truth without colouring it for the purpose of advancing the interests of this Government. I do not believe that this debate should be adjourned. I do not believe that the motion of my hon. friend from Huron should be denied. I believe that we should insist that if there is such a report in existence, that report should be made public.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I think the Government did very well and wisely when they invited the English farmers' delegates to come to this country for the purpose of ascertaining whether Canada was a desirable place to live in. This investigation has cost the country a large sum of money, and we are entitled to receive the opinions which these delegates formed during their stay in this country. The personal expenses of these delegates amounted to $6,811; we have also paid over $20,000 for the printing and distribution of the report which is made by them, and $2,000 which was spent on parties who attended the delegation in different sections of the country while they were gathering information. Here is nearly $30,000 which it has cost this country to bring these delegates from England to examine this country as to whether it was the proper place to urge immigrants to come to settle in. At the same time I understand that these delegates were told that they were not to deal with any political issues at all, and I believe that a private report to the Government brought in referred to the prejudicial effects of the National Policy on this country. I am satisfied that something of that kind has been said in this report, or it would have appeared in the House before this. Is the reason for its non-appearance that it contained anything derogatory to the National Policy, which has been now in force for ten or twelve years? I have no doubt that when these delegates came to Nova Scotia, and looked at its vast resources, when they saw its vast stores of iron and coal, they considered that if we had free trade with the United States those resources would have been developed to an extent we can now have little idea of. I have no doubt that when they visited the eastern provinces and saw the great market to the south, which the National Policy has shut out from them, they came to the conclusion that if Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are to become desirable places for immigration, we must change our fiscal policy. In the face of all this, can you expect, Sir, that we, as an Opposition having the interests of the country at heart, would fail to insist that the opinions of those men should be placed before Parliament and the country? There are several conditions in a country required to make it a desirable place to live in; and those delegates no doubt came to the conclusion that while we have a very fine climate and fertile soil and any amount of cultivable land fit for settlement, which the Government has placed at the disposal of immigrants at very low rates and easy terms of payment, they also became impressed

with the opinion that if we had free trade and if the natural markets to the south were upon to us, we would be enabled, which we are not now, to reap the fruits of all these natural advantages. I have no doubt that they concluded that if our policy were changed and our labouring classes relieved of the burdens which now weigh them down, this country would be a much more desirable place for settlement. They must have observed that the purchasing power of a dollar in this country is much lower than it is in England, and that unless that advantage was counterbalanced by a free market our country would not experience the development we have hitherto been looking for in vain. While we have a grand climate, fertile soil, and vast stretches of excellent land, on the other hand we have opposing influences which more than counterbalance these advantages and retard immigration; and if they have expressed such an opinion in their report, we are entitled to know it. If they have declared that the National Policy was not in the interests of immigration, we ought to know it. If they have told the Government that the burden of taxation is such that it has prevented many settling here who would otherwise have come, we are entitled to know it. It would surprise me that the Government should venture to give instructions to their delegates that they must avoid everything of a political character, because that certainly is the side of the shield which should be shown to the people of the old country. We cannot expect to have our lands settled for many years to come, even if we have a good climate and cheap land, unless the other conditions of life are of such a character as to make those cheap lands profitable to settlers. It is not within the right of the Government to withhold any report placed in their hands, even if it should express an opinion contrary to theirs. On the contrary, it is their duty to place that report before the House and the country so that we can read and deliberate upon the convictions therein expressed. If they have noticed that Prince Edward Island is suffering from the action of the National Policy, which every intelligent representative in this country knows, if they have told us that the people there are paying $120,000 every year to get their potatoes into the United States, which they might save were it not for the National Policy, we have a right to know. If they have told us that the iron and coal deposits of the eastern provinces could be developed to a much greater extent, if we had free trade with the United States, we have a right to know it. If they have told us that if the lumber products of these provinces were allowed free access to the United States, and employment would be furnished the people coming from the old country, we have a right to be informed of it. It is an insult to this Parliament and the country to refuse to place before us the reports of these men who were paid by the people to come here and report; and I beg leave to remind the Ministers and their supporters, who refuse to grant the request of the hon. member for South Huron, that their refusal will not be condoned by the people. I beg leave to remind them that the people will insist on their no longer standing in the way of our obtaining the information these people came here to give, and for which we are paying out of the hard earnings of the people. And therefore, I say, it is the duty of the Government to place these reports on the Table, even should they contain opinions at variance with those of the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is unfortunate that on a motion of this kind, neither the Minister of Agriculture nor the First Minister is in his place. I find that in the debate which took place a few evenings ago, the Minister of Agriculture admitted the existence of this report. We have it to-day from the Minister of Justice that the report has not been read by any Minister of the Crown, but was forwarded to England unread. I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, and I leave it to the members of this House, whether it is fair of the Government to ask Parliament to vote $30,000 of the people's money, ostensibly to promote immigration, and then, after they have got the report from their own chosen delegates, not to think it worth while to read it and to refuse to give it to the people of Canada. What was the object in asking these gentlemen to come out here and inspect the country if the world is not to be enlightened by their examination of the resources of this country? Last year the Government told the country they intended to inaugurate a vigorous immigration policy, and they took from Parliament a large sum, nearly $300,000, which they proceeded to spend by inviting delegates from various parts of the Empire to come to Canada and examine its resources and advise the outside world as to the attractions which Canada provides. I see men before me in this House who on some occasions profess a deep interest in the welfare of Canada. I see before me gentlemen who have professed themselves anxious to promote immigration. I see the hon. member for Northumberland, who sometimes waxes warm in favour of increasing the population of Canada by immigration; but when there is something before him which he cannot face, he has to think of something else. I see the hon. Minister of Militia, who sometimes professes a deep concern in the welfare of Canada and who pays great attention to the debates; but when a question like this comes up which he cannot answer, we find him deeply embarrassed by other matters and lacking time to give attention to the matter before the House. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) sometimes gives great attention to the business of the House, and the other evening, when Parliament was giving attention to the subject of immigration, supposing now that we were talking of a former session, when we were speaking of the funds which have been expended to bring delegates cut to Canada, and what those delegates had said in reference to the resources of Canada, the hon. gentleman said, in the high function of chairman of the committee which he then occupied: I rule out any discussion in regard to the report of the delegates to the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to correct the hon. gentleman. Whether he was present or not, I do not know, but I may state that I made no such ruling.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sure the House will be glad to know that the hon. member feels so interested in this question, that there is one member on that side who is interested in it; but I should like to ask, where is the Minister of Agriculture? When a question of this kind is

placed before the House, where is the responsible Minister? He has told the House that he has never seen this report, and I can, therefore, well understand why he has withdrawn from the Chamber, for need there be suggested a greater acknowledgment of negligence on the part of the responsible Minister than for him to say that last year he expended $30,000 to bring out delegates to this country to examine into our resources, and that not up to this day, the 11th May, did he take the trouble of looking between the two covers of their report? Was it because he was so much interested in looking after his election, or was it that other matters interfered with his doing what he was paid to do? Now, nearly a year has elapsed without his seeing what these men have reported as to the resources of Canada. On one occasion, he said he doubted whether such a report existed, and on another occasion he said that the High Commissioner had the report, and then he said that the report had been sent to him and he had sent it to the High Commissioner without reading it. We have the statement from the Minister of Justice that the report came to Canada, and, without being read, was sent to England, and that he had cabled to have it returned to Canada and it would be here in a few days. That is the position now. Nothing more unworthy of a Government professing to know what is right—I will not say to do what is right, because they have thrown off all that—could be shown than their action in this matter to-day. The interests of agriculture are dear to their hearts when it is suitable for them to so profess, but, when the time for action comes, where are they? My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has stated that this report contains serious charges against the fiscal policy of the Administration, and for that reason he suggests it is withheld from the public. If that is the case, we may understand how the Government has taken public money and made a fraudulent use of it for party purposes. The Minister of Militia seems to show some interest in this matter. I hope that, since his two colleagues, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Justice, have taken their flight from the Chamber, he will have enough military spirit to stand up and defend the action of the Government in this matter. I have no faith in the proposition of the Minister of Justice that this motion should be delayed. It appears as if the motion he has made was a dilatory motion intended to defeat the ends of justice, and I cannot assent to the doctrine that the ends of justice should be defeated at the instance of the Minister of Justice, who is bound to defend the interests of justice.

Mr. LISTER. We have heard frequently the argument of shouting used by gentlemen opposite, and especially by those on the back benches. They answer argument by yelling at the Speaker, and by conduct which would disgrace an ordinary county council. In a matter of this kind, involving the rights of the people of the country, when Ministers of the Crown vacate their seats and hon. gentlemen opposite are not found courageous enough to defend the refusal to adopt the motion of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan), gentlemen opposite take refuge in a howl. The Government, in refusing to give information on a very important subject in the interests of the country, are utterly disregarding the acknowledged rights of the representatives of the people. Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, with a majority of sixty in this House, feel that they can defy the wishes of the minority, that they can rely on hon. gentlemen to support them when they are right, and more strongly when they are wrong. We heard that statement a moment ago. The conduct of the Government in this matter is most discreditable. I say they are disregarding the rights of the people's representatives in this Parliament, and I say, further, that the motion of the Minister of Justice is purposely designed to burke the information which this motion seeks to obtain. Let us look at the true position of this matter. We have it admitted that the Government, through its Agent or High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, in London, selecting his own friends as delegates, paid these men out of the Canadian treasury, in order that immigrants might be induced to come to Canada. These men—honest men, I have no doubt—surveyed the field, they travelled from one end of the country to the other, and they found that the fiscal policy of this Government was inimical to the interests of the immigrants who might be induced to come here, and they so reported to Sir Charles Tupper. That report was not the property of Sir Charles Tupper, or Sir John Thompson, or of the Minister of Agriculture, who dares not face the House to-day on this subject, but it was the property of the people of Canada, and the Government had no more right to suppress this report than to suppress any other public document. The Minister of Agriculture, when he was asked the other night, responded in that mild tone of his, with a smile that was child-like and bland like the heathen Chinee, that he had never read the report, and his secretary had not read it, but that they just bundled it up and sent it back to Sir Charles Tupper. Does that hon. gentleman think there is sufficient credulity in this House to accept that statement unquestioned? An important document is sent to him as a member of the Government for the purpose of having the approval or disapproval of the Government, and then is returned to Sir Charles Tupper for the purpose of having it printed, if necessary, in the old country, and the Minister of Agriculture is simple enough to assert that he never examined it, that his secretary never examined it, that his deputy never examined it, but he bundled it up in an envelope and addressed it back to Sir Charles Tupper, and that is the last we have ever heard of it. The truth of the matter is that these men governing this country, tried to influence these delegates: they tried to give them to understand that there must be no reference made to the policy of the dominant party in this country, that would be distasteful to the Government, it would be disloyal to speak about this great National Policy, or to say that it retarded or interfered with the progress of this country. Sir, it appears they did not know whom they were dealing with. They were dealing with men who were not going to suppress the truth, men who would tell the truth notwithstanding the cajolery of members of the Government; and they go back to England and write out a report, and the Government deliberately suppress that report, they deliberately keep it back from the people's representatives who have a right to have it placed on the Table of this House to scrutinize it, to investigate it, and if there

is anything wrong in it, to have it righted. We have the statement to-day of the Government of this country, refusing to produce this document, urging one excuse after another, and the Minister of Justice standing up and moving in a perfunctory manner that this debate be adjourned. Somebody else has something to say about the adjournment of this debate besides the Minister of Justice. This debate will be adjourned when we are ready to adjourn it and not till then. The Minister of Agriculture gets up, child-like and bland the other day, and tells us that he never read this report, that his secretary never read it, that his deputy never read it, that none of his colleagues ever read it, and he bundled it up and sent it back to Sir Charles Tupper from whom it came. I doubt whether Sir Charles ever read it. This is the statement the Minister of Agriculture makes to us, and although Parliament has been sitting for over two months, there has been no effort on the part of the Government to have that document returned to this House: not until it was mentioned some days ago by the Opposition did the Government intimate that there was such a report, and until that time no step whatever was taken for the purpose of having it brought back. Now the Minister of Justice moves that the debate be adjourned, because he knows full well that the matter cannot come before the House again before prorogation takes place. The probabilities are that the Government will take the two days that remain to members in this House, and the strong probabilities are that if the hon. gentleman's motion is carried, it will be impossible for the members of this House to have an opportunity of examining the report given by these delegates. I repeat that, in my judgment, the conduct of the Government is disgraceful; they are ignoring and disregarding, utterly and entirely the rights of the representatives of the people of this House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suppose I might have interrupted the hon. gentleman when he accused me of having made this motion in order to burk discussion; but I preferred to wait until he finished his remarks in order that I might have an opportunity to repeat that the adoption to adjourn the debate will not, in any way, prevent the House from considering this motion before the end of the session, and at a very early date. I pledged myself when I made the motion—and I suppose it was in view of that pledge that the hon. member who moved for this return had the courtesy to acquiesce in the adoption of my motion—I pledged myself that the hon. member should have such an opportunity, even in advance of all other business of the House; and I repeat that in the hearing of the House, lest the hon. member who has just charged me with a desire to burk the discussion, may not have heard the observation which I made. I may add that the mere fact of the delegates, or one of them, if he has, or if they have, expressed opinion upon the public policy of the Government, will not, so far as I know, be a reason why the reports should not be laid upon the Table of the House. Therefore, I am not actuated by that view at all, or by any desire to suppress the report. We simply desired to have an opportunity of seeing the documents which are now called for, and in order that, if reason exists therefor, we might present them to the House in advance of the adoption of the order to have the papers brought down. If my motion passes to-day, trusting to our bringing them down or not, as we may deem best in the public interest, we should have an opportunity of seeing the papers before they are presented to the House. But we are not so much afraid of the opinion of one or two Englishmen sojourning in this country, criticizing our fiscal policy or any other branch of our policy, that that should be a reason for suppressing their reports, whatever they may be. My motion simply involves the ordinary courtesy of asking that the documents, which, I believe, are now on their way to us, should reach us and be read by us before they are put on the Table.

Mr. LAURIER. It is difficult to imagine what objection there can be to bringing down these papers, or why they should not have been brought down already. These are not diplomatic papers, there are no state secrets in them, they are simply reports of gentlemen entrusted by the Government to do certain work, and that work they have done. Now, it is, I presume, no secret abroad that the only reason why the Minister of Agriculture did not read these papers was simply because he did not like to find in them what he expected to find in them; otherwise it is not possible to imagine why he did not read these papers before returning them to Sir Charles Tupper—that is, the report of Mr. McQueen; as to the report of Mr. Davey, I understand to-day that it never crossed the ocean and that it remains in the hands of the High Commissioner.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know that he made one.

Mr. LAURIER. I would be loth to suppose that a gentleman selected by the Government to do a certain work, had failed to perform his work; I would be sorry to suppose that Mr. Davey, after having visited this country at the request of the Government, should have been so neglectful of his duty as not to make the report which he was bound to make. I believe that he did submit his report in due time, and I believe it was through the negligence of Sir Charles Tupper that the report did not come. If I am doing an injustice to Sir Charles Tupper I shall be very glad to acknowledge it and apologize to him, if the facts hereafter disclosed should show I am wrong. Under the present circumstances it seems impossible to conceive why these reports were not made known. At all events, since the hon. gentleman who leads the House tells us that we shall have an opportunity of bringing up the matter again, I suppose we might as well agree to the motion to adjourn.

Mr. FLINT. I think the members from the Maritime Provinces have a right to complain of the action of the Government in delaying, and even suppressing this report. It is well known that for many years during the first portion of our Confederation, indeed up to quite a recent period, large sums of money have been voted by the Dominion Parliament in the hope of promoting immigration to this country, and the Local Legislatures of the Maritime Provinces have been obliged, during a large portion of that period, to appropriate funds, which might have been expended for other purposes, on efforts to promote immigration into the various provinces. So heavy was this drain on the provincial resources that this policy on the part

of the provinces had to be abandoned, and we found that of the large sums expended from Dominion resources, almost the whole of it, in fact I think I would be justified in saying the whole of it, was extended for the benefit of the new territories in the North-West. When it was circulated by rumour and through the press that an effort was about being made through the High Commissioner and under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture, backed by the resources of the Dominion, to do something to promote immigration into the Maritime Provinces, there was a feeling of satisfaction throughout those provinces which was very general and gratifying. It was hoped that their great resources would be made known in the Old World, and that some of the crumbs from the great Dominion table might be allowed to fall within reach of the people of the Maritime Provinces so far as immigration is concerned. I consider the Government in suppressing this report have only carried out the policy they have inaugurated almost from the commencement of this session. Last session we might have styled the Government a white-washing Government, but they did condescend to allow certain investigations, but by their majority they neutralized the effects of the white-washing reports respecting those who had been guilty of practices unbecoming members of Parliament, or Ministers of the Crown. But this session I think they have concluded to adopt an opposite policy: instead of waiting for reports of committees or commissions or of any body to whom matters of importance were referred, they concluded it was advisable to suppress investigations and to suppress reports, whenever those investigations or reports were likely to strike a blow at the vanity or self-sufficiency of the advocates of the Government policy in regard to their administration of public affairs. The comedy of errors in regard to the visit of the English farm delegates to the Maritime Provinces began at the very outset; it began in England before word was given out in the provinces that anything of this kind was contemplated. I think the Government would have done themselves, the people and the resources of the Maritime Provinces justice if notice had more publicly been given of the proposed visit of the delegates to those provinces, had this Parliament been informed by some occupant of the Treasury benches that a visit of this kind was contemplated, and had the attention of the Maritime Provinces been called to the proposed visit of the delegates, in order that by communicating with the Local Government and their friends in the Lower Provinces they might have put forth greater efforts in order to make the visit a great and shining success. In order to contrast this policy or lack of policy on the part of the Government with the enterprise of private individuals and transportation companies, I would refer to the visit of the New England Press Association to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick during last summer. The opening of the missing link between Annapolis and Digby and the opening of the summer season of travel were taken advantage of by the transportation companies and the steamboat companies, and others interested in the prosperity of the province, to invite the New England Press Association to visit those provinces. The progress of some twenty or thirty representatives of the Press Association to Nova Scotia was more like a Royal progress than a visit by travellers who desired to investigate the resources of the province. In almost every town and village they were met by leading citizens and banquetted and taken to see beautiful scenery, and made acquainted, as far as it was within the power of all concerned, with the resources of the province, and above all were made to feel that Nova Scotia was fair to look upon and was a fine gem in the crown of this Dominion. Every effort was made to send this information abroad and have it published in the press controlled by those journalists. The Dominion Government expend large sums of money for purposes of very much the same character, but of even more importance; but in regard to the visit of the farmers' delegates they kept their plans in the dark, and the first intimation the people obtained was a telegram from the High Commissioner in London to the Premier of Nova Scotia, announcing that the delegates had been selected and were on the way to Nova Scotia and the Maritime Provinces in order to study the resources and report upon them. The second mistake was made just here; and I am not disposed, after the explanation given by the Minister of Marine the other night, to press unduly against the Administration the charge that they deliberately and with malice aforethought selected an improper instrument through whom to introduce those delegates to Nova Scotia. But there was a lack of judgment, and lack of tact displayed by men acquainted with political matters, which should have been avoided. Instead of continuing the wise and prudent policy of the High Commissioner, who is a man of experience, at all events, in all these matters and acquainted with the disposition of the people of Nova Scotia, instead of following out his advice and placing the delegates in the hands of the Government of the province, the Dominion Government appointed the leader of the Opposition in Nova Scotia for the task, and sent down an agent of the department to take charge of those delegates and show them such parts of the province as they might select. When the unfortunate contretemps was made known, the Provincial Government indignantly withdrew from all participation in the visit of the delegates. They were placed—I say nothing in regard to the agent of the Agriculture Department—in the hands of prominent men of the local Opposition and they were only allowed to see, hear and know such things as in the opinion of those men the delegates should see, hear and know. If I have studied this matter correctly, there were many portions of the province which the delegates did not visit. The visit was a failure as regards arousing the interest and enthusiasm of the people. I am convinced that had the Local Government been encouraged in the steps they were about to take to receive those delegates and during their visit to show them all the resources of the province, there would have been such a display of enthusiasm and interest as would have charmed those delegates, and would have led them to make more favourable reports in regard to the people, the social allurements of the province, and its agricultural and other resources, than can possibly characterize the present report. The same rumour came from other provinces, that the visits of these delegates was not made as important and interesting as it might have been. The next error on the part of the Government was to keep these delegates

in leading-strings, instead of being allowed to go free. If they entertained free trade views they should have been allowed to express them freely and fully, for there was nothing to conceal in a visit of intelligent gentlemen from the old country; but they were kept in leading strings, they were not allowed to freely express their views in opposition to the trade policy of the Government; and above all the Government committed an error in keeping back the report which we know was sent to this country, and which the public have not yet had an opportunity of seeing, and in this way the Government have created a suspicion which might not otherwise have existed. They were possibly afraid that the sentiments and statements of these delegates would have an injurious effect upon the fate of the Administration itself. Another error is the suppression of the report. I think the Minister of Agriculture can only escape the strong censure of the House for having returned this report without reading it, upon the plea that he was then in ill-health. That, however, is not a sufficient excuse for his not having sent this report to some other member of this Government to be revised and published. We are still in ignorance as to who these gentlemen met in Canada, the places they visited, their impressions as to the resources of this country, and of the effect of the fiscal policy of the Government upon intending immigrants. I quite agree with the remarks the Minister of Militia has made, that if the report is hostile to the immigration interests of the country, the Government would be justified in declining to send it abroad, but all that is no excuse for refusing information to the people of the Maritime Provinces, and to the Dominion generally, as to the impression made upon the minds of the delegates. They visited the Maritime Provinces at a period of the year when everything presents its most favourable aspect, and had they been taken to the right portion of the provinces, I am certain that they could view scenery unsurpassed in the Dominion, and meet people unsurpassed in the world for qualities which go to make up good citizens, good neighbours, intelligent and enterprising agriculturists and labourers in every sphere of life. As was stated here the other evening, the people of the Maritime Provinces do not fear comparison with any people on this continent. We have not the broad acres that they have in the North-West, we have not the teeming population of the great Province of Ontario, but we have resources which they have not. We have enormous fishing capabilities; we have great mining resources, splendid lumbering and forest resources, and fine agricultural lands wherever agriculture is cultivated. Were it not for the policy of the Government which makes the conditions of life to our people hard, we might be a happy and prosperous people. We have learned another strange thing during this discussion; one which members on this side of the House had suspected for a long time, and which now comes almost in an official form. That is, that the action of the Administration at Ottawa is to a large degree controlled by the influence of the High Commissioner in London. We have it almost as plainly admitted as if the statement was broadly made, that the High Commissioner in London has dictated the action of the Government in regard to this report. Why was it hurried back to London with such indecent haste, why has he had up to the present time control of the document: and, if public rumour is to be relied upon, why has he had consultation with some of the delegates to induce them to make alterations in their report before it is sent back to Ottawa for presentation to the public here? We have been made aware during the last few days, by private information as well as publications in the press, that these delegates are freely expressing their opinions in the old country as to how the fiscal policy of the Government affects the people. They are men of standing who are called upon to address agricultural associations and public meetings of intending immigrants and others, and they are ventilating the opinions which they gathered during their hasty and unsatisfactory visit to the Maritime Provinces. If there are representations in that report which are injurious to the interests of the Maritime Provinces, we must hold the Government and their agents strictly responsible for it, because we must come to the conclusion that any views hostile to the interests of the Maritime Provinces have been created by the lack of opportunities placed within the reach of the delegates sent out by Sir Charles Tupper. We are convinced that a full and fair examination of the resources of these provinces should not produce any other than the most favourable result which the visit of the Press delegates from New England created. It would be a pleasure to read to the representatives of the people of other portions of the Dominion the glowing accounts these gentlemen gave of the Province of Nova Scotia as they saw it in August last. If the farm delegates have reported differently, they can have only done so upon one or two grounds. They can only have done so because of their opinion as to the effect of the trade policy of the Dominion Government and upon its injurious effects on the people, and its preventing their progress and increase in wealth and happiness by the exercise of their talents as agriculturists, labourers, mechanics, miners, fishermen or any other occupation. The proof, to a large degree, that such an opinion of the delegates was correct, is furnished by the enormous emigration from these provinces during the last seven or eight years, and which is going on in increased volume at the present time. Every letter which we receive from the Maritime Provinces shows that the exodus is not diminishing, and that, notwithstanding the resources of the country, and the misguided efforts of the Dominion Government with its tariff policy, to promote the prosperity of that portion of the Dominion, we find that the young men, the bone and sinew of the country are leaving it as fast as they can get the opportunity. It betokens some frightful mistake and some dreadful blindness on the part of those who are charged with the government of the country: that, with our very great resources and with the character of the population which I have described, our people cannot find an opportunity for progressing in wealth in these provinces, and that they have to seek for it abroad. No people in this Dominion are more fond of their homes, or more loyal to their provinces, than the people of the Maritime Provinces; and yet, notwithstanding this love of home, and those favourable circumstances surrounding them, they are so pressed upon to solve the problem of life that they are fleeing to a foreign country to seek for opportunities which their own country has denied them.

I think the Government would be doing wisely to publish the opinions of those intelligent observers from the old world, and if they are hostile to their own views, and will not bear examination, then let them be met in the press and in Parliament with such refutations as will show that they have been misled and deceived by what they saw during their visit. I trust that the implied promise of the hon. Minister of Justice will be fulfilled; and that long enough before the close of this session to enable the members from the Maritime Provinces to make a careful, candid and critical study of the opinions of those delegates, we may have that report published and placed in the hands of the members of this House. I trust that whatever may have been the adverse opinions expressed by those gentlemen, they may be brought here for consideration and discussion, and if there is in them anything which shows that they have misapprehended the condition of life in those provinces, their errors can easily be pointed out. It is the most foolish and indefensible policy that can possibly be imagined to attempt to suppress their report altogether; and I have no doubt in my own mind that if it were not for the discussion which has taken place in committee, and the determined effort on the part of the Opposition that this report should be placed before the people, we should have heard nothing of it from the Ministers of the Crown. There can be only one reason given why a public document of this nature should not be placed in the hands of the people; but that one reason, I am certain, the Ministry will never allege; that is, that the safety and welfare of the state preclude it. This may frequently occur in regard to diplomatic documents, in regard to correspondence with the Government of the mother country, or in regard to information as to our relations with foreign countries. It may be advisable, at any rate during the continuance of the negotiations, that correspondence, reports and opinions should be temporarily suppressed; but this report does not come within the scope of this idea, and cannot be considered in any light as belonging to that class of public documents. The duty of the Government is plain, and I trust that the promise made by the Minister will be fulfilled, that the information given by these delegates and the opinions formed by them, will be placed before us, in order that we may form an estimate as to the correctness of the course they have pursued, and as to the wisdom they have displayed in carrying out the instructions given them by the Government.

Mr. WATSON. It is not my intention to take up much of the time of the House. As stated by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, these delegates have freely expressed their opinions as to what they saw in this country during their visit. I have received a letter from a gentleman, a prominent citizen of Winnipeg, who has just made a trip to the old country, and who tells me that while there he attended a banquet at Selkirk, Scotland, at which Mr. McQueen read a paper. In that paper Mr. McQueen stated that he was one of the farm delegates who visited Canada during the past year, and made reference to some pretty strong statements which the delegates had made in their report to the Dominion Government on the effect of the Canadian tariff, and he declared that he would be very much surprised if the Dominion Government would ever publish the delegates' report. This gentleman said further: "I learn from Mr. McQueen that he had a pretty lively row with Sir Charles Tupper over this matter." That shows that whatever may have been the report of the delegates with regard to the natural advantages of the country, certainly they must have reported against the fiscal policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. I would commend the hon. Minister of Agriculture in not publishing any report that might have the effect of keeping people away from this country, because we are spending large sums annually for the purpose of inducing immigrants to come to this country; but if the Government pay delegates to visit Canada and report upon it for the promotion of immigration—and these delegates were, no doubt, carefully selected, being wide-awake, representative men in their districts, whose opinion will have a great influence with the people with whom they are acquainted in the old country—and they find that notwithstanding all the natural advantages we have to offer, they cannot conscientiously advise their fellow countrymen to come to Canada on account of the trade policy of the Government, then I think it is time for the Government, if they will not be persuaded by the people of this country who oppose their policy, to have some regard for the views expressed by men who visit this country from abroad, and who have the power to advise large numbers of people to come or to stay away. If we cannot induce people to come to Canada, notwithstanding its natural advantages, there must be something wrong, and evidently Mr. McQueen and Mr. Davey have come to the same conclusion as some of us in Canada, that while we maintain a protective policy this country cannot progress. I hope that the promise made by the Minister of Justice will be carried out, and this report laid on the Table, and if we cannot convince hon. gentlemen opposite that their trade policy is not in the interest of the country, I hope that the report of these delegates may at least cause them to consider whether it is better to persist in that policy or to bring about some change which will make the people living here more prosperous, and thereby induce others to come to the country. We must have population in Canada; the country cannot progress without it; and if immigration is going to be retarded by reports from these delegates against our trade policy, then I think it is time that policy should be reversed.

Mr. McMULLEN. If it is in place, I would like to call the attention of the Minister in charge of immigration, to a report, which he has perhaps noticed, in the *North American Review* of April, made by a committee that was appointed by the United States Government for the purpose of investigating and reporting upon the influx of immigration to the United States, with a view of purging it of those elements who are not desirable as settlers, such as pauper immigrants. If he will read that report he will see that the committee reported that until better regulations were established between the northern portions of the United States and Canada, they might expect a continuation of the flow of objectionable immigrants. They come to Canada, are received here, and eventually they find their way across the border to the United States. Now, this is a very important statement, in the face of the announcement the Minister has

made, that they are going to give a bounty to the head of every family and an additional sum to every member of the family to bring them to this country; and the report of that committee clearly indicates that a very large percentage of the immigration, and even a considerable percentage of the objectionable portion of it, come to Canada in order that they may cross the border into the United States. The same precautions are not taken with regard to immigrants coming over Canadian lines as with regard to those carried by American lines. The American lines are obliged to assume the responsibility of carrying any immigrants back who are objected to, but no such system is enforced here. When once they come out with the sanction of an immigration agent, they are received, if they are in a proper healthy condition; and they take this course: First they get a bounty on coming here, and then they evade the rigid inspection to which they would be subjected on arriving at an American port. We are going to expend, under the proposed system of immigration, a very large amount of money this year, and these people, knowing the conveniences which exist for crossing into the United States, will take advantage of the bounty offered them and then cross the line, so that we will be helping them on their way into the United States, into which they would not be admitted had they come by an American line. I would like the Minister to secure a copy of the report; and if he gives it his attention, he will find that it contains information which possibly may be of benefit to him in this matter. With regard to this report of the delegates, I think it is a pity that the Government should have returned it. Undoubtedly we should be placed in possession of all reports that cost the country money; and while I cannot raise any very serious objection to the suggestion of the Minister of Justice, at the same time he has created the impression that this matter has been treated in a very cavalier fashion. The Commons of Canada are entitled to be treated with courtesy, and every item of information to which they are entitled should be laid before the House when Parliament meets. Considering that the Minister of Agriculture was aware that Parliament was about to meet shortly after he received that report, he should have put himself in the position, by having a copy made, to communicate its contents to this House, so that in the event of any discussion arising, the information gathered by the delegates would be before the House. Instead of that, he is in the unfortunate position of having to admit that he had never read the report, and that, notwithstanding the extensive staff under his control, he did not take the precaution of having a copy made. It is very desirable that we should have that report. It may contain remarks not very creditable to hon. gentlemen opposite as regards their trade policy. I do not know whether it does or not, but if it does we should know it. When we gather information outside the political arena by means of independent men, possessed of extensive knowledge, any remarks they chose to make with regard to our policy from the standpoint of immigration, the people should be made aware of, even though those remarks might be objectionable to the Government. I hope the Minister will take care to secure a copy of the report to which I have drawn his attention with regard to immigration, I mean the report of the commission appointed by the American Government to enquire into the advisability of continuing their present system, and he will find in it that attention is drawn to the influx of a large percentage of objectionable immigrants *viâ* Canada; and until such time as very rigid quarantine regulations are established between us and the United States, the American commission look for nothing better in the future than what has taken place in the past.

Mr. CARLING. I would like to correct a wrong impression of the hon. gentleman with regard to the bonus given immigrants. Bonus is not given to people passing through, but to those who become actual settlers. We do not give an assisted passage, but offer a bonus of $10 to every head of family and $5 to every member of family over twelve years of age, when they become settlers in the Province of Manitoba or the Territories; but if they do not become settlers, they do not receive any bonus. I explained that the other night.

Mr. McMULLEN. If this bonus is distributed in proportion to the number of men actually settled in the country, and the figures for this year are no more correct than they have been in the past, we will be far short of having accurate information.

Mr. DAVIN. As the question has just been raised, I will say that I hope that, if these reports would in any way swell the tide of immigration to Canada, the motion of my hon. friend will be adopted, because I think that every means in the power of the Government should be used to bring immigrants into this country. It must be remembered that the field of immigration may, within a measurable number of years, cease to be as plethoric as it is at present. You have at present a vast field to cultivate and get immigrants from, but the schoolmaster is abroad; and we know very well that it is a law that, as you extend education, you diminish fecundity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friends say explain, but it does not need any explanation. All it needs is to state the facts. You have only to look at the history of the New England States, you have only to look at the history of mankind to see that in proportion as you increase education and refinement, in the same proportion you circumscribe families: and therefore the time may come in Europe—if those gentlemen will stop their levity and pay some attention to what I am saying probably they will appreciate my argument—when you will not have the armies of immigrants to call upon that you have now. You should be up and doing now. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have at the present minute in Canada the means, if properly used, of greatly increasing the immigrants into this country. Now, what have we in Canada? We have the Dominion Government. We have the Provincial Governments. You have the railways and the shipping companies. You have at the head of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company four or five men of great executive ability. We have two railways in the west with men of great administrative power at their head. The shipping companies are deeply interested, and I say that all a man controlling the Immigration Department has to do is to sit down, consult with

these men, make his plan, and propose what I hope and believe this Parliament would be willing to give, a large grant for immigration purposes. Then, instead of the driblets which have been coming in in the past, and even the large number that I am happy to say are coming in to Manitoba and the North-West this year, we might treble or quadruple the number. I would, therefore, vote for the motion, because I consider that everything that brings people into the North-West makes not only for the prosperity of the North-West but makes for the prosperity of the whole Dominion of Canada.

Motion allowed to stand.

BRIDGE ON THE RICHELIEU RIVER.

Mr. BRUNEAU (Translation) moved for:

Copies of all documents, memorials and correspondence between the Government and the Corporation and Board of Trade of the town of Sorel and other persons, respecting the granting of a subsidy for the construction of a bridge on the Richelieu River to connect the town of Sorel with the Montreal and Sorel Railway.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in offering this motion, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that a $50,000 subsidy was voted by the Quebec Legislature at its last session for the building of a bridge on the Richelieu River. I wish also to put before the House the facts which may establish the importance and the propriety of such subsidy. The Montreal and Sorel Railway was incorporated in 1882 by a Quebec statute, 44-45 Victoria, chapter 35. The object of this Act was to provide for the construction of a railway, 35 miles long, from Longueuil to Sorel. Among the usual powers conferred upon the company was that of constructing a bridge on the Richelieu River. The company bent its energies on the fulfilment of the conditions of its charter, and without the help of any subsidy either from the Federal or the Local Government, it built its 45 miles of railway. In 1886, the Federal Government granted, by the statute 49-50 Victoria, chapter 59, a sum of $72,000. About the same time the Quebec Government also gave a subsidy of $112,000 to allow the claims of the workmen and of the expropriated land owners to be settled. Until the granting of these subsidies the company had had, for the construction of its line, no other resource but the proceeds of its debentures in England. About the same time, that is in 1886, the Dominion Government granted a subsidy of $32,000 for the construction of ten miles of railway from Yamaska to the St. Francis River. These ten miles of railway are built, and are not worked to-day, which is about the condition of the Montreal and Sorel Railway. Since then, nearly ten miles of railway have also been constructed from St. Grégoire to Nicolet, by the Great Eastern (which is the continuation of the Montreal and Sorel), and now we have, on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, nearly seventy miles of railway, built but still unworked. I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the advisability of connecting together these different sections of railway, and to complete them, and to give the power of so doing to the Montreal and Sorel and the Great Eastern Companies. To this end it would be necessary to bridge the Richelieu River. On the 6th of June, 1889, the Quebec Government granted a sum of $50,000 to this end. This subsidy was voted during the last session of the Quebec Legislature, provided the Dominion Government and the city of Sorel would grant each a like amount. The city of Sorel, in June, 1890, made enquiries of the Dominion Government as to its intention in the matter. During the following July it received from the Government a letter which was nothing but an acknowledgment of reception. Many and many a time since was this question put to the Government, by our Board of Trade and by the political friends of the Government, but without any result. And during the local, federal and municipal elections, this eternal question of the Sorel bridge—like that other eternal question of the Quebec bridge—was not the least effective bait with which the speakers of the two political parties tempted the electors of the County of Richelieu. On the south shore of the St. Lawrence the continuation and completion of the South Shore Railway is demanded, and many times the attention of the Government has been drawn to the necessity of finishing this road. Verchères, Chambly, Richelieu, Yamaska, Lotbinière and Lévis have asked for subsidies for this road. To ask for a subsidy in favour of a bridge over the Richelieu, is to work in favour of the railway on the south shore of the St. Lawrence. Three years ago, my hon. friend from Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) showed the Government the importance of this South Shore Railway, which would be the shortest route between Montreal and Lévis, and would necessarily increase the revenue of the Intercolonial by promoting the traffic from the east and the Pacific traffic from the north-west towards the Maritime Provinces, and which would at last render a tardy justice to the oldest parishes of Canada—that is those parishes strung along the south shore of the St. Lawrence. These parishes have contributed largely to all the great public enterprises of our country. In order to give an idea of the importance of these different counties on the south shore, it will be enough for me to give the following figures. In 1881, the aggregate crop of these counties was: 136,567 bushels of wheat, 146,858 bushels of barley, 2,403,244 bushels of oats, and 15,259 bushels of rye. According to the last census, these different counties have a population of 120,815 inhabitants, and these have but scanty means of communication between themselves, and no outlet for their commerce during winter, especially towards Montreal, the commercial metropolis of Canada, where they should be able to send their produce. Such is the position of the people of Sorel. They are obliged, when going to Montreal, to cross the St. Lawrence and to drive seven miles to take the Pacific Railway at Berthier, or else pass by the South-Eastern Railway, which gives them a distance of over a hundred and twenty-five miles to travel. As to the Montreal and Sorel Railway Company, I know that certain prejudices have been spread amongst the people in the Province of Quebec, and amongst public men against the company. I believe we must be just, and I wish—in order to show the *pro* and *con* to the Government—to lay before the House a letter, lately written to *La Presse*, by Mr. C. N. Armstrong, a political friend of the Government and president of the Montreal and Sorel Railway, under date of the 23rd of March last. His letter is a little long, but it shows so well the justness and importance of the claim which I am now making, that I believe it to be my duty to lay it before the Government:

"Mr. Editor of *La Presse*.

"SIR,—My attention has been called to your article entitled 'Down with the Sharpers!' (*A bas les faiseurs!*), which appeared in your paper of the 18th inst., and particularly to the charges against the Montreal and Sorel Railway Company.

"For some time certain persons have taken the habit of charging the company with malfeasance of all sorts, but as these accusations seemed to be circulated for political or personal ends, they were allowed to pass without notice.

"In justice to the company and its shareholders, however, I cannot to-day allow this article to pass in silence. It is not my intention to discuss here the question of knowing whether the Federal and Provincial Governments have granted too large subsidies to other companies; but in attacking particularly the Montreal and Sorel on this point, your mistake is complete, for the Montreal and Sorel is absolutely the only railway in this province which has been built without a single dollar of aid from any government or municipality.

"When, in 1882, the Provincial Legislature granted subsidies to almost all the other railways of the province, not a single dollar was granted to this company. Promises were then, and later, thought to be enough, and on the faith of these promises the company made engagements which it found impossible to keep, because these promises were never fulfilled. It is precisely because these promises were never fulfilled that the company got into difficulties.

"The company being of the opinion that the line could be worked more economically and advantageously by the Grand Trunk Company, leased its line to the latter for a certain term of years, and give it a large sum of money for improvements on the line. The Grand Trunk Company worked the line for a few months, then abandoned it to the mercy of the elements, refusing to continue working it, or to let it be worked by anybody else. It refused to spend, or reimburse, the amount put in its hands for improvements.

"The line remained in this state for nearly two years when the Dominion Government granted it a subsidy of $1,600 per mile, just half of the smallest subsidy granted to other companies. Moreover, this subsidy could only be obtained on condition that the shareholders, themselves, should furnish the sum of $50,000, which was done, and the line resumed its operations. The amount of the subsidy was not enough to pay for the damages caused by the non-working of the line.

"Subsequently, Mr. Mercier having become Prime Minister, a sum of $112,500 was voted to pay certain claims against the company, and to make certain improvements. This sum was not paid to the company, but was spent by commissioners appointed by the Government, and the account of expenditures was rendered to the Government and not to the company.

"In this case also, the subsidies were much less than those granted to other companies. The amount representing only $2,500 per mile, while other companies received from $4,000 to $7,000 per mile. At the request of the representatives of the Provincial Government on the board, the line had to cease its operations in 1888, and this notwithstanding the energetic protestations of the shareholders of the company, whose voice could only make itself heard at the next annual meeting, when a change was made in the board of directors, and arrangements at once concluded with the Great Eastern Company, the line coming thereby into immediate operation.

"The line was working well in June last, when the Provincial Government, through its representative, succeeded in having a sequestrator appointed who took possession of the railway, and since that time the line is not in operation.

"Neither the company nor the shareholders can, in any way, be blamed for this state of things. If the company ceased its operations it was at the formal request of the Provincial Government, which maintained its attitude in spite of the attempts, several times made, to reopen the line for traffic.

"The Dominion Government granted a supplementary subsidy of $40,000, or about $888 per mile, making a total of federal subsidy of $2,488 per mile, a part of which has not yet been spent—and this is all the aid that this company has obtained from the Governments.

"As to the municipalities, the city of Sorel voted $12,000, the village of Varennes $1,000, and the village of Boucherville $600. Not a single dollar of these sums has yet been paid. Verchères and Contrecœur refused to vote the proposed by-law. Therefore, up to this day not a single dollar has been paid by any municipality. So your sympathy for these municipalities is uncalled for.

"As to the money voted at the last provincial election, $50,000 were voted for the building of a bridge over the Richelieu River, on the condition that the Dominion Government would vote as much, which has not been done: and as the bridge would cost $200,000, any one that will undertake its construction for the subsidies will be welcome.

"The other $150,000 were voted for the completion of the line, for its equipment, and for securing a regular service. This amount was not granted at the request of the company, but at that of a certain clique, or syndicate, who hoped to grab the control of the property of the road, and who have only used the name and the money of the province for endless persecutions against the company, and who succeeded in stopping the operations of the line when it found it could not obtain its control.

"There remains to be seen what the new Government will do. This is not the place for offering them advice, but the public that needs the road hopes for prompt action by them. Although this letter is longer than I expected, I wish to state before concluding, that whatever be the facts concerning the construction of the subsidized lines, I defy you to name a single subsidized railway in this province of which the shareholders have contributed as large a share of cash per mile, as those of the Montreal and Sorel Company.

"It is easy for an editor to speak of the enormous profits realized by railway contractors who build lines subsidized by Government money. I believe that I have as much experience in railway construction in this province as any newspaper editor, and I know no contractor in this province, who has in that manner made profits worth mentioning.

"I know a certain number of them though, who, after years of hard labour, annoyance and anxiety, are poorer to-day than when they began. In fact those who have experience in these matters could show you that the construction of subsidized local lines, in this province, means nothing but continual annoyance and irritation.

"I have the honour to be,

"Your very obedient servant,

"CHARLES N. ARMSTRONG,

"*President of the Montreal and Sorel Railway Company.*

"MONTREAL, 23rd March, 1892."

These are the facts, Mr. Speaker, and they prove over-abundantly the importance and justness of the request I now make. Besides, this enterprise is not local and of exclusive interest for the town of Sorel or the County of Richelieu; it interests equally the Counties of Chambly, Verchères, Yamaska, Nicolet, Lotbinière and Lévis. As to the city of Sorel, I believe it has intimated to the Government that it was ready to grant $50,000 for the construction of a bridge over the Richelieu River. The Local Government has voted the same sum, and is ready to pay it. Now we are anxiously awaiting the action of the Dominion Government, and we hope that before long they will do justice to our reasonable demand.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no objection to bringing down all papers in the possession of the Government in reference to the matter. The hon. gentleman states that promises have been made that that bridge should be completed. I did not understand him to mention any one in particular who promised that the bridge should be constructed. He says that many petitions have been forwarded to the Government asking that the bridge should be built. Only two have been received, one from the mayor of the town of Sorel, and one from the city clerk, in which they state that the cost of the bridge would be $180,000, and offering $50,000 on behalf of the town of Sorel. They also state that the Quebec Government will give $50,000 more, if the Dominion Government will furnish the other $80,000. These are all the papers in possession of the Government.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all documents, memorials, plans, engineer's reports and correspondence, in relation to the dredging of Lavallière Bay.—(Mr. Bruneau.)

Copies of all documents, memorials and correspondence between the Government and the Corporation and Board of Trade of the town of Sorel and other persons respecting the granting of a subsidy for the construction of a bridge on the Richelieu river to connect the town of Sorel with the Montreal and Sorel Railway.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before going into the Orders of the Day, I would ask the leader of the House a question in respect to a Bill which was reserved for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General by Lieutenant Governor Carvell, of Prince Edward Island. I wish to know whether that Bill has been received by the Government here; whether the hon. gentleman has had an opportunity of examining its provisions; whether, in view of what I gathered from his remarks the other day, that he would return the Bill to the Lieutenant Governor at an early date to take constitutional action in the matter, anything has been done?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman had better repeat his question when the leader of the Government is in the House. I have not seen the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will crave the privilege of repeating my question when the leader is in his place.

ALIEN LABOUR IMPORTATION.

On the Order to resume the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Taylor, that the Bill (No. 4) to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada, be read a second time; and the motion of Sir John Thompson in amendment thereto, "That the said Bill be read a second time this day six months."

Amendment agreed to.

OBSCENE LITERATURE, &c.

Mr. CHARLTON moved second reading of Bill (No. 21) for the suppression of obscene literature, and to provide for the punishment of certain immoral and criminal practices. He said: In presenting this motion to the House I may be met, possibly, by the taunt that has sometimes been presented against proposed legislation of a similar character, namely, that this is a moral Bill, designed to make men better by Act of Parliament. Now, I am quite willing to admit that legislation for the purpose of making men either religious or moral, is useless; but it is perfectly within the province of a Legislature to discourage by appropriate legislation immorality or irreligion, and perfectly proper to adopt such measures, such enactments, as may be calculated to promote morality and religion, or whatever may be in the interest of the state. It is true that Governments deal more usually with questions of finance, with fiscal questions, with questions relating to taxation and expenditure, with questions relating to customs duties, and with laws for the protection of life and property—than with measures of the kind now under the consideration of the House. It is also true that the best means for promoting morality and religion are: first, teachings in the family; secondly, teachings in the school; and thirdly, the teachings of the church. This Bill does not propose to usurp the functions of either the family, the school or the church; but it does propose to make certain provisions intended to check certain evils so far as the power of the Government may be able to check them. We have, Sir, the fact meeting us everywhere in history that nations rise to prominence and to power in consequence of the exercise of virtue, of industry, and of the public virtues that are calculated to strengthen a people. We have in history the evidence that many nations have passed from the stage of human action and have left as evidence of their existence, only ruined temples, and here and there a pyramid and mounds of burnt brick. These are all the mementos left of imperial greatness and world-wide power in the case of many nations. We have no reason to doubt that if virtue is maintained, if integrity is maintained, if industry is maintained, a nation may exist through all time. Nations enter upon their periods of decadence through effeminacy, that is the result of vice, or corruption or of crime. Now, if this is true, there is no higher function of the state than that of providing for the welfare of the people and for the stability of their power by encouraging virtue, and by discouraging anything that may be of a contrary character. One of the highest functions of the state is for the authorities of the state themselves to give the example of a pure administration of public affairs, to abstain from corrupt practices and to set a good example in everything that pertains to their own management of the affairs entrusted to their charge. No higher functions rests upon the Government of a nation or of a people, than to guard the morals and to promote the public welfare of the people in every way that it is possible to do so by legislation; and they should cherish every influence that gives prosperity and stability to the institutions of a country. Now, it may be asserted that this is merely a Bill designed to make the people good, and I may be met with the sneers that I have often met with in this connection. It may be said that to attempt to assume the guardianship in any degree whatever, of young or old in our country, is an act of folly, and something that we should not lose time in discussing. Some may take objection to the Bill on the ground that it is an infringement of provincial rights. I shall read a few provisions of the Bill, as it is a brief one, that the House may know whether an objection of that kind will lie against the Bill. The fact is, Sir, that influences are at work in this country that are calculated to debase the morals of the people; influences are at work that may be checked and may properly be met by legislation in this House. Vile literature is secretly and widely circulated in Canada, literature of a character calculated to undermine the morals of the people, and entail the most disastrous consequences on society. Improper and obscene, or semi-obscene literature is imported into this country and openly sold. Drugs and instruments for procuring abortion and for kindred purposes are advertised secretly and are sold by agents, and this abuse cannot very readily be reached by the law as it now stands. Immodest and objectionable posters are posted, and the young in this country are exposed to influences

and temptations that should be hunted down by the law. The Parliament of this country owes a duty to society to take cognizance of these evils, and the Bill which I have introduced is calculated to meet the evils which I have briefly described. As not many members are accustomed to go through Bills presented here, and as probably many members have not read this Bill, I will take the liberty of reading its provisions :

"1. Whoever shall publish or offer to publish in any manner, or shall have in his possession for any such purpose or purposes, or shall sell, lend, or give away, or in any manner exhibit, or shall offer to sell, or lend, or give away or in any manner exhibit, any obscene book, pamphlet, paper, writing, advertisement, circular, print, picture, drawing, or other representation, image or figure, or of paper or other material, or any cast, instrument, or other article, of an immoral nature, or any medicine, drug, or article whatever for the prevention of conception, or for causing unlawful abortion, or shall advertise the same for sale, or shall write, or print, or cause to be written or printed any card, circular, book, pamphlet, advertisement or notice of any kind, stating when, where, how, or of whom, or by what means any of the articles in this section hereinbefore mentioned can be purchased or obtained, or shall manufacture, draw or print, or in any wise make any of such articles, is guilty of a misdemeanour.

"2. Every obscene, lewd or lascivious book, pamphlet, picture, paper, writing, print, writing paper heading, or other publication of an indecent character, and every article, or thing designed or intended for the prevention of conception, or procuring of abortion, and every article or thing intended or adopted for any indecent or immoral use, and every written or printed circular, card, pamphlet, book, advertisement, or notice of any kind giving information directly or indirectly, where, or how, or by whom, or by what means, any of the hereinbefore mentioned matters, articles or things may be obtained, or made, and every letter upon the envelope of which, or postal card upon which, indecent, lewd, obscene or lascivious delineations, epithets, terms, or language, may be written or printed, are hereby declared to be non-mailable matter, and shall not be conveyed in the mails, nor delivered from any post office nor by any letter carrier; and any person who shall knowingly deposit, or cause to be deposited for mailing or delivery anything declared by this section to be non-mailable matter, and any person who shall knowingly take the same, or cause the same to be taken from the mails, for the purpose of circulating or disposing of, or of aiding in the circulation and disposal of the same, is guilty of a misdemeanour.

"3. All persons are prohibited from importing into Canada from any foreign country, any of the hereinbefore mentioned articles or things, except the drugs hereinbefore mentioned, when imported in bulk, and not put up for any of the purposes before mentioned: and all such prohibited articles in the course of importation shall be detained by the officer of customs where entered, and proceedings taken against the same under section five of this Act.

"4. Whoever, being an officer, agent, or employé of the Government of Canada, shall knowingly aid or abet any person engaged in violation of this Act is guilty of a misdemeanour.

"5. Any judge of any county, or higher court in Canada within the proper district before whom complaint in writing of any violation of this Act shall be made, to the satisfaction of such judge, and founded on knowledge or belief, and if upon belief, setting forth the grounds of such belief, and supported by the oath or affirmation of the complainant, may issue a warrant directed to the sheriff or any police officer, or constable in the proper district, directing him to search for, seize, and take possession of any such article or thing hereinbefore mentioned, and to make due and immediate return thereof, to the end that the same may be condemned and destroyed by proceedings before the said judge which shall establish the facts that will, under this Act, warrant the decree for condemning and destroying the same.

"6. Any person engaged in placing before the public obscene, lewd, or immoral exhibitions, either as proprietor, manager, or assistant, is guilty of a misdemeanour.

"7. All newspaper matter imported in quantities as merchandize shall be debarred from an entry at any Canadian custom house, or conveyance by mail, until the same forms of registration have been complied with as are required of the publishers of Canadian newspapers, and that persons so registering shall be responsible, or shall give security.

"8. Any aggrieved person or corporation may complain to a judge of any county, or higher court, of any published or circulated matter printed in a foreign country, as being libellous or obscene, or as having an immoral tendency: whereupon the judge shall, after due and sufficient notice to the interested parties, try the case, and in the event of his finding the matter complained of to be a criminal libel, or to be subversive of morality, he may order the confiscation of all the printed matter implicated and liable to seizure under his warrant, and may further, in his discretion, order that the newspaper or periodical so condemned shall be debarred for any term not less than one month nor more than six months, from entry at the custom house, from conveyance through the mails, or from public sale.

"(2). Any person bringing any such publication into the country for circulation during any prohibited period, having been informed of, or made aware of, such prohibition, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour."

The ninth section is with respect to fines and penalties, which are left in blank. That is the Bill which I submit for the consideration of this House, a Bill calculated to promote morality by adopting restrictive measures. I presume the Minister of Justice has given the Bill his attention, and he will, no doubt, indicate the course he intends to pursue. I hope the Bill will receive the favourable consideration of the House and be permitted to go to committee, and that when it comes from committee it will be a measure which, if it has any imperfection, will have that imperfection removed, and if any additional provisions are required, those provisions will be added, and the measure will be made one calculated to promote the welfare and morality of the people of this country.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman's aim in introducing this Bill may have been a good one, and no doubt it was, and the Bill, according to his judgment, may be correctly drawn to further the object he has in view. I am engaged in a profession which I think this Bill would injure very materially, as it would also injure the druggists of the country. The measure, if passed in its present shape, would be entirely unworkable. It would not be possible for any medical man to discharge his professional duties in the country, or to obtain such drugs and instruments as he requires, without making himself liable to punishment under this Bill; and the same remark applies to instrument makers and even to those who sell instruments. So it would be with respect to those who manufacture drugs and those who sell them. It is perfectly clear that no druggist could manufacture and sell drugs, and the members of the medical profession could not obtain those drugs which are ordinarily used for the cure of disease, and it would be impossible for any instrument maker in Canada to sell those instruments which professional men use, if this Bill became law. I do not rise to oppose the Bill, because the principle I believe to be a good one, and I think the hon. member aims at doing what is right; but I have only to say that the Bill should be well considered in committee, and those provisions should be struck out of the different clauses which would prevent the medical profession from carrying on their legitimate work.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand the hon. member intends, after the Bill has received its second reading, to move that it be referred to the committee on the Bill that has the Criminal law under revision. If so, I shall be very glad to support the second reading of the Bill. I should have liked the hon. gentleman to have told the House the points on which the Bill differs from some of the provisions on the subject now. There will be a difference of course; but as to some of the clauses,

I think the present law is about parallel with the clauses in the Bill. However, the adoption of that course would lead to a very careful examination of the two measures, the Bill proposed and the Act now on the Statute-book, and the committee I am sure will be able to consider the hon. gentleman's Bill at a very early date.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. CHARLTON. I move that the Bill be referred, as the Minister of Justice has indicated the propriety of its being referred, to the special joint committee having in charge the revision of the Criminal law.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further papers respecting the enforcement against Canadian fishing vessels by the Government of Newfoundland of the Newfoundland Act respecting the sale of bait to foreign fishing vessels.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 11th May, 1892.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 42) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Brockville and New York Bridge Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited).—(Mr. Dickey.)

PONTIAC CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, a certified copy of the judgment in the electoral appeal for the Electoral District of the County of Pontiac, by which the said appeal was dismissed and the judgment of the trial judges voiding the election confirmed. Mr. Speaker further informed the House that he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ for the said electoral district.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES AMENDMENT ACT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved second reading of Bill (No. 27) further to amend the Acts respecting "The North-West Territories."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the "Nays" have it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Call in the members.

Mr. SPEAKER. Call in the members.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to speak on this question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Every possible opportunity was given to any hon. gentleman who wished to speak. It is too late now. When the members are called in no discussion can take place.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Allan,
Bain (Wentworth),
Beith,
Charlton,
Craig,
Davies,
Dawson,
Denison,
Gordon,
Henderson,
Hughes,
Macdonald (Huron),
McCarthy,
McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mulock,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant),
Pridham,
Ross (Dundas),
Rowand,
Smith (Ontario),
Somerville,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Watson,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
Wilson, and
Yeo.—33.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Barnard,
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bernier,
Bourassa,
Bowell,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Burns,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Cargil,
Carignan,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Casey,
Chapleau,
Choquette,
Christie,
Cochrane,
Colter,
Corbould,
Corby,
Curran,
Davis,
Delisle,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Devlin,
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Edwards,
Fairbairn,
Featherston,
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Flint,
Foster,
Fraser,
Hutchins,
Ives,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Lister,
Livingston,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Mackintosh,
McAlister,
McDougald (Picton),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McGregor,
McKay,
McLean,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Mignault,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Monerieff,
Monet,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Pelletier,
Perry,
Proulx,
Rider,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Sanborn,
Savard,
Semple,

Fréchette,	Simard,
Frémont,	Stairs,
Geoffrion,	Stevenson,
Gibson,	Temple,
Gillies,	Thompson (Sir John),
Gillmor,	Tisdale,
Girouard (Jacques Cartier),	Tupper,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Turcotte,
Godbout,	Vaillancourt,
Haggart,	White, (Shelburne),
Hazen,	Wilmot, and
Hearn,	Wood (Westmorland).—132.

PAIRS:

For.	*Against.*
Mr. Sproule,	Mr. Forbes,
Mr. Taylor,	Mr. Pope,
Mr. Ferguson (Leeds),	Mr. Cleveland,
Mr. Wood (Brockville),	Mr. Grandbois,
Mr. Sutherland,	Mr. Guay,
Mr. Boyle,	Mr. Préfontaine,
Mr. Kirkpatrick,	Mr. Baker,

Motion negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Brockville and the hon. member for East Grey have not voted.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I am paired until to-morrow night with the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Grandbois). Otherwise I should have voted for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I am paired with the hon. member for Queen's, N. S. (Mr. Forbes). Otherwise I should have voted for the Bill.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. member for North Oxford has not voted.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am paired with the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Desaulniers).

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lotbinière has not voted.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) I was not in the Speaker, when the motion was read, therefore I could not vote. If I could have voted it would have been against the second reading of the Bill.

Motion negatived.

Mr. BOYLE. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am paired with the hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Préfontaine) ——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is out of order, the question having been decided.

A CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE AT WASHINGTON.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McCarthy respecting the appointment of a representative at Washington specially charged to watch, guard and represent the interests of Canada.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, when this debate was adjourned a few days ago, the general opinion expressed by those who took part in it was that the time had arrived in the history of this country when some fuller and more complete representation of its interests, political and commercial, abroad, should be had; and the difference of opinion which prevailed seemed chiefly to have reference to the mode in which that fuller representation could best be brought about. There became apparent during the debate a danger in the framing of the resolution as it stands, as indicated by a convergence of the views of the two parties who are opposed to each other on a very cardinal question in connection with the policy of this country. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), for instance, who had lately advocated in this House a step which the majority of the House apparently regarded as a departure in favour of the independence of Canada, and whose resolution in that direction was voted down, hailed with much pleasure a resolution coming from the hands of an hon. gentleman who not only was opposed to the resolution of the hon. member for Bothwell, but who is a well-known ardent advocate of the unity of the Empire.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How do you know he is opposed? He never expressed himself.

Mr. TUPPER. I have no doubt, from the arguments expressed by the hon. member for North Simcoe, that he is as strongly opposed to the resolution of the hon. member for Bothwell, which was voted down, as I am myself; and I gather that, not only from the views which he has expressed in this House, but from the fact that in this very debate I saw no sign that he had been converted from his well-known position by anything which the hon. member for Bothwell had said. I do not wish to import into this discussion now a side issue, nor in the slightest degree to detract from its importance: but I merely advert to that fact for this reason, that if this resolution now in your hands can be read as having two different meanings, which I think are attributed to it by the hon. gentleman to whom I have referred, it is of the greatest importance that the Imperial Parliament and the Government of this Empire shall not be led astray nor be presented with a resolution in the slightest degree ambiguous. I take it that in that respect the hon. gentleman who placed the resolution in your hands, and myself are of the same mind, and I approach the question now with a sympathy for the general object in view, agreeing with all who have taken part in the debate that the more fully and completely our interests are represented abroad, and the more directly, the better, so long as we recollect that we are part and parcel of the British Empire, and that there is no desire on the part of the people of this country, or on the part of the members of this House to change that relation. I approach the question now merely to express my opinion of the manner in which this House should present it. It is beyond dispute that in taking a step in the direction of the views of the hon. mover of the resolution or of any other hon. gentleman who took part in the debate, we must have the cordial sympathy and approval and support of the mother country, and I suppose that in approaching the Parliament or the Government of Great Britain to court that co-operation, it would be well, if we desire to attain the end and aim of the resolution and of those gentlemen who advocate the general principle, that we should do so not only in a clear and unambiguous way, but that we should leave that Government in a free and unembarrassed position to deal with the question. If my memory serves me right, when it was desired to clothe the agent general in London with greater and more important powers and to advance his position there as the agent of this country, Parliament did not proceed to propound a reso-

lution defining the position it was thought desirable that officer should have, but the first step taken, the step most likely to lead to success, and which did lead to success, was to have a conference or consultation with the Imperial authorities and obtain their consent to the proposition; and then the representative of this Government was granted those powers and given the position he now holds. It therefore occurs to me, recognizing the position we hold as part of the Empire, subject to the control of the Imperial Parliament, that so far as our foreign relations are concerned, it would be well, if this Parliament desired greater and more complete representation, that we should follow that course, and that before committing ourselves as to the proper form in which the desired representation should be had or as to the particular title the officer or representative of this country should demand, we should obtain the views of Her Majesty's Government and have that question settled in advance. There are many objections, which have been fully pointed out already, to the particular position being given the officer or representative of this country which is asked by the resolution now in your hands. For instance, he is not merely to be a representative of Canada but is to be attached to the staff of Her Majesty's Minister at Washington—that is, so far as regards fuller representation in the States. I have alluded to the subject in general of the representation of this country wherever it may be deemed necessary and in any country whatsoever. But it appears to me that we would trammel the agent or commissioner of this Government by placing him in the position defined in the resolution before us; and it seems to me, if it be possible, and I see no reason why it should not, that an agent holding somewhat the position referred to by the Minister of Finance, who could report upon trade or any other question we desire, an agent who could represent us commercially and represent us politically, could do so with far greater effect and in a far freer manner, if not attached to the staff of the British Minister. If, for instance, he went to Washington and resided there with the approval of the British Government, as the agent of this Government and in hearty sympathy and co-operation with the British Minister, he could represent us more effectually than if he went there in the capacity implied by the original resolution. The same may be said as to other governments. For instance, in connection with the position of agent of this country in France, I think it would be infinitely better for him and us, that if we desire to put that agent in a political position, as a representative of this country, beyond its commercial interests, it would be far better to obtain the necessary powers and authority, so that he could have the free communication necessary with the British Empire, than that he should become attached to and subordinate to the British representative in Paris. I take it that the commissioner in London to-day is in a far stronger position, in so far as the importance and interests of this country are concerned, in holding the position of High Commissioner at the Court of St. James, than if he were attached for instance to the Colonial Office. The position as an *attaché* either in Washington, London or in the court of any foreign country, situated as we are, with our relations to the Empire, would be an extremely difficult one for that officer to properly fill. Many inconveniences would arise, many difficulties would occur, as to how far it would be proper to communicate to this Government direct the information he received while holding that office, through his relations with the Minister, in whose hands and before whom come so many subjects with which he had particularly no concern, or in reference to which great responsibility would rest upon the British Minister, subjects at times so delicate that information could go between no other than the foreign Minister in England and his representative abroad. On the general question, the leader of the Opposition, I think, dwelt upon the inconveniences arising from indirect communication, according to the ordinary routine, and gave good evidence of the inconveniences that have arisen in the past. No doubt in many experiences of this country in the past, that inconvenience has been felt and has been certainly productive of no very great good; but at the same time he will recognize that in recent years, and even in the last year or two, much has been changed in that direction. A great change has taken place even, for instance, at Washington. It is the custom in dealing with the United States now more than ever to assign in the various disputes a representative from Canada direct with the British Minister, not merely in matters of negotiations but even in much more responsible and important matters. For instance, touching the Behring Sea question itself, I may mention what was stated in the British Parliament recently with reference to the court of arbitration or board of arbitrators on that great question. The Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs stated they were in communication with the Canadian Government before coming to a conclusion in the matter. I myself, as Minister of Marine, had the opportunity, which was afforded to me by the British Government only a year or two ago, of attending on the British Minister at Washington in order that the views of the Canadian Government should be thoroughly understood and the case properly presented to that Minister when a conference between the British Minister and the Secretary of State took place, with the view of making an arrangement for settling the question in dispute touching Behring Sea, and notably for some *modus vivendi* with reference to the preservation of the seal species. I point to this to show that there is every possibility that, by friendly conference and previous consultation with the British Government before propounding a definite scheme here or attempting to act upon one, success will be attained, and the importance of fuller representation recognized. Our agent attached to the diplomatic staff in any country of course would not be recognized and could not be recognized by a foreign government. It has not been suggested by any one in this debate that we should seek that. What we do desire is to be fully and quickly informed in foreign countries upon those subjects which affect Canada, and that we should have some one at the elbow, as it were, of the gentleman who represents the British Government with that foreign government, so that not only would Canadian affairs be thoroughly understood, but Canadian interests promptly protected and guarded. I said that no hon. gentleman seemed to desire that there should be a direct diplomatic representative of Canada at Washington, but I may correct that, because,

towards the end of the debate the leader of the Opposition, if I understood him aright, proposed that there should be a Minister appointed at Washington who should report direct to the Canadian Government.

Mr. LAURIER. Concurrently to the two governments.

Mr. TUPPER. I think he will see that, if we were to demand that at the outset, the difficulty would be greater than if we simply proceeded to ask for the appointment of an agent as is now proposed. I think all will admit that the proposition is an exceedingly novel one on the part of the Dominion of Canada as a colony of the British Empire. The hon. gentleman recognizes that, and we all recognize that; therefore I hope that the amendment which I propose to place in your hands will in this matter practically meet the views of all parts of this House, those who share the views of the leader of the Opposition and those who sympathize with the resolution as it stands. I move that all the words after "that" in the main motion be struck out, and the following be inserted in lieu thereof:—

It is expedient that communications be opened with Her Majesty's Government in order to bring about such fuller representation of Canadian interests at Washington, and at the capitals of other countries in which such other representation may be found desirable, as may be consistent with the proper relations which should exist between Great Britain and Canada.

Mr. LAURIER. I have waited a moment or two to see if the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would rise, because he is evidently the one from whom the House would have expected to hear upon this matter. For my part, I am not disposed at present to accept the amendment of the hon. gentleman. I think it is preferable, before we try to understand what are the views of the British Government on this matter, that the British Government should be made aware of the views of the Canadian Parliament on the subject. There is a beautiful variation to be observed on the part of the Government whenever our relations with the British Government come in question. When, a few nights ago, my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) moved a resolution to the effect that we would be willing to alter our fiscal policy whenever Great Britain altered hers, hon. gentlemen opposite at once preferred their views and opinions to the British Government and the British nation. This time, however, when the policy is proposed as to what should be done in regard to a right which is not dependent at all on any change of our relations with the British Government, but which we deem essential to carry on our relations with the country in which we are most interested next to Great Britain, the hon. gentleman proposes that, instead of expressing our own views on this subject and giving an opportunity to the British Government to know what our views are, we should consult the British Government on the matter. Perhaps, if the British Government are consulted in regard to this matter, they may be slow to give advice in regard to it, because they are not the people primarily to be affected by it. They are not the people who suffer from the present state of things, but we are. The hon. gentleman said there was no precedent for this motion, and nothing similar in the history of nations. I am sure that he is quite right, that there is no precedent for this, and that there never was such a proposition as this presented anywhere, but, at the same time, there has been no instance in the history of nations of a colony occupying towards the mother country the position that Canada occupies towards Great Britain. Canada has been the first colony in the world to obtain the right of self-government, and the present motion is simply a development of the policy adopted fifty years ago when we claimed and obtained the right to govern ourselves. We have a position absolutely without precedent, and the motion is also without precedent, because it is a corollary of the position we occupy. The hon. gentleman stated that the motion was somewhat ambiguous. Ambiguous in what respect? Because it was supported by men who held different views as to the future of Canada? The motion is proposed by an hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) whose views, as to the future of Canada, are well known to be in favour of a closer relation with Great Britain than we now have. The motion is supported by myself, and it is known that I do not believe that the present condition of things will endure for ever. The present relations between us and Great Britain must become either closer or looser. My opinion is that in the course of time the relations of Canada with Great Britain must cease, as the relations of colonies with the mother country do cease, by independence, just as a child becomes a man. These are the views I hold, not in regard to the present or actual policy, but as to the future of the country. But, whether we look upon the future of Canada as involving closer relations with Great Britain than we have now, or as involving independence, the fact remains that, so long as we remain a colony, the position, though advantageous in some respects, is disadvantageous in other respects. We have the advantages of our connection with Great Britain which no one can value more than I do, but in regard to our relations with the country to the south of us, our dependent relation to Great Britain makes our position extremely awkward. The hon. gentleman refers to the difficulties in carrying on negotiations in matters affecting Canada directly with the United States. If we were an independent nation, we would have an ambassador at Washington and would have our own difficulties settled directly, but we are a dependency of the British Crown, and consequently our international relations with our neighbours are extremely difficult to arrange. The object of the motion is obviously to make these relations less difficult in the future than they have been in the past. The difficulties, the Minister states, are becoming less and less every year, and, as an instance, he has stated the negotiations which have taken place in regard to the Behring Sea difficulties. It seems to me that the example is a very bad one, and the difficulties with regard to the Behring Sea, to which he has referred, show conclusively the necessity of having such an officer at Washington, as is proposed by this motion. The difficulties with regard to the Behring Sea have only just been disclosed, and how many years have elapsed since the difficulties arose until the period when they were settled? If I remember aright, the seizure of the *Sayward* took place in 1888, and three years elapsed before any settlement took place—indeed I am not sure that even yet the difficulties with regard to that seizure have been

settled. The principle involved in the seizure of the vessel has been settled, in that it has been referred to arbitration, but the difficulties which arose on account of the seizure of the Canadian vessel, which was so arbitrarily taken possession of by the American authorities—have not been settled yet so far as my knowledge serves me. Those difficulties were lately pending before the Supreme Court of the United States, and their judgment was adverse to us, and since then I do not believe the House has been aware that anything has been done towards the settlement of that difficulty. Well, does the hon. gentleman suppose that if we had had at Washington an officer of the character proposed by the motion of the hon. member for Simcoe, whose especial object would have been to take charge at once of these difficulties, to advise the Canadian Government, and to advise the British Government as to the negotiations carried on—does he suppose that it would have taken three or four years to settle these difficulties? It seems to me that the very example he has cited shows most conclusively that the motion of the hon. gentleman is a most timely one. He says there are difficulties in the way. Of course there are, I admit it, it has been admitted before; but with those difficulties in the way it is impossible for me, and it is impossible for the hon. gentleman, to suggest any better plan. He does not propose any plan of his own; he speaks of an agent, that is the only alternative he proposes. It has been pointed out on a former occasion that an agent would, to some extent, relieve the difficulty. I do not say that we should not have a commercial agent at Washington, far from it; but there is a wide difference between having a diplomatic officer at Washington and having a consular agent. An agent such as he proposes would be something like a consular agent who would advise us upon matters of trade, upon the conditions of the country, as to the course which it would be of the greatest advantage to Canada to take; but in all questions of international relations that agent would have absolutely no standing at Washington; he could not be received at the White House, he could not be received at the Department of State, he could not have any relations at all with the Washington Government, and so far as our diplomatic relations at Washington are concerned, we would be no better off than we are now.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not, as the hon. gentleman seems to think, advocate the appointment of a commercial agent only. I said that the agent could act for us commercially, and would well act for us in that respect, and would be clothed with such powers as it was possible to obtain from the Imperial Government after consultation.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think the hon. gentleman's plan is at all feasible, because, as long as we are a dependency of Great Britain, we cannot be recognized at Washington. All our diplomatic communications must pass through the channel of the English embassy, therefore this fact is fatal to his motion. If we cannot be recognized at Washington, it is useless to have an agent there. He could advise us upon commercial matters, but in all diplomatic relations we cannot be recognized, and communications must pass through the British embassy.

Mr. TUPPER. Neither could an *attaché* of the Minister there. Would he be recognized?

Mr. LAURIER. He would not be recognized, I admit, but he would act through the British embassy. His special mission would be to look after our commercial affairs, and through the embassy he could communicate directly to the Canadian Government. That would be no new departure in the business in the British embassy, and this is why, for my part, I am disposed to accept the motion of the hon. gentleman. I do not conceal the difficulties of the situation, but as long as no better plan is offered, it seems to me that it is the duty of this House to adopt the motion proposed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I certainly thought we should have heard from the Treasury Benches some further explanation of the amendment moved by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Certainly I do not think the House has received satisfactory information as to what the Government intend to accomplish if that amendment is adopted. I should suppose that before the Government committed itself to making any change, they would undertake to satisfy this House that some change was necessary. Now, the Minister of Finance argued the other day, when the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) first proposed this motion, that things were quite satisfactory as they are, that no change is desirable, that under the existing regime and existing machinery, all the action it was necessary for Canada to take as a dependency of the United Kingdom, could be taken without the adoption of any such proposition as that embraced in the hon. member's motion. The Government since have changed their minds, they have come to the conclusion that it is necessary to enter into negotiations with the Imperial Government for the purpose of accomplishing something—they do not know exactly what, for some object which they have not seen proper to state. It is not very long since we had an announcement from the Treasury benches that the hon. gentlemen went to Washington for the purpose of ascertaining what their policy should be on fiscal matters. Now, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries proposes a resolution, and if any hon. gentleman will read it he will see that they undertake to go to Downing Street for the purpose of receiving information on this subject; not to negotiate and arrange with the Imperial Government with regard to the appointment of an officer with specific duties and functions, but to ascertain whether an officer of any sort is really necessary. The hon. gentleman is in search of a policy upon the subject; more than that, he is in search of information upon the subject. He does not know whether it is necessary to appoint an officer or not; he does not know, if such an officer were appointed, whether his duties could be reconciled with the Imperial constitution or not, and therefore he proposes to go to the Colonial Secretary, or to some other Imperial officer, for the purpose of getting information upon the subject upon which he is not sufficiently enlightened at the present time. Now, I think that would be a very humiliating position. What an immense falling off it is from the pretensions made at the close of the session last year? What did the Government propose last year? They proposed a commercial policy, a fiscal policy, not only for Canada but for the whole British Empire. They undertook to tell

the Government of the United Kingdom what they ought to do; they recommended them to denounce the treaties that at present subsist with all civilized states with a view of making radical alterations in the policy of the Empire. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman is less imperious in this resolution. In this resolution he says in effect: I do not know whether we need a commercial agent, or a diplomatic agent, at Washington; I do not know whether we need one anywhere else or not; but I am going to the Colonial Secretary for the purpose of finding out really if we do need one, and if we do, for what purpose he is needed, and whether his duties could be reconciled with our relations at the present time with the mother country. A more ridiculous position it would be impossible for any Parliament to place itself in than the Parliament of Canada would be placed in if that resolution were at the present time adopted. The hon. gentleman has told us that you could not have a diplomatic agent at Washington, because such an agent would not be recognized by the American Government, and as my hon. friend beside me has pointed out, as a matter of convenience, it is desirable that this officer should be an *attaché* of the British embassy. But what his duties shall be there, whether he shall be the party who is to communicate with the American Government, or whether it shall be his chief that shall communicate with the American Government with regard to the affairs of Canada, is a matter to be determined by the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of Canada. There is no rule better settled in international law than this, that every Sovereign State shall speak to every other Sovereign State through whatever agency it may itself determine upon. It is not for the United States to dictate to us or to the Government of the United Kingdom whether it shall communicate to the Government at Washington through one or through two diplomatic servants. The Government of the United Kingdom may communicate through one or through two such officers. If an Ambassador Extraordinary is appointed you have two agents, both of whom are authorized to speak, one of whom will speak generally, the other, who is authorized to speak on a particular subject, will speak on that particular matter. If the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of Canada come to an understanding that upon all matters affecting the people of Canada and the territory of Canada, the representative specially appointed by Canada, with the assent of the Imperial authorities, shall be the organ of communication, it is not for the American Government to object. It is as open to the Government of the United Kingdom to say that the Canadian *Chargé d'Affaires* shall be the officer through whom communication shall be had, as it is to say at this moment that the present British Minister shall be the sole mouthpiece. It is a matter between Canada and the United Kingdom, and between Canada and the United Kingdom alone. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) condemned the proposition which was submitted to this House at an earlier period of the session. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I do not know whether the hon. member for North Simcoe condemned it, but I said I was sure he would have condemned it. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me if he thought I said anything in regard to the expression of the hon. member for North Simcoe. I gave my reasons for constructing the views of the hon. member for North Simcoe, stating that he was an ardent advocate of imperial federation, and I knew he would be opposed to the views of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says he knew; but the hon. member for North Simcoe expressly declined the other day to give an opinion on that subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that statement is not quite correct. I certainly intended to say, and I think I did say, that although I was not present at the discussion which took place on the hon. gentleman's resolution with regard to the treaty-making power, I had no fault to find at all with the result at which the House had arrived. I think that is what I said; it is certainly what I intended to say.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will turn up the discussion, he will find he said more than that. Perhaps he has had more light since the House discussed that question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not at all. I think you will find those words in my speech.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, and I think I will find also the words to which I have referred. If on examination I am not borne out in the statement I have made as to what the hon. gentleman said, I shall be quite ready to retract what I have stated.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will excuse me. I find these are the words I used:

"The House this session has already considered the question which was mooted by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) with respect to the power of making treaties, and a very interesting discussion—I had not the good fortune to be present, but I have read the debate since—occurred on that occasion, in which the views entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite and those entertained by hon. members supporting the Government were very fully and prominently brought forward. I do not in the least desire to quarrel with the conclusion at which the House then arrived."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I know the hon. gentleman made that statement. I think it was in his second speech he made the observation in which he stated that he declined to express an opinion on that subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I deny altogether the inference drawn by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman's inference is really the inference drawn half a century ago with respect to the establishment of responsible government by the party to which he belonged. It was contended by the leaders of the party over and over again that it would be impossible to reconcile the principles of responsible government with the duties of the Governor as an Imperial officer, and that the responsible government of a colony meant separation of the colony from the parent state. Now, the hon. gentleman says that he accepts the situation; a half century's experience contradicts the contention of those who preceded him as leaders of the Tory party. But the hon. gentleman now says that if you apply exactly the same principles to the external relations of the colony which you apply to its internal affairs, that will lead to separation. I

deny it. I say that at all events, it is a measure of delay. It is one of the means of delaying separation, it is one of the means of preventing friction between the parent state and the colony; it is one of the means which will serve to reconcile, if it is carried out, the fullest measure of self government on the part of all the present dependencies of the Empire with the continuance of the connection, and it is the only solution that offers itself. What does the hon. gentleman do when he supports the motion which is placed before the House? He is asking that the Canadian Government shall have a voice—in what? In the domestic concerns of this country? Not at all. He is asking that the Canadian Government shall have a vote in determining the external relations of the country. Is that voice to be an effective one or not? Is it to be a voice whereby Canadian interests will have paramount influence in determining what the policy of the country shall be, what the settlement shall be? I say again on this question, as I said on the other motion, that the business of the Imperial Government is to trust to responsible advisers of the Crown in a large colony in regard to matters where its interests are paramount, just as much as it is our business to trust them. We do not ask them for a voice in the settlement of any disputed question between the United Kingdom and Russia in respect to matters in Central Asia. And why? Because their interests are paramount there. It is they and not we who are chiefly concerned. But on questions relating to the sovereignty of Her Majesty on this continent, we are far more interested than the United Kingdom, and why should not the determination of that question be in the hands of the responsible advisers of the Crown here, just as the other question is in the hands of the responsible advisers in the United Kingdom? My hon. friend beside me says that a dependency grows to a nation just as certainly as a child grows to a man. I agree with that view, and am pointing out to the Government and the country the only means by which you can reconcile the growth of this country and its development, with the higher aspirations which must come from the larger interests that from time to time grow up in the country. I say that you have in the division of executive authority with respect to the external relations of the Empire a solution of the question, and no solution is to be found on any other ground; and it is because that is the case, and because the motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe points in that direction, I give that motion my cordial support. I say again that it is not on the line of the federation of the Empire that the solution of the relation of the various parts of the Empire is in my opinion to be found. On that question you have no such thing as a common opinion. The Empire is too widely scattered. You cannot bring the representatives of its different portions together and settle any question affecting the whole, or any distant part without trusting to that particular part for all your information as to the wisdom of the course to be pursued. You must ever remain ill-informed with regard to every other matter except that which specially concerns your own particular section. Therefore the exercise of executive authority must be always a matter of confidence on the part of all the portions of the Empire in the one that is specially affected, and when the Minister of Marine says that you cannot reconcile such an arrangement with the existing state of things, I say the hon. gentleman is begging the question. No one supposes that you can incorporate a new feature on the constitution of the Empire without making alterations and adjusting the ancient parts to the new. That is a necessary consequence of an important change like this. The question we have to consider is: whether the change is demanded by the altered circumstances of the country, and I say that it is. I say that the events which have happened during the past few years with regard to the external relations of this Dominion show that to be the case. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman himself has been at Washington for the purpose of negotiating. The hon. gentleman not long ago was there, and I understand he was greatly dissatisfied with the treatment which he received from the British embassy.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to say that without authority, as I have never given the slightest intimation as to my not being received properly by the British embassy. On the contrary, I was received in the most courteous manner, and every representation I made on behalf of the Canadian Government was also received in the same cordial spirit.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of report that the hon. gentleman was so far dissatisfied that his chief advised him to return, unless greater attention was given to his representations.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no truth in that statement whatever, not the slightest. There is not the slightest foundation for that statement.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but let me say this: It is one of the misfortunes of being compelled to have to discuss these adventures across the border, without having the necessary official information that ought to be in our possession; and so we are obliged to trust to such information as has been given; and to such information as we have been enabled to obtain from various quarters. I admit that it is not a satisfactory way of obtaining information, and it is not at all proper to be forced to the discussion of questions on the relations between Canada and the United States, without having that information. But, Sir, that is not my fault; it is the hon. gentleman's fault. The hon. gentleman says that he was received with the greatest courtesy and that all the representations he made were listened to. We must assume that he had representations to make and that it was important that they should be heard. I suppose their importance would not have been diminished if the hon. gentleman had been allowed to speak on behalf of the Government of Canada instead of being obliged to speak through some other party.

Mr. TUPPER. I may state, and it is not a secret as the papers have been laid before the British Parliament; that I was not only permitted to make my representations to the British Minister but that I attended every conference between the British Minister and the Secretary of State of the United States and was heard myself.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it is very important that these papers should be before us.

Mr. TUPPER. They are before the English Parliament now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They are not before this Parliament.

Mr. TUPPER. They are being referred to this Parliament.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell), The hon. gentleman just shows the importance of having these papers which I have again and again stated it was important we should have.

Mr. TUPPER. They are being printed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman shows more. He makes it clear that he was not willing to trust to the representations of the British Minister.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not say that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh, yes, the hon. gentleman spoke himself and was present himself.

Mr. TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman took part in the discussion, and so the hon. gentleman acted throughout upon the assumption that Canada ought to have some person at Washington to speak for her, and that she ought not to trust solely to the British Minister there. That is what the hon. gentleman has said, and now he comes before us and says again: If you vote for the resolution, recognizing a permanent officer instead of a casual one, a casual visitor, instead of having in Washington a man who is there of right, speaking as a matter of right and not as a matter of forbearance or courtesy, that you will inflict upon this country a calamity, that you will do a great deal to sever the ties which unite Canada to the mother country, and that you will do this if you appoint a permanent official qualified for the discharge of his duties and responsible to Parliament of this country for the efficient and careful manner in which he does discharge his duty. But, says the hon. gentleman, I was there because it was important that I should be there. I was there to protect the interests of the country that I feared were in jeopardy if they were left to the British Minister alone, and so I am going to propose an amendment to the motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and I am going to try and vote down a proposition which gives practical and permanent effect to the course that I actually took myself less than 12 months ago.

Mr. TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him for one moment, so that my argument may be better understood? The hon. gentleman has made my argument all the stronger if he will allow me to say so. I was showing that instead of meeting with any difficulty in the conference with the British Government as to how best we should arrange a direct representation of our views, and I pointed to the experience we have had especially of late, and naturally I referred to my own experience, and I found there, just as the hon. gentleman has better and more fully explained to the House, that no such difficulties were placed in the way. I found that although I had no diplomatic character or position on that occasion, going merely to consult with the British Minister; I went by the request of the British Government itself with their approval; and being there, although not in any diplomatic capacity nor as representative of the Government, I actually took part with the British Minister in all the discussions that took place between him and the Secretary of State of the United States. I mentioned that to show the House that there was every reason to believe that the British Government would perhaps co-operate with us in this movement, and I suggested that the best way was to put the question to them first, before laying down here in a manner that might be misunderstood, a peremptory direction as to how that should be done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says that the British Government approved of his visit to Washington, authorized it, and let me read to the House the motion which the hon. gentleman has made for the purpose of giving effect to the experience he has had. The hon. gentleman says this:

"It is expedient that communications be opened with Her Majesty's Government in order to bring about such fuller representation of Canadian interests at Washington and at the capitals of other countries in which such other representations may be found desirable."

Mr. TUPPER. That is not all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is all I am reading at the present moment. Now, the hon. gentleman in this resolution submits nothing to the House for its approval. The hon. gentleman is still in the clouds. The motion of the hon. member for Simcoe is a definite proposition, and in voting for it the House knows for what it is voting. The House knows what policy will be pursued if that resolution is adopted. Does the House know what this amendment will result in? If the Government wish to take any action of this sort, they do not require a resolution of the House; it ought to be taken without asking the House. The business of the House is to pass an opinion upon the results at which the Government have arrived. But the hon. gentleman wants the House to assume the responsibility of taking a leap in the dark, and of approving of a course which may end in a way wholly different from what the House would have sanctioned if it had known beforehand what was determined upon by the Administration. The hon. gentleman says that there is more in this resolution. Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is more; and while the hon. gentleman, so far as I have read his resolution, takes a positive course, it is a shadowy and vague one; no one can tell how it will end. The hon. gentleman has qualified it that so it may mean nothing at all. The hon. gentleman certainly says more; he says not only "that may be found desirable," but "may be consistent with the proper relations which should exist between Great Britain and Canada." What are those proper relations? The hon. gentleman's colleague told us, when this matter was discussed a few days ago, that it was inconsistent with a dependency to undertake to establish diplomatic relations with a sovereign state like the United States. We might have a commercial agency; we might have a man who had no diplomatic character at all, to collect statistics and information with regard to the trade of the neighbouring republic; but if he undertook to discuss any diplomatic question, he would be entering the sacred enclosure confined to the mother country. So that what is apparently recognized as possible in the earlier portion of the hon. gentleman's resolution may be made altogether impossible by its concluding words. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman should have taken a more courageous course. He should have

either given his support to the resolution of the hon. member for North Simcoe or he should have resisted it; but he has done neither. He has submitted a resolution which may mean little, or it may mean nothing. It says to the Imperial Government: Oh, this is a matter about which we do not wish to worry you or offend your prejudices. We suppose that you may think that it is inconsistent with the position of a dependency that we should undertake to have a voice in our external relations at all; and if so, we are not going to press the question upon your attention. Now, I say that a more feeble resolution could not be submitted to this House, and I trust that the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, any more than the hon. gentlemen on this side, will not give such a resolution their support.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, if we except the superlatives in which the hon. member for Bothwell nearly always indulges, as, for instance, that this is the most feeble resolution that could be adopted, and the most ridiculous that could be devised——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not use the word ridiculous to-night.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At the beginning of the hon. gentleman's speech he used an expression quite equivalent to that. I am only quoting him from memory——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Your memory is bad.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sure that it is, and if I could repeat the exact superlative, I am sure that it would be stronger than that which I supply from memory. But, I say that with the exception of these superlatives, which are always to be expected and which we always receive in the kindliest manner from the hon. gentleman, there is only one statement in his speech from which I must dissent as a statement of fact. I dissent entirely from his proposition that he would have got on better in his argument if the papers had been brought down which he referred to in replying to the hon. Minister of Marine. The hon. member for Bothwell does not do himself half justice when he argues that his imagination is not a great deal better than the facts. The hon. gentleman would not have been able to argue this question or any other with regard to our relations with the United States, if he had not been in a position to draw largely, indeed entirely, from his imagination. When I have said that, I have mentioned all that I propose to dissent from in his speech, so far as his observations upon facts are concerned. The rest of his argument, and the argument of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, I listened to with a great deal of pleasure, because it was perfectly apparent that one-half of these arguments would vanish into thin air when these hon. gentlemen came to read the resolution in amendment, and the other half of their arguments were strongly in its favour. The hon. leader of the Opposition, for instance, said that this amendment was an extraordinary variation from the policy which we laid down a few days ago, and he proceeded to argue that it was so because we were not expressing any opinion on the part of this House, but were proposing to consult with the British Government and to ask what their opinion was. When the hon. gentleman has leisure to read the resolution, he will find that it expresses a definite opinion—the very definite opinion expressed from these benches when this question was last under debate, that negotiations should be opened up with Her Majesty's Government with the view of having that policy and those wishes carried out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What policy?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will tell the hon. gentleman in a single moment what policy. When the hon. gentleman heard me making the argument to this House that what we desired was something more than an *attaché* and something less than a representative clothed with plenipotentiary powers, and that a mere officer on the staff of the British Minister would not be as effective or as independent an officer for us as would be desirable in the interests of Canada, the hon. gentleman interrupted me to remark: "That would be a matter of arrangement with Her Majesty's Government." I argued at the moment in reply that while we asked for an *attaché*, we might find that the powers which this House desired to clothe him with were quite inconsistent with the status of an *attaché*, and that therefore it was unwise to commit ourselves to the particular name and designation of the officer; and when the hon. gentleman asks me now what we are to communicate with the British Government about, I tell him that it is precisely to make that arrangement which he suggested in answer to me in that debate might be made with Her Majesty's Government, and the only impediment to which was the mention of "an officer attached to the staff of Her Majesty's Ministry."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the hon. gentleman has left out half of his resolution.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, I have not left out anything, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member says that the argument of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is an admission that the representations which are made by the British Minister at Washington are ineffectual and insufficient; that the Minister of Marine had to go there and ask to be heard; and that he therefore admitted that we require fuller representation there than we have. Sir, the resolution proposed by way of amendment admits that, and invites this House to affirm it. But the point on which we differ is this: We are not at all sure, on the contrary we are very doubtful, that the particular kind of officer we are willing to appoint shall be heard as representing Canada. If we are not able to get an officer who can be heard, we do not want any officer at all. We would not have sent as High Commissioner to England, one who was to be an officer in the Civil Service of Great Britain, in the position of a clerk in the Department of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Nor are we prepared to accept as our representative at Washington any person who is to be a mere servant in the British legation there. The hon. member for Bothwell has told us that there is a great falling off in our policy of this session from that of last session, when we proposed a fiscal policy for the whole Empire; but I tell him that there is a greater falling off in his policy of to-night from that of two weeks ago, when he was advocating the right of this country to negotiate its own treaties, and practical independence for Canada, whereas now he is willing that our representative should be the servant of the British Ambassador at Washington—a man to whom his master

can say "go, and he goeth; do this and he doeth it." The hon. gentleman to-night would rather be a door-keeper in the house of his lord than dwell in the tents of independence. Just imagine the difference between a motion in favour of the independence of Canada and a motion asking that a servant be appointed in the office of the British Minister at Washington to represent Canada! When the hon. member asks me what we propose by this amending resolution, I tell him we propose to see just what kind of a representative we can have at Washingington to act in concert with Her Majesty's representative there, and clothed with sufficient powers by Her Majesty's Government. We have had suggested in this debate every kind of officer known in diplomatic usage. We have had an *attaché* proposed, and we on this side of the House have submitted that it is unwise to commit ourselves to that proposition. While, as the hon. member for Bothwell says, it is for Great Britain to say whether she shall be represented at Washington by one Minister or two; I think Great Britain would tell us it was unknown to diplomatic usage that she would be represented by servant and master too. It would be unwise to commit ourselves to the appointment of an officer who would be an inferior, and might be bound by reason of the confidential nature of his relation to his master, and therefore not in a position to report to us at all. A commercial agent was suggested, but that seemed unsatisfactory, as implying that he is only to attend to matters of commerce. A consular agent was also suggested, but it was admitted on all sides that such an officer as we desire should have greater powers than are given by diplomatic usage to officers of that class; and it is for the purpose of avoiding any expression which would limit the powers of this officer and narrow our expression of opinion by a name that we desire that the House should not be committed to any particular terms describing him; but that we should ask Her Majesty's permission to have a representative, with the right of introduction to and communication with the Government of the United States, and the right to speak for us, subordinate, of course, to the Minister there. Canada desires all these powers, and probably would not be satisfied with anything less if the country sends a representative there at all. That is why we propose a resolution in amendment in these general terms which will include the lesser terms; and hon. gentlemen opposite will surely not be unwilling to accept a resolution, which involves the less and involves something greater too. We want our officer to have the powers of access, and of speech, and of reporting to us whenever he deems necessary. But we were told by the Opposition when I last addressed the House that this was a matter of arrangement between this Government and the Government of Great Britain; and it is precisely to make such an arrangement, for large powers of that character, untrammelled by any designation of that particlar officer, that we desire the resolution passed in these particular terms. With regard to the hon. gentleman's observations as to the falling off in the policy we propose to-night from that of dictating a fiscal arrangement for the whole Empire, I have to say this, and it is only a casual remark with reference to something which does not enter into the debate, that we are not afraid whenever Canada is affected by the fiscal policy of the Empire, to ask Parliament to speak upon it, and we do not care if, in so doing, we shall be accused of suggesting a policy for the Empire at large. We will stand by Canadian interests no matter when or where, or how widely they involve the interests of the Empire at large. We speak with the more confidence because we believe that we speak to those who will listen to any representation from us with regard to matters affecting the interests of Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As Spain did.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In what instance?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In denouncing the treaty.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. She did what appeared to be in her own interests, and we propose to do precisely the same: and when we seek to address Her Majesty's Government upon a question which affects the interests of Canada, we expect to hear from the other side the taunt that we are dictating the policy of the Empire, but we do not intend to be prevented from speaking freely for that reason. It is because we desire this freedom of speech that we desire that our representative at Washington, of whatever class Her Majesty's Government may make him, shall have free speech, full right to report to us, and access, both to the British Minister and the Government of the country to which he goes, more or less accredited; and it is because we fear that this may be trammelled and prevented by any restrictive terms in the resolution, that we propose this amendment, looking to representations at Washington or wherever our interests may be affected, and looking to the fullest representation consistent with the relations which ought to exist between Canada and the mother country. It is unnecessary, surely, that I should answer the hon. gentleman's observations as to what those relations ought to be. They ought to be precisely what they are now for the present at least; and for the future, whatever the development of this country may be, they ought to be of the most cordial character that can be devised to interlace the two countries together.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition said he paused after this amendment was proposed, to hear what I had to say with regard to it, suggesting that possibly the House might like to hear what my views on the subject were. My only object in bringing this matter before the House was to draw its attention and that of the country, and more especially the attention of the Imperial Government to the position which Canada occupies in relation to the United States, to the very great interests that are at stake between this Dominion and the United States, and to the importance that we should have representation in some form or another at the capital of that country; and, not having heard the amendment before, not knowing what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries desired to move, I desired to fully understand its purport and its object before I committed myself either in opposition to or in support of it. Now it has been explained by the leader of the House that the object of the Government in making this amendment is to widen instead of to narrow the resolution which I had the honour to propose. I stated that I was not wedded either to the language of this resolution, athough

it was the best I was able at the moment to suggest, or to the particular course which this resolution proposes. The object I desired to gain I have already sufficiently stated, and, if this motion which is now put in amendment will have the effect of directing the attention of, and obtaining authority from the Imperial Government for the representation that I think we ought to have, then my object will be attained. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that the Government need no resolution of this House in order to communicate with the Government of Great Britain and Ireland on this subject. That, no doubt, is true, but it cannot be gainsaid on the other hand that the formal expression of the opinion of this House that communications be opened up with Her Majesty's Government with a view to fuller representation of Canadian interests will have much greater weight than the mere action of the Government would have without it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Look at the concluding words of the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will come to the concluding words in due course. No doubt, this is a matter to which the Imperial Government will have their attention called, and they will see the discussion which has taken place, and we may hope that the object which we all appear to have in view, no matter how we may differ as to the ways and means, may be attained. I do not see why my hon. friend thinks the latter part of this amendment cuts down the effect of the former portion. I certainly did not propose that we should have any representation at Washington which would be inconsistent with our relations with the British Crown. I am content to await the development of affairs and to get such powers from time to time as our position demands, and I believe that, if these powers are granted, it will not lead to dismemberment, but to closer relationships between us as a colonial dependency and the mother country instead of leading, as my hon. friend seems to think, towards independence or separation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to hear that my hon. friend does not desire that, but certainly my hon. friends opposite seem to expect it, and the leader of the Opposition at all events has stated it in clear and unambiguous terms. Whatever may be the end that awaits us, it is right and proper that, in the meantime, we should have such representation as to protect the material and political interests of this Dominion. Therefore I accept the amendment. I think it would be a pity and that it savours of special pleading to be able to draw a distinction between the resolution and the amendment. I think the Government might have accepted the resolution. The mere expression of the House that this was the best way to obtain representation for Canada would not have bound the Imperial authorities certainly, nor would even this Government have been bound by what after all was merely an abstract expression of opinion. In the same way this amendment simply empowers the Government to open up negotiations with the British Government on the subject, and we shall await next session the result of these negotiations with a good deal of curiosity and I hope a good deal of satisfaction.

Mr, MILLS (Bothwell). The concluding words of this resolution assume that the request which the hon. gentleman made in his resolution and which he says is being made in the early portion of the amendment, may be one inconsistent with our relations to the Empire. If that be so, it must be wholly inconsistent with the hon. gentleman's views.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not read it in that way but simply as a declaration on the part of this House that this fuller representation should be given to our representative, and that it should be consistent with the existing regulations between us and the mother country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not the way it reads.

Mr. McCARTHY. It reads as follows:—

"It is expedient that communications be opened with Her Majesty's Government in order to bring about such fuller representation of Canadian interests at Washington and at the capitals of other countries in which such other representation may be found desirable as may be consistent with the proper relations which should exist between Great Britain and Canada."

I cannot understand that as meaning anything more than I say, that we do not ask that the relation we propose should be inconsistent with those which now happily exist.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will read the passage to which I referred as to the remarks of the hon. gentleman. He said:

"I have felt for many years, and the longer I am in public life, the more strongly do I feel, that it is impossible for this great country to thwart the natural development and the process of evolution which is going on. We must remember that we are a great nation, we are recognized in that capacity, although we have not yet the full powers of nationality."

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Amendment agreed to on a division.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 12th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MONTREAL AND LAKE MASKINONGÉ RAILWAY CO.

Mr. BÉCHARD moved:

That the petition of C. Beausoleil, M. P., President of the Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Railway Company, and others, presented this day; praying to be permitted to lay before the House the petition of the aforesaid railway company, for the passing of an Act authorizing them to lease or sell their railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for presenting petitions for Private Bills.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Mr. McCARTHY. I beg to move that Bill (No. 27) further to amend the Act respecting the North-West Territories Act be set down for second reading on Monday next. I desire to explain, after the vote taken last night, why I make the motion. I had intended, at some stage of the debate, to speak on the question, and I understood, in fact I was informed by many hon. gentlemen, that other hon. members also desired to speak on it as well. My principal object in moving this motion, however, is to direct attention to the practice which prevails in this House, without in the slightest degree intending to cast any imputation on you, Mr. Speaker, as to the manner in which the question was put on this occasion, and indeed on other occasions. One side of the House cried "carried" and the other side "lost," and you, Mr. Speaker, announced from your place, without putting the question, and calling for the yeas and nays, that the nays had it. That, of course, properly speaking, put an end to all opportunity for debate. That being done, in order that the yeas and nays might be recorded, I called for the yeas and nays. I think the proper practice, and it is the English practice, that the question being put by you, Mr. Speaker, from the Chair, you should call for the yeas and then call for the nays, and then declare whether the yeas or nays had it, and it is on appeal from that decision that the yeas and nays are called for. The House would then have the fullest opportunity of knowing when the question was being put, and not, as last night, be taken by surprise.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. For one, I am not able to concur in the adoption of this motion, to-day. I think the House fully understood, when the question was put last night, that the principle of the Bill was being voted on, and in relation to a public measure, as this is, it is a very unusual course to adopt such a motion. As regards what took place last night, I feel bound to say that, to my mind, the Chair showed unusual deliberation in putting the question. It struck me when the question was called for, and when both sides of the House called either "carried" or "lost," that you, Mr. Speaker, must have been under the impression that a discussion would take place, otherwise you would not have deliberated so long as you did in announcing what you thought was the result of the division. I, therefore, feel bound to say that I think the Chair cannot rest under any charge of undue expedition.

Mr. DENISON. I intended to have said a few words last night, but, as many hon. members will recollect, there is one hour allowed for private Bills, and as the question was called not more than 15 or 20 minutes after eight o'clock, I and many other hon. members were taken by surprise.

Mr. McMULLEN. Since the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) placed the Bill on the Order Paper it has been called in this House not less than three or four times. It was called when he was present, it was allowed to stand, I presume at his request, from time to time, and eventually, at the eleventh hour last night, the Bill was call d. We are now reaching the last stages of the session. It is a question that will cause considerable discussion, and for my part I am not disposed to vote to reinstate it this session.

Mr. McCARTHY. My particular object, as I stated, was to have an understanding, and I think it is well we should have it as to how questions are to be put from the Chair. As it seems to be against the general feeling of the House, I do not desire to press this motion. I quite realize now, that it would be the occasion of very great inconvenience to have a discussion upon this question this session, but I thought it only due to my friends who desire to speak on either side, and also to myself, to draw attention to the fact that we were taken by surprise. I do not desire at all to impute any want of courtesy to you, Mr. Speaker, or to say that you did not give us time. There was plenty of opportunity, that is quite certain, for any gentleman here who desired to speak. At the same time I think I am quite within the mark when I say, as I do say, that I for one was taken by surprise when you declared that the "nays" had it, and I think other gentlemen were in the same position.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Just allow me to mention one circumstance which took place when the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was not in the House; as completely meeting, I think, the hon. gentleman's impression that the advocates of the Bill were taken by surprise. The Bill was called at a quarter to six, before recess, and the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) rose to discuss it; but at his request we all agreed to call it six o'clock, in order that any gentleman wishing to speak in favour of the Bill might get a full hearing, and might know that the Bill was to come up at eight o'clock.

Mr. LAURIER. I would remind the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that on this occasion it was exactly as it was two years ago, when he introduced his Bill with regard to the French language. At that time, he expounded his Bill on the first reading, and on the second reading he moved it without speech, exactly as he did yesterday. Mr. Speaker gave ample opportunity last night to any one who desired to speak on the Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. No doubt.

Mr. LAURIER. I think two or three minutes elapsed at least before the Speaker said: "Call in the members."

Mr. BECHARD. Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was wrong in saying that he was taken by surprise. I was in my seat when the Bill was called, and when the motion for the second reading was put everybody was looking for the hon. member to rise and make a speech, but he was one of the first to call "yeas" and "nays." It was after that, that hon. gentlemen said "call in the members," and you, Mr. Speaker, gave the order to call in the members after a few minutes had elapsed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand the rule to be that where a Bill is voted down, and not postponed to any future date, that it can be put on the Order Paper again by the hon. gentleman who has charge of it if he sees proper; and it is not a question of order at all. If the hon. gentleman wishes to put his Bill on the Order Paper, I suppose there is nothing in the rules to prevent him. There is no doubt whatever, it seems to me, that there was ample opportunity given for hon. gentlemen who wished to speak. Mr. Speaker

took the chair at the ordinary hour for meeting, and I know that I came into the House somewhat after the usual hour and I was here in time to vote upon the subject. The calling of the "yeas" and "nays" does not prevent any member from speaking. It is only after the members are called in that hon. gentlemen are precluded from entering upon a discussion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not share the opinion of my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and I think that in a matter of the importance of this Bill, time might be given for a fair consideration of it. I for one, Mr. Speaker, was taken by surprise last night. I could not accept the Bill in its shape as introduced by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), but I had intended to move an amendment to it and to substitute something else in the place of it. I had just begun to write the amendment, thinking that the hon. gentleman would give a reason for the faith that was in him, a reason why he moved the second reading of the Bill, and that I would have had time to write the resolution amending it. However, the debate was shut off, after ample opportunity was given to the hon. gentleman to speak, no doubt, and it simply remained to me to vote for or against the Bill. I hope the House will allow the Bill to be reintroduced.

Mr. McGREGOR. I was present when the motion for the second reading was called last evening, and I saw the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) sitting in his place, and I heard the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) saying "yeas" and "nays," after you, Mr. Speaker, had given ample time for discussion. We expected that the hon. member would speak on the motion, but he did not, and I feel satisfied that ample time was given for discussion. We have had enough fooling with this question already, and if the hon. gentleman is in earnest let him be in earnest and come forward with his Bill properly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I trust you will allow me the indulgence of the House to say this: The reason I did not speak in moving the second reading of the Bill was just as the hon. the leader of the Opposition has said. I made my statement when I introduced the Bill. That is the proper time, when introducing a Bill in the hands of a private member, to explain it, and having only one opportunity of speaking I exercised my right to reserve what I had to say until I heard the statement against the measure. That is the course I took two years ago, and that is the course I intended to take on this occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am very sorry indeed that that hon. member should have thought that I allowed him to be taken by surprise when the motion was put to the House last night. I do not understand that the rule requires that a motion should be put a second time before calling the "yeas" and the "nays." The motion was put from the Chair for the second reading of the Bill, and I waited a considerable time, as every member will bear testimony, to ascertain whether anybody desired to speak, but the cries of "lost" and "carried" came from both sides of the House. In my opinion the "nays" had it, and I so expressed it, but even then I would have been willing to have allowed the discussion to go on if any member had chosen to rise after I had so expressed my opinion. After the members are called in, however, as every hon. member knows, no discussion can be permitted. In future, if the House thinks it desirable that the question should be put twice from the Chair, I have no objection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say in regard to this present motion, that it is in order. If the hon. gentleman desires to withdraw it, it may be withdrawn if the House consents to it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will withdraw if the House desires it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman shall have permission to withdraw?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think the motion should be withdrawn, because, from whatever cause it is, a number of hon. gentlemen in this House who have been anxious to speak on this question were prevented from so doing. I think the blame rests with the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in the first place, in not allowing it to be known when such an important measure as this is coming up, that he intends to bring it before the attention of the House at a particular time, and that he does not intend to speak upon it. I know, for my own part, that I came into the House just as Mr. Speaker was saying "call in the members." If I had known the Bill would have come up so early I would have been here to offer a few remarks on it, as I intended to do; but I was prevented from having the opportunity. I think, therefore, permission should be given to reintroduce the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I submit that this is not a question which should be decided specially with reference to the present motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), because it involves a parliamentary precedent and a parliamentary right. If, when the motion was made that the Bill be now read a second time, an amendment had been moved that the Bill should not be read then, but should be read this day three months or six months; then the question would have been disposed of entirely. The only question before the House last night was "that the Bill should be now read a second time," and that was the only question disposed of. It is open to the hon. gentleman, and it is his right, to put his Bill on the Order Paper without any motion in this House, because the only question which the House has passed on is, "Shall the Bill be now read a second time?" As no amendment was then moved that the Bill should not be read, it is still before Parliament, and still within the hon. gentleman's power to put it on the Paper. I deprecate the introduction of a new rule in this matter, at variance with constitutional practice and precedents.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule as laid down by Dr. Bourinot in the last edition of his book is as follows:—

"If a resolution adverse to the Bill be resolved in the affirmative; or the motion, 'that the Bill be now read a second time,' be simply negatived on a division, the measure will disappear from the order book, but it may be revived at any subsequent time, as the House has only decided that it should not then be read a second time, and the order previously made for the second reading remains good. When a Bill disappears in this way from

the Order Paper, it is competent for a member to move at any time :

"'That it be read a second time on ——— next.'

"On this motion being agreed to, the Bill takes its place on the orders. The same practice obtains with respect to the Bill at any previous or succeeding stage."

My opinion is that a motion must be made to reinstate a Bill on the Order Paper, before it can reappear there.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think that the comparative smallness of the vote of last night shows one of two things, either that a number of members like myself, supposing that the discussion on the Bill would continue to a comparatively late hour, did not hurry themselves to be present, and were therefore absent, or that a number were conveniently absent. I beg to say that I was in the former category : and without giving any intimation of what I might or might not have done, I may say it was my intention to vote on the question and to preface my vote with some remarks explanatory of my reasons for doing what I proposed to do. Having been, unfortunately, absent when the vote was taken, through a reason which I do not care now to state, I was taken by surprise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. SCRIVER. And I would be glad of an opportunity to vote upon the question. Therefore I should be very much pleased, indeed, to see the motion of my hon. friend from North Simcoe prevail and the Order restored to the Order Paper.

Mr. IVES. It may be, Mr. Speaker, as you have said, that the Bill may be restored to the Order Paper ; but what purpose would be served by restoring it ? I fancy that the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House showed the object which hon. gentlemen would gain if the motion were restored to the Order Paper, namely, to rise in their places and in a very few words explain to their constituents why they did not vote. I fancy it would answer all purposes if we gave a few moments to these hon. gentlemen to explain to their constituents why they were not here, or why they were here and voted but did not speak. But it certainly would not serve any good purpose to take up the time of the House during one or two or, perhaps, three sittings to repeat speeches which we have already heard on two or three occasions ; and certainly, at this late stage of the session, the interests of the large majority of the House, who are against the second reading of the Bill, ought to be considered rather than the interests of the score and a-half who are in favour of it, and who are not satisfied because they have not had an opportunity of explaining to their constituents what they think of this matter when their constituents already know what their views are.

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall the hon. gentleman have leave to withdraw the motion ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost. Carried.

Mr. SPEAKER. If there is a single dissenting voice the motion cannot be withdrawn.

Mr. OUIMET. If the motion is withdrawn the question will not be settled, but the motion will be presented again, and we will have another discussion. So, for my part, I object to the motion being withdrawn.

Motion negatived on a division.

Mr. SPEAKER.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HAGGART moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 84) to amend the Railway Act. He said : The principal clause in the Bill makes provision for the prevention of frauds by conductors and those buying tickets upon which a rebate is allowed. The rebate is to be confined to the person purchasing the ticket. Another clause refers to interlocking switches. Under the old law all trains were compelled to come to a dead stop on approaching a crossing. The modern appliances used on railways render that entirely unnecessary, and the provision is to allow a train to go on at a moderate speed where there is an interlocking switch. There are besides a few minor clauses.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

UNLAWFUL ASSOCIATIONS AND OATHS.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 85) further to amend the 10th chapter of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, respecting seditious and unlawful associations and oaths. He said : This is a very unpretentious little Bill. It only seeks to change the word "of" to "in" in the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, chapter 10, which is an Act respecting seditious and unlawful associations and oaths. Section 9 of that Act provides :

"And whereas certain societies have been long accustomed to be holden in this province, under the denomination of Lodges of Free Masons, the meetings whereof have been, in a great measure, directed to charitable purposes, nothing in this Act shall extend to the meetings of any society or lodge, holden under the said denomination and in conformity to the rules prevailing among the said Societies of Free Masons : provided such society or lodge has been constituted, by or under the authority of warrants in that behalf, granted by or derived from any Grand Master or Grand Lodge in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland."

It was subsequently found that there was a Grand Lodge of Masons in Canada, under which a great number of lodges were constituted, and, therefore, in 1865 the Parliament of the then Province of Canada enacted as follows :—

"The words 'or Grand Master or Grand Lodge of Canada' are hereby added to, and shall follow the words 'Great Britain and Ireland' in the ninth section of the tenth chapter of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, intituled : An Act respecting seditious and unlawful associations and oaths."

Shortly after 1865, political changes took place whereby the name of Canada was applied to the Dominion, and it embraced all the provinces extending from ocean to ocean, and the name, therefore, of the Grand Lodge for Canada became a misnomer. Grand Lodges of Freemasons are constituted in all the provinces ; and in the Province of Quebec doubts have arisen as to whether the Grand Lodge of that province is excepted from the Act respecting seditious and unlawful associations, because it speaks of the Grand Lodge of Canada, whereas there is now practically no Grand Lodge of Canada. It has been desired by a large number of the societies which have long existed in that province and have done a good deal of charitable work, that the words "of Canada" shall be changed so as to read "any Grand Master or Grand Lodge in Canada," and that the Act shall not apply to any lodges constituted under warrant issued by any Grand Lodge or Grand Master in Canada.

Mr. LISTER. Who has asked for this legislation—any particular Grand Lodge of the Dominion?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Ex-Grand Master Walken has been asking for it. There has been some disturbance or disagreement among the lodges in Quebec, some objecting to take their warrant from the Grand Lodge of Quebec, alleging this doubt as to the legality of the warrant; and Grand Master Walken was appointed to go to Quebec to try and settle this difficulty. When he arrived there he found this legal doubt in existence, and he has asked that it be removed and the words changed.

Mr. WALLACE. Does that apply only to Masonry lodges or does it apply generally?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Masonry lodges; it is altering a public Act.

Mr. GIROUARD. This is not a private Bill?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No; it is asking to amend the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada. It is asking to amend a public Bill.

Mr. AMYOT. Does it affect any private interests?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Why not make it general?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Because the Act is not general which was passed in 1865, and I am only asking to amend that Act. If we go back to the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, we find that the whole clause refers to certain societies having been long accustomed to be holden in this province under the denomination of Lodges of Freemasons, the meetings whereof have been in great measure for charitable purposes, so that the whole clause refers only to Lodges of Freemasons.

Mr. GIBSON. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he is authorized by Mr. Walken, of Kingston, who is not a member of the Grand Lodge of Quebec. It would not be fair to pass anything of the kind without receiving the consent of the Grand Lodge of Canada. At the time the Grand Lodge of Quebec was formed, the Grand Lodge of Canada embraced those of Quebec and Ontario, and after the Grand Lodge of Quebec seceded from the Grand Lodge of Canada the name of the Grand Lodge of Canada was and is adhered to with addition of the Grand Lodge of A. F. & A. M. of Canada in the Province of Ontario. I cannot understand why an Act of this kind should be asked to take from the Grand Lodge of Canada the name that it now has in the Province of Ontario. If I understand the matter rightly, the Grand Lodge of Quebec is simply called the Grand Lodge of Ancient, Free and Accepted Masons of Quebec, and not of Canada. If this Bill is passed it will place the Grand Lodge of Quebec in exactly the same position as the Grand Lodge of Canada in Ontario now is.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It simply changes the wording of it.

HARBOUR OF THREE SISTERS, N.S.

Mr. BÉCHARD asked, What is the total amount expended on the harbour of Three Sisters, N.S., since the year 1880?

Mr. OUIMET. No expenditure has been made on that harbour.

WILLIAM PROSSER, FISHERY OVERSEER, ESSEX.

Mr. ALLAN asked, Whether an investigation has been made into the conduct of William Prosser relating to the discharge of his duties as overseer of fisheries for the district fronting the County of Essex? Has the said William Prosser been dismissed from the position of overseer, and is he now in any way in the employment of the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. TUPPER. An investigation was made into his conduct as overseer of fisheries, and he was dismissed, and is not now in any way in the employ of the department.

ANTOINE RHÉAUME—LAND GRANT.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked, Did the Government ever make a grant of land in the County of Essex to one Antoine Rhéaume for services rendered during the war of 1812? If so, what quantity of land did they grant, and what is the number of said lots, and in what part of the country are they situated? When, and to whom, was the patent granted for the said lands? Have the said lands, or any part of them, ever reverted to the Crown?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government have made no grant of lands for services rendered during the war of 1812. All the records concerning land grants to militiamen for services in 1812 and 1815 are under the control of the Ontario and Quebec Governments and kept in the Provincial Land Offices in these provinces since 1867.

I. C. R.--DISMISSAL OF ALFRED DRAKE.

Mr. GUAY asked, Whether Mr. Alfred Drake, foreman in the Intercolonial Railway shops at Hadlow, County of Lévis, has been dismissed from his position? If so, for what reason? Is it the intention of the Government to select a new foreman from amongst the residents of Lévis?

Mr. HAGGART. He was dismissed for intemperance, and it is the intention to place a suitable man in charge.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That Government Orders have precedence on Wednesdays for the remainder of the session, after Questions put by Members.

He said: The House will observe that the Order Paper is unusually short now, and that even if public Bills and Orders should be added, they are sure to be reached on Mondays.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would suggest Mondays instead of Wednesdays, as on Wednesdays the time can be devoted after six o'clock to public Bills, whereas, if the Government takes Wednesdays, and there are sufficient Notices of Motion, public Bills and Orders cannot be reached. On one occasion some years ago, the same suggestion was made to Sir John Macdonald, and he accepted it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Monday would not be so suitable because on that day there are many members who will not arrive in the House in time to discuss any public measure, and the questions which come up on Government days are those at

the discussion of which members would like to be present. We might go on with this motion, and if we find any inconvenience we can change the Order from Wednesday to Monday.

Mr. LAURIER. The practice in former years, when the Government have taken Wednesdays, has been to substitute the Order for Wednesday for the Order for Monday, but I do not see any inconvenience in adopting the contrary rule this year, because there is so little private members' business on the Paper that we would practically have nothing to do after six o'clock. My opinion is that on every Monday public Bills and Orders will be reached.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it would be unjust to private members who have business on the Order Paper if we did not adopt the Order of Wednesday for Monday, unless there is an understanding that public Bills and Orders may be gone on with on that day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think next Monday we will get through the private Order Paper.

Motion agreed to.

THE LAST GENERAL ELECTIONS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the Government Orders are proceeded with, I would ask the Government for the correspondence between the Government and the returning officers in the elections of 1891-92 which was moved for by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) early in the session. I would also ask the leader of the House for the return giving the reasons for the delay in the issue of the writs after the receipt of the warrants.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The latter return, I believe, will be ready on Monday. It was being prepared yesterday when I enquired about it. I do not remember the former motion, but I will ask the Secretary of State about it.

THE CENSUS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to ask the Minister of Agriculture when we may expect the census returns showing the origins and religions of the people? They usually appear in the first volume, and are usually laid on the Table within a moderate time after the population returns. It seems to me that we should have had them before this.

Mr. CARLING. I expect them every day. They have been in the hands of the printer for some days, and I was told by Mr. Johnson that he expected to have them ready to lay on the Table to-morrow.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to repeat a question which I put yesterday as to the action taken or about to be taken by the Government here in reference to the Bill reserved for the consideration of the Governor General by Lieutenant Governor Carvell, of Prince Edward Island. I asked whether that Bill had been received by the Government here; whether the hon. gentleman has had an opportunity of examining its provisions; whether, in view of what I gathered from his remarks the other day, approving of the constitutional rule laid down by previous Ministers of Justice in regard to these Bills, he would be prepared at an early day to return that Bill to the Lieutenant Governor of Prince Edward Island. I justify myself in pressing this matter on the attention of the leader of the House on the ground that there must be a general election in Prince Edward Island within the present year, and this Bill has been passed by both branches of the Legislature abolishing the Upper House and providing that the election shall be held for the single Chamber within the year. Therefore, if this is allowed to remain for any time undisposed of, it will place affairs in the Island in a very awkward position. I have had a copy of the Bill sent to me and have examined it, and I may say there is no doubt that it is entirely within the purview of the Local Legislature. If the hon. gentleman has received the Bill, I would urge him, in view of the grave possibilities which might be caused by delay, to return the Bill at once to the Lieutenant Governor to take such constitutional action upon it as he may be advised.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand that the Bill was received yesterday by the Secretary of State, who informs me that it was sent to my department to-day. I have not seen it. I should assume, from the description of the Bill which I have heard, that it was one within the competence of the Provincial Legislature. In view of the position of affairs in the Island, no unavoidable delay will take place in regard to it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps we may hear something about it in a week or two.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

SUPPLY -- PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

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

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before going into Supply, I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter of some little importance in reference to the debate which took place in the House a short time ago as to the relations between Great Britain and Canada. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) moved a resolution to the effect that, if and when the Imperial Government adopted discriminatory duties in favour of Canada and the other colonies, substantial reductions should be made in the duties on British goods. I had the honour of moving an amendment to that resolution on which the House subsequently divided. A report of these resolutions was forwarded by cable to Great Britain and the London *Times* of the 27th April, two days after the debate took place, contains a cablegram giving the two resolutions and a summary of the debate. I have no complaint to make in regard to the original resolution itself, because it is substantially correct, nor do I complain of the telegraphic reports of the comments which were made by the mover of that resolution and his seconder. I think it is well stated that the mover made an eloquent speech in its support, and that his supporters also spoke well, but I do complain that the resolution which we asked the House to adopt as an amendment has been misreported and travestied, and I say that this misreport and travesty has

worked grave and serious injury. The *Times*, adopting the false report forwarded from Ottawa as to the terms of that resolution, has published an editorial article which is calculated to bring the mover of the resolution in amendment, and those who supported it, into contempt. I do not know that there is anything more important at the present time than to give the English public a correct view of the policy which the colonies intend to pursue in regard to the mother country. I will read the amendment as it appears in the *Times*:

"OTTAWA, April 26.—The Dominion House of Commons yesterday discussed for several hours a motion brought forward by Mr. McNeill, to the effect that when the Parliament of Great Britain admits Canadian products to the British markets on more favourable terms than it grants to foreign products, Canada will be prepared to extend corresponding advantages of reduction of duties to British manufactured goods."

Now, Sir, in amendment to that resolution I moved the following:—

"That inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada into her ports free of duty, this House is of the opinion that the present scale of duties exacted on goods mainly imported from Great Britain, should be reduced."

This was a simple, plain and clear resolution, and one would suppose that its meaning could not fail to be understood by anybody who read it or heard it; but, instead of that, I find that the *Times* report says:

"Mr. Davies strongly opposed the resolution as being impracticable, and moved an amendment that Canadian goods should be admitted free into Great Britain, British goods being allowed a reduced duty in Canada."

Sir, I never moved a resolution that Canadian goods should be admitted free into Great Britain. We are aware already that Canadian goods are admitted, and have been admitted, free into Great Britain for many years. The *Times*, in commenting upon the ignorance displayed by the mover of the resolution, remarks:

"The Opposition put forward an amendment, which Sir John Thompson, the ministerial leader, treated as a subterfuge in view of the Liberal policy of discrimination against the mother country, and which is on the face of it, hollow and unmeaning. To demand that Canadian goods should be admitted free into the United Kingdom is a mere rhetorical phrase, for we tax no Canadian product except spirits, and Canadian whiskey is not likely to compete successfully with Scotch or Irish in the home market. At the same time, these Canadian free-traders would retain the right of levying duties on British goods."

Now, everybody will see how serious this is. The resolution has been misrepresented, and in the form in which it is published in the London *Times*, it is calculated to bring the party who supported it into contempt. I think the *Times* is quite justified in making the comment it did upon the report of the resolution that was sent to it; but we know, and everybody knows who debated the question on the true assumption and the knowledge of the facts—the assumption and knowledge of the facts which were incorporated in my amendment—that it would certainly be a mere hollow and unmeaning resolution if it was as reported by the cablegram to the *Times*. I desire, so far as I can do so, to make a public correction of this report in the hope that it may reach the quarter where it has been misrepresented. I do not wish to make any further remarks upon it except that, in justice to the gentleman who forwarded the cablegram, I would like to read to the House his explanation which he wrote me the other day. He says:

"I greatly regret to find, from certain statements made in the *Globe* of Saturday, that in my despatch to Reuter summarizing the debate on Mr. McNeill's motion in favour of preferential trade with Great Britain, your amendment to the resolution should have become so changed in course of transmission as to largely destroy its effect."

"Largely destroy its effect;" it completely altered it, and substituted a resolution which is absolutely unmeaning.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a transformation scene.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In an ordinary matter affecting the interprovincial relations of Canada, I would not make a complaint, because our local papers would at once correct the mistake; but hon. gentlemen see that in a grave matter affecting the fiscal relations between Great Britain and her most important colony, it is a very serious thing for the policy of a party to be misrepresented to the leading organ of public opinion of Great Britain. The letter goes on to say:

"I need hardly say that so far as I am personally concerned I neither did, nor desired to, misrepresent the scope of your amendment, and I greatly regret that it should have been placed incorrectly before the English public. By reference to my despatch on file in the C.P.R. telegraph office, it is clearly evident that this is the result of an unfortunate accident. The words which I cabled were as follows:—

"Mr. Davies strongly dissented; resolutions impracticable. Moved amendment, Canadian goods free Britain, duty British goods reduced Canada."

There is no doubt the *Times* has not misrepresented the cablegram that was received.

Mr. BOWELL. That does not necessarily follow.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hon. gentlemen can judge that for themselves.

Mr. BOWELL. It would depend a great deal upon the manner in which it was filled up. A word might have been put in there which would turn the whole meaning.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The letter goes on:

"Before filing the despatch I carefully read it over to see if there was any likelihood of its terms being misapprehended, and it seemed perfectly clear to my mind that there could be no difficulty in properly extending the paragraph in reference to yourself. As intended to be extended it would read as follows:—

"Mr. Davies strongly dissented from Mr. McNeill's resolution as impracticable. He moved in amendment that as Canadian goods are admitted free into Great Britain, the duty on British goods should be reduced when entering Canada."

Of course if that had been cabled, I would have been satisfied, and justice would have been done to the party who supported the resolution. The letter goes on to say:

"This summary of your amendment, as you will readily perceive, was calculated to place the Liberal party in a far better position in the eyes of the British people than if the full text of the amendment had been transmitted, inasmuch as the qualifying words 'mainly' upon which, in my humble judgment, the whole point of your argument hinges, was omitted by me. This was due to the fact that I had not seen the amendment at the time, and was simply told its tenor by one of my *confrères* in the Press Gallery. In 'filling out' the message, the telegraph editor in England has evidently not grasped the meaning of the despatch, hence the mistake which has occurred."

Well, Sir, I can only say that I deeply regret this mistake. It is very probable that the mistake will not be rectified. Everybody who knows anything of English public life knows to what an extent the London *Times* is looked to for a correct report of what takes place in the outlying parts of the Empire. This debate has been given the importance of an editorial article in the *Times*, and the travesty of the resolution which we moved, and the ridiculous character which it is made to assume

has been commented upon at length in the editorial columns of the *Times*, and is no doubt now looked upon as correct by a large portion of the English public. I hope in some way or another that we may be able partly to overcome the mistake, and to lessen the injury which will arise from that mistake; but it is a very serious one in my opinion, and I take this opportunity of bringing it before the House, doing what I can in that way to correct the mistake.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think we must all admit with the hon. gentleman that it is exceedingly desirable that accurate statements should be sent to the other side of the water as to what is done in this country, and as to the attitude of both parties in this country. We have had occasion to deplore frequently the grossest kind of misrepresentation as to the attitude of the Government, as to the policy of the Government, and as to the statements of the Government, in this House and elsewhere; and I am sure we would cordially join hon. gentlemen opposite to secure the transmission of truthful statements to the other side of the water, or to punish those who misrepresent, wilfully, what takes place in this House, and in this country, and in the councils of the Government. I do not think that, as regards this particular case, the hon. gentleman can have suffered so much as he apprehends. I think almost any one who reads that telegram would suppose that there was a misprint or an inaccuracy in transmitting it. The reader could hardly credit the hon. gentleman with ignorance of the facts——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It has done so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The *Times* has not done so at all. The *Times* has given an inaccurate account by telegraph of what the hon. gentleman's resolution was, and any person of sense in reading it would see that the resolution must have been either "as goods are admitted free," or "Canadian goods being admitted free." The comments of the London *Times* simply gives the hon. gentleman credit for a rhetorical phrase, and I should not suppose he would object very much to that. I know that upon this side of the House we were under the impression that the hon. gentleman had committed that indiscretion more than once.

Mr. BOWELL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he read the whole of that letter, or whether he gave the full information that he received from the gentleman who sent the despatch? I am informed that he told the gentleman, either in that letter or verbally, that he had sent a correction. If such be the case, I think it is only due to him that this fact should be stated in connection with this debate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I thought the concluding paragraph was a personal one entirely, and so I did not read it. I see it contains the statement to which the hon. gentleman referred. I will read the whole paragraph:

"I deem it but right that I should make this explanation to you, as during the past three years that we have been thrown together our intercourse has been of the pleasantest character, and I did not wish you to get the idea into your head that there was any desire on my part to misrepresent you."

Then there is this paragraph, which is a personal matter:

"I may state that I have cabled the full text of your motion to England, in order that the error may be rectified."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot accept the explanation. I believe the thing was designedly done, and I believe it is only part of a continuous system of misrepresentation which has been carried on for some time.

Mr. BOWELL. The same as the letter you sent to London, which any one can judge for himself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My letter speaks for itself. My letter is true, every word of it; and what is more, it is accepted as true by those in England who know best what the men who are at present misgoverning Canada are doing.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It did not deceive any one, because the stocks of Canada rose at its publication.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did they rise?

Mr. BOWELL. They did rise.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has the right to express what views he may think proper in the London papers, and if hon. gentlemen opposite think they are untrue, the same opportunity is afforded them of denying them and controverting the hon. gentleman's statements. But no matter what the hon. member for South Oxford may have written, what we are now considering is a misrepresentation of a debate which took place in this House, a misrepresentation of the proceedings of this House. My hon. friend from Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) moved a resolution assuming that Canadian goods go free into the English markets. How does this cablegram read? It reads that he moved an amendment: "Canadian goods free Britain, duty British goods reduced Canada." What is the meaning of that? If that is properly paraphrased it means precisely what the London *Times* said it means, that when Canadian goods are admitted free into the English markets, the duty on English goods will be reduced when they enter the Canadian markets. This is the clear, palpable paraphrase of that cablegram, and it is preposterous for hon. gentlemen, after it has been employed to exhibit a party as ignorant, who are not ignorant of the relations between Canada and the mother country, after the mischief is done, to say that a cablegram conveying a proper representation of the motion has been conveyed across the Atlantic. When? A fortnight after this cablegram was published and commented upon. The Minister of Justice says nobody in the United Kingdom can be so ignorant, so ill-informed, as to suppose that any party in this country will be ignorant of the fact that Canadian goods are admitted free into the English markets. But the London *Times* assumes that to be the case. Here is a whole column in this paper based on that assumption, and hon. gentlemen opposite have, to the best of their ability, profited by that, and hon. members sitting on the back benches opposite seem to think it is a capital joke. They are highly amused at the fact that the position of one-half of the people of this country has been misrepresented by a cablegram sent by a party who sits in the gallery of this House. That may be amusing to hon. gentlemen and may suit their estimate of the principles of fair-play; but these are not the views entertained by the hon. gentlemen on this side of

the House, and when you look at the *Times*, and I hold it in my hands and read it constantly, you find that Reuter's telegrams of the proceedings of this House during the past two sessions have been nothing but perversions of the facts as they transpired, so far as they affect the relations between the two parties on opposite sides of the Chamber.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is so. You have only to look at the proceedings of the House during the whole of last session and you will find exactly the same misrepresentation, the same caricature, the same perversion of the facts exhibited in this telegram. I think it is monstrous that such a course should be pursued, and yet it has been persistently pursued during the last two years in connection with the cabled record of events that have transpired in this Parliament.

Mr. McNEILL. I very much regret that hon. gentlemen opposite should have thought it necessary to make so violent an attack upon a gentleman who has sent this cablegram to England. Now, what is the cablegram? It is this: "Canadian goods free Britain duty British goods reduced Canada." The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that must be read "when." A still more natural view, and one according to the facts, would make it read "as": as Canadian goods are free to Britain, duty on British goods will be reduced in Canada. It is more natural that it should be read according to the facts than contrary to the facts. It is more natural to suppose that the person who extended this telegram in England knew what the facts were, than to assume that he was ignorant of them, and when the gentleman sent the telegram over in this form, he naturally assumed that it would be construed in accordance with the facts, and not in accordance with a state of affairs that does not exist. It is simply because he did so and sent the telegram in the belief that any one knowing the facts would properly construe the telegram, that this attack has been hurled on that gentleman by hon. members opposite.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The construction is shown by the view the *Times* has put on the telegram.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman will excuse me. The writer of the editorial article in the *Times* was referring to the telegram then before his eyes. He was not the person who extended the telegram. He was referring to the extended telegram. I was referring to the person who made the mistake in the extension of the telegram, and I think it a most unfortunate and most ungenerous act for hon. gentlemen opposite to make an attack on a gentleman who sent a telegram, that any hon. gentleman would understand at once to mean "as" and not "when."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I). The hon. gentleman does not express any regret at the error that has taken place.

Mr. McNEILL. I am very sorry indeed that the error has taken place, and so far as the gentleman who sent the telegram is concerned, he has made the best reparation in his power. He immediately cabled over to the mother country putting the matter right, so far as he could. I must say that I think the hon. gentleman, if he will forgive my saying so, should have read the letter of explanation a little more carefully.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did read it all except the personal part, which I did not think would interest the House.

Mr. McNEILL. The latter part of the explanation was very important, and I was sorry that the hon. gentleman did not read it at the outset.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I made enquiries some time ago in regard to these cablegrams, and I ascertained that we were paying out money through the Government for these misrepresentations which were made through Reuter's agent. I should like to know how much money was paid for this work last year? It is bad enough to be misrepresented, but it is infinitely worse, if in addition to the misrepresentation, you are obliged to pay for the misrepresentation. I hope if the Government have been spending money in this direction, the expenditure will stop, because it is an outrageous act to be misrepresented and then to be compelled to pay for the misrepresentation.

Mr. DAVIN. Before these remarks on going into committee come to a close, I cannot but protest in the strongest language against the misconception of the journalistic profession that I find the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) entertains. To suppose, as that hon. gentleman has done, or must be supposed to suppose, that a gentleman sitting in the gallery, occupying a responsible position on one of the papers of this country, and a responsible position in regard to the first paper in the world, should deliberately falsify, in order, I suppose, to serve some party ends, what took place in this House, is one of those monstrous and erratic propositions that nestle in the brain of the hon. member for South Oxford so frequently, and which make us sometimes stand aghast at the capacity of an hon. member of this House of his standing for entertaining such absurd and monstrous notions. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) seems to have got excited about a very small matter. As a fact, the *Times* has taken very little notice of him or of his motion. It has not bothered itself much about it. The whole article is taken up in dealing with the significance of this House passing the motion of my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill); but with a wave of the hand, it dismisses my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No wonder.

Mr. DAVIN. I agree with my hon. friend, no wonder. But, Sir, that wave of the hand is due to the fact that the broad Atlantic rolls between us. If they knew my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) as well as we do, they would not even have condescended to a wave of the hand. Having quoted Mr. McNeill's motion, the *Times* says:

"The Opposition put forward an amendment, which Sir John Thompson, the ministerial leader, treated as a subterfuge in view of the Liberal policy of discrimination against the mother country, and which is on the face of it, hollow and unmeaning. To demand that Canadian goods should be admitted free into the United Kingdom is a mere rhetorical phrase."

Now, Sir, the statement that that is hollow and unmeaning is a statement that could be made with truth of the motion of the hon. member. Does anybody suppose that when the party opposite

have been clamouring, and are still clamouring for unrestricted reciprocity, that the motion the hon. gentleman from Queen's made, was not hollow and unmeaning? My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has recently been in East York. He has talked much in the same strain there, and the result has been that he has astonished the people of East York, and astonished some Liberal organs who have asked what has become of the Liberal leaders; and my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin), I take it, is one of the Liberal leaders. What has become of them? You do not know where to find them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would just like to say to the hon. gentleman that you would not find 21 of them voting on a swamp lot near the marsh in Toronto.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know what my hon. friend means by that. I do not own any swamp lot, and I know nothing about what he refers to. I say this, however, that hon. gentlemen opposite are like a live flea; you do not know where to find it; and those who were supporting them in East York were in the same inconsistent position that my hon. friend was in. When my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) brought forward his motion, which ought to have passed this House unanimously, hon. gentlemen opposite came forward with a buncombe motion, and if the *Times* was thoroughly conversant with the state of debate in this House for two or three sessions past, and had the exact motion of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) before it, perhaps, instead of dismissing it, as a rhetorical phrase, the Thunderer would have come down with condign rebuke upon my hon. friend for bringing forward a motion that was insincere.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. Pardon; I withdraw that. I have no doubt it was sincere subjectively, but it was insincere objectively. I have no doubt that my hon. friend was sincere, but the motion, regarded in connection with the previous, and I believe present policy of his party, might be fairly called insincere. I say it was an inconsistent motion, and it might be described as buncombe. I do not know whether "buncombe" is parliamentary or not, but I believe it is. At all events if we follow the example of Congress it is. It was a motion that did very little credit to my hon. friend from Queen's, and it did very little to strengthen the position of the party of which he is an ornament in this House. A serious complaint is made here to-day, as though the party were misrepresented and injured in England, when the *Times* newspaper only gives a referrence to the matter, and then proceeds with a long article to discuss the significance of the vote——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of the buncombe.

Mr. DAVIN. Not buncombe; a vote, Sir, that has been echoed in the heart of the Empire, and a vote that will be echoed in every part of the Empire. I do believe, Sir, that the motion of my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is the very first step towards the solution of some of the problems which have in recent years busied the minds of Canadian statesmen.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I would have expected that upon an occasion such as this, where it is shown to the House that a fellow-member has been misrepresented by the leading organ of the British Empire, that the least that should have been done was that an expression of opinion should have come from both sides of the House that a fellow-member had been misrepresented. If I am to judge of the temper of hon. gentlemen opposite by the exhibition which they make now, instead of having regret, they rather rejoice because a brother member has been misrepresented. I will not say it was done wilfully, I would not go that length under any circumstances, but if it has not been done wilfully, when it was found to have been done I would expect expressions of regret rather than of rejoicing from hon. members opposite. If that is the tone in which debates are to be carried on, if that is the depth to which Canadian political life has sunk, it is a great pity for Canada at large. But, Sir, upon an occasion such as this, for my part, while not charging the gentleman who has been the author of this telegram with insincerity, whether subjectively or objectively, I say at all events that it should be his duty, as I understand he did afterwards, not only to call it to the attention of the paper by telegram, but to see also if possible that the mischief which had been done by the editorial comments of the paper should have been also explained away. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) so far has received no justice. It may be that a corrected telegram has been sent to the other side of the water, but that is no justice at all. He has been misrepresented in the columns of the *Times* the editor of which has done him a great injustice indeed, and he will receive no satisfaction until this injustice is corrected in some way.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sorry that these hon. gentlemen who are so indignant to-day, had not been equally indignant last year, when reams of falsehoods were cabled across the ocean intended to stab Canada, and to do her the greatest injury.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What were they?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman knows well what they were. They were cablegrams that were a libel on the whole Canadian people, cablegrams without a particle of truth, which did an infinite amount of damage to this country, and yet, Sir, we have not, so far, heard from these hon. gentlemen across the floor of the House one word of condemnation that Canada was described in such terms as was contained in the false cablegrams.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I have a few words to say, not primarily upon this subject, but I cannot pass over some of the remarks made here without referring to them before I advert to the matter which principally brought me to my feet. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down says that reams of falsehoods were telegraphed last year across the ocean containing libels upon this House and upon the country. It would have been a grand thing for Canada if the statements cabled across the ocean last year had been falsehoods. They were accounts of the evidence taken before committees of this House. Most of those who gave evidence were members of the Government or civil servants, and if there was falsehood it was falsehoods told by them to their own disgrace and degradation. I would to heaven that those statements had been falsehoods, that the state of things had not been as bad as it was shown to be by the evidence of the men who incriminated them-

selves by making those statements. The hon. member for West Assiniboia charges us with harbouring monstrous and erratic propositions in our heads and making buncombe speeches. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman is a good judge of erratic speeches and he should be a good judge of buncombe, and I think that on this occasion he was only exerting himself to display his own superiority in these respects. In criticising what was said on this side of the House, he assumes that the resolution in question made by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island was a buncombe resolution. It is as buncombe an an assertion as can be to state that a resolution presented by another member is a buncombe one, though alleging no facts to prove its buncombe nature. But I think the country at large will be satisfied on reading the two motions, which was buncombe and which was moved in earnest. My hon. friend from Assiniboia also said that the motion of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island was passed over with slight notice by the *Times*, and that that paper referred entirely to the significance of the motion passed by the House. The significance of the action of the House depended entirely on the significance of the motion it voted down. If the motion voted down by the House was misrepresented, then the action of the House was misrepresented, and the action of hon. gentlemen who voted for one motion and against the other was misrepresented. So that the whole House has been put in a false position by this incorrect report. As to the conduct of the correspondent, I shall leave that as it is. It has been sufficiently discussed, I think. But, Sir, what I rose more particularly to do was to call the attention of the House to a series of double payments made to members of the Civil Service which, I think, can be more conveniently discussed on the motion to go into Supply, than on any particular item in Committee of Supply, although it may be necessary to give some further attention to some of these items when we are in committee. We find in the early part of the Auditor General's Report a list of persons to whom double payments have been made for different services. I do not propose by any means to go into them all, but I propose to quote a few examples in order to show how I think public money has been misapplied. One of the first notable instances is that of Dr. Allen, of Fort Macleod, who is paid $1,200 a year as collector of customs and $600 a year as inspector of ranches. Now, it seems to me extraordinary that the same person can be at two places at once, unless, as the memorable Sir Boyle Roche said, he is a bird. How a man can be at his post as collector of customs, and can also be going around the country inspecting ranches, is something which only the imagination of my hon. friend from Assiniboia can possibly compass. Perhaps he will be able to explain how this double individual gets his duties performed. Then, I find that an official in Halifax of the name of Balcam is paid $900 as receiving teller in the Assistant Receiver General's office, and is paid $201 for 201 nights of guard duty. Now, this man is certainly an overworked civil servant if he is on duty all day as a receiving teller and on duty all night as a watchman. The duties of a night watchman seem to be hardly adapted to the dignified person who performs them in this instance. Then, Sir, I find here a case which I have referred to before, and which I may have to refer to again, the case of Lieutenant-Colonel D'Orsonnens at St. Johns, Quebec, Infantry School. I find that he is paid $1,400 a year as commandant of the school, $456.25 as a commander's pay for 365 days at $1.25 per day, and in addition $365 as Deputy Adjutant-General. Now, Sir, those who know anything about the volunteer system know that the duties of Deputy Adjutant-General and those of the commander of an infantry school are quite distinct, and cannot be properly performed by the same person. As to the pay for command, it does not seem to be the rule in the service to give the commanding officer of a school extra pay for being in command. I do not find the commander of any other school receiving double pay, and some explanation will be required of that. Then, I find in the Halifax office, a gentleman of the name of Howe, who is paid $1,216 as a superannuated auditor, and is employed as a clerk in the post office inspector's office at a salary of $600. Now, I have always thought it was the rule of the service, as it is the law, that a superannuated official could not again receive pay in actual service, a superannuation grant being made on the assumption that he is not fit for actual service. I believe this payment is contrary to the law as well as to common sense, and a waste of public money. Then, I find the name of a gentleman in the service at Ottawa, Mr. Marceau, who receives $1,440 as assistant engineer in the Trent Canal office and a further sum of $1,250 for translating the report of the Geological Survey — $2,490 in all. Now, it stands to reason that he can hardly give his full attention to his duties as assistant engineer of the Trent Canal if he is able to earn $1,250 besides in his odd moments. There are several instances of that kind, but I mention that as one of the larger. Now I come to a very large class of cases, those in which civil servants are allowed to derive large incidental payments of money from the public treasury in addition to their pay in their nominal occupations. I refer to the cases of customs and excise officers who receive a share of the seizures made through their information. Bad as the system is of giving extra pay to civil servants in any capacity, I think this is the worst of all. In the first place, the assumption is that a customs or excise officer is bound to give his whole time for the salary which is paid to him. In the second place, it is assumed that while giving his time to that business he will do his duty. He is paid for doing his duty, and his duty is to catch those who are attempting to infringe the customs or revenue law. There is no reason why he should be paid extra for doing his duty any more than a policeman should every time he arrests a criminal. It is said this is done to stimulate zeal, but instead of stimulating zeal it stimulates cupidity. It gives an opportunity to officials to levy blackmail upon importers. We should not proceed upon the assumption that every importer is a scoundrel and is trying to cheat the revenue, but we do proceed upon that assumption; and we give to the customs officials unlimited power to value any article presented for entry duty at the customs, according to their own opinion of its value and without any regard whatever to its actual cost. This is a tremendous engine of power

to be put in the hands of men of the class of tide-waiters and assistants in the different custom houses. It puts in their hands the power of saying to an importer: "If you do not grease our hands, we will seize your goods. You may be able to get an investigation or you may not. That depends on the good-will of the customs officers, who can put you to a great deal of trouble and expense, who can injure your name and business reputation throughout the country, and who say they will do this unless you make it square with them." I do not say that they all do this, but the temptation is tremendous to levy blackmail upon honest or dishonest importers who do not wish their goods to be seized, and it is a temptation, which the state of the Civil Service, as revealed in recent investigations, does not authorize us to say the service is able to stand. We are justified in believing that the system of blackmail does exist. We have heard charges of that kind made by merchants. At all events, we have put upon the Statute-book a provision which makes it a distinct object for every clerk in the customs, every underling in a customs office, to take every opportunity of worrying the merchants. I might instance the Ayer Sarsaparilla case where this temptation led to a very large seizure and the distribution of a large sum of money among customs officers as their share of the seizure. Afterwards the seizure was found to have been illegal, and the country had to pay back the whole value of the goods confiscated and be at the loss of the amount paid the agents who secured the seizure in the first case. There are other instances, but it is sufficient to mention that one. I want to call attention to cases where such double payment has been made. The first one I come across in alphabetical order is that made by Mr. Bélanger, of Quebec, who received $808.37 as landing-waiter and $665 for his share of seizures. I shall only mention cases where the sum the men have received for seizures is a large proportion of the salary. We have Mr. Bolger at Quebec whose salary is only $750 while he got $910 as his share of the seizures. There is Mr. Bourget, of Quebec, whose salary is $750 and whose share of seizures is $821. We, have again, a clerk of customs at Montmagny whose salary is $191.67, and who is, therefore, evidently one of the lower officials, and his share of the seizures for the last year amounted to $1,659. It is absurd that a man should receive a great many times the amount of his salary for merely doing his duty. We find, again, at Toronto, Mr. Michael, Inspector of Customs, getting $1,600 a year of salary and getting as his share of the seizures $5,248, all for simply doing his duty in a position to which is attached a salary of $1,600. We find that a Mr. O'Hara at Montreal, whose salary is $2,000, got $579 as his share of seizures; and this Mr. O'Hara is the gentleman who was so severely stigmatized by Chief Justice Ritchie during the trial of the Ayer Sarsaparilla case as not worthy of belief in connection with the matter. This man who had received a lot of money for illegal seizures before, is given $579 more this year. It remains to be seen whether in this case his opinion is more correct than it was in the other. We come to another Quebecker, Mr. Sexton, whose salary is $630 and who got $535 for his share of seizures. This gentleman appears to be lucky, for it appears from some documents lately published in the *Globe* that he was also in receipt of money for

electoral purposes from Mr. Thomas McGreevy. Mr. Sexton is a lucky man, his hands seem to be open for money in all directions, and he seems to get it. We come now to the largest haul of all, Mr. Trudel, customs tide-waiter, whose salary is $650 and whose share of customs seizures was $9,880, nearly $10,000 to this man whose work is only worth $650. Can the Minister of Customs say that such a state of things is right, that a man should receive an addition to his salary largely exceeding the salary of a Minister of the Crown for simply doing the duty for which he was engaged? Is it not placing too great a temptation before him? This may be another sarsaparilla case, and the country may have to pay $9,000 or $10,000 back to the owners of the seized goods, while Trudel gets off with his share of, I am almost inclined to call it boodle, for it appears to me the boodle bacillus has been invading the service as well as other sections of political life. Then we find two gentlemen of the name of Waters. One is in Montreal getting $1,200 per year, and his share of the customs is $1,780. T. J. Waters, accountant in the customs, salary $2,200, got $6,863 during the past year, making altogether over $8,000 per year. In fact this gentleman is getting a much larger income out of his position as accountant of the Customs Department than does a Minister of the Crown or a judge of the Supreme Court. His duties are only to keep the books. He must neglect his duties as accountant to secure this money, or else the information by which he makes this large amount must come to him in consequence of his position as accountant. If that information comes to him in the exercise of his duties as accountant, from the view of the correspondence which passes through his hands, why should these immense sums be paid to him? It is his duty to do this in any case. It is because he is a paid officer of the department, receiving $2,200 as accountant of that department, that he is able to earn these other large sums of money. We pay him more than is necessary to give him a good subsistence in order to enable him to make these other large amounts. He has prospered greatly in the service. He is building houses and buying lots and becoming rapidly one of the leading land and house proprietors in Ottawa, and how? Because his position in the department enables him to pile up the boodle in this way. Then there is Mr. Young, of Winnipeg, who receives a salary of $1,000 and made $1,108 by customs seizures. That is not so glaring a case as the other, but it shows how the thing goes. Then I find that some members of the North-West Council are paid in other situations. This should not be allowed. The North-West Council is supposed to be an independent Legislature looking after the affairs of that territory, and yet there is one member of that council, Mr. H. Cayley, who draws $500 a year as a member of the council, and gets $400 a year for keeping a weather station. Surely if it is improper for a member of Parliament to receive a salary for any other duties than those he performs as a member, it is improper for Mr. Cayley to receive any pay for keeping this weather station, and it is improper, and an invasion of privilege, that paid servants of the Government should be members of the North-West Council. I would specially call the attention of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to this, if he can bring his mind down from the consideration of

monstrous and erratic propositions to serious matters. We have a system in force which allows men to be paid twice for doing their duty, which not only allows them to get double pay for doing their duty, but places a serious temptation in their way to blackmail the public, which I fear has too often been yielded to. We should consider this matter in general, and when we get into committee, it will be proper later on to go more fully into the details.

Mr. DENISON. In reference to the article in the *Times* which has occupied so much attention this afternoon, the member for West York (Mr. Wallace), in referring to the false despatches which were sent over last year, did not mention that they were sent through the Dalziel agency. Many members might imagine that those were from the Reuter agency also. It is only right to make that statement. For myself, I would personally express to the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) my own dissent from such a despatch, evidently interpreted, being sent. I think it is a great pity and very much to be deplored.

Mr. LISTER. The statement has been made by several hon. gentlemen on the other side, as a defence in a sense to the charge made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that the telegrams sent by the Reuter Company were false and misleading, that certain telegrams which were sent during the last session of this House through the Dalziel agency were also false and misleading. An hon. friend reminds me that no such telegrams have been read. It would be utterly impossible for the telegrams which were sent during last session as to the proceedings before the public committees of this House to have exaggerated the actual facts of the case, and, moreover, if it were true that the Dalziel Company had sent messages or cablegrams which were not strictly accurate, that would be no answer to the fact that telegrams have been sent now which are not in accordance with the facts. I said just now that it would be impossible for any person to exaggerate the facts as they were disclosed before committees of this House during the last session of this Parliament. What were the facts? We all know that the Minister of Public Works was compelled to resign his seat as a member of the Cabinet on account of matters which it is unnecessary now to recall. We find that the Printing Bureau under the control of the then Secretary of State was corrupt from roof to foundation. We find that the evidence before the committee brought that corruption dangerously close to the Secretary of State himself. We find that in the public departments clerks were paid for extra work without any steps being taken to ascertain whether they did that extra work or not, and in direct contravention of the statutes which provided that they should not he paid for such extra work. We find that a member of this House was found guilty of voting for subsidies to aid a railway company, in which subsidies he was to be a participant. We find a member of this House voting for a subsidy to a steamboat of which he was really the owner, but which, for the purpose of misleading, he had conveyed to another person for his own benefit, and that he was year after year receiving large sums of money in defiance of the law. We find that in the Public Works Department, men who were supposed to be respectable and in whom the Government confided, the management being so loose, were purchasers of goods to a large extent, which were charged to the Government, that they were bought for themselves and paid for by the money of this country. We find that the secretary of one of the public departments was dishonest enough to take pay for the services of his son who never spent a day in the public departments. We find that hon. gentlemen were charged with the sale of public offices to friends or otherwise in the counties they represented. We find that during this session a Minister of the Crown is charged with having participated in subsidies given by this Government, and that the moneys so received were used in corrupting the electors of the country, and this is supported by testimony that no one can gainsay. We find in the daily press that these charges are proved beyond a peradventure; the orders given by these hon. gentlemen are there in their own handwriting. We find that a charge is made against a judge of this country, that by his judgment an hon. gentleman holds a seat in this House that he has no right to hold. I say that in face of all these charges, proved as they have been, about which there can be no question, it would be impossible for the agent of the Dalziel agency in this country to have misrepresented or exaggerated the facts. When hon. gentlemen on the other side get up and try to show that this misleading statement made by the agent of Reuter, should not receive the disapproval of this House, because, forsooth, telegrams were sent by another agency relating to other matters during the past session, I say that they are taking untenable ground. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who is not in the House at the present moment, and is very seldom here, indeed, never loses an opportunity of indulging in what he is pleased to look upon as wit. Sir, that hon. gentleman, I think, presumes a great deal upon the good feeling of this House. He never loses an opportunity of assailing, in what he considers his peculiar witty manner, hon. gentlemen who please to differ from him. That hon. gentleman on more than one occasion during the present session has made speeches in favour of certain propositions, and he has failed to be on the floor of the House to record his vote for them when the vote came on. Sir, that hon. gentleman must not presume too far, because some people may term what he considers as wit, to be nothing more or less than the merest buffoonery; and he has no license to attack an hon. gentleman in this House who is his superior in everything that constitutes true manhood.

Mr. BERGERON. I am sorry to detain the House, but I want to say a word in answer to a remark made a moment ago by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) in which he cast a slur upon certain employés of the Customs Department. I think I have heard the same speech before in this House, and probably on a similar occasion. I am surprised that an hon. gentleman should get up in this House and attack men who cannot defend themselves. These employés of the custom house, as I understand it, are acting according to a law which was passed by the Liberals when in power, and has been since maintained by this Government; and it seems to me that the proper way would be for them to move that the law be changed instead

of blaming the employés. Now, the hon. gentleman said in his speech that we thought that all the wholesale merchants in this country were blackguards and rascals, or thieves. I do not think that any man sitting on either side of the House believes that; still, there is one thing sure, and if it be, as the hon. gentleman says, that some employés got about ten times the amount of their salaries, it was because they found men in trade who were not acting according to law. Among the names which have been read by the hon. gentleman, and who, I suppose, are in the same position and unable to defend themselves, he mentioned the one of Mr. O'Hara, of Montreal, and I do not want the insinuation made by the hon. member for West Elgin against that gentleman to pass unanswered. As the ex-Minister of Customs said a moment ago, these things have already been answered ten times over, still, as the charge is made afresh, and as the former defence may have been forgotten, I may say that in the case referred to, Mr. O'Hara and those who were acting with him as employés of the Government, were only acting under instructions of the department, and according to the law. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. O'Hara having received $500 this time, received it as plunder in the same way that he did in the Ayer case, after the testimony which he and his *confrère* had given. Now, I wish everybody to understand that in that case there was not a cent of plunder given to the employés, and neither Mr. O'Hara nor his colleagues got a cent. I wish merely to add that it would be more proper for the hon. gentleman, instead of attacking employés of the Government who are not here to defend themselves, to move that the law be changed, because these men are only obeying the law which the Liberal Government passed themselves.

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me that the discussion this afternoon has been one of a very unusual character. I dare say that many members of the House think the afternoon has been practically wasted, and I think that the Government side are in a large measure to blame for this waste of time, if waste of time it has been. I think if they had received in a proper spirit the complaint made by an hon. member of this House to whom a grievous wrong had been done, either designedly or inadvertently, and had acknowledged that such was the case, and proposed to make such amends as lay in their power, this discussion would not have gone on. But this wrong was attempted to be justified by the attempt to show that just as great wrongs had been perpetrated by this side. The allegation made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was not met in a proper spirit. I think it would have been much better if the Government side of the House had frankly admitted that the report that appeared in the London *Times* was to be regretted, that it was not a fair and correct report, and had let the matter drop there, instead of attempting to retort on this side of the House that just as great wrong had been done here. The hon. member for Queen's is perfectly justified in feeling indignant about this matter, and those who act with him are also justified in entertaining the same feeling, because it was a representation of the position taken by this party which was calculated to prejudice this party in the eyes of the people of Great Britain. It was a despatch—if it was so designed, it was cunningly designed; if it was not designed, it served the purpose just as admirably—it was a despatch designed in its character to place us in a false position, to make us appear ridiculous and to prejudice our interests in England. That fact should have been fully and amply acknowledged by the Government side of the House, regret should have been expressed for it, and if the course which has been taken with regard to this grievance is taken in the future, on similar occasions, we are liable to see repeated just such proceedings as we have seen this afternoon.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When a member claims that he has been misrepresented, that consideration is due which is given by one gentleman to another, but it seems to me there have been statements made by those who have taken part in this debate that are entirely unwarranted. It must be evident to every one, even if we accept the version of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the telegram sent was susceptible of only one interpretation, or the proper interpretation as they say, that those who interpreted that telegram and based an article on it in the London *Times* are not as bright as intellectual writers on that journal should be. It is evident from the remarks made that there is a misconception. Whether the sender of the telegram is to blame, or the writer on that paper, I do not care to discuss at the present time; persons can take their own views in regard to that matter. But that the motion submitted by the hon. member for Queen's has been misrepresented and misunderstood on the other side from some cause is very apparent, and hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of feeling regret at this, seem to be somewhat pleased because a political opponent has been placed in a ridiculous light in another country. Some hon. members have, moreover, taken occasion to say that the comments made by the writer of the articles on what he supposed to be the resolution actually moved by the hon. member for Queen's, were remarks that would be made by any intelligent writer even if he understood and had an exact copy of the resolution moved by that hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Assiniboia says that the comment made in the London *Times* as to the motion being hollow and unmeaning is absolutely correct when applied to the motion made by the hon. member for Queen's. But whatever may be said by that hon. gentleman, whatever his gigantic intellect may discover in that resolution and the motive which prompted it, the majority of hon. members opposite do not consider it a hollow and unmeaning motion, but one that embodied practical results. They recognized the fact from the able speech which supported that motion as delivered by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), that he was moving in a practical direction, that instead of the motion being a hollow and unmeaning one it was a practical one, altogether different in its nature from that submitted from the other side of the House, which might more justly be termed a hollow and unmeaning resolution. The hon. gentleman said that you wished to encourage free relations with England but you wished to do so in a spirit of barter and sale, while the declaration of the hon. member for Queen's that there was injustice in the matter in which the tariff was levied against certain classes of goods was a fact which had long engaged the attention of the Opposition and which had been repeatedly pointed out as an

injustice to the people of the mother country, and these views found expression in the properly worded resolution of the hon. member for Queen's which set forth that, if power were placed in the hands of the Opposition, they would alter the tariff in its working so that it would not bear, as it has in the past, so injuriously against the mother country and in favour of other lands. It meant that the tariff should be so arranged as to alter the fact that some millions of dollars worth more of goods came from other countries, at nearly $2,000,000 less duty, as compared with goods coming from the mother country. I, therefore, take exception entirely to the statement made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia, that even if the editor of the *Times* had had the exact resolution of the hon. member for Queen's before him he would have been justified in using the expression that it was a hollow and unmeaning one. It is of importance that correct information should be given with respect to what transpires in this House. I want no information that is not correct published, affecting either hon. members or their motions or their policy on this side of the House, or hon. members, their motions or their policy or the other side of the House; but it is not to the credit of hon. gentlemen opposite that they seem to think it a first-class joke, instead of something to be deplored, that there had occurred this misrepresentation, upon which were based very unjust allusions, not only to the mover of the resolution, but to those who voted for it. This motion was not made by arrangement. It is true that the tariff bears more heavily on English goods than on the produce of other nations, and the object of the hon. member for Queen's in offering his resolution was to have that state of matters remedied, and it was not a buncombe resolution proposed and advanced for the first time when the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) offered his motion, but it embodied the views expressed from this side of the House ever since the inauguration of the present tariff, pointed out every year and demonstrated by facts and figures from the Public Accounts that could not be controverted. Yet in face of these facts, hon. gentlemen opposite say it was a hollow and mean resolution. I would not have made any remarks in regard to this matter if the observations made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), when he brought the matter to the attention of the House, had received that treatment which I think they were entitled to receive in a body of gentlemen who must have some regard for the honour of each other and for their fair reputations. It is not necessary that we should seek to take a mean advantage of each other because we are political opponents. We can differ and differ widely in opinion and in our lines of action, but it should be possible in political life yet to endeavour to give something like fair-play to an opponent, although you cannot agree with him in all his views.

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

(In the Committee.)

Intercolonial Railway—Increased accommodation at Halifax.....$152,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before we proceed to discuss this item, I desire to say a few words with respect to the discussion which took place the other evening. One fact was made clear to every member of the House, that the statement made by the Minister of Railways confirmed at every point all the statements that had ever been made on this side of the House as to the mismanagement of the Intercolonial Railway for a good many years past. It is to the credit of the hon. gentleman that he in his place endeavoured to explain these matters, and admitted frankly and candidly, as frankly and candidly as a man in his position could very well admit, that in his judgment the number of employés on the Intercolonial Railway is far in excess of the requirements, which we have pointed out time and again; and more than that, that a very great number of those appointments had been, as they ought not to have been, made simply and solely for political reasons and thus inefficient and improper men had been appointed. These matters have been pointed out time and again from this side of this House. We have always contended that this railway was extravagantly managed; that it was run for political purposes and as a political machine, and that a great number of the employés were men who would never have been employed in the railway service unless the manager had been compelled, first of all, to place them there, and next, contrary to his own opinion and contrary to the advice of his officers, to keep improper and inefficient men there to the great detriment of the railway. The Minister of Railways also stated very candidly that at present and for years back we have been not merely sinking a vast sum of money in the shape of interest on the cost of this work, but we have been absolutely and actually conveying goods at a great loss, so that the more business we get to do on the Intercolonial Railway the poorer the country at large is. He has admitted with equal frankness, what we have always contended on this side of the House, that the conduct of the Government in subsidizing a rival road has led—as it was certain to lead, and as it was shown that it would be sure to lead—to a very great loss of income on the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman's speech is a practical confession to the country that what we on this side have been stating for years back, has been right in every particular. I am glad to hear that the hon. gentleman proposes certain reforms and intends to grapple with this question, and that he hopes—if I have taken down his words aright—to effect a saving of something like half a million dollars a year. I trust that he will be successful, although knowing as we do how often these promises have been made to us, and knowing as we do, what a most miserable performance has resulted from the promises that have been made, I reserve final judgment until a year or two's experience has shown us whether the hon. gentleman is likely to be able—I give him credit for desiring—whether the hon. gentleman is likely to be allowed, I should say perhaps more correctly, to carry out the reforms which he contemplates. I may tell him that on this side of the House he will receive support in doing everything that he fairly can do in bringing about an equilibrium between the expenditure and receipts on the Intercolonial Railway, but I fancy that in this as in a good many other cases, the obstacles that he will have to deal with will come more particularly from those of his own household. I would entertain a much greater hope of the hon. gentleman's success if I saw him propose to dea.

properly with the very dubious items of expenditure which we are now discussing. Even from his own statement I doubt extremely the wisdom of allowing ourselves to be committed to grant a large sum of money until the hon. gentleman's scheme is matured, until he is able to come down to this House and tell us clearly and distinctly what he proposes to do, and what he thinks is likely to be the actual cost of carrying out many of these extensive improvements; notably these at Halifax. With respect to the latter expenditure, I have to tell the hon. gentleman that I understand that it is very doubtful indeed, even if he gets possession of the property which he speaks of, whether it will be possible to turn it to account for railway purposes without an enormous expenditure. I do not possess that minute knowledge of the locality which I presume he either possesses or will possess himself of before he proceeds to the expenditure; but I submit that we ought to know much more fully than we do know now, what is likely to be the result of the purchase of this large tract at Halifax, and what it will commit us to. I make this statement subject to correction, because, as I have said, we have not at hand these details which we ought to have before we vote $152,000 for this purpose. I have been informed that if the hon. gentleman purchases some of the land which he talks of purchasing, a very large sum of money indeed will be required to be used for the purpose of carrying out the improvements he proposes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A million dollars.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A million dollars, my hon. friend says.

Mr. HAGGART. I gave the exact amount to the hon. gentleman. The proposition of the city council is to give us the property required for $400,000 from Cornwallis street to the station. The amount of expenditure by the railway company for buildings, work, &c., is $179,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman had that statement thoroughly examined, and did his engineers report to that effect? That statement I believe refers only to one of two alternative propositions, and I understood him to say he had not made up his mind what proposition he would adopt, and that he held it in reserve as he wished to go down there himself.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that the alternate proposition would require an equal expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The information that has reached me is that it is probable, and judging from what we have seen in respect to the same Intercolonial Railway, I am justified in holding that it is very probable, that when the scheme comes to be carried into effect a vastly larger sum will be required. We all know how we have been led into expenditures on this railway. We know that time and again we have been told that works would cost four or five hundred thousand dollars, and that the actual expenditure has gone into millions; notably in the case of that famous St. Charles Branch which I think is one of the items under discussion. I believe, therefore, we ought to have the clearest and most distinct assurances from the Minister as to what he proposes to do, where he proposes to go, and what will be the actual effect of this vote, before we commit ourselves to it. Well, Sir, I have another word or two to say with respect to certain comparisons which were instituted, having regard to the Intercolonial Railway in its earlier history. If my recollection serves me right, in 1876 the Intercolonial Railway as we know it now, was first opened for traffic under my lamented friend Mr. Mackenzie, and I remember very well how it was admitted on both sides of the House, that being a perfectly new road it must for a considerable space of time expect to be run at a loss. Now, Sir, in making comparisons between the cost of the Intercolonial Railway in 1876, 1877, 1878 and the present time, there are three points which this House would do well to bear in mind. In the first place, as every man who has the slightest experience in these affairs knows, it is a well-established fact in all railway management that during the first two or three years on most roads before traffic is developed, the business will be of necessity run at a loss. There is no need to waste any words in arguing so simple and well-established a proposition as that. In the next place, it is known that under Mr. Mackenzie the capital account was intended to be closed, and was about to be closed; and that in 1878 more particularly, a large sum of money amounting to $200,000 was charged for renewals—I think the substitution of steel rails for iron—which under the present regime, or under the recent regime at all events, would most undoubtedly have been charged to capital instead of to ordinary expenditure. If that sum had been deducted, instead of there having been an increase of expenditure to $430,000, the total amount of expenditure over receipts in 1876-77-78 would have very little exceeded $230,000 or thereabouts. But over and above all that, and I think the House will do well to remember this point: when you make a comparison between the cost of working the Intercolonial Railway between the years 1876, 1877 and 1878, and the cost of working the Intercolonial Railway to-day, some hon. gentlemen choose to leave out of sight the fact that between 1876 and between 1892, a matter of about $17,000,000 on which we pay interest has been added to the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway. In Mr. Mackenzie's time the amount of interest we paid on the Intercolonial Railway amounted to $1,450,000, in round numbers; to-day the amount of interest which we pay is $2,150,000, on a capital expenditure of about $53,000,000. Now, if we want to ascertain what the Intercolonial Railway has cost us, and I am speaking of it in a purely business aspect, when you look to the deficit to-day, and compare it with the deficit of 1878, you have to remember that you must add to the deficit now, the sum of $700,000 a year, paid by us as interest on the increased capital expenditure. And when you compare that with the state of things in Mr. Mackenzie's time, then will you be able to form a reasonable idea of the enormous discrepancy between the position of the Intercolonial Railway now and the position of the Intercolonial Railway 14 or 15 years ago. Now, Sir, I turn to the Public Accounts, and I find that taking public works generally under Mr. Mackenzie's regime, our total deficit on all our public works amounted to $340,000 including a charge of $200,000 for renewals. Looking at the receipts and expenditures, I find that we have received on railways and canals $3,683,000, and expended $4,705,000. So that, whereas in Mr. Mackenzie's time there was an apparent

deficit of $340,000, there is to-day a deficit of $1,020,000 a year on the public works of this country. I do not say that that may not be more or less accounted for; yet, bearing in mind the enormous additions which have been made to the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway on which we pay interest of $700,000 a year, that statement shows that there is a great amount of extravagance in the management of that road. The fact of the matter is that over and above this enormous annual deficit, over and above this enormous additional charge for interest, amounting to three-quarters of a million a year, it has become almost a fixed fact that every year for the last fifteen or sixteen years from half a million to a million is charged to capital account on the Intercolonial Railway, and apparently there is no end to it. Even while the Minister is making, I have no doubt sincerely, professions of his desire to reform and improve the working of the railway and to bring about an equilibrium, still the same Minister is forced to come down to Parliament and demand further sums amounting to many hundreds of thousand of dollars besides. Now, I would be very glad indeed to have had a more distinct assurance from the hon. gentleman as to what he proposes to do about these same freight rates. For my own part, looking at the fact that the people of Canada have to pay over $2,000,000 a year of interest on the capital sunk in the Intercolonial Railway, from which they do not get any return, it is my opinion that this road ought to be made at least to convey goods at such prices as would pay the cost of transport; and I had hoped that the hon. Minister of Railways would have felt himself able under the circumstances, and in view of the huge deficit, to have laid down that as a part of his policy. I can understand that it may be advisable on the part of the Government to convey goods at cost price. I am not going to squabble with him on a point of that kind. But I do declare that nothing has been advanced by him, or by any of the hon. gentlemen behind him, to justify us in carrying goods either for the benefit of the consumers below or the exporters from the Upper Provinces at less than those goods require to be charged for the purpose of making both ends meet. I must say, both on that point and in reference to these proposed expenditures at Halifax and St. John, that I am very far from being satisfied that the hon. Minister is prepared to go as far under the circumstances as he ought to go. He knows that the probabilities are that every day the Canadian Pacific Railway continues to run with the enormous advantages which it possesses, there is a risk of this deficit being very much increased in spite of all that the hon. gentleman can do; and under these circumstances, I think that the least the hon. gentleman could do would be to assure the House that he will not allow the proposed improvements at Halifax to go on until he is thoroughly satisfied as to what they will cost, and until he has made up his mind as to the real necessities of the case, and to lay down the principle that goods must be carried at rates which will, I will not say pay a profit, but save the railway from absolute loss.

Mr. WELSH. The hon. Minister of Railways made an excellent beginning in his speech, in promising economy in the management of the Intercolonial Railway with the view of bringing the expenditure and income closer together. I agree with the remarks made by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny); but with some of his remarks I do not agree. I agree with what he said about the Upper Provinces receiving greater benefit from the Intercolonial Railway than the Maritime Provinces. I say that at least eighty per cent of the benefit accrues to the Upper Provinces; there is no doubt in my mind about that. Nevertheless, the Intercolonial is a mutual advantage to all parts of the Dominion. I thank the hon. member for Halifax for the remarks he made in that respect, and I also thank him for his reference to the Prince Edward Island Railway, when he said:

> "During the debate reference was made to the deficit on the Prince Edward Island Railway, but we must not forget that it was part of our agreement, when Prince Edward Island joined the Dominion of Canada, that we should operate that railway with all due economy and efficiency, I believe. We must not forget, after all, that the people of Prince Edward Island have had to pay their share for the canal system and the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway out of which they can derive no immediate benefit, and that they have contributed that cheerfully, so that it falls with bad grace from gentlemen in this House to assail Prince Edward Island for the deficiency which may arise on the railway in that province."

I thank the hon. gentleman for these words, which are quite true. Since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, when any gentleman proposes anything for the district which he represents and with which I am not conversant, I have always considered it my duty to hold my tongue and give it a silent assent, for the various members of this House are supposed to represent the wants and requirements of their own districts; and I think it amounts almost to an insult on the part of hon. gentlemen who know nothing about Halifax or Prince Edward Island or other sections of the Maritime Provinces to get up here and dictate what those provinces require. However, I disapprove altogether of this vote. I think the hon. Minister of Railways will require to go to Halifax and see for himself before he recommends this large expenditure for new stations. About seventeen years ago the station at Halifax was about three miles from the city at a place called Richmond, but to-day there is plenty of room and accommodation there, and the station there, which I am informed was built at an expense of half a million dollars, is a very fine one. A great improvement has also been made in the station at St. John in the last twenty years. If this vote is passed, I hope the hon. Minister will hesitate a long while before he will consent to this large expenditure without being fully convinced that it is required. But if this kind of thing is going on, what is to be done for Charlottetown? Halifax and St. John must have palace stations, but Charlottetown has a pigsty for a station which is a disgrace to the Government. I appeal to every hon. gentleman in this House, who ever had the misery to go into that station, if it is not so. Let us have even justice all around. Prince Edward Island is threatened with large reductions in the staff. In Nova Scotia five per cent is considered sufficient reduction in the staff of the Intercolonial Railway, but ten per cent is little enough for Prince Edward Island. I will leave the matter to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, who, I am sure, when he pays the Island a visit and looks over the requirements of the railway and the country, will see that justice is done. I did not expect to see this large

vote in the Estimates. You preach economy, and the first thing you ask is to vote a large sum beyond what is usually required. If the Government will look back, they will find that when those branch lines were proposed, they were warned at the time that they were not required. They were warned that the Intercolonial Railway was going to lose money by those roads. We have one road running almost parallel to the other, the receipts of each eating into the other, and no doubt the loss to the Intercolonial Railway arises in great measure out of the short line from Oxford to Pictou and the line from Montreal to St. John. We were told at the time that the more railways we have, the greater will be the receipts to the Intercolonial Railway, but such has not been the case. Still I do not object to those lines, particularly as they are an accommodation to the people, but we have to pay for them. I would like to have a word from the hon. member from Halifax as to how the elevator works there. Judging by the quantities of grain shipped from Halifax, the result is not very encouraging. I used to know Halifax very much better than I do at present, but I know, while the present station at Halifax is not adequate, at Richmond they have greater wharf accommodation, and if they want greater wharf accommodation for the port of Halifax they can get any amount without going into Halifax. Is it proposed in this grant to give additional wharf accommodation? This sum is asked for terminal accommodation, and I do not care to vote until I know more about the matter. However, the responsibility will be upon the Minister of Railways, and I hope he will consider well before he will consent to an extension that will cost, as my hon. friend from Queen's has said, about a million of money. I hope something will be done, and I would like to see an item in the Estimates for a new terminus in Charlottetown. I appeal to my hon. friend the Finance Minister, and also to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, who have been there, to say if it is creditable to the Railway Department to have a miserable terminus in Charlottetown such as the one that is there. Certainly, something ought to be done. However, while we are preaching economy, I do not know whether we are going to practice it by voting this amount, and all I can say is that I do not like it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I had not the opportunity last evening, when this item was discussed, to point out where I got my information, and I desire now to show the source from which I got the item with regard to stationery and printing and advertising which I presented to the House. The Minister of Railways no doubt will remember my asking him what the amount in value was of stationery supplied to the Intercolonial Railway during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1891, and also the amount in value used by the railway during the same time. The Minister replied as follows :—

"The amount in value of stationery supplied to the Intercolonial Railway during the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1891, was $48.238.06. The amount in value used by the railway during the same time was $57,855.46."

Now, that is a clear and distinct statement. I took that item to start with in making up the amount I then stated was expended by the Intercolonial Railway for stationery and advertising during the year closing the 30th of June, 1891. Then I come to advertising, as set out in the Auditor's Report, page D-353, and I find that the advertising amounted to $17,956 and the printing and lithographing to $45,437.28. Those three amounts added together make $121,238.62. If the hon. gentleman now claims that there are other items included in the first amount I have given to the House, he himself is to blame for having confused the House by the answer he gave in reply to my very explicit question. With regard to the other two items, there can be no doubt, as the Auditor General has passed them and they have been charged and paid. I contend, therefore, that this clearly proves the statement I presented to the House, that on the Intercolonial Railway, during the years that I have referred to, there was $121,238.62 spent in printing, advertising and lithographing. Now, I contend that the amount I gave with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway was also correct. The Minister challenged the statement I made, and said that he had received his information from Mr. Wainright. Well, I received mine from the same source.

Mr. HAGGART. I received mine from Mr. Seargeant and read his letter.

Mr. McMULLEN. Admitting that the statement the hon. gentleman made was correct, it only added the sum of $22,000 to the Grand Trunk Railway expenditure altogether, and it would, therefore, show that while we spent $121,238, the Grand Trunk Railway only spent something like $146,000. This is the source of my information, and I consider it but just that I should again call the Minister's attention to the source from which I gathered it.

Mr. HAGGART. It is only a few minutes to six o'clock, and I will strictly answer the statement of the hon. gentleman. Such an ardent and devoted student of public accounts in the Auditor General's Report ought not to be led into a mistake by any statement of mine. The statement I made I naturally supposed included stationery, printing and lithographing. I telegraphed down to Moncton and obtained the information, and also got from the Auditor General a statement of the account. If the hon. gentleman only looked at the Auditor General's Report, he would see that the amount for advertising was $17,956.16, and the amount for printing and lithographing, $45,427.38, making a total of $62,383. If the hon. gentleman will look further and glance at the Public Accounts he will see that the amount of stationery charged to the Intercolonial Railway was $4,168.30, and to Railways and Canals, $3,679.87. I sent to the Auditor General's Department to find the total amount, and it was as I stated, in the neighbourhood of $5,000, which makes the statement I made to the House perfectly correct, and which the hon. gentleman could easily verify by a reference to the Auditor General's Report and the Public Accounts.

Mr. McMULLEN. The explanation of the hon. gentleman is not satisfactory. He has not referred to the question I put to him as to the amount of stationery the Intercolonial Railway used last year.

Mr. HAGGART. I stated that it not only included stationery but printing and lithographing as well, but even then it would not be exact. I telegraphed to Moncton and got the statement from the officers there. They had evidently committed an error in adding the two amounts together.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the error was made by——

Mr. HAGGART. By myself. I admit it freely.

Mr. McMULLEN. So the Minister evidently misled me, though unintentionally, and the fault lies at the door of the hon. gentleman rather than at mine.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire now to make some reference to some of the remarks made last night by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), to the effect that the canals had cost so much money and the Maritime Provinces had contributed largely to their construction, and as an offset the Intercolonial Railway, if it was a loss to the country, was something that the Maritime Provinces were entitled to expect in return for the loss they were sustaining in regard to the money spent on the canals. I do not think that is an argument that should weigh with the committee as to the general management of the Intercolonial Railway. I think we should judge of the Intercolonial Railway on its own merits, and the question of the outlay on the canals is separate and distinct from the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman also made some reference to the fact that a large amount of money had been invested in steel rails, and that the cost of these had been charged to operating expenses instead of to capital account. There has been a good deal of difference of opinion as to what items should be charged to operating expenses and what should be charged to capital account. Some years ago, when Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways, he clearly defined what he conceived should be items belonging to capital account and what should be items charged to working expenses. He stated that, where a new engine was put on the road, adding to the number of engines, it was charged to capital account, but where an engine was worked out and another was put in its place, it was charged to working expenses. In the same way, if we are to charge engines which are supplied in the place of those that are worn out to working expenses and also cars which take the place of worn-out cars, it is quite in line to provide new rails in the place of rails that are worn out and to charge them also to working expenses. Sir Charles Tupper also made some reference to snow sheds. He said that a large number of wooden snow sheds had been erected, and in some cases they were removing those and putting iron snow sheds in their place. He said that in that case, the new sheds being better and more durable, the cost was charged to capital account, but if they had placed a similar kind of snow shed to those that were already on the road, he would have considered that the cost should be charged to working expenses. Now, in connection with the manner in which the previous Minister of Railways purposed handling, and no doubt did handle, the Intercolonial Railway, there can be no doubt that the $100,000 to which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) called attention was properly charged to working expenses and not to capital account. There was another remark of the hon. member for Halifax, that he would recommend that the road should be placed under efficient management at Moncton, as the centre of the railway system, and that an efficient, energetic and able staff of officers should manage the whole line. Now, that is virtually an admission on his part that inefficient management has characterized the operations of the Intercolonial Railway for years past.

Mr. KENNY. I referred to the administration of the mechanical department of the road.

Mr. McMULLEN. Perhaps I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, but from what we have gathered from the operations of the road, and comparing it with other lines in the matter of freight rates and earnings, we certainly must come to the conclusion that it has been loosely managed. I fancy that much of the cause of the present unsatisfactory condition of the Intercolonial Railway is owing to the branch lines, and, as I have already said, the cut-throat lines, that have been constructed. When Sir Charles Tupper came before this House years ago and urged in such eloquent terms that we should consent to the construction of the Oxford and New Glasgow road, he outlined what an advantage it would be, both to the Province of Nova Scotia and to the Upper Provinces; that it would shorten the line very materially, and that it would reduce the grades. I well remember that he stated that the drawing capacity of an engine of a train load of cars was measured by the grades she had to ascend from the point where she started to the place where she wanted to deliver her cargo. That is true. He then went on to show that the grades upon the Intercolonial Railway from New Glasgow to Oxford were so very steep that it was impossible for an engine to draw a sufficiently large train of cars to cheapen the freight of coal going to the west; and he went on to point out what an advantage it would be to have the Oxford and New Glasgow road, that it would be some 40 or 50 miles shorter, that the grades would be one-half as steep, and that we would be able on that branch to move a very much larger quantity of freight with the same engine power. We know what the experience has been in that respect. Some two millions of money has been spent on the Oxford and New Glasgow road, and it is virtually a monument of folly. It may render a certain service to the section of country through which it runs; but to ask this House to build that road entirely at the cost of this Dominion, while the western sections of the Dominion were contributing largely by way of bonus to build their own roads, was a gross injustice to the other provinces. But the eloquence of Sir Charles Tupper secured the Province of Nova Scotia the construction of that entire line at the cost of the Dominion, and it is now competing with the main line of the Intercolonial Railway, and what the main line could do in the way of freight, is now divided between the main line and the Oxford and New Glasgow Road. We are now running about 120 miles more railway than was necessary, and we are every day spending money to keep the track in order, to keep the bridges and railway in order, when in reality we had a line before that fully served the interests of the country which were intended to be served by the construction of the Intercolonial

Railway. Now, there is another point to which I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways. He quoted yesterday from what is evidently the manuscript of the Railway Statistics for 1891. These railway statistics have not yet been placed in the hands of members of Parliament; none have been furnished since 1890. We should be in possession of these figures as well as the Minister of Railways, and the Minister has had the advantage over other members of the House in quoting from statistics that ought to be in our hands just as well as in his own. These statistics have been published annually for several years, and I would like to know why the Minister of Railways has not seen fit to place those statistics for 1891 in hands of the members of the House. They are published for the year 1890, and we are now within a few days of two years short in getting these statistics that we have been accustomed to receive from year to year. If we had in our hands these statistics we would be able, probably, to point out some very objectionable features in the management of the Intercolonial Railway when compared with other lines. Now, I think it would be well that we should have annually a list of the employés of the Intercolonial Railway. Some time ago I put a notice on the paper that I would move for a return giving the names, occupation and addresses of the employés of the Intercolonial Road. The Minister of Justice got up and said it would be a most expensive and extensive return to make; but we find that the Minister of Railways came down yesterday and said that the entire number of employés is something like 4,200. Now, if there are only 4,200 on the entire staff, it certainly would not have been such an enormous costly return as the Minister of Justice represented to meet the request of my motion. Then the Minister of Railways proposes to apply the pruning knife in the way of cutting off a number of unnecessary officials. That, I think, is a step in the right direction, and had we the return that I asked for, we would be able to judge of the motives which will guide the Minister in striking off the names of the employés that he proposes to remove. I wish, also, to draw attention to the number of expensive officials that we have on this road. In the first place, we have got the Chief Engineer, Mr. Schreiber, at $6,000, although I do not see that it is charged to the Intercolonial Railway, and I do not know whether it is necessary that we should have a chief engineer in the Department of Railways. Then we have Mr. Pottinger, who is chief superintendent, at $4,000 a year. I see that we have no less than four auditors. We have a police inspector at $1,000; we have a Mr. Archibald, chief engineer, at $3,500; we have C. T. Hillson, inspector of buildings, at $1,300, a M. Mackenzie, assistant engineer, at $1,300; a Mr. Whitney, mechanical superintendent, at $3,200. These are very expensive officials. Then when we come to the audit department, we have Mr. J. R. Bruce, traffic auditor, at $1,500; C. A. Lowe, travelling auditor, at $1,000; Mr. McNaughton, travelling auditor, at $1,000 at year; and we have J. W. Workman, assistant traffic auditor, at $1,000 a year. Then we have T. V. Cooke, general storekeeper, at a salary of $1,900. I cannot understand why it is necessary to keep a general storekeeper, a man to receive goods, to deliver goods, and also I admit perhaps, to exercise his judgment in connection with these goods, at $1,900 a year. That appears to be a very large salary for such a man. No doubt there are men in different branches who will judge as to the commodities to be purchased for use on the road. But this storekeeper will receive goods after they have been purchased, and they will be afterwards delivered out by him, and for this duty he receives $1,900 a year, which is an almost extravagant salary for a man of that stamp. Then we have Geo. H. Pick, assistant freight agent, at a salary of $1,500; Geo. Taylor, general freight agent, at $2,400; A. Busby, general passenger agent, at $2,400; N. Weatherston, western passenger and freight agent, at $1,850, and D. W. Robinson, eastern passenger and freight agent, at $1,800. It appears to me that is overloading the railway staff to employ so many very expensive men in connection with it, 1,200 or 1,300 miles of railway. There are four travelling auditors, two engineers, and three freight agents, one for the east end, one for the west end and one in the centre of the road. Is it the intention of the Minister to keep all the auditors in connection with the line at the salaries mentioned?

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman will conclude his remarks, I will then try to answer all his statements.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should prefer to have the Minister's reply now. I may possibly be able to say something in reply to him, when he has stated whether he intends to continue to employ all these auditors or not.

Mr. HAGGART. With respect to the two items discussed by the hon. gentleman, the statement I will make will show the absurdity of the remark he has made. The hon. gentleman complains of the storekeeper receiving $1,900 a year. When the hon. gentleman considers that stores to the value of $1,000,000 go into the storehouse in a year, he will not think the salary too much. I do not know any auditor on any railway on the continent who receives any such a ridiculously small salary as $1,500 a year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can say to the Minister that he is not very well posted. I know auditors who do not receive any more salary.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to know whether all the freight and passenger agents are to be continued. Do you consider it necessary to have an eastern freight agent at $1,800, a western agent at $1,850, and a central agent at $2,400, taking into consideration the limited amount of business the road is doing?

Mr. HAGGART. I have not taken the matter into consideration. It is the first time my attention has been drawn to it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I respectfully suggest that the Minister takes the subject into consideration, and ascertain whether one or two of these agents might not be dispensed with. I should like also to ask the Minister why this country should pay the club fees of General Manager Pottinger, who receives a salary of $4,000, the amount of these fees being $30. The country should not be asked to contribute that sum. Another item is Canadian Pacific through freight $117,017. Is that the balance due the Canadian Pacific Railway, after deducting the amount earned by the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. HAGGART. I think that is the total amount, $117,017. These matters were before the Public Accounts Committee, which is a proper place to investigate these items.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have not dealt with these items before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. HAGGART. The following is the information asked for by the hon. gentleman:—

Earned by C. P. R., payable by I. C. R.:	
Car mileage	$ 18,704 93
Freight dues (through)	185,731 36
Ticket dues	87,701 80
Shunting dues	90 50
Sundries	20 48
Freight dues (W. B. Div)	65,589 46
Total	$357,838 53
Earned by I. C. R., payable to C. P. R.:	
Car mileage	$ 7,933 28
Freight dues (through)	57,484 44
Tickt dues	87,701 80
Lighting and fuel, &c.	6,800 20
St. John station	20,586 35
Coal, &c., supplied	11,236 44
Freight dues (W. B. Div)	33,751 53
Total	$225,494 04
Balance paid C. P. R. by I. C. R.	$132,344 49

Mr. McMULLEN. I see another item here for the Collector of Customs at Moncton, "duty, $1,683.27; Customs, $150; total, $1,833.23." Could the Minister state what that is for?

Mr. HAGGART. This is not the place at all for asking that kind of information. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should bring the matter before the Public Accounts Committee. These accounts refer to 1890-91, and the proper thing to do is to get an officer of the department to explain them before the Public Accounts Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And when you get him there he is not allowed to be cross-examined.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think we have the right to get it here. The hon. gentleman is not to dictate to the committee.

Mr. HAGGART. I am unable to give the information without going every now and then to the officer.

Mr. McMULLEN. He is kept here for the purpose of giving information.

Mr. HAGGART. Bring him before the Public Accounts Committee and he will give you the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. Could the Minister say why we pay the club fees of Mr. Pottinger, General Manager?

Mr. HAGGART. I enquired about that, and the attention of the chief of the department was drawn to it. The club fees are not paid this year and we put an end to such payments.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are glad to find that out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Chairman, I think that we require further information on this matter than we have as yet received. I notice since this discussion began that several hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House have instituted comparisons between the deficit on this railway in 1877-78 and at the present time. In order that we may institute a proper comparison between different periods, it is necessary that the charges for running expenses should be on the same line, and I understand that for some years past it has been the practice to charge to capital account what was formerly charged to running expenses. I notice for instance in the report of the Minister that about $50,000 is charged to capital account for the building of cars and engines, and unless these are in addition to what are already in use it seems to me they ought to be charged to running expenses. Repairs to engines or cars, or the building of a new car or engine to replace a worn-out one, certainly ought to be charged to running expenses. It would be satisfactory if the Minister were able to give us full information to enable us to institute a comparison betwen the former practice when it was supposed the capital account was closed, and the practice which has grown up since. The very large increase in the capital account was brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) this afternoon. The first time this capital account was closed I think it amounted to something less than $36,000,000, but now it is over $53,000,000 and it is clear the amount of money that the country loses by payment for interest on this capital account is very much greater now than it was in 1878. The losses upon the road are not indicated by the statement made, as to the difference between the working expenses and the earnings of the road, because there is an addition to that loss by the increased interest on the capital. Assuming that the capital account is closed, and if you take the interest on the capital account and the loss upon the running expenses, and charge everything, you will have a statement showing us precisely what the maintenance of this institution costs the country. I apprehend that, if we were to charge a reasonable rate on the public treasury for carrying the freight that is carried by the Intercolonial Railway both ways, the entire freight carriage could be paid for out of the public treasury for a less sum than is now being paid in the shape of interest and of running expenses. Well, Sir, that is a very serious condition of things, and it is one for which it seems to me the reforms proposed by the Minister of Railways will not afford adequate redress. The hon. Minister has stated that he is about to dismiss 210 of the employés, out of the 4,000 odd engaged on the road. It would be satisfactory to know whether the Minister proposes to fix that as the number of men who are to be removed, or whether he proposes this merely as a tentative measure intending after investigation to effect further reforms if the opportunity presents itself. I understood from the hon. Minister that he was not fully aware as to the extent to which the reforms might be effected in that direction, and it does seem to me that the Government ought to apply—and I believe that the country will sustain them if they energetically and earnestly undertake to apply—the ordinary principles of the conduct of the business of a railway corporation to the management of this road. There ought to be no difference between the management of a railway in the hands of the Government and the management of a railway in the hands of a private corporation; and I am perfectly sure that a private corporation would not retain in its

service for any length of time a larger number of persons than are actually required. It is rather remarkable that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) and several other hon. gentlemen whose constituencies lie along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, have spoken in a deprecating way of the non-employment of persons who are at present employed on the road. They seem to think if you fasten 4,000 people upon the public treasury, although the public interest may not require more than half this number, yet it would be a cruel thing not to retain them in the public service. While I think that the Government ought to exercise some care in dispensing with the services of public employés, while they ought not to deprive them of employment without giving them a little warning, it is preposterous to say that these men should be retained when their services are no longer required. Then, the hon. Minister has suggested to us that further accommodation is required at Halifax, and that it would be necessary to purchase 18½ acres, which I think he said was recommended by the municipal authorities of Halifax, at a cost of something over $400,000, though the charge upon the public treasury would be something in the neighbourhood of $600,000. The hon. gentleman also referred to a plan proposed by the Board of Trade, and to a third plan, which so far as I remember, he has not explained to the committee. Now, I am told that these 18½ acres are on a rocky eminence or hill, and that an enormous amount of excavation will be required before the property can be made available for railway purposes. I would ask the hon. Minister whether the chief of that branch of the public service has not had this subject brought under his notice, and whether he has not reported as to what it would cost to acquire that territory, to excavate the rock upon the surface, and to fit the property for use for side-tracking? I am told by gentlemen whose opinions have some value, and who have given attention to this subject, that the excavations, in addition to the price of this piece of property, would considerably exceed $1,100,000, at the ordinary cost of rock excavation. Has the hon. Minister of Railways had a report made as to the number of cubic yards to be removed?

Mr. HAGGART. A report has been made as to the cost.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has a report been made as to the amount of rock excavation that would be required? That, I submit, is a matter of very considerable importance. Then, I understand that the Government have had brought to their attention a proposition for furnishing facilities for all the warehousing men along the harbour, which need not add anything to the public charges if that be so, that, it seems to me, is a scheme of very considerable importance. Assuming that further accommodation is necessary, there is also to be considered how that accommodation can be secured at the least possible cost to the public treasury. Now, I think that upon all these matters we ought to have a fuller statement. I do not say that we should do anything to relieve the Minister of responsibility, but we ought to have an opportunity of knowing whether such an appropriation as the Minister asks for is at all necessary to secure the accommodation, and whether the accommodation is in the public interest and worth the amount of money required to obtain it. I have listened attentively to what has been said by the hon. Minister and by the hon. member for Halifax, and I have not yet heard them give to the committee the information in these respects which I think ought to be in the possession of the committee before we are called upon to make any appropriation. I understand that the Minister intends, after the appropriation is made, to judge as to which of the three schemes submitted to him will be the preferable one for adoption in the public interest; but the one about which he has expressed no opinion is one which I understand if adopted, may not entail any charge upon the public treasury at all, So, with respect to this appropriation for the purchase of property at Halifax, the use that is to be made of it, and the cost of getting it into shape for use, are matters upon which we require further information.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) both ask for a statement of the capital account and the cost of betterments from 1876 to the present day in order to institute a comparison. The hon. member for South Oxford is under the impression that when Mr. Mackenzie was in power, the capital account was closed, and that there had been no charges to capital in his time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, no. I did not say that. I said that he had expressed his intention to close it.

Mr. HAGGART. I mistook the hon. gentleman. However, I will give him a statement of the amount expended on capital account year by year from 1876 to the present time, betterments which the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald) said the other night would, if charged to capital account, make the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway almost disappear. The expenditure on capital account for last year can be found in my report for 1890-91. Speaking from memory, I think it was about $77,000, to which has to be added an amount which does not appear in the account, chargeable to another railway in connection with the Intercolonial, making a total chargeable to capital account last year of $83,000. The hon. gentleman takes perhaps the same view upon the question that I do, that on a road which is completed like the Intercolonial, for sidings, for increase of locomotive power and for increase of everything else required for the running of the road, the capital account should be closed, and all these things should be charged to income or revenue. Now, I will give a statement of the expenditure out of revenue for additions or betterments from 1st July, 1881, to 1st July, 1891:

Additional ballasting	$ 160,284
New buildings or additions, and improvements to old	183,999
Difference in cost between iron and wood, difference in cost between standard and original floors, strengthening old bridges	234,495
Difference in cost between wood and wire fences, and new fences where none existed	201,417
Additional land for stations, snow fences, &c	30,802
Difference in cost between 56-lb. rail and 67-lb. rail, including nut locks and tie plates	462,439
New sidings and extensions of old sidings, grading, &c	246,537
New ties, to change spacing from 2½ ft. to 2 ft.	168,191
New additional signals and improvements to old ones	37,098
Additional track scales, hoisting crane, dredging plant, hand cars, coal waggons, &c	86,404

Raising bridges and snow sheds to comply with the law	$16,500
30 new locomotives, average cost $10,000, if replaced by the same kind, cost would be $7,000, 30 at $3,000	90,000
4 new locomotives, increasing the stock	43,750
Improvements to 44 locomotives	40,000
Improvements to 90 passenger cars	45,000
Improvements to 14 express and baggage and postal and smoking cars	7,000
Improvements to 2,600 freight cars	137,700
Improvements to 8 snow ploughs and 4 wing ploughs	12,000
Putting the Westinghouse automatic air brake on the passenger trains	30,600
New tools and improvements in workshops	20,000
Improvements in the water supply of locomotives	92,183
Total	$2,531,601

That is the expenditure out of revenue for betterments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total number of miles of road?

Mr. HAGGART. I gave the hon. gentleman that the other day. 1,300 and some odd miles. This is a statement of the capital expenditure in each year from the 3rd of June, 1886, up to the 30th of June, 1891.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The statement the hon. gentleman has just read as to betterments, what period of time does it cover?

Mr. HAGGART. 10 years. These are the details of the expenditure on capital account:

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

STATEMENT of Capital Expenditure in each Year, from 30th June, 1876, to 30th June, 1891.

—	Purchase and repairs of the purchased road and betterments thereto.	Construction and equipment of branch roads.	Judgment in suit of the W. A. Railway and W. C. Railway against the Crown.	Increased accommodation at Halifax.	Increased accommodation at St. John.	Rolling stock for Intercolonial Railway—additional.	Betterments and judgments on old claims.	Increased accommodation at Moncton.	Total in each Year.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1876-77	.....	.....	.....	214,433 56	98,819 33	.....	966,217 91	.....	1,279,470 80
1877-78	.....	.....	.....	72,664 07	99,452 18	125,245 52	111,453 97	.....	408,815 74
1878-79	.....	.....	.....	21,282 78	45,771 70	.....	159,584 71	.....	226,639 19
1879-80	1,889,595 43	.....	.....	7,164 02	94,545 65	.....	56,729 50	.....	*2,048,034 60
1880-81	540,302 84	.....	.....	33,684 27	10,373 15	.....	24,372 54	.....	†608,732 80
1881-82	168,834 31	660 30	.....	173,109 84	19,712 16	205,005 20	18,246 98	.....	‡585,568 79
1882-83	6,805 86	482,321 20	.....	257,824 73	201,312 18	628,244 39	40,124 59	.....	§1,616,632 95
1883-84	1,284,311 97	351,815 84	.....	47,671 45	139,432 00	586,386 84	388,837 84	.....	‖2,798,455 94
1884-85	.....	573,226 94	.....	16,580 01	116,732 68	287,313 97	56,524 70	.....	1,050,378 30
1885-86	183 79	260,974 21	.....	18,670 77	32,174 04	224,025 63	10,289 52	.....	546,317 96
1886-87	.....	501,735 01	125,936 75	12,613 07	18,547 66	160,260 42	4,146 35	.....	823,239 26
1887-88	.....	350,449 44	.....	8,992 97	2,513 89	258,334 81	101,443 20	16,653 56	742,385 58
1888-89	34,235 73	258,443 15	.....	9,582 27	2,452 69	368,837 81	11,655 71	5,366 80	690,574 16
1889-90	.....	229,616 10	.....	2,491 90	25,693 85	24,072 03	7,211 93	76,160 49	365,246 30
1890-91	3,255 40	12,850 06	.....	.....	4,355 17	50,083 44	12,640 67	.....	83,184 74
Total	3,927,525 33	3,022,092 25	125,936 75	896,765 71	911,889 33	2,917,810 06	1,969,480 12	98,180 85	13,873,677 11

(This statement does not embrace the Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton Railways.)

Before sitting down I might give the amount of excavation in Halifax and the amount required to build the railway extension there:

	Cubic yards.
Retaining walls, along Water street, 2,600 x 12 x 4½	5,200
Along middle of lots, 1,400 x 12 x 4½	2,800
Between Gerrish street and Lockman street, 520 x 15 x 6	1,730
Along Lockman street to Cornwallis, 950 x 20 x 8	5,630
	15,360 at $4.50 = $69,120

Then there is the grading:

	Cubic yards.
Betweeen North and Gerrish streets, 1,350 x 10 x 150	75,000
Between Gerrish and Gray's Lane, 250 x 350 x 15	50,000
Between Gray's Lane and Cornwallis street, 800 x 300 x 9	80,000
	205,000 at 40cts. = 82,000

Freight sheds, brick, 1,100 x 50	$27,000
Streets and loading platforms	5,000
Three miles of sidings at $4,000 per mile	12,000
	$195,120

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the character of that piece of land?

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, the place where the present station was built was found to be too high, and they had to excavate in order to put the depot down there. The excavation would require a pretty large expenditure as I have mentioned.

Mr. FLINT. What was the total amount?

Mr. HAGGART. The total amount for the tracks, and the laying of the track, and the buildings is, I think, $195,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course there is some expenditure on capital account for rolling stock and repairs which were necessary on the Rivière

* Of this, $1,500,000 is for the purchase and $389,575.43 for repairs of Rivière du Loup Branch, bought of Grand Trunk Railway. † Of this, $540,302.84 is for renewals of the Rivière du Loup Branch, bought of Grand Trunk Railway. ‡ Of this, $168,834.31 is for ditto. § Of this, $6,805.86 is for ditto. ‖ Of this, $1,284,311.97 is for the purchase of the Eastern Extension Railway.

du Loup branch when it was acquired. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what has been the actual cost of the Rivière du Loup branch? Then the hon. gentleman has read to us a statement of a number of years in which payments of disputed claims have taken place. I suppose they are mostly settlements with contractors in regard to the cost of construction in the first instance?

Mr. HAGGART. I think so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And they should have been charged at first to capital account. Then he has read several statements as to expenditures for better accommodation in Halifax and St. John. If the hon. gentleman could give us the total amount expended for railway accommodation in connection with the Intercolonial Road altogether, at Halifax, both before and since Confederation, to the completion of this scheme, and also at St. John, it would be of some interest to the committee, and it would show us what railway accommodation is costing us at both those points.

Mr. HAGGART. I will give the hon. gentleman the first statement he wants, what the Rivière du Loup branch cost, and the expenditure for the purpose of putting it in repair—it was relaid with steel rails, and the rolling stock was increased, both of which are charged to it. The amount paid was $1,500,000. Then there was an expenditure of $389,595.43; then there was an expenditure of $540,302.84; another expenditure the following year of $168,834.31; then there was an expenditure the following year, which finishes it up, of $6,805.86.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is entirely independent of the St. Charles branch.

Mr. HAGGART. No, it includes the St. Charles branch. The total amount expended at Halifax is a little over $800,000 from 1876 up to 1890-91, and the expenditure at St. John is about $911,000 for the same period.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose that is the expenditure from 1876.

Mr. HAGGART. The total expenditure altogether.

Mr. GILLMOR. I was pleased to hear the Minister admit that there was a time in the history of this road when the capital account should be closed; that is the first time in 18 years that I ever heard it admitted on that side of the House. I am pleased that the Minister has undertaken to lessen the deficit on this great public work. As a commercial undertaking, I do not believe that you can find in the civilized world so great a failure as the Intercolonial Railway, an undertaking that has cost the people of this country over $50,000,000, with an interest account amounting to $2,000,000 yearly, and a deficit of about a million—$3,000,000 a year, that comes out of the taxpayers of Canada to run that road. Now, I think that the hon. gentleman ought to be encouraged in his good intentions of trying to make that road more of a commercial success than it ever has been; but if it is going to be continued as a political machine, he cannot do it. He cannot lessen the deficit on that road unless he can increase the traffic or reduce the expenditure. I do not think that you ever can make it a commercial success. In the first place, it is built in the wrong place; in the next place, there never was, and there never will be, any great amount of traffic between the Lower Provinces and Western Canada. You cannot create a traffic. You have forced a limited traffic by a protective policy, and you have done it at an enormous cost to the people of this country. You speak about the flour that has been carried down from the upper provinces to the Maritime Provinces. Well, the interest on the capital account and the yearly deficit, both making $3,000,000 a year, will purchase 600,000 barrels of flour, and that is more than all the men, women and children of the Maritime Provinces eat. Now, it would be a considerable demand to make on the Dominion of Canada if the Maritime Provinces were to ask you to give them 600,000 barrels of flour a year; but the taxpayers of this country are paying out that much money to keep that road going. Now, that road ought never to have been built where it is built. The policy of building that road was a military idea; you wanted to get as far from the United States as possible, and I suppose if you could have got across the St. Lawrence you would have gone across it and built your road along the mountains. You are working against geography and against nature, and against the interests of the people of this Dominion. You see how things have worked since. You see that it is a failure financially, and does not succeed in keeping us away from our brethren and friends to the south of us. You have got another road now. Bad as the road was, it is losing more and more, because the small amount of traffic that it carried is now divided between two.

Mr. McALISTER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the Short Line never would have been built if the Intercolonial Railway had been built up the St. Lawrence Valley?

Mr. GILLMOR. I have had some experience in the matter, and I mean to say that both these lines, the one that has cost us over $50,000,000, and on which we lose $3,000,000 yearly, and the other that has cost us $100,000,000, were built with the idea of keeping as far from the Americans as we could. They were both built to be independent of the United States, and now the biggest one has gone through the United States at both ends. I mean to say that this Intercolonial Railway has not only been a failure commercially and financially but it has been a failure in uniting and binding together these provinces. I mean to say there is no more national sentiment now than there was before; the same flag that floats over us floated over us then. You think that there is a national sentiment, that there is a fusion, because 215 of us come here at the public expense and sit together for a few months. But the people of these provinces never were united and never can be. There is no traffic between them. You talk about taking the products of the Lower Provinces. Why a man has got to mortgage his farm to pay the expenses of coming up here to sell a hundred dollars worth of his produce. They do not come here, they do not travel here, and the provinces are not being fused together. What men or women from Ontario are coming down to the Lower Provinces and intermarrying with our people? What business are they doing with us? There are not as many Upper Canadians in Prince Edward Island, or New Brunswick or Nova Scotia as there was before Confederation; the census will show there

are not as many. There are more Americans coming to the Maritime Provinces than Canadians. There is no interchange of national sentiment or fusion between the people of these provinces. We are all British subjects, we are all interested in the welfare of one another, but we were that before Confederation, and it was to carry out Confederation that this great undertaking, this foolish undertaking, this extravagant undertaking, was consummated. The Lower Provinces were induced to come into Confederation because they were told that it would create trade. You say now that it was never intended to do so; I have heard hon. gentlemen say it never was intended that it should be a paying enterprise, that it should be a commercial success. It was not so stated when we undertook the construction of the road, it was not so argued when Confederation was being agitated. We, in the Maritime Provinces, were then told that there would be no increase of taxation; but it is contended now that we can lose millions on the Intercolonial Railway, that we can expend $100,000,000 on the Canadian Pacific Railway and yet not increase taxation. The truth is we have increased our taxation, and have not effected our object. For whose benefit has this work been carried out? It is no use for one province to find fault with another, for we have now together to bear the burden. After Confederation this road was not built for the Maritime Provinces. They were going on very well; they are on the seaboard, and the western provinces could not get to the ocean without getting a right of way through New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. I think the Minister of Railways, who has not been very long in the department, is very well up in the details of this railway matter, and it would be quite impossible, even if he had been in his present position for many years, to answer all the questions that may be put to him. I remember at one time when Mr. Mackenzie was Minister of Public Works that his deputy sat alongside of him, and I do not think it would be contrary to the rules of the House if the deputy of the Minister of Railways sat by his side, and then all these questions could be answered, if they have to be asked in this House. Of course it is not expected that all our public works will give a revenue directly, as it is as impossible to make the Intercolonial Railway a commercial success as it is to fly. You cannot create a trade, you can force a little trade—but there is no trade of any extent between these provinces. The products of the Maritime Provinces do not come this way, and we can obtain flour cheaper than by bringing it over the Intercolonial Railway, and the people of the western provinces can obtain coal cheaper than by that route. I hope the Railway Department has got into the hands of a man who will make it a success. He cannot make much money out of it for the reasons I have stated, but he can reduce the annual loss. I happened to be in public life at the time of Confederation, and I remember the inducements then held out, and it is not proper for the western provinces to claim that this railway expenditure was made in the interests of the Maritime Provinces, for the railway is not as much in their interests as in the interests of the western provinces. We do not send as many goods west as western people send down to us. We could get our goods from ports in the United States and we could get our flour cheaper than now. But it is no more use talking about that matter than it is talking about details, because we have the railway and we will continue to run it. We should encourage the Minister of Railways to reduce the annual loss as much as possible under the circumstances.

Mr. HAGGART. I desire to correct what may be an error in my statement. I hope the hon. gentleman will understand that I was reading from a return for 1876-77 of the expenditure in Halifax and St. John. That is the total amount from those dates up to 1890-91.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The immediate question before the House is the proposition to vote a certain sum of money for extensions at Halifax. I have followed without intervening in the debate, the hon. gentleman as clearly as I could, with a view to ascertaining what would be not only the probable but the possible cost if the House were to make this grant, and up to this moment I have not clearly or satisfactorily understood it. Last year when the present Minister of Militia was acting Minister of Railways, this question came up and the same vote was proposed. He was asked the quantity of land proposed to be expropriated, that is land lying south of Lockman street and between the station and Cornwallis street, and the hon. gentleman said the quantity of land would be 2,500 feet by 830 feet. The hon. gentleman knows that the land is on the slope of the hill, and that it will be necessary to level that land. It is rock of a very hard character, and I have seen an estimate made by very competent men of the cost of excavation. The estimates of the Minister placed the cost of expropriation at $400,000, assuming that the city council expropriate the land and hand it over to the Government after keeping part of the street they propose to widen. It is then estimated that $179,000 will be required for buildings, making $579,000. The hon. gentleman stated that of the three propositions before the House the cost of each would be about the same. I am told by competent men what it will cost to level that land, which we were told last year comprised seven and a half acres and which we are now told comprises eighteen acres, which is about accurate, will be $1,000,000 outside of the expropriation for the land and outside of the money for the contemplated buildings. Has the Minister in his possession an estimate of his own engineers showing that, supposing we adopt this plan and vote the money and expropriate eighteen and a half acres, it will not cost in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000 to level that land?

Mr. HAGGART. The quantity of land proposed to be used between Cornwallis street and the station is 2,500 feet long by 330 feet wide. The assessed value of the property is $450,000. If it were expropriated by the Government, we could scarcely judge the cost, as we would very likely have to pay very largely in excess of the assessed value of the property. The proposition is, as the Halifax people want to widen the street at the station, that they should take a few feet for that purpose and give us the balance of the property for $400,000. The estimated cost of buildings, grading, laying the rails, furnishing the ties, rails and everything else is $195,000. There is no excavation to be made in doing this work, as I am informed by my officers, the principal work being grading, raising or filling.

The total cost of the station and improvements will be $595,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is the statement which the hon. gentleman very frankly made before. I am informed by those who know the property that they have had an estimate made by an engineer, and that the cost of levelling that property would be at least $1,000,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not hear me. I read a detailed statement of every yard of excavation and every yard of land to be built, and the estimated cost of the building from my department, and the cost of work on all excavation, grading and building was within $195,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is therefore perfectly plain that the hon. gentleman does not propose to level the land, and everybody who knows the land knows it is on the hill side. We are bound to accept the hon. gentleman's statement that it can be expropriated for $400,000, and that the buildings can be put up for $179,000; but I have confined myself entirely to the question whether it is necessary to level the land, and I am told that if we do level it it will cost $1,000,000. I am told further that that estimate was made by the chief engineer himself.

Mr. HAGGART. It is the statement of the engineer of the department which I have. It does not require any levelling, but instead of that it requires filling. I have the plan here and hon. gentlemen can see for themselves.

Mr. KENNY. I should be as familiar with the property as my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). I have taken the trouble to inform myself on this matter, and I can tell my hon. friend that the Minister of Railways is perfectly correct in what he says. From the western side of the property as he has described it, he will not be able to get sufficient material to fill it on the eastern side. The hon. gentleman may have seen the property, but I doubt very much if he has critically examined it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not personally.

Mr. KENNY. I have done so, and I was much surprised myself to find when I examined the grades carefully that such is the case, and that one expense will be carrying material in order to secure a level properly. I may just say, as this matter has come up again, that when this question was mentioned in the House last year, I advised the then Minister of Railways, as I would advise the hon. gentleman who is in charge of the department to-day, not to accept the dictum of the city of Halifax, or anybody else who may be interested in any particular route: but let him satisfy himself when he is on the spot, and take the very best expert opinion in Canada. That is the suggestion I made to the hon. Minister of Railways in 1890, and as a representative in this House from Halifax, I have to express my surprise and regret that the Department of Railways has not informed itself accurately as to what was best to do in the interests of the Intercolonial Railway—I mean the interests of the Dominion of Canada. We cannot imagine that in the expenditure of Dominion money we are to be guided altogether by the advice of the citizens of Halifax, but when the city of Halifax heard that this property was likely to be required, and when it was explained to the city council that the Government would object to expropriate property, I understand that the city council made an offer to the Dominion Government that if this property was found suitable they would acquire it and give it to the Dominion Government for the sum of $400,000. That is the position in which the city council of Halifax stands in the conduct of these negotiations with the Dominion Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of course we all accept the statement of the Minister, as to the amount required for expropriation, and it would be very great presumption on my part to insist upon repeating the statements I made as to the probable cost of levelling this land in the face of the statement made by the hon. gentleman. I wish to call the attention of the Minister, and of his friends behind him, to this fact: That when they have acquired the land, and put buildings upon it at an expense of nearly $600,000, they will not have solved the problem at all. The complaint now is that the station is about a mile from the business centre of the city. If you acquire the land between Cornwallis street on the west and the railway station and south of Lockman street, you will only have moved the station a little further towards the business centre, and it will cost you just as much to convey freight to the station as it does now. I understand well the proposition made by the Board of Trade which was referred to by my hon. friend from Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Forbes), last year: that if you build a line and expropriate land along the end of the docks nearest the city, you can bring the terminus of the road up to the warehouses of the chief merchants. However, he was then answered by the leader of the House that the expropriation of that land would cost at least $2,000,000. That is one of the alternative propositions which the Minister suggests as before him, and I find from turning up *Hansard*, that the First Minister of the Crown in this House says that to expropriate the land alone for that scheme would cost $2,000,000. So that I suppose it is out of the question. I would ask the Minister of Railways what benefits are to be conferred on the citizens of Halifax by the expenditure of this $600,000. You only bring the terminus a very little nearer the business centre and a hackman will not charge a cent more to carry his load 100 or 500 yards further. I have listened to the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite and I failed to hear any arguments which justify the expenditure, even of the amount which the Minister of Railways says it will actually cost to extend the line to Cornwallis street. This House is entitled to be assured beyond reasonable doubt that the $600,000 expenditure will satisfy the people of Halifax, and bring the station as near to the business centre of the town as ever it will be required to build it. The leader of the House told us last year that to build the road along the docks would cost $2,000,000 for the land, and we were told also that it would be an impossibility to build it along Water street. If you adopt the third alternative as is now suggested by the Minister of Railways you are no better off than now. I submit to the House that for the purpose of merely expending this $600,000, unless you acquire all that is sought, it is a criminal expenditure. If you only want to acquire increase accommodation at the railway terminus you can do it, I suppose, at one-tenth of

the expense now suggested. The only object of buying these 18 acres is to build the railway station into the business centre of the town. That you are not going to do, and your wharves and warehouses, for all practical purposes after you have expended this large sum of money, will be as far from the station as they are now. The Minister is not justified in asking the House to vote this enormous sum of money unless he is able to assure us that its expenditure will bring about the advantages which the people of Halifax expect it will; and I have not heard from hon. gentlemen who represent Halifax that that will be accomplished.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. Minister of Railways will be exceedingly indebted to the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), if he will tell him how adequate railway facilities at Halifax can be acquired for the sum he estimates. I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman, if he were thoroughly familiar with the question, would not have made the contention that he has made here this evening. The hon. gentleman says that the only advantage that will accrue will be that the freight which now comes into Halifax, instead of being delivered at North street, will be delivered at Cornwallis street.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And *vice versa*, the freight that goes from Halifax.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman must pardon me for saying, what I think he ought to know, because it has been frequently discussed in his presence before, that all the freight that comes to Halifax from the western part of Nova Scotia, has to be trucked to the business part of Halifax, not from North street, but from Richmond; and an agreement was entered into between the Dominion Government and the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company that that company shall be furnished with the same facilities for handling its freight as the Intercolonial Railway possesses. The hon. gentleman is sufficiently familiar with the city of Halifax and its neighbourhood to know that there is a very great difference between the delivery and reception of freight at Richmond, and its delivery and reception at Cornwallis street or North street. When this question was first proposed to the Minister of Railways in 1887, the late Mr. Pope, he immediately admitted that more space and more storage room were necessary at Halifax; and I desire to point out to the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., who is so energetically opposing what he considers might be an advantage to Halifax, but that at North street the space is so limited and circumscribed that it is impossible properly to handle the freight which passes over the Intercolonial, and therefore the freight for the Windsor and Annapolis Railway cannot be handled there. The space at North street is all required for passenger traffic alone. I might remind the committee that the amount which the hon. Minister has placed in the Estimates this year is simply a revote. It has appeared in the Estimates every year since 1887, but it seems to be more energetically opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite this year than it has been in any preceding year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We are not opposing; we are seeking explanations.

Mr. KENNY. And the hon. gentleman undertakes to enlighten the committee on a matter in which, he will permit me to say, he cannot be personally well informed, because he does not pretend to say that he has ever examined the locality with the idea of expressing an opinion as to its adaptability to meet the railway emergency in the city of Halifax. I suggest to the Minister that if he is not prepared to make a definite proposal to the committee to-night he should tell us how soon it is his intention to examine the locality; and I would repeat to him what I said to his predecessor, that to me it seems to be in the public interest that the whole question should be examined dispassionately and impartially by the very best railway authorities in Canada. I understand that very recently two members of the Board of Trade of Halifax were here; and the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., has correctly stated that the members of the Board of Trade, whose opinion on all matters is entitled to respect, advocate the extension of the track along the water frontage. Well, when the representatives of that Board of Trade were here some three or four weeks ago they communicated with the Railway Department, I believe—I was not here at the time myself—and asked the Minister, without any conference or communication with me on the subject, to do exactly what I suggested to him, and what I suggested to his predecessor, should be done, that is, that before we spend any money we should get the very best expert evidence possible and then do what is best in order to secure proper railway facilities for the terminus of our railway. Let me tell hon. gentlemen now that last year when we had an unusual amount of grain passing over the road the facilities at Halifax were so inadequate that the whole railway system was congested. Every siding was filled with grain cars from Halifax to Moncton, and as a consequence the delay in loading ships was so great that the vessels of the Donaldson line which, during the summer months, run to Montreal, and the owners of which expressed their desire to load their ships at Halifax during the winter months, were so delayed, and the facilities for loading grain were so inadequate, that they were obliged to abandon Halifax and go to an American port. That is evidently to the detriment of Canadian trade and commerce and even to the prestige of Canada. We should be able at least to so manage our Intercolonial Railway and to have it so supplied with proper terminal facilities that we could ship from our own seaports the produce of our own country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The committee will notice how ingeniously and carefully my hon. friend avoided the point I tried to make. He pointed out that increased accommodation was necessary and would be obtained by this mode of purchasing the property between Cornwallis street and the station, at a cost of $600,000 or $700,000. But the hon. gentleman did not state that that would satisfy the demands of the business portion of the city, or that it would bring the station to the wharves or warehouses as the business portion of Halifax ask us to do. I suggested that the increased accommodation, if that is all you are going to get, can be obtained at a very much less expense than by purchasing eighteen and a-half acres.

Mr. KENNY. How?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not in a position to tell the hon. gentleman how it can be done. Does the hon. gentleman state that in his opinion it is necessary to purchase eighteen and a-half acres of land in the centre of the city in order to give the increased accommodation? He knows it is not: and let me just point out to him that the only instance he gave was this, that last year the enormous quantity of grain carried congested the road almost from Truro to Halifax. At what cost? He knows well that one of the chief sources of loss on the Intercolonial Railway last year was the foolish attempt to carry grain to Halifax from the Chaudière Junction in competition with the Grand Trunk Railway carrying it to Portland. Now it may be very well to carry grain on our own railways, but if I am correctly informed by the officials at Moncton, we carried grain last year at $12 or $13 a car load from Chaudière Junction to Halifax; and any man who knows anything about railways knows that is an absolutely ruinous rate. If the hon. gentleman is going to carry grain at a ruinous rate and then pay $600,000 besides to provide accommodation for it at the terminus, he is adopting a policy which will not commend itself to sensible business men. He knows that very well. I do not blame him in a sense for constituting himself the special representative of Halifax, but he ought to know that he represents a little more than one section of his own constituents, and I think, in a matter of this grave importance, we should discuss it not from a mere sectional standpoint alone, but from a general standpoint. I would like him to state whether he would advise the continuance of the policy of carrying grain from Chaudière Junction at those ruinous rates.

Mr. KENNY. I am sorry to have to speak so frequently this evening, but the hon. gentleman has undertaken charge of the representation of the city of Halifax and to lecture me on matters in which he must permit me to say I consider myself as well informed as he is. The hon. gentleman has told us that it is not necessary to make any expenditure in order to secure adequate railway facilities at Halifax, because that is the question which is under discussion. I have carefully abstained, not only to-night, but in years past, from expressing any positive opinion as to which mode is the best to adopt to secure these facilities, that is to say, whether we should acquire more property or try to secure a track along the water frontage, for this reason, that I do not possess the universal knowledge with which Providence has gifted my hon. friend and do not pose as a railway expert.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In relation to the extension of the track across the front of the wharves, I did not give any opinion of my own, but quoted the opinion of the Minister of Justice that the right of way along that track would cost $2,000,000.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman has a very Irish way of answering a question by usually putting another; and I always feel at a very great disadvantage, as an ordinary business man, in making a response to a gentleman so prominent in the legal profession as my hon. friend, whose special pleading is always most formidable. The hon. gentleman told us distinctly to-night that all that is necessary to secure adequate terminal arrangements at Halifax can be accomplished without the expenditure to which the Minister of Railways referred. The hon. gentleman says that he knows how it can be accomplished without spending the amount of money which the Minister of Railways tells us is necessary to the acquisition of the Cornwallis street property. If the hon. gentleman will tell us how it can be done for less money, I am quite sure that not only will the Minister of Railways, but all of us, because we are here as the guardians of the public treasury, and I recognize my duty in that respect without being told it by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., would be happy to adopt his suggestion. Therefore it is that I, not having any intuitive knowledge of railway matters, and not having any railway training, suggest to the Minister, as the expense involved is a large one, that he should be guided, not by what hon. gentlemen on this side or that side may say, but by what the best railway talent in Canada consider best to be done in the public interests.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Everybody must admire the facility with which the hon. gentleman evaded answering the simple question I put to him. He stated that the line is congested between Truro and Halifax because of the grain carried on the line to be shipped from Halifax; and I asked him whether he thought it desirable in the public interest that grain should be carried at the ruinous rate at which it is; and the committee must have seen that the hon. gentleman never attempted to grapple with that question at all. If the committee determine that it is desirable we should compete with the Grand Trunk Railway and carry grain at ruinous rates to Halifax, as we did last year, and pile up a deficit of a million dollars for the glory of carrying it, besides spending $600,000 extra as now proposed, well and good. But I suppose we are discussing this matter in a common sense way as business men. I do not profess to give any opinion beyond what appears on the surface that the thing cannot be continued. The hon. gentleman knows it cannot, and I challenge him to tell us that he would advise the Railway Department to continue it if we are to lose nearly $500,000 in the traffic besides this large expenditure of $600,000.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman puts so many questions that I cannot answer them all at once. I do not care to repeat what has been said in the House over and over again as regard competitive rates on grain and flour. It has been pointed out in this House before that the rate at which flour is carried from the western points in Ontario to the Maritime Provinces is a low rate, but hon. gentlemen will remember that it is a competitive rate, and that the Intercolonial Railway and its associate lines in the western part of Canada, be they the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway, carry that flour at a low rate, because otherwise it would go by the American railway system to Boston and thence by water. I say that it is in the interests of Canada that we should try to retain that traffic for our own railways. In the matter of grain the hon. gentleman has referred to me, and I will candidly tell him that whilst I have taken some pains to inform myself as to the rates on flour I am not familiar with the rates at which grain was carried last year or any previous year. But I do say this, as a Canadian, that in order to develop our own grain traffic, through our own territory it would be wise for us to make experi-

ments at a rate which would be to some extent unremunerative. I say that it will require time and energy to divert the export trade of Canada from foreign ports. We have to overcome the prejudices of a settled course of commerce, and all business men know that this is difficult of accomplishment. And it would be well for us to expend a certain amount in order to ship successfully from our own ports the grain produced in our own country. My hon. friend will remember that much of the grain which is shipped to Europe is shipped from points in the west, like Winnipeg, on direct bills of lading to the consignee, say in Liverpool, and that the shipper in Winnipeg who receives the order for the grain makes arrangements with some railway system to carry it from that point direct through by railway and steamer on a bill of lading to Europe. The hon. member for Queen's, I hope does not want to disparage the seaports of Canada, and he knows that they are nearer Europe than the American ports, and that on a through bill of lading, the steamer and the railway divide the freight, and it is well worth our while in the public interest of Canada to endeavour to carry out this experiment, even if it should at first involve some loss, and my hon. friend knows that it is a matter of time to overcome prejudices of trade and divert trade from other channels. I say it is worth our while to make the experiment even if it involved a loss.

Mr. GILLIES. When this subject was under discussion last year, I refrained from taking any part in it, in the first place because I was a young member of the House, and for the equally potent reason that the debate was confined at that time within much narrower limits than it has on this occasion assumed. I would now pursue the same course as I did then were I not reminded by the remarks of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) that we are sitting here as the guardians of the public treasury and that, when we are considering the expenditure of so many millions of dollars as the Intercolonial Railway has cost this country and the amount of money which it is costing annually, it behooves every member who can give an intelligent opinion upon the subject to express that opinion and to show why this should be put a stop to if possible. I may begin my remarks by saying that I am very much pleased with the tone this debate has maintained since its commencement. It shows the very excellent feeling that exists between the far east and the far west. I have every reason to congratulate the Minister of Railways for the manner in which he has set out on his ministerial mission by curtailing the expenses of this service, and I have no doubt, from the ability which that hon. gentleman possesses, that we will have the gratifying spectacle next year of meeting a much smaller deficit than confronts us on this occasion. I think I may be pardoned in saying that we have almost sickened and tired of the assertion which is so often made from some quarters that this railway has been built and is being maintained altogether in the interest of the Maritime Provinces. Any one who knows the political history of this country for the past 25 years will remember that, at the very inception of this scheme, the broad statement was made that the Intercolonial Railway was not to be constructed as a commercial adventure or to be maintained as a paying enterprise, but that it was to be a great bond of union to bind together the provinces on the east and those on the west. That road has been fulfilling that mission to a remarkable extent. Let us investigate this question for a few moments, and, by submitting it to the best analysis, to the test of an argumentative analysis, we will see that this road has been far more beneficial to the western people than to the people down by the sea. We have been told, and told with truth, that the coal carried from the eastern provinces has been carried at a commercial loss. That coal pays only $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) showed a few evenings ago that during the years 1889 and 1890 the quantity of coal carried over the road amounted to 294,879 tons dead weight. I have investigated the correctness of the figures and I find them to be substantially as quoted by the hon. member. That quantity passed west of Chaudière Junction and was carried at three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile. Let us see what quantity of products of the western provinces found their way to the sea, either for consumption in the Maritime Provinces or for the purpose of transatlantic transportation. If the products from the east to the west were carried at a less rate than these from the west to the east, then the Upper Provinces are suffering. But we find that the western products were carried at still lower rates than the coal was carried. During the years mentioned, 1889 and 1890, there were 2,129,169 barrels of flour carried at a little less than three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile, so that was less than the rate at which coal was carried. During the same period we find that the quantity of 5,501,303 bushels of grain were carried at the rate of two-tenths of a cent per ton per mile, or one-tenth of a cent per ton per mile less than was paid for coal. Therefore it is plain, and clear, and palpable, that the advantage was altogether in favour of the western producer. The great loss on the carriage on the Intercolonial Railway was on the quantity of dead freight carried. What do we find against the 294,789 tons of coal? We find 330,444 tons of these two products alone, grain and flour, or 35,655 tons in favour of the western producer over the eastern man. Now, on the question of values what do we find? Our coal, at the rate of $1.75 per ton, was carried to the value of something like $520,000. Flour at the rate of $4.20 per barrel, and grain at 50 cents a bushel were carried over that road, aggregating in value $11,779,529: nearly 21 to 1; that is, we sent you $520,000 worth from east to west, and you sent down to us $11,799,529 worth, or a difference in your favour of $11,279,529. I think this fact shows clearly that the trade is largely in favour of the western producer, and that, therefore, the Intercolonial Railway is not operated altogether in the interests of the people of the Lower Provinces. Take our West Indian exports, which are now in their infancy, and what do we find? I find from the Trade and Navigation Returns, made up to the end of June last, that the people of Ontario sent down to Halifax and St. John, to be transhipped to West India ports, peas alone to the value of $22,953, and other grains to the value of $66,347, and this trade, it is to be remembered, is but in its early stages. How could these goods find their way to the West India ports through Canada without the Intercolonial Railway? We would be at the mercy of our commercially capricious southern

neighbour, a position I trust that both sides of this House would have us widely shun. If the road is carrying freight at a non-paying rate, and if that freight, principally, comes from Western Canada, is it not, therefore, ungenerous for any hon. gentleman from the upper provinces to say that this road is being operated entirely to the advantage of maritime men? Then there is another point that must not be overlooked. That road is not altogether within the Maritime Provinces; a large portion of it runs through the great contiguous Province of Quebec. Leaving aside the Prince Edward Island division, which does not properly belong to the system, we find that the trunk line of the Intercolonial Railway from Lévis to its eastern extremity, is 1,145 miles long. It is comprised of these three divisions: the Quebec division is 322 miles; the Nova Scotia division, 455 miles; and the New Brunswick division, 368 miles. Therefore one-third of the whole trunk system is in the Province of Quebec, which is another answer to the assertion that the Intercolonial Railway is run, maintained and operated in the interest of the Maritime Provinces. There is another point to which I wish to draw the attention of this honourable House. There is a vast and growing expenditure made upon canals in the Province of Ontario, and I, as a member of this House, am very glad to see it, and I always have been ready to raise my voice to further any measure towards deepening the great waterways that are to bear upon their bosoms the barges that will carry your products down to us by the sea, and return with an unbroken cargo from our shores below to your fertile fields above. Now, we find that since Confederation the sum of $50,000,000 has been spent upon your canals, and it is the intention, the laudable intention, of this Government to deepen those canals to the extent of 14 feet. Last year the large amount of $3,251,871 was spent exclusively for the purpose of deepening and enlarging the canals of Ontario and Quebec; not one dollar of that was spent in the Maritime Provinces. Then we find that a sum of $2,460,000 is appropriated for that same purpose this year, and so you are continuing from year to year to deepen the canals until they will enable vessels to leave your ports and come down to ours, and *vice versa*. The question of the deficit in the management of the road was very ably and lucidly dealt with the other evening by my hon. friend the junior member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald). He showed in a conclusive manner that if the book-keeping in connection with the Intercolonial Railway system was kept in the same manner as it is upon railways operated by companies, instead of there being a deficit a surplus would be shown every year. He backed up his contentions by the reports made by the present manager, Mr. Schreiber, and the late manager, Mr. Brydges. Mr. Brydges, I think, may justly and correctly be reckoned as a railway expert as his experience was great both in England and in this country. He was manager of the Grand Trunk Railway for several years before he came into the employ of the Government, and his experience would warrant him in speaking with a great deal of accuracy and would entitle his opinion to a great deal of weight. I will not read at length from his report made in 1878, but he stated in effect that the permanent repairs then made to the Intercolonial Railway amounted to $105,000, and this sum, instead of being charged to capital account, as it would have been on any railway operated by a corporation, was charged to revenue account, and consequently the deficit appeared that much greater than it would have appeared if the books had been kept in the manner I have suggested. Mr. Pottinger reported in 1885 that $41,402 had been expended in a manner that would entitle it to be charged to capital account, but it was charged to revenue. That, of course, left the deficit that much greater. Mr. Pottinger in 1886 made another report, in which he reported that the large sum of $115,000 had been expended in permanent ways and betterments, which instead of being charged to revenue account, should have been charged to capital. This sum was made up of the following items: New sidings, $14,000; new buildings, $7,000; new fences, $8,000; increased water supply, $20,000; new iron bridges, $6,000; improvement to permanent way, rails and ties, $37,000; improvements to locomotives and cars, $20,000. The committee will observe that each one of these items have been charged improperly as repairs, with the exception probably of improvements to locomotives and cars: at all events, Mr. Pottinger, who is an able, energetic, experienced and conscientious officer, said that under the ordinary mode of keeping railway accounts, this amount would have been charged to capital and not to revenue. The deficit accordingly was that much larger. The last report available was made in 1890, and that shows a large outlay made for the construction of iron bridges to replace the old wooden ones. During that year some twenty wooden bridges were torn down and replaced by iron structures. I fail to see why an item of that kind should be charged to revenue account and not to capital. Therefore it is, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald) showed very clearly the other evening, that the deficit on this road is made to appear greater than it has any right to year by year. However, these deficits, we hope, are of the past. The present Minister of Railways has laid down two items in which a saving of $513,000 will be effected without impairing in the slightest degree the efficiency of the road. He has informed us that the new train service will show a reduction of 780,000 miles, which will give an immediate saving of $418,000, and the discharged hands will save $95,000, or a total of $513,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There must have been a fearful amount of extravagance in the past.

Mr. GILLIES. Nothing of the sort appears. There was an unnecessary train service of 780,000 miles. This certainly must have been the case as the service is not to be impaired under the new arrangement. I desire in passing to say a word as to the discharged hands. There will perhaps be sore spots on some hon. gentlemen in consequence of those hands being discharged, and it may be contended that it will be a hardship, and it is well known that nothing appeals more forcibly to the feelings like a statement of that kind. I can say here unhesitatingly that if it is necessary to discharge those hands, if we can dispense with their services without impairing the efficiency of the road, they should go; and in that respect the Minister of Railways will no doubt exercise his judgment in directing that the parties who should be removed should be those who will suffer the least. Certainly I would rid the service of every single man who has not enough work to do.

Drones and idlers should have no abiding place in the Government service, and should be made to travel. I desire to offer a few remarks in connection with the item immediately before us. I am very sorry indeed to have to differ in the slightest degree with my ever watchful and excellent friends from Halifax. If it was not that we were reminded by the senior member from the metropolitan county of my province, I certainly would not refer to this matter, but he has contended, and contended properly, that we are guardians of the public purse, and I would therefore be doing myself injustice if I failed to draw, in the most cogent manner, the attention of the committee to this very large item. The Minister of Railways has made it clear that Halifax has very munificently made an offer to give the site for increased facilities for $400,000, the assessed value being $50,000 more. Track-laying, &c, on that extension will cost $179,000 more, or a total of $579,000. Much as I would like to see Halifax progress and have all the railway facilities that her able representatives could ask, still I must object in the most emphatic and unqualified manner against the expenditure of $400,000 on the purchase of that site. When I have given my reasons, I think the committee will concur that I am correct. The city of Halifax has been pretty well looked after as regards railway matters. The road originally was built to Richmond station. The people then clamoured for an extension into the city and beleaguered every Government from Confederation down, until the late Mackenzie Government built the road from Richmond to North street, and constructed the depot that exists there to-day. But Halifax is not yet content. It wants something more. It kept knocking at the treasury door until it got an elevator there costing $110,000. They were not yet content, and they wanted a deep-water terminus. They got it, and as the Minister of Railways stated to-night, and I am sure he was not excessive in the amount, $900,000 have been expended in Halifax in giving its people what they call increased railway facilities, from 1876 to the present time. If the people require additional railway facilities, the least we can expect from them is to place the site at the disposal of the Government. And why? When the Government in its wisdom and in its justice decided to extend the Intercolonial Railway through the Island of Cape Breton, they erected a terminus at Sydney Harbour at a point known as Fresh Water Creek. The people of the town became anxious, and they said they wanted a deep-water terminus at what is known as Barrack Point. The department, however, took high ground with the town of Sydney, and said: If you want the road extended to that point, or if you want any further railway facilities, you have got to pay for the right of way. We did so, we did not come begging here and knocking at the doors of the treasury for help. We paid for these facilities ourselves and we have got them now. But Halifax, the great, wealthy city of Halifax, approaches the Government and says: Buy from us our land for our further railway terminal facilities, and for that land pay us $400,000, and upon this land expend the further sum of $179,000. Don't ask the city of Halifax to give an inch of land, let it be all done out of the public exchequer. I am not saying this in a carping spirit at all; far from it, because I like Halifax and I like the people of Halifax, but I do say it ill-becomes Halifax to say: True, you have given us an elevator, true, you have given us a deep-water terminus, true, you have extended the road to the city and paid for the right of way, but we want a further frontage of 18 acres, for which we want you to pay $400,000. I think that is asking too much. All this has been done for Halifax to make it an ocean terminus, and it is yet as far off from that as it was when this world began. Sir, commerce is like rivers, it will force itself towards the sea by the easiest route that will afford the swiftest course, and Halifax is not the point that the river of commerce of this Dominion will seek the ocean. That point is further east and that point is Louisburg, in Cape Breton, to which a railway *via* St. Peter's will be built. An early day will verify this statement. I will not detain the committee further than to say that I do hope, and I have every confidence, that the predictions of the Minister of Railways will be fully realized. I trust that he will exercise that business caution that I know he so fully possesses, and that he will keep his hands pretty tight on the public purse, before he will give one dollar towards the buying of a site on a rocky hill at Halifax, with our money to the tune of $400,000.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not wish to intervene in this discussion, but I would like to call attention to a report which is current to-day in connection with the Intercolonial Railway and which perhaps is of a great deal of importance. I have listened with considerable pleasure to the facts and figures which have been presented to the House by gentlemen on both sides, but I do not think if we were to discuss them even for the next month, that they would establish that the Intercolonial Railway is a paying institution. The fact remains that there is a deficit of $750,000 annually, and this large deficit is a matter for the very serious consideration of the members of this House, it matters not from what part of Canada they may come. Of course, as the hon. gentleman who last just resumed his seat, and who has spoken admirably upon this subject, has pointed out, nobody denies the advantages of the Intercolonial Railway. It is an institution which certainly has proved of great benefit not only to the Maritime Provinces, but to that portion of the Province of Quebec through which it passes. It is a benefit to the towns which are on the line of this road, and it must also be a benefit to the Province of Ontario whose flour it carries to the east. Still the fact remains that there is an annual deficit of $750,000 on its working. The proposition to which I wish to call the attention of the Minister and of the House, is one which it appears will remove this deficit, and I take it from a ministerial organ published this morning in the city of Montreal, *La Minerve*, whose editor is, I believe, the Hon. Senator Tassé, who agrees entirely with the views of the Government in all the branches of its policy, publishes this morning, the following, not as a mere report but as a leading editorial. It says:

"OVER LAND AND SEA.

"Rapid service a saving of $1,300,000. The operating of the Intercolonial Railway brings about an annual deficit of about $750,000. This is enormous. On the other hand everybody admits the importance of having a more rapid service for the carrying of the mails and passengers across the Atlantic. The Government has

even offered with this object in view an annual subsidy of $750,000 without having been able as yet to find a company willing to accept the offer. This double service would therefore represent an expenditure of $1,500,000. If we are rightly informed, and we will believe that we are, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would be disposed to undertake the running of the Intercolonial Railway and of a line of fast steamers across the Atlantic in consideration of the sum of $200,000 per annum. This would constitute a saving of $1,300,000 a year, which would be considerable for our treasury. Moreover, the company would bind itself to give full satisfaction to Halifax and St. John as the permanent transatlantic points in winter and to Quebec in summer. From Quebec a special train just as is the case from Havre to Paris would carry the passengers to Montreal. We have always maintained that the Pacific Railway would never be complete until it had upon the Atlantic a service as direct and as rapid as that on the Pacific ocean. This line is destined to become over land and sea the great means of communication between Europe, Asia, America and Oceania. The Pacific has obtained for us up to the present such a wonderful service that we are disposed to accord to it our fullest confidence in its gigantic undertakings as long as it should prove to be Canada's most powerful factor for progress and future grandeur."

This is an editorial appearing in *La Minerve* of this morning, and as I have said, this paper is the ministerial organ supposed to represent in the District of Montreal the views of the Government, and having as its editor one, who to-day, and during the past, is well known to voice sentiments entirely in sympathy, I believe, with leading members of the Government. It will be of interest no doubt to members from the Maritime Provinces, as it will be of interest to members from every portion of the country to know what truth there may be in this proposition, which according to *La Minerve* is well founded. I therefore ask the Minister of Railways if we can add faith to the statements I have just read, which seem to come from a high source, and which apparently are well founded.

Mr. HAGGART. My attention was drawn to the article to-day. It is the only thing I have ever heard on the subject from the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other.

Mr. FORBES. I trust that the article just read by the hon. member for Ottawa County will have no weight with the Minister of Railways, because the very moment we put the Intercolonial Railway in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we destroy competition, and up go the rates against the Maritime Provinces, and we are then in a hot box. We are sufficiently subjected to the power of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at present without letting them put their fingers around our throats and clasp them on the other side. Now, I would like to make a few remarks in answer to those made by the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) on the question of the advantages of the several schemes which have been proposed for the further extension of railway facilities in the city of Halifax. That hon. member as well as the hon. Minister of Railways well knows that there are at least three schemes proposed. They were spoken about last year in this House, and they have been before the Government for some time. At any rate, two of them have been, and the third is about to be brought to such a stage of development that it will shortly be put before the Minister with all its details; and I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that it will command the confidence of every commercial man, and I believe also the confidence of the Minister of Railways and his engineers. I would, therefore, ask the Minister to delay the voting of this appropriation as a consummation of the carrying out of the scheme proposed of extending the line from North street to Lockman street. The hon. senior member for Halifax has not, I think, spoken fairly on this question, if he will allow me to say so. His skill in debating has enabled him to avoid placing himself on record as either favourable to or opposed to either of these schemes. I commend his discretion in that respect, as the question is specially one of engineering difficulties to be overcome: but the hon. gentleman should have said so. The excavation from North street to Lockman street will I think cost far more than the hon. Minister has stated. If it is intended, as the plan shows, to cut a canal for the extension of the line which will only give enough space for the track, why should it be necessary to purchase the lands lying on each side of that canal? Without being excavated, they will be useless for warehouse purposes, and if it is intended to excavate the solid rock of which they are composed, the expenditure will go far above what the Minister told us, and reach close to the amount mentioned by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). It has been estimated roughly that the cost will reach nearly a million dollars, if the land is excavated to the same level as the railway at the station. It has not been explained to us in detail how much it is intended to excavate, and therefore the hon. Minister should tell us a little more fully what extent of sheds or of increased accommodation will be given. There is no doubt about the cramped nature of the accommodation at present existing in the city of Halifax. The citizens of that city must be accommodated with better railway terminal facilities.

Mr. KENNY. The railway must be accommodated.

Mr. FORBES. No, the railway is only a means of accommodation to the people. It is not an ornament; it is put there for the use of the people, just as all other traffic facilities are. Now, some of the Atlantic cities in the United States have adopted systems of belt lines which, in many cases, skirt the lowest street bordering on a harbour, next the wharves.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The city does that.

Mr. FORBES. Whether the city puts down the tracks or not, I am not prepared to say; but it permits the laying of the tracks for the purpose of carrying freight and passengers to and from the outskirts of the city; and it is a simple plan to carry freight over these tracks, either upon trucks drawn by steam or other motive power. In Halifax it is intended to make the connection at North street by carrying the line down Water street, over which the city has already given the right of way. Freight can be carried at 25 cents per ton, and delivered to citizens at the heads of the wharves and at the various depots along that route. A rate of 40 cents per ton is charged in other cities. This would be of great advantage to the city of Halifax. If the Government will grant a bonus by way of guarantee, on a certain fund for the equipment of this line, they can be recouped from the charges against the consignees and the shippers of freight equivalent to 25 cents a ton; so that there will be no loss to the Government from this scheme, and it will be of immense advantage to the citizens of Halifax and to the shippers and receivers of freight. Over

300,000 tons of freight is received and discharged at the North street depot. While I am not prepared to go as far as the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) has gone in denouncing the scheme under consideration, I do say that it is positively wrong for this Government to put themselves on record at this initiatory stage of the matter as being decidedly and positively pledged to one method of accommodation as against another. I was very sorry, indeed, to hear the hon. member for Richmond offset the loss upon the Intercolonial Railway by the loss upon the canals. That idea, I had hoped, was long exploded. I do not, as a Maritime member, for one moment blame the canal system because there is a loss upon it, and I do not want any member from the west to blame the Intercolonial as a railroad because the receipts do not equal the expenditures; because both are national undertakings. If the railway is extravagantly managed, and not carried on in a business-like way, it is the duty of the Opposition and the duty of all the Maritime members to point out the difficulties to the Government, and ask them to correct them, instead of attempting to justify the extravagance that prevails. For instance, I do not think any member is justified in saying that it would be right to charge more to capital account than is done at present with the view of reducing the discrepancy between revenue and expenditure, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald) and the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) attempted to do. To do that would be to show a false balance sheet. The money comes out of the country whether it is charged to revenue or to capital account; and to do as proposed would only be to cover the thing so that the public could not analyse the accounts. It is a dishonest way of handling the machinery of the finance department of the railway. I say that they should take the thing in a proper light and put that railway out of the control of the party management of the Government. That is the only way it can be run. We have had it asserted that the Canadian Pacific Railway will run it if the Government will give them $200,000 a year of a subsidy, which would make a saving of $300,000 at least to the people of Canada; but I denounce that proposition *in toto*. That shows however that the Canadian Pacific Railway, as a commercial company, are able to see that there is a screw loose somewhere in the management of the road, and that it can be run on commercial principles so as to make the two ends meet. Four schemes were laid down by the junior member for St. Johns. He suggested first that the management at Ottawa should remain as it is and that the pruning knife should be applied.

Mr. HAZEN. I did not propose those schemes. I said they were possible policies which might be adopted.

Mr. FORBES. He said they were schemes that might be adopted, and I am not prepared to say that he committed himself to any one of them. Of the four possible schemes he suggested, the first was that the road should be still managed at Ottawa but the pruning knife should be applied and no doubt in that way the object we are aiming at could be partially secured. His second suggestion was to hand it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway. That scheme I denounce. His third suggestion was to put that road under the management of a commission with headquarters at a point on the road, and his fourth suggestion that it might be continued as at present, with the exception that the manager should have his headquarters say at Moncton. The third and fourth amount practically to the same thing. It is practically the same suggestion whether the road shall be under a commission appointed by the Government consisting of several parties or whether it should be under the control of one manager with headquarters at a midway point. The last scheme suggested is the most feasible, and I trust it is one which will be accepted, viz., that the road should be put under the management of a competent man hedged in by legislation, such as the Auditor General is bound by, and responsible to no one but Parliament, and that the manager should be held responsible and be put under heavy bonds. A handsome salary should be paid him, and I do not hesitate to say that in twelve months the road would be found to yield a fair return instead of a deficit, or at least cost us much less than it does at present. As far as regards the vote before the House to grant $152,000 for the expropriation of lands in the city of Halifax, I would further suggest to the Government that they should employ a competent man to visit the scene in Halifax, a man able not only to judge localities as to what would be of most advantage temporarily to the city but also what would be most advantageous by way of shipments from and receipts by the city of Halifax. We would require a really competent man, conversant with railway traffic, such a man as we have very few of in the Dominion to-day. A man like that could go there and in a very short time give an unbiassed opinion as to the several routes proposed to the Government, and I believe that the citizens of Halifax would stand by his report, whatever it might be, if the Government and the members of the city would do the same. I know that the proposers of the several schemes ask that that should be done. At any rate, I know that the proposer of one of the schemes is desirous that that should be done, and I hope if this vote is intended to pledge the Government to any one course, the House will not allow it to pass but let it stand before we allow this House to be so pledged. Another suggestion made by the junior member for St. John is that the Intercolonial Railway should buy up the branch lines in the Maritime Provinces and put all these lines under one management. That, I declare, would not be at all to the general advantage of Canada. If these local railways are paying to-day and have every possible connection with the Intercolonial Railway system of Canada, their profits belong for the most part to the shareholders of these companies, and it is but right they should keep those profits which otherwise would be sunk in the general deficit of the Intercolonial Railway. Before the Government undertake to spend another dollar in buying up branch lines, which I would not call a scheme to obtain security or value for lines that have been built by private means, the Government should first of all look to the extension of railway facilities to the non railway counties of the Maritime Provinces. There are counties in these provinces to-day entitled to railway connection with the system of the Dominion; and before the Government undertake to assist any one of

these local companies, now burdened with non-paying local lines connected with the Intercolonial Railway, it should first of all spend public money in opening up those counties which have no railway facilities. I was sorry to see the junior member for St. John make such a suggestion, because he thereby deliberately weakened the whole of his argument. It showed that in the suggestion from Maritime members of the conservative type to help the Intercolonial Railway out of its difficulties, there was a dark cloud—I will not say a nigger on the fence. It showed there was a matter they desired to place to the front when the opportunity presented itself, and there must be some lame railway ducks floating around the Province of New Brunswick, as otherwise I do not see why they should ask the Government to help the Intercolonial Railway out of the hole in which it is, and, in the next breath, ask the Government to liberate parties by acquiring their rights. It has been conclusively shown to the House, from returns, that the rates from the railway are non-paying, and I may say, from the information I have gathered in localities through which that railway runs, a good deal of injustice is felt. For instance, the local cattlemen cannot get partial car loads of cattle from the west as cheaply as those who ship whole car loads, and this tends to injure the interests of the local shippers of the Maritime Provinces. I am further told that the rates west to east are far below the rates charged on some goods from east to west on that line. Therefore, it is in the interests of the Maritime Provinces that the running expenses of the Intercolonial Railway should be reduced to such an extent that the road will commend itself to every citizen of Canada. You must have that road running as long as the Canadian Pacific Railway is allowed to run to American seaports, and we must have it give the best service the trade of the country requires. Therefore it is I trust that the Minister of Railways will see his way clear to such a solution of the difficult problem in a business-like way, not hampered by the suggestions made to him by his friends on the other side.

Mr. WELDON. I took occasion some weeks ago, in answering a question put to me by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) to say that later in the session I should think it my duty to address an argument to the House in the line of the argument which I made last session in favour of putting the Intercolonial Railway in the charge of a non-political commission. Since then, disclosures have been made in this House which indicate that the object which I desired to secure, and which I thought could only be secured by that commission, has been put before us by the Minister of Railways in a different shape, because he has declared his determination to take hold of that road with a firm hand and to do all that he can, if not to efface, at least to reduce the deficit. I feel bound as a member supporting this Administration, to say, that, while personally I have not the confidence that the Minister has, and the Government have, and the members on this side of the House who have spoken have, in the success of that policy, still I will, in my humble way, give my support as a county member to that policy, and no one will be more pleased than I will if I am disappointed in what I fear will happen, namely, that political pressure on the Government in connection with the railway will be found to be strong, and that some of the abuses will still be found to exist which have existed since this road was completed in 1876. In other words, if the Minister finds, or if Parliament finds, after two or three years' experience, that the experiment is not a success, then I will have a right to ask the House to listen to me, if I am here at that time in pressing my view again upon the House. I have read the report of one of the commissioners in the Australian colonies, and I am very much impressed with the record that these non-political commissions have made in Australia—more impressed with them now than I was a year ago. The record in New South Wales, as shown in the report of the commissioner, is a record of greater economy and vigour in the service. I make no comparison between our railway system and theirs, but I do make a comparison between our political system and theirs. They are a British people and their government is operating a railway. We are a British people and our government is operating a railway. Here the electors put pressure on the members in regard to the operation of that railway and there the electors put pressure on the members in the same way. Though I am not an old member of Parliament, I have been a member long enough to know, and before I was elected I have seen enough of the management of that railway under one party and the other to make me fear that we cannot accomplish all that we desire under the present system. At the same time, as I have said, I feel bound to give a loyal support to the Minister in his endeavour to do what we all desire to have done in connection with this railway. My attention was called to the leading article in *La Minerve* to which two hon. gentlemen opposite have referred. I hope strongly that the Administration and the House will be very slow to look with favour on any such project as that, and that this country will retain control of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. DICKEY. I wish to make a few observations on only one point. I wish to say one or two words in regard to the tariff upon coal which has been referred to several times during the debate, and to remove, if I possibly can, an impression which I feel is pretty general in the House, that this coal is carried at a losing rate. I say frankly for myself that, after a careful and impartial consideration of that question, I am satisfied that the Intercolonial Railway ought not at any rate to lose any money in carrying coal at the rate it does at present. I am perfectly conscious that in saying this I have to face the reports of the Chief Engineer of Railways. It is distinctly stated in more than one report that the country is carrying the coal at a loss, but still I feel that this coal has not been carried at a loss. There are several statements in these reports alleging that this carriage of coal is one of the chief causes for the deficits on the Intercolonial Railway, and it is stated that, when the amount of coal carried is less in any year, then the deficit is also reduced. That cannot be verified as it seems to me in any way whatever. Take the coal carried to Chaudière from year to year, and I venture to say that no hon. gentleman can discover any relation whatever between these two factors. The amount of coal carried may go up and the deficit may go down or both may go down. In the year 1885, 112,000 tons of coal were carried to the Chaudière.

In that year the railway earned $10,000, so that did not produce a deficit. In 1887, the carriage of coal increased 43 per cent and the deficit increased 700 per cent. That shows that other important factors are at work besides these two, and there is no relation at all between these two factors. If anything was needed more than another to show this, it is the fact that last year the carriage of coal decreased by over 16,000 tons, and we all know the enormous increase in the deficit during that year. I say this because my county, in common with other coal counties in the Province of Nova Scotia, is particularly interested in this rate, and I feel, without saying for an instant that an unfair feeling is entertained on the part of the management of the Intercolonial Railway towards this coal traffic, still the management has looked upon this as a prominent feature in connection with the deficit and has, I think, been too quick to seize the first thing that came to their hands and to lay the burden of the deficit upon this particular trade. I think I have shown that there is no constant relationship between the coal traffic and the deficit. The Minister of Railways himself mentions the coal traffic as only one of a number of causes, and it is quite clear from his statement that one of the chief causes of the deficit has been the excessive train service on the road. I wish to make just one remark more with regard to this coal rate. The returns in the railway report give us the cost of carrying freight per ton mile, and I say it is fair to take that cost and deduce from it what is the effect of this coal business on the road. I am well aware that the cost of no particular class of freight on a road can be told, even by railway managers. I know perfectly well that roads whose accounts are kept in the best way cannot tell the cost of any particular class of freight; but we can get at the average cost of freight, and that we have in the returns. When you come to consider the cost of a particular freight, you must in fairness, eliminate from that the fixed charges of the road. You have your road there, you must keep it in order, and you must keep your stations running, you must keep all your permanent staff, whether you carry 50,000 tons or 150,000 tons; and if you can increase your traffic from 50,000 to 150,000 tons, your permanent expenses will not be a dollar greater—that is admitted on all hands. In order to fortify myself on that point, I will read from a very high authority, which is sound common sense and business-like as well. I will cite from Hadley on Railway Transportation, page 112, where he says:

"A good deal of freight is carried not merely at less than the average rates, but at less than the average cost, that is at rates which if applied to the whole business of the road would not pay. Many persons assume that this business is a loss to the road * * * This is a fallacy * * * If a manager should reject such business because it did not pay its share of the fixed charges (as distinct from train expresses) he would make a great mistake. He would reduce the business and leave those charges the same * * * If our railways made it a rule not to carry at less than the average cost of doing the whole business they would give up nearly all the coal trade and a great deal of the grain trade."

That is the statement of a standard authority upon railway transportation, and in view of that I feel myself safe, when making this calculation, in eliminating the fixed charges given in the railway report. The railway report gives as the average cost of carrying all the trains on the Intercolonial Railway, 68 cents per mile. I will not give the mills because it is not worth while. Of that cost 29 cents is for permanent fixed charges, maintenance of railway stations expenses and general charges. That leaves 39 cents per train mile to do all the business of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, it is 557 miles from Spring Hill Junction to Chaudière. An average locomotive on the Intercolonial Railway will haul 225 tons of coal in a train load; it ought to haul more, but I will put it at the lowest. That train load of 225 tons pays the Intercolonial in freight, $376. This $376 will pay the way of that train up to Chaudière, which costs $217, leaving $157 to bring the empty cars back to Spring Hill Junction. That gives more than two-thirds of the average cost per train mile, and it costs less than two-thirds to bring back the empty cars. Now, I submit that there must be business there for these return cars to do, and I will say this, that if I have one fault to find with the management of the Intercolonial Railway it is that the empty cars coming down have not been able to find at least some business that could be done at some rate, no matter whether it would be a paying rate or not, something that would enable them to get some returns for these empty cars. But even assuming there was not a pound of freight for that train to bring from Chaudière back to Spring Hill Junction, at the average cost of running a train on the Intercolonial Railway, if this train takes 270 tons of coal, it will pay the Intercolonial Railway $445, which would pay the average train cost both ways and leave a profit. So that if the Intercolonial Railway takes this coal in the quantity that it should, 270 to 300 tons per train, that business can be done on the average expense of freight on the road and make a profit. Now, there is one other feature of this question that must be taken into consideration. I have taken the average rate of hauling trains; that includes the fast expresses. It costs three times as much to run a fast express as it costs to run a train freighted with coal. The ordinary express costs 50 per cent more, so that I am taking the cheapest class of train, and applying to it the average prices of the whole, calculating the expenses of expresses, which we know are very expensive. I believe it costs 80 cents a mile to run an express. I am letting that go into the average, and still this coal traffic pays enough to pay expenses. So that I cannot accept the statement of these reports: I believe that it is a hasty statement, made without due consideration, because I am in a position to state upon the best railway authority I have been able to find in the library, that it is guesswork at the best, because it is admitted that no railway manager can put his hands upon a class of freight and say that it costs so much per ton. It is impossible to figure that closely, and using my own judgment upon general averages, so far as I have been able to calculate the general facts, I am satisfied there should be no actual loss in the carriage of that coal to Chaudière. I am quite ready to say that I do not wish to see any loss incurred in the carriage of coal, I do not wish it to be carried at a loss at all.

Mr. McGREGOR. Has the hon. member taken into consideration the snow difficulties?

Mr. DICKEY. I am taking into consideration the average cost of operating the Intercolonial

Railway, which includes the snow difficulty the year round. Now, I have shown, I think, here last year, that, as a matter of fact, coal is carried on this continent cheaper than the Intercolonial Railway is carrying it ; that the Canadian Pacific Railway is willing to carry this coal cheaper, that the Grand Trunk Railway carries coal for its fuel department cheaper, and that lines in the States carry it cheaper. Now, merely confining myself to the question whether this coal traffic is carried at a loss, I think that the proposition can be fully sustained that it is not carried at a loss. When it comes to a question of dealing with this coal rate, I think it is fair for the Minister of Railways to remember, and for the House to remember, and I believe from the temper in which this matter has been discussed that the House will remember, that this has been a tariff rate standing for a number of years ; that contracts for the delivery of coal in Quebec have been signed and closed on the basis of this rate for the coming season, and that to make a change now, at the beginning of the season with these contracts made, would be a course of action that I believe any company would be very slow in adopting, and one which the Government should be still slower to adopt. For these reasons, I hope that nothing said in this debate will influence the Minister of Railways to consider the question favourably of suddenly raising the coal rate at the present time. I do not pretend to-night to have discussed this question at any length or considered more than one side of it, whether this coal rate is an absolutely losing rate. I confined myself to that branch because the other aspects were fully dealt with in the discussion last night.

Mr. HAGGART. The question of increasing or reducing the coal rates I have not considered. I desire, however, to offer a few remarks in regard to the cost of carrying coal over the Intercolonial Railway. The distance from Spring Hill to Chaudière is 557 miles. At the rate of three-tenths of a cent per mile, that would be for a car load of ten tons, going 334 miles, $16 per car. The distance is 634 miles from Chaudière Junction to Halifax, which at two-tenths of a cent per mile would be $12.50 per car load. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) said we had under the circumstances to maintain the stations and the running of the line. The hon. gentleman has left out the cost of repairs and maintenance of the road, which is considerable. He has not taken into consideration the cost of running the line in winter, due to snow. I am informed that for every ten coal cars from Spring Hill to Chaudière Junction in winter two locomotives are required.

Mr. DICKEY. With regard to maintenance of way I did leave that out deliberately, because I consider it a permanent charge, which would not be appreciably affected by the fact as to whether three or four trains ran over the road. The section men are there and have their regular routine work to do, and this is considered a fixed charge on American lines, and according to every book I have been able to read on the subject. The snow has to be cleared from the road, and, unless it is proposed to close the road, I cannot see why any part of this sum should be charged against the coal traffic.

Mr. McGREGOR. It should pay its proportion.

Mr. DICKEY. The Intercolonial Railway keeps snow ploughs running constantly to clear the track for the express trains, and the passage of coal trains will be of service in keeping the line clear. I know that in winter there is a worse rail and the expenses are larger. Taking an average freight rate on the whole business of the road, including the expense of keeping the snow clear, I contend that the coal traffic is not carried at a losing rate.

Mr. FLINT. It is a little unfortunate, perhaps' that this discussion should range over such a wide extent of territory, and if the items were differently arranged we could discuss each one more clearly. After listening to the long and very interesting discussion which has taken place on the whole question of the Intercolonial Railway and public interests affected, we seem this evening to have mainly exercised our thoughts upon one or two points, apart from the general bearing of the financial question. In the first place, we have had much discussion on both sides as to the proposed extension in Halifax, an expenditure which may be called for at a very early period. It must be gratifying to the Minister in charge of the department that the discussion appears to have taken a very non-partisan range, and although the advisability of the expenditure is questioned on this side of the House, yet, perhaps, the strongest attack on it has come from an hon. gentleman who supports the Government on almost all other questions. I have been impressed by the argument made by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) and I think there is considerable force in what he has stated, because I reflect that not only are the interests of Halifax concerned in a proper arrangement of the terminal facilities at that port. The Western Counties Railway is largely interested in having adequate terminal facilities at Halifax. The Windsor and Annapolis Railway is also interested, and when I speak of these railways I speak of all the counties through which these roads run and the people who are interested in handling the freight on both those roads. The question therefore takes perhaps a wider range than would appear at the outset, and I think, acting in the interests of the whole Province of Nova Scotia, as well as in the interests of Halifax, we shall be doing wisely to consider very generously and in a very broad spirit any proposition, although it may involve the expenditure of quite a large sum of money, towards increasing the terminal facilities at Halifax. I must say that when last session the plans were laid before the committee, I was surprised to think that the improvements could be carried out for the small sum of about $500,000, which was mentioned by the Minister at that time. Now, however, in the face of the most careful estimates given by the present Minister of Railways, I must say that if we are not to be deceived, as the House has been deceived before—I am not using this word in the sense of any intentional deception,—and if the estimate is not exceeded, I think the proposition is well worthy the consideration of this House and of the Government. $575,000, although a very large sum of money, larger than I think under the circumstances we ought to be called upon to expend if there is any possible way of avoiding it, is much below what any superficial judgment would lead us to anticipate as the cost of this extension of a half mile through the heart of the city of Halifax, that

we must consider it not an excessive expenditure for the purpose, and the committee would be doing fairly to trust the Minister, particularly after his promise to make personal examination of all these alternative schemes before he adopts any one of them. The city of Halifax does require increased terminal facilities. Situated as it is upon the slope of a hill, and the water street of the city being so narrow, and being hedged in by property belonging to the Imperial Government, there are difficulties to overcome which are not apparent to those not acquainted with the locality. The bulk of the business portion of the city lies some distance below the termination of the proposed extension, but as I understand it, this extension does give more facilities than it is possible to obtain in any other way. The present freight station is so far out of the city as to be very embarrassing to those who handle freight. I am disposed very favourably towards a candid consideration of the proposal of the Minister. Of course we always have this fear haunting us that the estimates will be largely exceeded. If we go back through the history of the Administration—it may not be peculiarly characteristic of this Administration—we find that very glowing prospects were held out and very careful calculations are submitted to us as to the maximum cost, but we find that when the work is completed, the expectations are not realized and the estimates are largely exceeded. The other provinces of the Dominion are no doubt naturally jealous of the expenditure of an unduly large sum in this direction, particularly as the road itself is rolling up a large deficit from year to year. Had the Intercolonial Railway been in the position of paying its way substantially, or had we seen during the last few years a large reduction of these deficits, this Parliament would probably be more generously disposed towards the expenditures in the Lower Provinces. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) I think, suggested that the city of Halifax should pay something towards securing these facilities for its own benefit; and a strong argument in this direction can be made in the case of the city of Halifax, because there was an undertaking on the part of the city of Halifax that they would contribute £100,000 sterling towards the construction of the Intercolonial Railway when it was first built. How the city succeeded in crawling out of that contract I cannot say, but taking advantage of some political or other complication, the city of Halifax did succeed in clearing itself of this legal liability. I throw out this suggestion for the Minister to make use of if he can towards obtaining from the city of Halifax whatever assistance it is possible to obtain to carry out the undertaking which he proposes. In common with the other members of the House I was gratified to learn from the emphatic statement of the Minister of Railways that it was his intention to take hold of the expenses of the Intercolonial Railway with a firm hand. Being supported in the House with a large majority owing to the result of various elections which have been held, perhaps the temptation will be removed from him which many of his predecessors have been obliged to succumb to: the temptation to exercise unduly their influence and position, as controllers of this great public work for political exigencies. The discussions which we have had in this House on many occasions prove conclusively that it is almost impossible for any one to lay his finger upon the precise points where the expenditure was unduly great, yet we are painfully aware that the deficits upon the Intercolonial Railway working must be to a certain extent the result of circumstances over which neither the Minister nor his leading officials have any control. It is largely due, I believe, to the fact that the road was not constructed at first as a commercial undertaking. It was a military undertaking, a political undertaking, and had other objects, either professedly or actually in view, than that of a commercial undertaking. It was built at an expense far greater than roads as well equipped could be built for to-day. A large portion of it was constructed through a sparsely settled territory, and all the circumstances which go to build up a commercial undertaking were notoriously absent in the case of the Intercolonial Railway. Unfortunately, through the force of political and commercial circumstances alone, the Government of the Dominion in recent years felt itself pressed upon and obliged to subsidize a line competing with its own road. I think the arguments in favour of a competing line were very strong from a commercial standpoint. All these, with the great cost of the road and the expense of operating it, owing to the fact of its being a political as well as a commercial undertaking, have combined to produce these alarming deficits from year to year. Other circumstances have tended to increase them. The high tariff policy of the Government was intended to assist the coal mine owners of the lower provinces on the one hand, and the grain and flour producers of the upper provinces on the other hand, to send their products to market at an advantageous rate to them. The consequence was that the rates were reduced either below cost, as the authorities of the road contend, scarcely above cost. At any rate, owing to this combination of circumstances, a stage has been reached at which gentlemen on both parties seem to have combined in an earnest desire to arrive at a sound conclusion as to how best to obviate the great catastrophe which seems to be at hand; for I am convinced that the people of Canada will not long tolerate the enormous deficit of $750,000 a year, in addition to the interest on $47,000,000, which we may consider as entirely lost, particularly when there are constant claims, many of them reasonable, for increased facilities at various points. Now, the Minister having set his hand to the work, and having pledged his reputation, as a financier and an economist, to make a vigorous effort to cut down the expenses and reduce the train service without impairing the efficiency of the road, I think all his propositions bearing upon this object would be entitled to the favourable consideration of the House. Having in view the ideas and pledges of the Minister, several hon. members have discussed the question what may ultimately be the fate of this railroad. One suggestion has been thrown out in the press and in the House, which has met with no very strong expressions of approval, that is, that if the deficits continue, the Government may be induced to offer to sell out this railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Now, there are arguments in favour even of that proposition, derived from the able manner in which the Canadian Pacific Railway as a commercial undertaking is carried on, and from the expectation that possibly

even lower rates might result owing to the extensive connections of that railway. But in the minds of the people of the Dominion all these favourable arguments would be completely overshadowed, I believe, by their opposition to any further aggrandisement of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I think the political disadvantages of having that company made more powerful in the various provinces would far outweigh any temporary or commercial advantages which might flow from the more economical and non-political character of the management of the Intercolonial Railway. Another proposition has been suggested, that this railroad be handed over to a non-partisan commission. This has been advocated with a great deal of force and ability by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon); and unless the Minister can carry out the ideas to which he has pledged himself, I believe the suggestion of the hon. member for Albert may yet take such a shape that Parliament may feel itself compelled to acquiesce in that proposition. We would have at any rate one evil removed, which I think all must agree has tended to increase the expense of operating the railway. A Government road running through large numbers of constituencies represented in this House by supporters of the Government, all its employés being, if not technically, yet practically, civil servants of the Dominion, from the lowest porter or day labourer to the highest official, there has been, and must necessarily be, a constant pressure from the constituents of every member representing those counties, to secure positions or opportunities in connection with that road to further their private interests. In no single individual case may this pressure be immoral or improper; but all who are conversant with public affairs know that in the heat of election contests, promises have been made by candidates; and I believe that a large proportion of the undue expense of running the Intercolonial Railway has arisen from the fact that an enormous number of employés are paid out of the income of the railway who could be well dispensed with. We know that only recently, when the Minister deliberately decided that a large number of employés should be dismissed, there was an outcry, not only from the supporters of the Administration, but in some cases from their opponents, caused by sympathy, and a natural sympathy, with men who were threatened with the loss of their opportunities of working on this road. In my opinion, the political position is the key to nine-tenths of the difficulty, and this would be avoided if the road were placed under the control of a non-partisan commission. I am not prepared to say that just now the time is opportune to take this course, but I believe that the growing opinion in Parliament will tend very strongly in that direction if the expectations of the Minister are not realized within the next year or two with regard to reducing the deficit to a nominal point. Of course, even the matter of rates has unfortunately been made political use of. It is perhaps impossible to obviate that. I know that not long ago when an effort was made—I do not know whether it went as far as the adoption of an Order in Council—to increase the rates upon coal, the constituents of my hon. friend from Cumberland who are interested in the operating of the coal mines in that county, were in a state of extreme agitation, and pressure was brought to bear through their representative upon the Government, and the step was hastily retraced; showing that under political management even the most reasonable views of the Government have to give way from time to time to political pressure. I listened very carefully to the explanation of my hon. friend from Cumberland, but I am not sufficiently posted in the technicalities of long and short hauls and the different deductions that must be made to account for the cost of the haul per mile; but even if his calculation is correct that coal is not hauled at a loss, I think he has made a very good point against the Government, and at the same time he was met almost immediately by a further calculation which threw a great deal of doubt on the result he gave to it. At any rate the Minister has before him a very difficult task, which, if he succeeds in carrying out, will entitle him to a great deal of respect and admiration, because he will have succeeded in accomplishing that which none of his predecessors apparently have been able to accomplish. There is no doubt that the moment he begins to carry into effect the line of conduct he has mapped out for himself, he will be met by powerful objections from powerful quarters, which will require all his courage to withstand. I can only trust that when the reports of the Intercolonial Railway next year come before us, they will show a result more favourable to the treasury than it is at present. Before resuming my seat, I would call the attention of the Minister to a matter which must have suggested itself to other minds, and that is with regard to the form of the information given the members of this House and the means given them to study the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway. In order to ascertain the particular cost of any department, we have to look through a large number of publications; and I would suggest that it might be possible to combine in one volume of the reports all the information which is contained in the Auditor General's Report and in the Railway Report and all the information bearing upon the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway which may be contained in some other volume. We are compelled to trace the history of any particular line of traffic or any particular item of expenditure through several volumes; and even this, in my humble estimation, is not arranged as lucidly as it might be. Perhaps for a book-keeper or engineer or other expert this particular form of keeping accounts may do very well, but for the information of Parliament and a large number of our constituents interested, I would suggest to the Minister that the information with regard to the Intercolonial Railway and other Government railways might be so tabulated as to present in a more complete form, one more easily understood, the history of the expenses and income and general operation of the road. I throw out the suggestion because in my humble efforts to follow the discussions here and ascertain for my own information how matters are being managed, I found myself confronted with many difficulties. Take, for instance, the payment of employés of the road and the large number of officials named in the Auditor's Report. I think any gentleman who devoted himself for a short time to the subject could tabulate these under different heads according to the salaries received and the conditions on which they are employed, so that the information would be more easily within our reach. At any rate, if the affairs of the Inter-

colonial Railway are to continue as prominent in discussion as they have in the past, information should be laid before us in a more distinct form than at present. Then all the members who take an interest in the operation and success of this work should be put in the position of being able, without the necessity for the present research, of bringing before the Minister objections and suggestions connected with his conduct of this work.

Mr. STAIRS. With regard to the economy proposed to be effected by the Minister of Railways, there is nothing more important for him to consider than the question of rates. I mention it again, although it has been referred to already several times in the course of this discussion, simply for the purpose of impressing upon him the importance of exercising great care as to how he interferes with the rates now ruling. If my recollection is right, the experiment was tried in 1874-75 of excessively advancing the rates, and the effect was not to decrease but largely to increase the deficit. The committee will bear in mind that there is a great deal of freight upon which only very low rates can be charged and which will not stand any higher rates. The effect of increasing these rates would simply be to drive the business from the road; and this must be borne in mind in connection with the argument made by the hon. member for Cumberland with reference to the rates on coal from Nova Scotia mines to points west of the Chaudière, if the rate were advanced materially that would probably have the effect of driving the business from the road and have no appreciable effect on the deficit. It must be remembered that this large traffic brings a great deal of other business in connection with the mines, and anything which injures the prosperity of these mines will have a bad effect on the general traffic.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is decreasing at the rate of 20,000 tons per year.

Mr. STAIRS. I am not thoroughly posted as to the details of the Spring Hill coal business, but I know it is not very long since there was a very considerable fire in the mines there caused by an explosion which shut the mines up for some little time; and I have heard lately that during the past few months the coal business is increasing. With reference to the other question, which has been considerably discussed, the proposed extension in Halifax, I desire to repeat what has been forcibly said by my colleague, the senior member for Halifax, that the members from Halifax are not in any way supporting this vote for the sake of having a large expenditure in that city. They look at this matter largely from a railway standpoint, I believe, and it is the opinion of many citizens of Halifax who have given a great deal of consideration to the question, notably the members of the City Council and of the Board of Trade, that much increased facilities are required for railway purposes there. It is not a matter for the city alone. The railway ought to find station accommodation in the city for the purposes of the road. It has been said that the city should pay. I cannot understand why the citizens should be asked to pay a large amount of money for property which is to be handed over to the Dominion of Canada for railway purposes and to become the property of the Government for ever. It is true that the citizens do propose to give something on account of the purchase of this property, and I think a reasonable amount. As to the facilities to be provided, a good deal has been said with reference to the different propositions which have been made, but the Minister has said that he is going to enquire into this before he comes to any decision and I am sure that, when he visits Halifax —and I know the citizens will be very much pleased to see him—he will look carefully into the case, and that whatever is right will be done. I was very much interested in the arguments of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) in this matter, because it brought out strongly and I think most fairly, the fact that this expenditure was not in the interests of the citizens alone, and this was also brought out in the previous discussion by the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden). In fact, all the western part of Nova Scotia is as much interested in having increased railway accommodation in Halifax as the people of Halifax themselves. The Windsor and Annapolis Railway and its connections have to use a station about two miles away from the centre of the city, as has been very fully explained by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny). I think the Dominion Government are bound by the lease to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway to allow them to come into the North street station, but they have not room at present for the freight brought in over the Intercolonial Railway, and that is the reason why the Windsor and Annapolis have never been allowed to occupy that station. I believe the Railway Department could be compelled under the terms of the lease, if legal proceedings were taken, to find room for the Windsor and Annapolis Railway at the North street station. The Windsor and Annapolis have never tried to enforce this, but it is a very serious matter to the people of the western counties of Nova Scotia that the freight has to be landed at a station two miles from the centre of the city, and that the freight going to the west has to be trucked out that distance at a very heavy expense. There are other reasons why these facilities should be provided which have been very fully gone into by previous speakers, and therefore I will not go into them. I will only refer to a remark made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). I understood him to say that the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway, amounting to $500,000, was caused by the carrying of grain for shipment at Halifax.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think I said it contributed largely to the deficit.

Mr. STAIRS. I understood, and hon. members around me understood, the hon. gentleman to say that it was that which caused the deficit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not say it was the whole cause, because I have a very different view from that, but I thought it was a prominent cause.

Mr. STAIRS. Of course I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, and I hope the record will not be published in *Hansard* that the whole deficit of $500,000 was incurred by carrying 1,000,000 bushels of grain to Halifax.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I remarked that, while grain was carried from Chaudière to Halifax at

$12 or $13 per car load, that was a ruinous rate, and contributed to the deficit.

Mr. STAIRS. The real amount could not be more than $40,000 which is very different from what I understood the hon. gentleman to say.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In reference to the matter under discussion, that is, increased accommodation at Halifax, it is very natural that the members for Halifax should advocate that scheme, but I have not been able to learn, and I do not think the committee has had any definite information yet, as to what benefit it is to be to the people of the Dominion, or what necessity there is for the increased expenditure. Every one who has been in Halifax knows that they have a good station and they have a line running along the wharves, so that vessels can be loaded from the cars, and they have a line running round to Dartmouth which has been built by the Government at great expense. I think Halifax has as great railway accommodation as any city in the Dominion. Look at the accommodation in Toronto, and compare it with the accommodation in Halifax. We know that, when people receive goods over the Intercolonial Railway at Halifax, the railway is not bound to furnish them with storage. It is their duty to unload whatever it may be, such as a car load of flour, within 48 hours. Then, if freight is received in broken car load, the railway delivers it free to the customer. So, whether it is drawn half a mile or a mile, it does not cost the receiver or the shipper anything, because it is included in the freight. As was well expressed by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) to-night, we should hesitate before expending another dollar for further accommodation at Halifax. So far as the freights are concerned, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) figured out that the carrying of the coal was not done at a loss. The Minister of Railways, however, said that cars were taken from Spring Hill to Chaudière, a distance of 550 miles, for $12

Mr. HAGGART. $16.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That would be far less than three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile.

Mr. HAGGART. No, that is exactly it. It is made up on that basis.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then, if the railway gets three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile on the through coal, I do not think the railway loses a cent in carrying it. We know as a fact that the local freight rate from Spring Hill to Moncton, or St. John, or Halifax, is much higher than the through rate, and while you may possibly lose a trifle on the coal you haul to Chaudière, yet you take the whole coal trade and you will find that nothing is lost on it. Now, so far as freight on flour is concerned, I am satisfied that the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) was incorrect in the statements he furnished to the House. He stated, if I understood him aright, that flour was carried for two-tenths of a cent per ton per mile. Now, I know that at the present rates, and they are about the same as they have been for some years—flour is carried from Point Lévis to Halifax, 670 miles, at about one-third of a cent per ton per mile. It amounts to a little over 11 cents per 100 pounds on the Intercolonial Railway portion of the road. Then if we take flour the through rate to stations along the line is two and a half cents per 100 pounds higher than it is to Halifax or to St. John. The rates to Truro, to Amherst, or Londonderry, or Stellarton, or any of those points, is two and a half cents per 100 pounds higher than to Halifax, and the Intercolonial Railway get the same proportion of the through rate as they do to Halifax, so that what goes to the points along the line of railway, nets the road over half a cent per ton per mile. Now, my opinion is that the railway do not lose on coal or on flour. When they carry wheat for $12 per car from Chaudière to Halifax, we know there is a loss. But I believe that the great loss is on account of the enormous number of men that are employed on the road. For instance, I find that in the city of St. John alone there are no less than 148 men employed on the Intercolonial Railway service.

Mr. McLEOD. They are all needed there.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They cost the country $46,996 a year at St. John. We also find in that city there are 61 men employed as porters alone, and their salaries amount to nearly $22,000. I believe that the same extravagance occurs at other points of the road. I have no hesitation in saying that if the Minister of Railways would take hold of this railway as a business transaction, the first thing he would do would be to send 1,000 men about their business. If any good business man had hold of that he would dismiss 1,000 men at least, and he would cancel some of these fast trains which have been admitted by all parties to be unnecessary. I believe there is no reason why that railway should not pay running expenses, and give a dividend to the country. From St. John to Halifax there is no better paying road in this Dominion. It has no competitor, and it passes through a number of large towns, and through a comparatively good country. I hope the Minister of Railways will take this matter in hand with his usual business ability, and if he puts in the pruning knife and dismisses all these unnecessary hands, cutting off all these unnecessary things, I believe that next year he will be able to come down and congratulate the House that the Intercolonial Railway has paid all running expenses, and given a handsome dividend to the country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the whole resolution be adopted?

Mr. LAURIER. It was understood there should be a preliminary discussion upon the whole business of the railway, and that has taken place. Now, it is understood between both sides that we are to carry all these items except the item of St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. And upon that one subject there may be a general discussion.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 13th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. TISDALE. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a personal explanation. I notice the following published in the Ottawa *Free Press* of last night in connection with a meeting of the Trades and Labour Council at Ottawa :—

"COL. TISDALE, M.P., CENSURED.

"The following resolution was then passed: 'That whereas it has come to the knowledge of this council that on the night of the 9th of May inst., Colonel Tisdale, a member of the Dominion House of Commons of Canada, during a debate on a petition presented by forty-nine (49) residents of the city of London, Ont., undertook to question said petitioners' right to present such on the ground that many of the signers were clerks, tailors and other mechanics. Said member holding said petitioners up to public scorn on account of their calling. And at the same time regretting the absence of the names of doctors, lawyers and clergymen instead. Therefore, be it resolved, that the Ottawa Trades and Labour Council in meeting assembled, do hereby, on behalf of the workingmen of Ottawa, express our unqualified condemnation of such an unwarrantable attack on the wage-earners of Canada. And be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the different trades and labour councils of Ottawa.'

"Several of the delegates referred in feeling terms to the honourable manner in which Mr. Fraser, M.P., spoke in defence of the workingmen, after which the meeting adjourned."

Now, I did not in the debate referred to——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is reading something taken from a newspaper commenting on or referring to something that took place in the House. If that is so, of course it is not in order.

Mr. TISDALE. I have read all that I propose to read from a newspaper. The balance is my own statement. I say I did not use any such language, and I was simply making a denial in the words of the resolution. I say that I did not question the petitioners' right to present the same on the ground that the signers were clerks, tailors or mechanics, nor did I hold such petitioners up to public scorn on account of their calling. I have never in public nor in private expressed such sentiments, nor do I entertain them. I find, however, by reference to the *Hansard* of that date, that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who followed me in the debate, used this language, meaning me :

"He did not scorn to say that these men should not be listened to because seventeen of them were clerks, a few were tailors, four were licensed dealers, and the rest were miserable mechanics.

"Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman is wrong. I said nothing about 'miserable mechanics.' I said 'merchants and small traders.'

"Mr. FRASER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon if he did not say 'mechanics.'"

Now, I feel quite satisfied that the hon. member for Guysborough would not intentionally misrepresent what I said or contended; but he certainly did, or he is misreported. What I did say, referring to the petitioners, I propose to read from *Hansard*. I said :

"How many do you think signed it? Forty-five persons out of the one hundred thousand over whom Judge Elliott has presided for twenty-five years in the County and in the District Court. And who are these men who signed the petition? Sixteen of them are irresponsible clerks, whose employers would not sign, as mentioned by the hon. member for Lambton. Seventeen are merchants, small dealers, and strong partisans, and hon. gentlemen from Ontario will understand how strong partisans they are, by the explanation that every one of them furnishes the London Asylum with supplies. Hon. members for Ontario know what that means, but I will explain it to other hon. gentlemen. Under the Reform Government in Ontario, we have the same individuals, year after year, supplying our different institutions which are under the control of our Local House, and in no case are these contracts put up to public tender despite the frequent protests of the Opposition in the Local House. And so it comes these seventeen favoured gentlemen, thus encouraged by public contracts, had no hesitation in signing this petition. Who else signed it? The liquor dealers. I do not blame these poor fellows, for they have no other resource. In Ontario we have not the secret ballot. No, they will not give us, corrupt Tories, the secret ballot. A mark is put on every ballot, and although these ballots are sealed up, when the election is over, they are in the control of the people in power, and they either open them afterwards or else they tell falsehoods in the matter, because they have told people in my riding that they knew how they voted. It is in their power to know how, and they either exercise that power or at any rate threaten people with its exercise. What has happened? There was a time when we used to have some municipal control. The glory of Ontario was her municipal institutions, and the old Reformers who helped to get them for us deserved as much credit as, and perhaps a little more, than the Conservatives, but the people now in power in Ontario have restricted those municipal rights. The municipal counties used to decide who should have liquor licenses, but now this pure Government which runs Ontario took that power away into their own hands. They appoint a couple of license commissioners and an inspector, who are political heelers for the riding, and who go around earning the salary they obtain by looking after the elections and running the voters, and, as the result, every hotel-keeper almost is now a Grit. There used to be a large majority of them Conservatives in Ontario, but to-day you cannot find one Conservative in ten. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but what I tell them is true, and I can prove it. The hotel-keeper has either to vote straight under the coercion of this ballot, which is not secret, or he cannot get a license. Four of them have signed the petition. Who else? Two license commissioners, and last, but not least, the three witnesses my hon. friend referred to who may be the respectable citizens he spoke of. Who are these three witnesses? One is the man who collected $2,000, who kept no accounts, destroyed the books and had no memory. The others are conveners of electors in London, who get up meetings to be addressed by Mr. Hyman, and at which beer and music are furnished at intervals. That is the class of men who signed this petition. Mr. Hyman had too much sense of self-respect himself to sign it. Mr. Gibbons, the great lawyer in London, would not dare sign it. There is not a lawyer, a doctor, a clergyman or a professional man in the city of London, or ten miles out of it, who would dare sign the petition."

That is all I said in regard to the petitioners.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did the hon. gentleman read what he said about the tailors living on back streets?

Mr. TISDALE. I have read the report from *Hansard*, and that is all there is in it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it is not a correct report.

Mr. TISDALE. The mention of tailors was in the clause in the report in which I answered the hon. member for Guysborough. It was at first reported, "merchants and small tailors," the word "traders" having been mistaken for the word "tailors," and I think the hon. gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is no misunderstanding.

Mr. TISDALE. All I can say is that I have read the report from *Hansard* of what I intended to say

and what I did say. I am quite aware that something was said about tailors by some hon. members, and I confess that I did not understand what they meant. I said small traders; the word tailors was not used by me. I wish to make that explanation, because I am sure that the hon. member for Guysborough misunderstood me. There was no reflection on any one, in regard to their trade or calling, in anything I said. No man ever heard me express any such sentiments in any way, shape or manner. I was simply stating who the signers of the petition were, and giving reasons why they were partisans, and I made no reflection whatever on the trade or calling of any man.

MISCOUCHE, P.E.I., STATION.

Mr. PERRY. I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Railways whether there is any truth in the statement I saw in the Charlottetown *Guardian* this morning that the ticket agent at Miscouche, P.E.I., had been telegraphed to, that the order closing that station had been cancelled by the Minister?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think the station has been closed or is intended to be closed.

Mr. PERRY. I want to know whether the order has been given by the Minister to keep it open?

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Additional property accommodation at St. John $121,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to ask the hon. gentleman who valued the property?

Mr. HAGGART. The Harris estate ask for the triangular block $175,000, and for the whole block $275,000. Mr. C. H. Fairweather valued it at $131.-153 for the triangular block, and for the whole block $313,457, and Charles E. Edwards valued the triangular at $317,000, and the whole at $349,659.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did the hon. gentleman read Mr. Fairweather's valuation? I understand he denies that he fixed any figure.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no doubt about his doing it, but the papers were sent down by the Justice Department to the officers of the department at St. John who is preparing the deed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did the hon. gentleman pay those valuations?

Mr. HAGGART. No, the price agreed upon was $200,000 for the whole.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was that a private agreement, or were steps taken to expropriate it?

Mr. HAGGART. Private agreement.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman state exactly what property has been taken, and when the private agreement was come to, and by whom?

Mr. HAGGART. The area is about 216,000 superficial feet, the price paid is $200,000 for the triangular block. The first proposition was to take 78,000 superficial feet. I have not the date here on which the agreement was made. The Acting Minister of Railways, I understand, made it.

Mr. BOWELL. After the reports were made and a valuation placed upon the property, on consultation with the chief engineer and others of my colleagues, we thought it was too much; and after a good deal of bargaining, they made the proposition to take $230,000 or $240,000. We then made them an offer of $200,000 for the whole property, and they were to give a clear title to the property, a portion of which was under lease. That proposition was taken to the Council and approved, and that is the manner in which the agreement was arrived at.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When is this $200,000 to be paid? And does this include the McIntyre and De Veber property?

Mr. HAGGART. It includes all the property they had in their possession. $75,000 has been paid out of an appropriation of $80,000. They were not in a position immediately, if I remember rightly, to transfer the McIntyre leased property, and we held the balance until they could give it over.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the hon. gentleman taken steps to expropriate that McIntyre property?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, I think we have.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the amount that may be awarded for the McIntyre and DeVeber estates for the property supposed to be expropriated to be deducted from the $200,000?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, and a great deal more than the amount will be retained for the purpose of meeting the expropriation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is whatever amount that may be awarded to the McIntyre and DeVeber estates to be deducted from the $200,000, or have they agreed for a specific sum?

Mr. HAGGART. The full amount of our costs are to be retained out of the $200,000 which we have to pay to the McIntyre property.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) For what purpose does the hon. gentleman require this property?

Mr. HAGGART. It is owing to the increase of business at St. John station, by reason of the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway Short Line *via* Mattawamkeag. The space for the accommodation of this business was too limited, for not only did the Canadian Pacific Railway bring new business from the west, but diverted considerable trade from points on the Intercolonial Railway, which formerly went by the Chaudière, through the route west by St. John. This is for increased car accommodation and warehouses.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman propose to build warehouses upon it?

Mr. HAGGART. I think the intention of the department is that there are some buildings on the property which may suit for that, and they are to be transferred and removed to where they are required.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seems to me rather an extravagant proposition. The property the hon. gentleman has purchased, known as the Harris Block, consists of what is known as the Harris Car Works, which lie to the north side of the Intercolonial Railway station at St. John. Some years ago the hon. gentleman purchased the nail factory

of Mr. Moore, and hon. gentlemen will remember the proposition was made to the House last year to vote $80,000 for the purchase of a portion of the Harris property carrying out the line of the Moore property along the north side of the Intercolonial Railway. That proposition was combatted in the House, and the hon. gentleman produced at the time certain reports from the agent of the Intercolonial Railway in St. John asking that increased accommodation should be given because they had not sufficient accommodation for the empty cars and also for the full cars, and, as was pointed out by the hon. gentleman last year, it seems an extraordinary proposition to buy land in the heart of the city at an enormous value for the purpose of finding extra car room. Well, the part of the land they proposed to buy last year was the south end of the Harris property adjoining the Intercolonial Railway, and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. McLeod) stated:

"The railway has not at all sufficient accommodation for track room to hold their cars there. The Harris property has provided tracks of its own, and these tracks are nearly always filled with the Intercolonial Railway cars, because they have no room on their own line. In addition to that, some of the cars are at Fairville, outside of St. John, and a great deal of difficulty is experienced in having sufficient cars at the city, so that we have been continually suffering for the want of car room. This is a matter which has been urged upon the Government by the citizens of St. John and the people interested in it for some years. I remember speaking to Mr. Pope, the late Minister of Railways, some four years ago, and urging him, at the request of the citizens, to secure this additional car room, as the freight there was continually increasing. It will not be necessary for the present to build any additional freight sheds, but it will be necessary to lay such additional tracks as are necessary to provide accommodation for the cars."

It was afterwards stated by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) that the Moore property is 60 feet by 100, and that the 60 feet is fronting on the street and the 100 feet runs parallel with the railway land.

"You will easily see that you could not build on a sharp curve like that, and the property which it is now proposed to take, along with the present property, will enable the Government to afford accommodation which is badly required for the use of the railway."

So, if hon. gentlemen will look at the plan which I hold in my hand, they will see that the Intercolonial Railway line running to the south had an amount of land of 60 by 100 feet, and the Government took that portion of the Harris property which was then valued at $80,000, but when the vote was taken, they said that was too much and that steps would be taken to expropriate the land and pay only the sum which the Exchequer Court would award. On that pledge the House passed the vote, and I have to express my regret that the Government have taken three or four times or perhaps more, in fact the whole of the Harris estate, and have paid a sum by private agreement which is not what the Exchequer Court awarded or the arbitrator awarded, but which is a very unjust and unfair valuation. The property covered with old buildings has been taken, though those buildings could be made of no use for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway. If any hon. gentleman doubts that, I will refer to the plan I have here which was officially certified, and which gives a statement of the value of the buildings. This gives the details of the blacksmith's shop, the wheel shop and so on, and I have no hesitation in saying, from the information I have received from those who know the property accurately, that there is no buildings there that can be used for the railway at all. Now, in the face of the statement made last year, how can the Government justify the taking over of this large piece of property? All they wanted, according to their statement last year, which was endorsed by the manager of the road, Mr. Pottinger, was a strip of land running across the south side of the Harris property, but they have now paid about $200,000 for this land which they did not say was required. I do not think the country should be bound by any private agreements or by any values that they may choose to put on the Harris property. We find that it was taxed at $66,000, and that is the property for which we are now paying $200,000. Besides that, the Harris Company got into litigation with the Halifax Banking Company, who had advanced them large sums of money to carry on their business, and the Harris Company stated that the bank had not carried out their agreement, so the matter came up for trial before the Equity Court in St. John. There was a dispute between the Halifax Banking Company and the owners of this property as to what the value of this property was, and the cashier of the Halifax Banking Company, Mr. Taylor, swore as follows:—

"Referring to the statement in the 26th section of the plaintiff's bill of complaint that the plaintiff company was forced by the action of the bank to sell their property at a sacrifice, I say it is currently reported, and I believe it to be the case, that the said purchase money is the sum of $200,000, while, in a balance sheet furnished to me by the company during the past year, the said foundry property and leases are valued at $93,401.46.

That is the statement sworn to by Mr. James G. Taylor. So we stand here to-day with this fact staring us in the face, that the property which the Government has purchased for $200,000 was, within a year, stated to be worth, in a statement which is sworn to by the owners themselves, $93,401. It appears to me that, with that affidavit before us, and with the fact that the property was valued for taxable purposes at only $66,000, a *primâ facie* case is made out that the Government have paid at least twice the real value of the property. I have here the report of the trial which took place on the 12th January last, and the affidavits which were read then, many of which were given *in extenso*. The solicitor of the banking company and the cashier of the banking company gave evidence, and Mr. Pitcaithley, the cashier, being sworn, said: "That it is not true that the company have been put to loss and forced to sell their real estate for much less than the same is worth, for the amount obtained is $200,000; whereas J. C. Robertson, who is the chief manager of the Harris Company, told him repeatedly that the value of their real estate, on the books of the company, was under $100,000, and that said Robertson had held out as an inducement for the bank to make advances the almost absolute certainty of a sale being effected to the Intercolonial Railway, and that he (Robertson) was exceedingly desirous of effecting such sale." I do not think there would be much doubt about his desire when he did succeed in disposing of the property in the manner with which we are now familiar.

Mr. KENNY. Is that the same land?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is exactly the same land.

Mr. McLEOD. You are wrong. It is nearly all leasehold land.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is the same land.

Mr. McLEOD. No, it is not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have read the affidavit of James G. Taylor, who says that the foundry property and leases are valued at $93,401, while the purchase money is $200,000, and Mr. Pitcaithley says it was valued at under $100,000, and then you have the city valuation of $66,000. No one expects that the company will undervalue their property when they are applying to the Halifax Banking Company for an advance, and they value it at $93,401. Mr. Armstrong, the solicitor of the company, goes on to swear that Mr. Robertson valued the car works at $175,000, including the value of the real estate, plant and machinery. Now, the deed which the Government have taken from the Harris Company expressly exempts all the plant and all the machinery, and all the Government gets is the bare land itself and the buildings upon it. So that by all the valuations which were made by the company themselves in their own book, by the statement they made to the bank, by the city taxable valuation, and every other index which we can use as a guide to ascertain the real value of that property, we find that the Government have paid twice too much for it. Now, I hold in my hand a statement from the accountant of the Harris Company, showing what the value of the buildings upon that property was. The cost of the erection of all these buildings was $21,800; of course they are no good to us now, but that was the original cost. The land next to the railway, as hon. gentlemen know, is low swampy ground.

Mr. FOSTER. Ha! ha!

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman need not laugh; he knows it is. It is low-lying ground which cannot be used until it is built up, and I submit to this House that when the Government came last year and asked us to vote $80,000 in order that they might purchase a strip along this property, and told the House they would not pay the money until legal proceedings had been taken to expropriate the land, and they would only pay the sum which the Exchequer Court awarded after these proceedings, and during recess, after they got a grant from the House, they went in and bought by private contract what they told the House they were going to purchase, and purchased the whole foundry property and paid $200,000 for it, in face of the facts which I submit to the committee, I can come to no other conclusion than that there has been a job, a job of a very bad character indeed. The hon. gentleman knows very well what the public suspect, and what the public believe; the public believe, rightly or wrongly, that this money was paid, and a portion of it is to be repaid by the Harris Company to pay certain election expenses which were incurred in the city of St. John. That is what the public believe, and I think there is ample ground for believing that this has been a job of a very bad character indeed. Now, I accept fully the statement made by the Minister as to what was intended to be bought; but I sent down the other day to St. John for a certified copy of that which the Government obtained; of course, the description is enormously long, nobody could tell except from local knowledge whether the description includes all the property or not. I assume it does, because it was prepared by a very careful solicitor there Dr. Barker, well known to gentlemen in this House and I have no doubt that so far as his part of the business is concerned, he did what was proper. But I doubt very much from what I see on the face of this deed, whether you get the McIntyre and DeVeber property at all. I think, under the description of this deed, you will have to pay the McIntyre and DeVeber estates for whatever sum is voted under the expropriation proceedings now taken, and I will tell hon. gentlemen why I come to this conclusion. The deed, after conveying to the Queen all the lands and describing them, goes on to say:

"It being the intention of the said company that all the lands and premises now in their possession and used in connection with their car works property shall pass hereunder and be conveyed to Her Majesty, whether specially hereinbefore described or not, excepting the properties described in the three following leases, that is to say: A lease bearing date the 1st day of May, A.D. 1883, from John P. McIntyre to James Harris; a lease from Nathaniel Dudley DeVeber and others to James Harris bearing date the 1st day of May, A.D. 1884; and a lease from Nathaniel D. DeVeber and others to James Harris bearing date the 1st day of May, A.D. 1885, and registered * * * * also saving and excepting the machinery and the plant of the said company on the said premises."

So that the deed which the hon. gentleman took by private contract, and which purports to convey all the Harris property, expressly exempts out of that property not only the plant and the machinery, but also the properties embraced in the three leases known as the McIntyre and DeVeber property, and I want the hon. gentleman to understand how that is. I can see very well what the intention was, because the consideration on the face of the deed expressed $200,000, that is in the preamble. But when the solicitor went further in the deed and expressed the consideration which was paid for the property there inscribed, he put it at $195,000, excepting therefrom the property embraced in the three leases; so I say there has only been $5,000 reserved—the deed expressly says so—and the Government has only got $5,000 reserved to pay what moneys may be required to pay for the McIntyre and DeVeber property. Now, hon. gentlemen who wish to know what these properties consist of, if they look at the sketch, they will see they are right in the centre of the property on which some of the chief works are built. Now, we find here that they have got 213,000 square feet, all told.

Mr. HAGGART. 216,000.

Mr. DAVIES, (P.E.I.) Let it be 216,000. It embraces the alleged encroachments upon the street. The city claim that this property encroaches very largely upon the street in two different places, and the hon. gentlemen have bought a lawsuit in the city of St. John besides buying a property. They have paid the Harris Company for the whole of it, although a large portion of it consists of the encroachment upon Lombard and Southwark streets. Now, if you want to get at the value of this property, take some other test. The Moore property, which was 60 feet by 100 feet, which the Government bought some years ago and paid for it $16,000——

Mr. HAZEN. $25,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I beg your pardon.

Mr. HAZEN. I beg your pardon.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will see I am right in my figures. They paid $16,000 for that Moore property, and the hon. gentleman will see that the deed of the part of the Harris property, known as the Hazen estate, which was bought by the Harrises in 1891, 5,000 square feet, was not recorded until 1892. That part of the Harris property which you purchased, which was known as the Hazen estate——

Mr. McLEOD. What deed was that?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The deed was not recorded then, but it has been recorded since. I have got the date of the deed, and I am reading it now. It is dated the 24th day of December, 1891; it was not recorded till 1892. That deed embraces 5,000 square feet, and Harris has only paid $2,000 for it. Then there was the Wales property, which was bought by Harris also on the same day in 1891, and was not recorded, either, till 1892. There were 3,200 square feet in that, and he paid only $1,000 for it. Then Harris bought from Moore the adjoining property three or four years ago, 50 feet by 160, 8,000 square feet, for $3,000. Now, if the hon. gentleman will take any one of the tests I have submitted, that is, the value of the property that the Harrises bought from these three people: the Moore property, the Hazen property, and the Wales property, and see how much they paid, he will find that the Government have paid more than twice to the Harrises what the Harrises paid only last year for these three properties. They have paid more than twice what the Harrises valued it in their own book, and more than twice in a statement submitted to the bank they declared what was the value of that property. They have paid three times the assessed value of the property, and taking all these things together, and the breaking of the pledge, for I can consider it nothing else, which the Government gave the House last year, that no payment would be made until the land had been legally expropriated and an award made under legal proceedings, I am justified in coming to the conclusion that public suspicion is more than well founded, and the House has not been fairly treated by the Government buying more land than is necessary, by the Government paying twice the price of the land, as this was done for a purpose which ought not to receive the approval and commendation of this House.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has made serious statements in the remarks he has offered. He denounced this as a very gross job, and added that there was a general impression in the mind of the public, and I presume in his own mind, because his last remarks would justify the conclusion at which I have arrived, that a portion of that money was to be used in repayment of election expenses in the city of St. John. An hon. gentleman making that statement on the floor of the House should have some ground on which to base it, and as I was acting at that time as Minister of Railways, the inference from the remarks of the hon. gentleman would be that I entered into the corrupt bargain to which he referred. I ask the hon. gentleman whether he intended, either directly or indirectly, to make such an insinuation against myself in connection with this matter? If he does, I will take means to enable him to establish it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman had better reserve his threat until after an insinuation has been made.

Mr. BOWELL. You did make the insinuation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not charge the hon. gentleman with anything.

Mr. BOWELL. Not myself personally. First, there was the statement that I was the person through whom and by whom these negotiations were made; this was followed up by the statement that it was done for corrupt purposes, and that the people believed such was the case, and I suppose the hon. gentleman does. His statement is unworthy of the position he holds. No member of this House has a right to stand in his place and make charges of so serious a character, reflecting on the honour and honesty of any man, unless he believes them to be true and is prepared to prove them. If I were to stand here and repeat all the insinuations I have heard in regard to hon. gentlemen opposite, in their election contests and on many other matters, I think the hon. member would resent it with a warmth that would become him, and until he is prepared to substantiate that charge, I repeat that it is unworthy of him or any other hon. gentleman to throw out insinuations of that kind.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has worked himself into a passion without cause.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to be slandered.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not make any charge, directly or indirectly, against the hon. gentleman. I said I believed the statement made to me that a part of this money was so applied.

Mr. HAZEN. Whom do you make the charge against?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not against anybody. It would better become the hon. Minister and his associates to answer the statement of facts which I have submitted to this House, and not try to drag a red herring across the track.

Mr. BOWELL. I propose to deal with them afterwards.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not make a statement against any one. I read the records, I read from the deed, and I submitted statements in regard to the value of the property; all these facts I have given to the House are *bonâ fide*, they are accessible to the hon. gentleman, and until my statements are answered, what conclusion can the hon. gentleman expect an independent man to come to? If my statements are true, that twice the proper amount of money was paid to these people by private agreement that should have been paid, and this was done after the pledge was given to the House that no money would be paid until an expropriation had been made and an award given by a proper tribunal, I am justified in coming to the conclusion that it is an improper transaction. The hon. gentleman need not jump. I say he had no responsibility in it; I do not suppose he knew very much about it. I never heard his name mentioned in connection with it until I heard it here to-day; I never knew he had anything to do in connection with it. But this has nothing to do with the statement of facts which I have presented to the committee. If the facts are wrong, refute

them ; if the conclusions I have drawn are wrong, show them to be erroneous, but do not get off the track to something else. We should discuss the facts as they are accessible at present to the committee.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman had confined himself to the facts without indulging in insinuations, then this would not have arisen.

Mr. HAGGART. One word in regard to the conveyance that the department has obtained for the Harris property. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has read a deed, on which he puts a certain interpretation, according to which we are to give $195,000 for the property and only retain $5,000 for the purpose of payment to those other places which are under lease. Here is a letter in explanation of the matter which we have received from Mr. Barker, and he gives an entirely different interpretation from that given by the hon. gentleman, and according to his interpretation it does not mean at all what the hon. gentleman stated was the meaning of the deed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say that in the preamble of the deed it is recited that the consideration is $200,000. In the granting part the consideration is mentioned as $195,000 paid by the Government to the Harrises, the right of which they acknowledge, and they convey all certain properties therein described except the leased property. Therefore, if the Government paid $195,000, excepting the leased property, and retained $5,000, the conclusion at which you must arrive is that the $5,000 is to pay the expropriation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Before my colleague, the Minister of Railways, reads the report made to his department on the matter, I desire to say a few words in regard to the $5,000. The transaction was this : The purchase is for $200,000. There are outstanding leases, which cannot be extinguished except by expropriation. The owner of the Harris property says $5,000 is a sufficient recompense for the extinction of the outstanding leases. Of course, we get the leased property of the Harris estate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They claim $25,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I know that the Harrises say that $5,000 is enough. We take advantage of their admission, and say : "Very well, you admit there is a deficiency in the title, which is worth at least $5,000 ; we will keep that out of the $80,000 which was voted by Parliament, and therefore there is only needed $75,000 in cash." Then the arrangement as to expropriation will go on, and the balance of the purchase money to be awarded by order of the Exchequer Court will be paid, less the costs of expropriation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is according to the terms of the deed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have not read the deed yet, but I will read it.

Mr. HAGGART. Here is the letter from Mr. Barker :

"ST. JOHN, 2nd January, 1892.

"*Re Harris Property.*

"SIR.—I have the honour to report that a conveyance of this property, exclusive of the leaseholds and the plant and machinery, has been this day executed by the company—'J. Harris & Co., Limited'—and is now in my possession, ready for registry, on the other terms being complied with.

"I understand that a cheque for $75,000 will be sent, payable to the order of myself and Mr. Schofield, manager of the Bank of New Brunswick, to be delivered to Mr. Schofield under the assignment of the money and the powers of attorney from J. Harris & Co., Limited, to him, and that this $75,000 is a part of the $80,000 which was the cash payment to be made.

"I also understand that J. Harris & Co., Limited, are to wait for the balance of the purchase money until the same shall have been voted by Parliament.

"I also understand that the $5,000 retained from the $80,000 is to cover the cost, so far as it will suffice for the purpose, of expropriating the three lots held under lease, and that any sum required for that purpose beyond the $5,000 is to be deducted from the balance of the purchase money.

"I also understand that I am at once to take proceedings for the expropriation of the leasehold lots.

"I of course understand that no money is to be paid until the title to the freehold portion of the property of which I now hold a conveyance, is made free by the cancellation of the mortgage to the Imperial Trust Company.

"So many changes have been proposed in carrying out the purchase that I write fully to avoid any misunderstanding on my part in a matter of so much importance.

"The company I understand have made the necessary arrangements with the Bank of New Brunswick to place them in funds to pay off the mortgage to the Imperial Trust Company so soon as the cheque for $75,000 comes to hand, and as they may be desirous to close the matter at once, I have to request on receipt of this your confirmation by telegraph of my understanding of the arrangement as herein contained if it should be accurate.

"I have the honour to be,

"Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) "FRED. E. BARKER.

"The Deputy Minister of Justice,
"Ottawa."

So you see the meaning which the solicitor who drew up the document himself puts upon it.

Mr. McLEOD. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) appears to be very much excited and somewhat violent over this. Of course he does not speak from his own knowledge, because he has no knowledge on the matter. I can tell him and this committee, whence his information comes, The company has been attacked continually, and any persons who have had political leanings towards the Conservative party have been continually attacked by the same person for a long time. I may also say that when the late Mr. James Harris was in business he was continually attacked by the same party as being a contractor. He was a contractor, and a very large contractor, and he gave employment to a very large number of men. I will now explain this matter to the committee, and perhaps I know as much about the property as any one here, having lived in St. John for 20 years and being intimately acquainted with it. When I speak of the location and condition of the property I wish it to be understood that I am speaking of a property that I know personally, and through which I have been, and know all about. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said that the McIntyre leases were in the centre of the property ; whereas they are on the north side of the property and not in the centre at all. He said that the piece between Paradise Row is not taken by the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You have no front on Paradise Row at all.

Mr. McLEOD. We have two entrances on Paradise Row. He says also that the best and most valuable buildings are on this lease. That is incorrect, because the McIntyre lease itself has no buildings upon it. The DeVeber leases have an office and some stores and a blacksmith shop and a house, but the most valuable and most important buildings are down right alongside the railway on

the very land that the hon. gentleman said was a swamp. They have the car shop, the construction shop, the paint shop, and the most valuable shops in this place described as a swamp by the hon. gentleman, and within two feet or less of the track. The hon. gentleman also says that the buildings on the property are old and torn down, but I can tell him that the car shop, the construction shop and the paint shop are all valuable and new buildings. The others are buildings good for their purpose and have cost a large amount of money to erect. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his valuation of $21,000, but I can say that the valuation made by three different independent valuators places the value of the buildings on the strip—I speak of the strip which the hon. gentleman mentions—at somewhere about $30,000. That valuation was made by three disinterested persons.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I gave the hon. gentleman the cost at $21,800.

Mr. McLEOD. The hon. gentleman will excuse me if I say that he cannot produce any correct authority for that valuation, because the value I have given was made by three disinterested parties who are thoroughly qualified to place a correct valuation upon it. Looking at the buildings, they do not show the entire cost, because there is a great deal of work done inside of the foundry, the car-wheel shop and the machine shop.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him? The memorandum at the foot of this statement, which is not a general statement but a specific one giving details, says: This includes the value of chimneys, wheel pits, engine pits, cupolas, &c.

Mr. McLEOD. I do not know what the hon. gentleman is reading from, but I know the valuation I give was made by three persons independently, who were not connected with the Harrises in any way, and who went through the buildings and examined them for themselves. I wish also to speak with reference to the property mentioned as having been purchased, namely, the Hazen, the Wales, and another property. Some of this property has been in Mr. Harris's possession for fifty years. At first, he took them as leasehold properties with the right to purchase the leases, and he purchased most of them years ago, and when he first got the property it was worth nothing like what it is now. He agreed to purchase the Hazen and the Wales property some three years ago, but did not get the deed. The agreement of purchase had been made long before, and the property had been in the possession of Harris from year to year and had been used by him to put buildings on it as he required to do so. When this matter was in progress and he thought he was going to sell, he completed the deed. At the time the lease was made he had bought all except the McIntyre and the DeVeber leases. As to the Moore property, the price paid for it was $25,000. At that time I was acting as agent for the Minister of Justice and I got the cheque for $25,000 from Ottawa and paid it. There was nothing in the world except an old wooden building of no account on that property.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A nail factory.

Mr. McLEOD. The nail factory was not there. The machinery had been moved out some years ago, and there was just a simple wooden building which was not used for anything. The price, as I said, was $25,000, or at the rate of $1.22 per superficial foot. They destroyed nobody's buildings on that property and did no harm to the owner of it. Now, in this property there are 216,000 superficial feet, and putting that at $1 a foot, it would be $216,000. The estimate of the buildings on the whole property is something like $50,000 or $60,000, and the estimate of the buildings on the strip taken, and on which the most valuable buildings are, is something in the vicinity of $30,000. Now, the hon. gentleman may take any test he pleases. Let him go to St. John and ask any business man he pleases, or any man who knows the value of property in that city, and I will undertake to say that they will tell him that its value is more than $200,000. Talk about leaving the question to the Exchequer Court: if I were the owner of the property, I would be glad to leave it to the Exchequer Court, and if I did, I venture to say that I would get $50,000 more for it than the Government are paying for it. With regard to Mr. Taylor's affidavit, he says that no statement was furnished from the books that the foundry property was valued at $93,000. On this very property, which the hon. gentleman values at $90,000, Mr. Taylor's own bank had advanced $100,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Had he not bonds to the amount of over $100,000 besides?

Mr. McLEOD. Not at all. That is where the dispute commenced. He had Mr. Robertson's bonds and a warehouse receipt, on which Mr. Robertson asked him to make additional advances. But this property was placed in the hands of a limited company, which had issued bonds to the extent of $150,000 or $175,000, I do not know which, and the bank took these bonds. They advanced $100,000 on the property, and then they advanced $50,000 more on bonds; and that is where the difficulty arose.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the official statement of the trial it is said that in addition to the bonds there was given a security to the bank for the advances made by it, an individual bond of Mr. I. C. Robertson for $20,000, two promissory notes for $4,000 and $4,800 respectively and a warehouse receipt for $30,000.

Mr. McLEOD. There were two notes discounted, and they were not under this security at all. A bond for $20,000 and a bond for $30,000 were given, and that is what the lawsuit was about. If the hon. gentleman will read the affidavit, he will find that Mr. Robertson said that Mr. Taylor stated that the bank was not able to continue doing business and give the company all the advances they wanted. Further than that, Mr. Pitcaithley himself said that the whole of that property was worth more than $400,000, and he was negotiating to sell it at that figure in England. Mr. Armstrong said that when this property was offered it was worth $175,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That included the plant and machinery.

Mr. McLEOD. No. He said he understood so, but he does not swear to it. Mr. Robertson stated that when the company was being formed, J. Harris & Co. owned the bulk of the stock, and they did not place any special value on this property known as the car works and foundry, which

was to be handed over to the company, with a capital of something like $275,000, and this property was to be put in at nearly $200,000. Then he says that the statement in the book was this: When Mr. Harris went there first, it was before the Intercolonial Railway was built, and before any station was there. Of course, everybody knows that in the last ten years, since that station was built, this property has greatly increased in value. Mr. Harris went there over fifty years ago, and he acquired the property gradually in small amounts, and the valuation in his book, as stated in the affidavit of Mr. Robertson, was the valuation of the property when he first bought it—the prices he gave some fifty years ago, and the price at which he obtained leasehold property. He never considered that as the value of the property.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman deny that after the company was formed a year or two ago, the Harris Company put the value of the whole foundry property in their books at $93,000?

Mr. McLEOD. I say that Mr. Robertson states that that is not true. He says that the valuation is very much more. I did not look at the book. No importance whatever was attached to that. This great question has arisen simply because of the difficulty between the Halifax Banking Company and the Harris Company, Limited. The bank had advanced $100,000 on bonds issued on the security of this very property, and there is an agreement now before the courts showing that further advances were to be made by way of discounting business paper. I may say, further, that the Harris Company not only own this property, but own a part of the property known as the Harris rolling mill. The first agreement with the banking company was that it would do the banking for both establishments, and then the bank declined to do so. Mr. Robertson states in his affidavit that he understood that it had not capital enough to do all the business for both, and that is what the dispute is about. The bank asks, that the amount of the mortgage be paid, and that it be relieved of the mortgage. It is true, that the Harris Company were obliged to sell their property and to close their sale much more quickly than they otherwise would, because the banking company had these bonds and mortgages, and had given notice of foreclosure; and as the Government were about to take the property, they could not afford to hold out and have the property valued in the Exchequer Court, though they would rather have done so. As to taking the whole of the property, if the hon. gentleman will look at the map, he will find that from the corner of the Moore property to the southern corner of Lombard street there is a sort of gore; and it would be necessary to cut through the car shop, the paint shop and all the most valuable buildings, and practically to destroy the whole business. So that if you paid for that, you would have to pay for the reconstruction of the buildings, and only get a part of the land. So the question was whether it would not be best to take the whole property, when it could be got for $200,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman said last year that $80,000 was sufficient.

Mr. McLEOD. I did not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why did the hon. gentleman ask the House to vote that?

Mr. McLEOD. I did not. I stated to the House that it was not sufficient But the Government wisely and properly thought that they had a right to fix on a valuation. But I knew very well, and so does any one who knows the property, that $80,000 would not begin to be sufficient to buy the strip, and the only question left after that, and it was the wisest and most business plan to adopt, was to have a valuation made. Any member of this committee who knows the citizens of St. John will know that Mr. Fairweather and Mr. Charles A. Everett are two of the most respected citizens and merchants in St. John. They are two men of the highest stamp, and I am sure neither I nor any one else who knows these gentlemen would ask for more honest and disinterested men to give a fair and candid opinion, and there are no two men on whose judgment I would rather rely. The Harris representatives knew nothing about the value of the property until they heard it from the Government. You may take any test you please. Take the Moore property which was bought two or three years ago and compare it with this, and you will find that the Government have not given more than two-thirds what was given for the Moore property, and yet the Moore property was absolutely worthless unless this was taken also. It is said there are no buildings there, but I know that the railway authorities propose to use the construction shops and, I think, the car shops, but I know they propose to use the construction shops for storing purposes. They need it, and they need the other land there for tracks. At present I assume the Government will not need to use the whole property, but I say that as a matter of business, when they had to buy the gore or the whole lot, they acted very wisely in buying the whole of it. I expressed the opinion last year, and I express it again now, that the Government made a mistake, when they took land for the building of a passenger station, in not taking more. They just crept right along the Harris property, and the Harris construction shops are within two feet of the Intercolonial Railway track. Many violent charges have been made by the hon. gentleman which I cannot think he believes. I give my most unequivocal and unqualified denial to the statement that the money or any part of it was used for the purpose of meeting election expenses, nor do I believe the hon. gentleman is convinced that it was. I know the source whence his information comes, I know that source is not to be relied upon, and I know that the statement put forward here in that respect is absolutely and entirely untrue.

Mr. HAGGART. A word in reply to the hon. gentleman. My friend, the Acting Minister of Railways, would, I know, carry out implicitly any promise he made to the House. The hon. member for Queen's, reading from *Hansard*, led the House to believe that a promise was made by the Acting Minister of Railways that no part of this money would be expended unless the property was expropriated. Knowing the care with which my hon. colleague sees that everything he states to the House is punctually carried out, I could not possibly understand how he could have made a promise of that kind and acted differently, so I sent for the

Hansard to see whether the statement of the hon. gentleman was correct or not. He led the House to believe, and he was reading from *Hansard* at the time, that a promise was made by the Acting Minister of Railways that no part of this money would be expended until expropriation was made. I will quote *Hansard*, page 3887 :

"Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to know how the value of that will be settled?

"Mr. BOWELL. The proposition is that if an equitable arrangement cannot be come to with the parties, the price will have to be decided by arbitration."

Evidently, therefore, the hon. member intended to carry out the matter by an equitable arrangement shortly afterwards, and it is the only remark my hon. colleague made on the subject, and it was after Mr. Hazen was speaking, my hon. friend and colleague said :

"I think I said a little while ago that the value of the property would be ascertained by arbitration. I meant to say, by expropriation."

He corrected what evidently was his intended meaning by arbitration, that is expropriation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not an arbitration.

Mr. HAGGART. There can be no other deduction from the statement of the hon. gentleman than that he intended to make an equitable arrangement, and if it was not possible to do that, he intended to expropriate the property.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The last statement made by the then Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Bowell) is perfectly correct, and that is what I quoted.

Mr. HAGGART. Why did you not quote the other?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Because this is the statement he made in correcting the other : "I think I said a little while ago that the value of this property would be ascertained by arbitration," implying a private agreement to be made between the parties, and then he added that by arbitration he meant expropriation, which does not imply a private agreement but a forced take.

Mr. HAGGART. It was explaining the word "arbitration" and no other meaning could he have. He explained that he meant expropriation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is what I said.

Mr. BOWELL. That was in case an equitable arrangement could not be made between the parties. I first said we would try to arrange an equitable valuation for the property, and if that could not be done, then an arbitration would be had subsequently. The Minister of Railways has correctly explained that what I meant by arbitration was expropriation, and if necessary to go into court. The promise I made to the House has been strictly carried out. The hon. gentleman, as a barrister, knows very well that is the construction to be put upon my language; and if he desired to do me justice, he would have said so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the hon. member for St. John a question or two. As I understand, the chief value of the property lies in the land and the buildings are a secondary consideration?

Mr. McLEOD. The buildings are sufficient for the purposes for which they are required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But not of great value in themselves?

Mr. HAZEN. I am told by Mr. Schreiber that it is the intention of the Government to use this car shed for a flour store, and they intend to spend a small amount of money on it to make it in every respect suitable for the storage of flour.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At any rate, I understand that the land is the principal part of the value. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. McLeod) substantially admitted that, although there are some differences between himself and my friend beside me as to the value of these buildings. There was a statement made by my hon. friend from Queen's, which I did not hear the hon. gentleman notice at all, as to which I would like some information. He informs us that the assessed value of these properties is $66,000. Does the hon. member for St. John contradict that?

Mr. McLEOD. I do not know the assessed value, but the property was situated in what we call the city of Portland until a short time ago, and the value of property in Portland is very much lower than its value in the city. I mean for assessment purposes. In addition, I may say that we never pretend to assess our factories there at anything like the value for taxation purposes, because there is a continual cry raised about taxation, and in the case of some of them, there is exceptional legislation with regard to taxes, as for instance in the case of the carriage factory and rope walk, and although there was no special legislation with reference to this property the same rule was adopted as regards their assessment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be, but I put the question to elicit information, because, in a great many cities the value is put very near, though not always, the actual value of the property, or at all events within a small percentage of the actual value. This is very largely the case with us, but of course I do not know how that is in St. John. The assessors are bound under oath to do that, but of course I know that, particularly in regard to farm property, their habit is not to assess the properties at their full value, though it is generally the case in cities. The hon. gentleman referred to some statements made by Mr. Taylor, who, I believe, is the manager of the Halifax Banking Company. The statement made by Mr. Taylor is a very serious one. I have here a certified copy of his affidavit, and he says :

"Referring to the statement in the 26th section of the plaintiff's bill of complaint that the said plaintiff company was forced by the action of the bank to sell their property at a sacrifice, I say it is currently reported, and I believe it to be the case, that the said purchase money is the sum of $200,000, while in a balance sheet furnished to me by the company during the last year the said foundry property and leases are valued at $93,401.43."

Now, I am tolerably well conversant with matters submitted by mercantile firms to banks, and it is wholly contrary to my experience, and, I think, to the experience of all persons who have any knowledge of the statements usually furnished by debtors to creditors, that they should furnish a statement such as was furnished in this case. He says that the amount furnished was $93,400 and as the value of property which was really, honestly believed to be worth two or three times as much. If that statement was made, as this person swears, by those who now sell it to the Government, I should regard the transaction with very great suspicion. I should consider that such a statement

made by a debtor to his creditor, and more particularly when his creditor was a bank, when it was advancing money on the property, was very formidable evidence as to the value of the property.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As the hon. member for St. John (Mr. McLeod) has made some suggestions in regard to the statement to which I referred, I will read the statement in full, and give the details:

Wales' house (wooden and old)	$650
Wales' foundry (wooden and 1875), brass work	200
Blacksmith shop (wooden and old)	400
Iron shed, store and office and house (wooden and old), vault only of value	600
House (wooden and old)	700
Stable do	100
Warehouse do	150
Warehouse (wood about 10 years old)	300
Lumber shed	100
Car wheel moulding shop, with cupola and wheel pits. Just a brick shell, building about 10 years old, cost less	4,000
Shed opposite office	no value
Machine moulding shop (wood and very old) with steel shell pits and cupolas (2)	1,000
Pig iron and coal sheds (wooden), roof only	100
Machine shop, 1854, brick (in bad condition)	2,000
Casting and dressing shed (wood and new)	400
Dryhouse (old and brick), engine and boiler gone or not used	1,000
Moulding shop (wood and new)	1,000
Block of buildings (sand shed, &c.), rattle traps, old and new	200
Passenger car shop (old and new) about 120 feet long, 50 feet wide. A shell	2,000
Construction shop, paint shop, car shop, mill engine, wooden buildings of all recent build, except the paint shop and part of the mill	5,000
Dryhouse, new (shed) and wooden	400
Passenger car shops (wooden and recent)	1,500
	$21,800

Mr. HAZEN. What statement are you reading from?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A statement made by an officer of the Harris Company.

Mr. HAZEN. What is his name?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will state who made the statement later on.

Mr. McLEOD. What is the name of the officer who made the statement?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I cannot give the name. I believe he is the accountant of the Harris Company.

Mr. McLEOD. Is it not Mr. Adam McIntyre?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If it were Mr. McIntyre what difference would that make?

Mr. McLEOD. It would make this difference, that his word is not worth the snap of my finger. He is simply trying to strike at Harris & Co.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He knows the value of the property.

Mr. McLEOD. He was there for two years as a book-keeper, and I undertake to say that that statement was made by him, and it might as well have been made by any one who had never been there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman states that this man was book-keeper there for two years, and the hon. gentleman, omniscient as no doubt he is, and knowing more about this matter than any other man—I quite admit that——

Mr. BOWELL. What do you mean by that?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I mean what I say.

Mr. BOWELL. What do you insinuate?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman stated that he was the solicitor for Harris & Co.

Mr. McLEOD. I did not say so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then, what did you say?

Mr. McLEOD. I said I was counsel for them in that suit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On that ground the hon. gentleman claimed to speak with a special knowledge of the facts, but I say that the statement of counsel in a suit is not to be received by this House with more weight than the statement of a man who has been on the property for two years, and consequently must know a great deal as to its value.

Mr. McLEOD. The hon. gentleman has discredited his own statement, because he thinks that a man who takes advantage of his position as an assistant book-keeper to get information out of the books of the company should be believed, whereas, when he goes through the country with statements of this kind, he writes himself down as a man not to be trusted.

Mr. BOWELL. If a statement is read to the House by the hon. gentleman, surely it is not asking too much to ask by whom that statement was made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have said that he was the accountant of the company.

Mr. BOWELL. What is his name?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not know his name. The hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. McLeod) says it is Mr. McIntyre.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman has the name, he refuses to give it. There may have been a dozen book-keepers in that firm. Does the hon. gentleman know what was the name of this one? He contradicts everything which has been said, and he does it with an apparent honesty that would lead people to believe what he says.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is that insinuation?

Mr. BOWELL. That is no insinuation. It is plain talk. This is a statement made by a man not known to the House, and is put against the statement of two of the most respectable men in the Province of New Brunswick. My hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) says both are business men. Mr. Fairweather and Mr. Everett stand as high in the estimation of those who know them as any men in the Dominion, and who have no superiors, so far as business ability and knowledge of the value of property in St. John are concerned. Now, these gentlemen were asked by the Government, not at the suggestion of the owner of this property, to make a valuation. The valuation has been given, and until we have some better evidence than the mere statement by some anonymous person whose name the hon. gentleman appears to be afraid to give to the world, I think we have a right to place dependence on the valuation of men of known honour and known integrity.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will permit me to say, that I asked expressly for the valuation of Mr. Fairweather and the other gentleman whose name I forget, for the purpose of seeing whether they valued these buildings or not. The Minister of Militia has endeavoured to lead the House to believe that these gentlemen did value the buildings, and valued them differently from the valuation I read, and I challenge him to produce the valuation.

Mr. FOSTER. The valuation, as given by Mr. Fairweather who did value the buildings, was, on the whole piece of ground, $61,318; on the triangular piece of ground, $37,221; so that we have Mr. Fairweather, a reputable gentleman of known integrity and business ability, trusted wherever he is known, making an estimate of the buildings and sending it in on his faith and knowledge as a business man, and he values them at $61,318.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will you produce it?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that valuation can be produced.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the House is entitled to that valuation, and just as soon as we can get it, both reports will be laid upon the Table.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We are entitled to it, because you are asking us for the money.

Mr. HAZEN. This question of increased room in connection with the station at St. John is not by any means a new question. It has not sprung into being since the last election, or immediately before the last election. In the year 1886 the Department of Railways concluded that further accommodation was required at the station in the city of St. John, and having come to that conclusion, and with that idea in their minds, they acquired the property known as the E. R. Moore property, adjoining the station in the city of St. John, fronting on Main street, containing altogether 17,600 superficial feet, and they paid for that property, with no buildings on it at the time, the sum of $25,000. I understand that before they took the Moore property the Government intended to expropriate it, and had arbitrators appointed who placed upon the property, after going over it and looking at it, a higher sum than $25,000. That was in the year 1886, before the Act was passed requiring the expropriation to be done through the Exchequer Court. However, the Government made this private bargain for the Moore property for the sum of $25,000, and as it contained 17,600 superficial feet, it will be seen that they paid for that property $1.42 per superficial foot. Now, I will say for the benefit of gentlemen who do not understand the situation of that station at St. John, that the Moore property was utterly and absolutely useless for railway purposes unless it also included the Harris property that was in rear of the Moore property; so that when the department acquired the Moore property it was with the intention, at a later day, of also acquiring the Harris property in rear, without which, as I say, the Moore property was utterly useless for railway purposes. Well, matters remained in abeyance for several years. When the Canadian Pacific Railway came into the St. John station, where their business was handled, they required further car room and further yard room, and the question was forced upon the Railway Department with the result that when they were making up their estimates for the last session of Parliament, they placed the sum of $80,000 in the Estimates. The Minister stated at that time that he was looking over the whole ground to see what was best to be done. Now, I desire to say that in the first instance, this sum was placed in the Estimates, not at the request of the members for the City and County of St. John; it was placed in the Estimates because Mr. Pottinger, and Mr. Wallace, the district superintendent, and Mr. Robertson, the station master at St. John, represented to the Government that for the purpose of the business of the Intercolonial Railway they would have to have this increased room and this increased accommodation, and the sum was placed in the Estimates from that standpoint. Last year the hon. gentleman who is now the Minister of Militia, and who was then Acting Minister of Railways and Canals, went down to St. John and looked over the whole ground for himself, and he came to the conclusion that it would be much more desirable for railway purposes to acquire the whole of the Harris property than to acquire a narrow strip behind, especially when he found out that that narrow strip behind could not be purchased from the Harris people except for a sum, I think, of about $150,000 or $160,000. Before the hon. gentleman purchased this property as Acting Minister of Railways, he asked for two opinions as to its value, from gentlemen living in the city of St. John. Both those men are above reproach and above suspicion. Neither of them could be influenced in any way by any personal consideration for the Harris people, and neither of them could have any interest in the Harris concern. What is the report of those gentlemen? We find that Mr. Charles H. Fairweather, one of the leading merchants of the city of St. John, a member of the firm of Hall & Fairweather, a gentleman who has been for the past 30 or 40 years a leading citizen of that city, and stands high in the respect and esteem of every one, whether Liberal or Conservative—I say Mr. Charles Fairweather went over that property in company with Mr. John McKeen, a leading architect in the city of St. John, and Mr. Edward Bates, a most trustworthy and honest citizen of St. John; they went over these properties at the request of the Government. Mr. Fairweather reported to the Government. That report, I am sorry to say, is not here now, it has been sent to the agent of the Minister of Justice at St. John, but I presume it will be before the House soon. Mr. Fairweather, after a careful inspection of the property in company with these other two gentlemen I have named, reported to the Government that they valued it at $313,457. Now, no man who knows Mr. Fairweather will question the honesty of any report he may make, and I say, in giving that report Mr. Fairweather gave an honest and unbiassed opinion, free from any outside consideration.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would the hon. gentleman prefer that valuation to the valuation submitted by the Harris Company themselves to the bank, when they applied for money?

Mr. HAZEN. I may say to the hon. gentleman that he is basing his argument on affidavits that are produced in a contested equity case in the city of St. John, brought by the Harris people against

the Halifax Banking Company, because they say the Halifax Banking Company, not having carried out their agreement to advance them the money which they have agreed to do, compelled them to sell their property at a sacrifice. I will not enter into the merits of that case, as I am not retained professionally in the case, and have no interest in it. For the present, I am merely relying on the statement of Mr. Fairweather, a thoroughly independent man, who has no interest in the property, and who is not mixed up in any litigation, and who made this report at the request of the Government, without, I will venture to say, knowing at the time that the representatives from the City and County of St. John knew that he was going to make it. Now it might be fairly said that Mr. Fairweather's opinion is merely the opinion of one man. It may be said: It is true, he is an intelligent man, and knows the city of St. John as well as any other man in it; still, he may be mistaken, and there is a very serious error of judgment on the part of Mr. Fairweather. But we have another opinion. The Acting Minister of Railways at that time was not satisfied simply with one opinion, for he foresaw that one man might be in error, and so he obtained several opinions, and he asked Mr. Charles A. Everett to give an opinion. Most hon. gentlemen opposite will remember that Mr. Everett was at one time the representative of the City and County of St. John in this Parliament; Mr. Everett was born in St. John and has lived there all his life, and he enjoys an admirable and excellent business reputation. Mr. Everett went over that property in company with an architect and builder, and he placed on it a valuation of $349,656, or $36,000 more than Mr. Fairweather put on it. We have not got Mr. Fairweather's statement here, but the report submitted to the department shows that the architect and builder placed the valuation of the buildings on the property at $60,000. In view of such an important statement, is it fair to say, is it honourable to say, that the price paid for this property shows that it must have been a job?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the hon. gentleman's contention is that the Government are getting the property at something over $100,000 less than its real value.

Mr. HAZEN. I am not saying anything of the sort. I am placing facts before the committee, so that hon. gentlemen can draw their own conclusion. I do not pretend to be able myself to give an estimate as to what the property is worth. I was through the factory and workshops just before the last election, for a purpose which, no doubt, hon. gentlemen are familiar, for the purpose of securing votes at the election. I went through the shops seeing the men employed, and I thought it was a very extensive establishment, and that there were very large buildings on the property. If $25,000 was a fair amount to pay for the Moore property in 1886, and I never heard that payment criticised or questioned, and I never saw it criticised in a single journal of public opinion in the city of St. John—if that was a fair amount to pay for the Moore property, which was equivalent to $1.42 per superficial foot, then $200,000 for the Harris property, on which there were buildings worth, according to Mr. Bates's and Mr. McKeen's report, $60,000, is not too much, because this amount of $200,000 is paid for 216,000 superficial feet, at 90 cents per superficial foot, as against $1.42 per superficial foot for the Moore property.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) One property faces on the street and the other does not.

Mr. HAZEN. The difference in price accounts for it. I have some other proofs for the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman will say that this estimate by Mr. Fairweather is the estimate of a Conservative, and that the estimate of Mr. Everett is the estimate of a Conservative. Let me show him estimates of value placed on property in that vicinity by three prominent Liberals in St. John. A few years ago the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company built a bridge across the falls and had to acquire the land to the railway station. The hon. gentleman knows the locality. Almost every time he comes to Ottawa he passes through St. John, and he knows the part of the city through which the railway, from the station to the cantilever bridge, passes. Under the terms of the company's charter to build that bridge, the land damages were to be assessed by a board of three arbitrators appointed by the Local Liberal Government in New Brunswick. That Government appointed as arbitrators for the purpose of assessing the land damages, three gentlemen residing in St. John: A. Chipman Smith, now a director of public works; Mr. Tapley, a gentleman very well known in the north end of the city, and a leading Liberal; and Mr. Moore, then chamberlain of Portland and a leading Liberal. Listen to the valuation which those gentlemen placed on property taken by that company. The strip they took was in some cases 40 feet and in other cases 60 feet in width. They awarded to Edward Fisher, who had a pond across which the railway ran on a trestle, $3,100. They awarded to A. C. Sorel, who had a pond, $1,400. To the firm of Kirk & Daniel, across whose property the road ran, and from whom they acquired a strip of land, 40 by 200 feet, $42,000 damages, and the Bridge Company had to pay it. They awarded Messrs. Hilyards, who had a mill there and whose property I am safe in saying was very little injured, for a strip 60 by 500 feet, damages to the amount of $29,313. They awarded R. Rankin $2,100 for a strip 60 by 200 feet. They awarded Lynch $4,000, M. Simonds $2,655, Hamilton $750, E. J. Simonds $8,000, Gregory $1,750 and John Simonds $3,722. I do not pretend to be a judge of property there, but I say that if that valuation, made only a few years ago by Smith, Moore and Tapley, three prominent Liberals, as against the Railway and Bridge Company, was true and right, then the sum paid to the Harrises is not too large in proportion to that amount, and also as compared with the sum paid for the Moore property. There has been a very serious side to this discussion. The hon. member for Queen's was, as is always the case when the hon. gentleman deals with questions of facts, most inaccurate, and he was even more than ordinarily inaccurate in his remarks on this occasion. The hon. gentleman made the assertion that all that was paid for the Moore property was $16,000. The hon. gentleman then declared that the Harris property was a low swamp.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman deny that the land bought for the Intercolonial Railway is low land?

Mr. HAZEN. There is no justification for the statement that it is a low swamp.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said that is was swampy land. I qualified that by saying that it was low land.

Mr. HAZEN. Then the hon. gentleman, in the third place, made the statement, in dealing with another question of fact, that the Acting Minister of Railways last year assured and pledged his word to the House—and the hon. gentleman said this with great gravity—that the property would only be taken after expropriation. That is also shown to be absolutely incorrect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is not.

Mr. HAZEN. The plea which my hon. and learned friend made was that of a special pleader or a police court attorney. What are the facts? The then Minister of Railways, addressing the House last year, said, as will be found in *Hansard*, that if an equitable arrangement could not be come to, then the property would be taken by arbitration. And then a few minutes afterwards he corrected himself and said he did not mean by arbitration but by expropriation. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell this committee that this statement does not mean that, if an equitable arrangement could not be arrived at, the property would be taken by expropriation? That is the only meaning to be attached to it. Yet the hon. gentleman tells this committee that the Minister of Railways pledged his word that this land should be taken by expropriation. For my own part I do not know how the land was taken or what the arrangement was, and I really knew nothing about it, and did not know that the land had been purchased until I saw it announced in the newspapers; but the hon. gentleman, in dealing with questions of facts, is, even for him, more than ordinarily inaccurate in the present case. He went further, and made the most serious charge that has been made on the floor of Parliament this session. He said this was a huge job, and that he believed this large sum of money was being paid so that a large portion of it might go to pay expenses at the recent election. Does the hon. gentleman realize the gravity of what he has stated? The hon. gentleman made this charge, and when asked against whom he made it, he said he did not make it against any one. No; the hon. gentleman is not man enough to make a charge against any one, or in a manner in which the responsibility for that charge can be brought home to him. He makes a charge in general terms, and then when he is challenged and asked against whom he makes it, he is not man enough to say against whom; but he stands up in this House and in a cowardly way says he makes the charges against nobody. Is that the line of conduct which a member of this House should pursue when he makes the assertion that corrupt practices have taken place, and that the representatives of the City and County of St. John have been guilty of putting up a job, and getting money corruptly for election purposes?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is what you found long ago charged in the city of St. John.

Mr. HAZEN. We did not. There was not a man or a newspaper in the city of St. John who dared to make such a charge. I desire to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I believe it absolutely, and undeniably true, that the man who makes such an assertion as that against me is nothing else than a foul-mouthed slanderer. I say it was contemptible for the hon. gentleman to make a charge of that sort, which will be published in the papers of the country to-morrow, that the three members from the City and County of St. John, have been getting money from the public chest for the purpose of meeting their election expenses. He is not man enough to make the charge in such a way that the responsibility can be brought home to him so that we may be able to meet him face to face and to punish him for the slander. Insinuations have been made in certain newspapers, and perhaps that is where the hon. gentleman got the information, that there was something wrong in this transaction, but no direct charge was ever made on which an action for libel could be based. I am glad to have an opportunity to say in this House, that the man who makes a charge like that against me, is nothing more or less than a foul-mouthed slanderer, and if he makes the charge in such a way as to give me an opportunity of meeting it, I will be only too glad to give him an opportunity of proving it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) These mock heroics which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) has just indulged in are quite uncalled for. I never heard the hon. gentleman's integrity called in question, and I never referred to it directly or indirectly. I did not know he had anything to do with the matter, and his violent statements, therefore, are without any foundation. He challenges some person to come forward and prove that he did something improper, but I would remind him it is time enough for him to excuse himself when he finds himself accused. Does he know the old French proverb?

Mr. HAZEN. You make a general charge and you are not man enough to bring it against any particular person.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has forgotten himself and has lost his head. He has used without reason extremely unparliamentary and ungentlemanly language. He has made himself a spectacle in this House to-day charging hon. gentlemen here with having made accusations which they never made. He had better wait to deny them until he is charged. He had better reserve his heroics until a suitable time comes. When he is charged it is time enough to defend himself. I never heard his name connected with this matter, and he knows his name was not mentioned. He knows I did not mention it, and that I never referred to him directly or indirectly. What is the meaning, therefore, of this mock denunciation and assertion of his innocence? I would advise the hon. gentleman hereafter when he wants to make an exhibition of this kind, to feel his ground a little better and not to hurl ungentlemanly and ungenerous accusations across the floor of the House, and try to impute to hon. members language which they never used, and try to put in their mouths charges which they never made. I stated that it was generally believed in St. John that this money was paid, and would be appropriated for election expenses. The hon. gentleman knows that statement has been made in the St. John press.

Mr. HAZEN. It has not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He knows that the representatives of St. John never brought an action of libel against the papers which made that statement. What is the meaning, therefore, of the heroic challenge that if somebody would make the statement in the press he would take an action for libel? The statement has been made in the press in the terms in which I made it in the House, and why did he not bring his action?

Mr. HAZEN. That is another misstatement of your facts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What?

Mr. HAZEN. That such a statement was made in the press.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You yourself admitted it a few minutes ago.

Mr. HAZEN. I said "insinuations."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You said that insinuations were made in the St. John press to the effect that this money was paid, and that some of it might be diverted to the election expenses in St. John. I repeated that, and I said that it was the belief, and the hon. gentleman knows that it is the belief.

Mr. HAZEN. It is not the belief.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is the belief expressed by a large portion of the press of St. John, and I submitted to the House the facts on which I rely for my belief: that a very much larger sum than ought to have been paid was paid for the land. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) with all his shouting and mouthing has not had the courage to challenge the correctness of the main proposition on which my statement was based, namely, the men who got the money had submitted a statement to the bank within a year, that the value of their property was less than half what was paid them. In the face of that statement I was warranted and justified and bound to call the attention of the House to it. I would have been recreant to my duty had I held my tongue in the face of facts of this kind, showing that public money had been misappropriated. If the fact is true, I say I was bound to bring it before the House, and until the fact is challenged, I say that the conclusion which independent minds will draw is the same conclusion that I draw, namely, that a very much larger sum of money was paid than ought to have been paid for this property. That is the proposition which I submitted this afternoon.

Mr. McLEOD. Perhaps I have not made myself clear in my remarks in reference to what was stated by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as to the statement made to the bank in Mr. Taylor's affidavit. I am sure I am speaking correctly when I say that no such statement was made to the bank, with a view of getting credit for J. Harris & Co. Of course all this comes up in consequence of the difficulty that arose between James Harris & Co., Limited, and the Halifax Banking Co. The business commenced with James Harris & Co., Limited, some years ago. I may say Harris & Co., Limited, had been for some time proposing to put this property into a corporation called James Harris & Co., and it is correct that the Halifax Banking Co. advanced to this company this $103,000, the company giving as security these bonds. The advance was made on the faith of these bonds, and not on any statements that J. Harris & Co. made, if they did make one. I do not know whether they did or not, but I assume that in the negotiations and in the matters which arose from time to time as to getting this company arranged—because there was a great deal of difficulty in it, there was an offer made and then withdrawn and changes in the Act of incorporation were continually going on—and I suppose they went over the books and saw it in this way. What Mr. Robertson, in his affidavit, stated was this: that the valuation in the books was not the valuation of the property. As I said before, the property was entered in the books simply at the price it cost, some of it having been bought as far back as 50 years ago, some of it leasehold property, and it was not intended to be put in at the present valuation at all. This statement was not made with a view of getting any credit, because the credit, as I say, on the $100,000 advanced, was advanced on the faith of the bonds issued by James Harris & Co., Limited, which were deposited with the Halifax Bank, and a mortgage given on this property to the Trust Company. The money owing to the Halifax Banking Company was by James Harris & Co., Limited, and not by James Harris & Co., who made no statement to the bank with a view of getting credit. Further than that I may say that this money was not advanced by any statement made by Harris, but Mr. Pitcaithley and this man went and looked at the property themselves, which I may say, in passing, was the most complete car works in Canada. Everything in connection with a car was made there. I think there were not more complete, if as complete, car works in Canada. Mr. Pitcaithley himself valued the property at $400,000. I have in my possession his letter negotiating for its sale at that figure, and he would have carried it through except that the capitalists thought it was not enough to justify them in bringing foreign capital. But the property would not sell for that figure, I suppose, because it would be difficult to get that much in a sale; but no statement was ever made fixing the present value at $90,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have listened attentively to the reading of the extract from the speech of the hon. Minister of Militia by the hon. Minister of Railways, and I have no doubt in my own mind that that speech is open to the construction which the hon. Minister of Railways has put upon it, and that that construction is the one which the hon. Minister of Militia himself had in his mind. I think that much is clear from what the Minister has said and from what he did. But, Sir, we have still before us the important question as to the valuation of this property. One hon. gentleman from the city of St. John tells the committee that the valuation put upon the property by the owners themselves, $93,401, came out in a suit. It is not of the slightest importance how it came out; it is the fact itself that is important to the committee. Here is a company, which has been organized within two years, and this is the value which the owners themselves put upon it at the institution of the company, not the valuation that existed half a century before. Then, my hon. friend referred to an affidavit made by one of the principal members of the company, in which the whole

property, land, buildings and plant was valued at $175,000, and the hon. gentleman ignores that fact altogether. If the valuation of the plant was anything like what one would suppose it to be in so complete a work, for the hon. gentleman says it is the most complete car shop in Canada—I suppose the hon. gentleman has examined all the car shops in Canada and, therefore, speaks from personal knowledge——

Mr. McLEOD. I said I believed it was.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We would like to know what the foundation of the hon. gentleman's belief is. If he does not possess the knowledge, the mere statement of his belief is of no value. It was a very complete institution, and if so the plant must have been worth a great deal. The buildings which the hon. gentleman endeavours to value at $60,000, my hon. friend says cost less than $22,000. The hon. gentleman knows that the lands, the buildings, the plant and everything else, were estimated by one of the principal proprietors at $175,000. Then, to show that the Government got a good bargain, the other hon. gentleman from St. John said that one of the gentlemen appointed by the Government to value the property valued it at $349,000, and the other valued it at $314,000. If they put these values on the property, that would go to show, not what disinterested men value the property at, but the utter worthlessness of the valuation put upon it by these men. Another hon. gentleman from St. John says it is worth $400,000.

Mr. McLEOD. I did not say so. I said that Mr. Pitcaithley said so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said that though it might not sell for that, and though that might not be its market value, still its intrinsic value was the sum mentioned. Well, how came the Government to get the property for $200,000, which is less than two-thirds of the valuation mentioned by these parties? Have they been taking the property for far less than its value? Have they been driving a hard and unconscionable bargain with those poor fellows in St. John? Is that the opinion the hon. gentleman wishes to impress on the House? The hon. gentleman ought to know that extravagant statements and extravagant valuations of that kind are calculated to create distrust, not to allay distrust. But, Sir, I would place very little confidence in a statement putting the value of the property at $349,000 when I find the parties themselves ready to part with it for less than two-thirds of this amount. It just shows that the valuation is a preposterous one. If the hon. gentleman wanted to get a proper valuation for this property, there ought to have been selected some responsible parties outside of St. John who would have taken evidence in a proper way to ascertain the value, like a court expropriating property. We find this property assessed at $66,000. I do not know any real estate in this country that is assessed at less than half its value. In the towns it is assessed at very nearly its full value, and in the rural districts the assessors with us are bound to assess it at the price at which it would sell at a forced sale. Is the rule in St. John a different one? What would be the value of an assessment which had no reference to the value of the property assessed? Here is a property for which the Government are paying $195,000, for which the owners are assessed at $66,000, and which they themselves value at $93,401; or, including the plant, buildings and everything else, at $175,000; and the Government purchase it for $200,000, without the plant, or $25,000 more than the property with the plant is valued by the owners themselves. It is of the first consequence, if the House intends to discharge its duty, that it should take the evidence of competent persons and ascertain for itself, before it authorizes the payment of this money, the value of this property. The Government ask for this appropriation. What evidence do they give to the House? Why, they do not bring the papers but have sent them to the city of St. John. What is more, my hon. friend beside me reads the deed which the Government have taken, and it excepts the property held by lease by these very parties. When the hon. Minister of Railways undertakes to defend the transaction, what does he do? Does he undertake to construe the deed? Does he undertake to show that that is not the meaning the deed bears? No, he reads a communication from the solicitor stating what was in his mind, which may or may not have been carried out, but which those paragraphs of the deed, which my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island read, go to show were not carried out. The deed simply conveys to the Government for the sum of $195,000 the property of which Harris & Co. had the title in fee, and that is all the property which the Government obtained for the money they agreed to pay and which they have already paid. Now, I think that the House is entitled to some information upon the subject, and I am not willing, so far as I am concerned, to take the testimony of two parties who are residents of the city of St. John, however respectable and estimable they may be, as to the value of so large a property as this. What do we know as to the relation between those parties? How do we know but that Mr. Harris, it may be, confided to those very persons appointed to value the property——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Some hon. gentlemen say "oh, oh." Is that the way business is done by ordinary business men? Nay, more, is it the way in which business is transacted on behalf of any other country? It is the business of the House to see that parties who are free from local influences ascertain the value of this property and ascertain it by proper evidence taken in a proper way, and not by the mere exercise of judgment. They may be related by interest or other considerations, for aught we know, to the party who resides in the particular locality. I say that it is not a business way of making a purchase, and it is one which requires enquiry by the House before the money is paid.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentlemen who seem to rely their whole case upon a statement of valuation given by Harris & Co. to the Halifax Banking Company, when they obtained this loan, I have to say that it is perfectly clear by the statement of the hon. member for St. John that there was not any valuation given at the time the money was raised from the bank. On the contrary, the bonds given as security show that no such valuation, as stated by the hon. gentleman, was ever given to the Halifax Banking Company. Another statement of hon. gentlemen is that the books show the actual valuation of the property,

but that was a valuation made some fifty-years ago, and every one knows that property has largely increased in value since then, and that the valuation then is no indication of its present worth. The hon. member for Queen's argues that the valuation in the books was the full value put upon the property by the Harris Company themselves, but he must have known differently had he listened to the statement made by the hon. member for St. John. That statement shows that bonds to the amount of $175,000 were issued on this property, which originally, fifty years ago, had been valued at $93,000, and therefore the larger amount represents more accurately the real value of the property than the record in the books.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in assuming that the bonds were issued on this property only. Do I understand the hon. member for St. John to say that the bonds were issued on the property alone?

Mr. McLEOD. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The report of the trial does not say so.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood from the hon. gentleman that the bonds were issued on the same property which had been given to the Government, and we have, therefore, the statement of the hon. member for Queen's as against that of the hon. member for St. John. Why was not the hon. member for Queen's honest enough to acknowledge that Harris & Co. had valued the property at $175,000 when they issued the bonds to that amount, although they carried $93,000 in their books as the original cost?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The $175,000 included the plant. Did not the bonds cover the rolling mills?

Mr. McLEOD. No: this does not say so. It says the property and buildings, $175,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood that included the plant.

Mr. McLEOD. It does not say whether it does or not.

Mr. HAGGART. They would not issue bonds to the extent of $175,000 on $93,000 worth of property.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was it not $125,000 that the bonds were on the property?

Mr. HAGGART. No, they issued bonds to the extent of $175,000 on this property sold to the Government, which shows that is the valuation they put upon it. There is not a scintilla of foundation for the statement of the hon. gentleman; and we have the statement of the hon. member for St. John, who knows the facts, that the $93,000 was the cash value paid some fifty years ago for the property. With regard to the valuation of the buildings and fixtures, the hon. gentleman said there was not sufficient care taken, and he quotes a valuation which he obtained from an anonymous valuator showing the buildings to be worth only $21,000. I will give the House a statement made by gentlemen well known in St. John, one a leading architect and the other a prominent builder, and gentlemen who are not ashamed to sign their name to the paper, in which they value every particular building on the property:

"REPORT of the measurements and estimates of the value of the buildings and fixtures on the Harris estate at St. John, N.B., for the information of the Official Referee, Jas. Cowan, Esq.

"The numbers in this report refer to the numbers on the lithographed plan used in examining the buildings.

"No. 1.	Paint shop	$ 1,755 00
2.	Construction shop	7,000 00
3.	Passenger car shop	4,500 00
4.	do do (new)	2,800 00
5.	Car shop and mill	4,928 00
6.	Engine room, boiler and chimney	2,000 00
7.	Dry house, fan, &c.	1,114 00
8.	Lumber shed	300 00
9.	Warehouse	1,500 00
10.	do and shed	300 00
11.	Stable	217 00
12.	Engine house, oven, boiler and chimney	800 00
13.	Car wheel moulding shop with iron cupola	3,422 00
14.	Dwelling	800 00
15.	Shed—no value	
16.	do	100 00
17.	do	60 00
18.	Engine and machine shop	5,100 00
19.	Moulding machine shop	9,812 00
20.	Office with brick vault	650 00
21.	Stores	200 00
22.	Dwelling	600 00
23.	Iron warehouse	300 00
24.	Blacksmith shop, forges, boilers, oven and chimney	2,680 00
25.	Pattern shop, platform casting dressing room	2,600 00
26	Dry house and machine shop, engine house, boiler house and chimney	2,900 00
27.	Moulding shop—one cupola, two sheds	3,450 00
28.	No building	
29.	Box shed—no value	
30.	Pattern shop, two stories	100 00
31.	No value	
32.	do	
33.	Coal shed	50 00
34.	Dwelling	900 00
35.	Brass foundry	600 00
	Total	$61,318 00

(Sgd.) "J. T. C. McKEEN,
"*Architect.*
(Sgd.) "EDWARD BATES,
"*Builder.*

"ST. JOHN, N.B., 30th October, 1891."

You will see that this does not include the machinery, but that the only machinery left on the property is that in the blacksmith's shop, and the boiler valued at $800.

Mr. McLEOD. They could not be moved out.

Mr. HAGGART. No, they could not be moved out because they are fixtures. Here is a copy of the report of Mr. Charles A. Everett and Mr. Fairweather. The original is in the Department of Justice:

"ST. JOHN, N.B., 28th October, 1891.

"Investigation into the value of the Harris Property. Before James Cowan, Official Referee.

"Mr. Charles A. Everett says:

"Considering that the whole property now occupied by James Harris & Co. is scarcely sufficient for the business operations which they are carrying on as it now stands, and as the taking of a considerable portion from it must unnecessarily destroy the balance for their uses, I consider that the sale of the entire property, extinguishing their right, should be for a sum which would give them per square foot, as much as was given for the purchase of the Moore estate fronting on Mill street. If, however, the intention is to purchase the portion of the property adjoining the railway as shown on the plan presented, I think that the losses that must accrue to them from such a division of the property should warrant the payment for such part taken equal to 10 per cent per square foot beyond the price paid for the Moore estate.

"All these remarks have reference to the value of the ground without any property on its surface.

(Sgd.) "CHAS. E. EVERETT."

Mr. C. H. Fairweather says:

"St. John, N.B., 28th October, 1891.

"I am of opinion that the land proposed to be taken from the Harris estate is of equal value square foot by square foot with the land formerly occupied by Moore fronting on Mill street (exclusive of buildings).

"The balance of the property, exclusive of all erections, would, in my opinion, be 20 per cent less. The two added together would make the total value of the Harris estate exclusive of buildings and machinery.

(Sgd.) "C. H. FAIRWEATHER."

"*Re value of Harris property at St. John, N.B.*

"From evidence of C. H. Fairweather, 28th October, 1891:

Amount proposed to be taken by railway 80,453 square feet at $1.33 per foot		$107,056 35
Value of buildings		61,318 00
		$168,374 35
136,356·37 square feet at $1.64 per foot		145,083 18
Total value of land		252,139 53
Buildings as per estimate of J. T. C. McKeen and Edward Bates		61,318 00
		$313,557 53

"*Re value of the Harris property at St. John, N.B.*

"From evidence of Charles A. Everett, 28th October, 1891:

Total value of land is 216,795·87 square feet at $1.33 per square foot		$288,338 50
Value of portion proposed to be taken by railway, 80,493 square feet at $1.46 per square foot		117,520 51
Buildings, per estimate of J. T. C. McKeen and Edward Bates		61,318 00
Total		$178,838 51

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought forward this statement, because it appears from it that neither Mr. Everett nor Mr. Fairweather attempted to put any value on this property at all. They simply said: Because you have put a certain value upon the Moore property which fronts on Mill street, you ought to place the same value on this property which is alongside that. They do not put any value upon it themselves. The Government referred this to the official referee and he heard two witnesses, and they said: I think you should give as much for this property as you did for the other. That is what it amounts to. Where is the award of the sworn referee? There is no such award. The Government were in such a hurry that they paid the money before the referee gave his award at all, and the only statement made is that the money should be paid on the basis of that which was paid for the Moore property.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Everett says:

"I consider that the sale of the entire property extinguishing their right should be for a sum which would give them per square foot as much as was given for the purchase of the Moore estate fronting on Mill street."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, that is what I say. That is the opinion of one of the witnesses. Where is the opinion or the judgment or the award of the referee? Did he make one? I think these are pertinent questions.

Mr. HAGGART. He simply reported.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He simply reported the evidence of these two gentlemen.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 59) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Carl Auer Von Welsbach and others.—(Mr. Stairs.)

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Additional property accommodation at St. John	$121,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When the House rose at six o'clock, I was expressing my pleasure that the Minister of Railways had read to the House the alleged valuation made by Messrs. Fairweather and Everett. The House was led to believe that a distinct valuation had been made by these gentlemen of the intrinsic value of the property, and when the hon. gentleman read the statement he did, it appeared that so far from their having made a distinct valuation of the property, they merely, in giving evidence before Mr. Cowan, to whom the matter had been referred——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They gave no evidence at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is what the hon. gentleman read, "investigation before J. Cowan, referee."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was no reference to Mr. Cowan: there were no proceedings at all. These were independent valuations.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I only took it down as the hon. gentleman read it. He read the statement: "Investigation before J. Cowan, referee."

Mr. HAGGART. "Before James Cowan, official referee." He was the official referee, but he was not the referee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Exactly. "Official investigation made before J. Cowan, referee"; and the statement, if I understood it aright, was that these gentlemen had given evidence before him to the effect that inasmuch as another property called the Moore property had been valued at a certain sum, on the same basis the property in question should be valued at the sum which they fixed. Now, I contended before, and I contend again, that the Moore property, being a property fronting on Mill street, was of very much greater value than a property which did not front on that street or any other street. It is ridiculous and absurd to allege that because a property fronting upon a street was valued at a certain sum, another property hemmed in in the centre of a block, and not fronting upon any street, should be placed at the same valuation. I submit that to the committee as a matter about which there can be no question. Everybody knows that the valuation of a property fronting upon a street is sometimes ten or twenty times as much as the valuation of a property which does not front upon any street. Property acquires its value almost entirely from its street frontage. Therefore,

I submit that the valuation which the Government assumed to have been the valuation of Fairweather and Everett, is not the valuation of those gentlemen at all ; but they simply say, what anybody knows : If you paid so much for that, we think it fair you should pay so much for this. That is not the way to value property, and hon. gentlemen cannot shield themselves, as they are trying to do, behind this assumed valuation of Everett and Fairweather. I am not going to say a word about the respectability of these gentlemen ; it is not called in question. But I am reminding the committee that no distinct valuation was made, and the referee to whom the matter was referred has made no valuation. Now, I want to say one word with reference to the alleged valuation which the hon. gentleman says was made of the buildings upon that property. That valuation, as the hon. gentleman read it, included the boilers and ovens and cupolas. The hon. gentleman sees that the valuation I read of the buildings, and the valuation which these gentlemen submitted to the Government, plus the boilers, plus the ovens and plus the cupolas, must necessarily be largely different, because of the incorporation in one valuation of the ovens, and the boilers and the cupolas. It may be the two valuations are about the same as regards the buildings *per se*. What position do we take in the matter ? We simply say, and it has not been controverted, that so far as the taxable value of the property was concerned, it was not one-third what the Government paid for it. We say, in the second place, that the value of the property made by Harris & Co., when they submitted a statement to the bank with which they were dealing, showed that the value of the property was $93,400. We say, further, that in addition to the valuation of the property which they submitted to the bank, including buildings, at $93,400, they valued the property which the Government bought, plus the plant, at $175,000. If you deduct the value of the plant which Harris & Co. take and which the Government do not get, you leave the valuation of the property for which the Government paid $200,000, at about $100,000, as made by the statements of the Harris Company, not only to the bank in the one instance, but also from the manager when he included the plant in it. In the face of these facts, hon. gentlemen opposite talk about our not having any grounds to go upon. The Minister of Railways presented a most surprising argument to the House just before recess. He said, if I understood him correctly, that inasmuch as bonds had been issued for $175,000, that must be the amount at which they valued the property. I understand these bonds covered the rolling mills as well.

Mr. McLEOD. They did not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. But no man in his senses would contend that because the firm issued bonds to the amount of $175,000 on the property, which covered the plant as well as the real estate, that was the value of the real estate itself. The argument is ridiculous and absurd, and the hon. gentleman must see it in that light. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot shelter themselves behind this assumption in regard to the issue of the bonds, because the bonds covered plant which the Government do not get. The bonds are simply in furtherance of the valuation which the sworn testimony shows the firm put on the property and the plant. Mr. Armstrong swears in his affidavit, that he understood the valuation of the property and plant to be $175,000. The bond issued was for $175,000. Deduct the plant, and the value of the property will come down to $100,000, and for this property the Government have paid $200,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite may shelter themselves behind the argument, which is used by Messrs. Everett and Fairweather, that inasmuch as they paid so much for the Moore property per square foot, they should pay for this property at the same rate. I have shown where this is fallacious, and I submit that the position which we take in regard to this valuation is correct in every particular. I think I am in duty bound to say that I was wrong in charging the Minister of Militia, who was the Acting Minister of Railways, with having given a pledge to this committee last year that he would expropriate the property and not purchase it by private agreement. After reading over the report I think the hon. gentleman's language at that time clearly showed that he reserved to himself the right to purchase the property by private arrangement if he pleased. I make this statement in simple justice to the hon gentleman, and I admit that in that respect I was in error. The hon. gentleman did not pledge his word or pledge the Government to purchase the property by expropriation simply, but he reserved to himself the right to purchase it by private agreement. In so far as I stated the matter differently from this, I was clearly wrong, and I make the *amende honorable* to the hon. gentleman in that respect.

Mr. TEMPLE. I think the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has made many other statements that are incorrect. The hon. gentleman has stated that the Harris property is not so valuable as the Moore property, as the latter faces on the street. I admit its position ; but any one who is acquainted with railway property is aware that a railway company would give a great deal more for the Harris property for railway purposes than for the Moore property. The Harris property lies alongside of the railway station and is more available for railway purposes than the Moore property.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Moore property also lies along the street.

Mr. TEMPLE. It lies in front, next to the road, and is not nearly so valuable as the Harris property. I would leave it to any engineer to say whether the Harris property is not worth double the Moore property as regards its value for railway purposes. I desire next to call attention to the hon. gentleman's statement with respect to the buildings. The hon. gentleman has stated that the buildings are almost utterly worthless.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No.

Mr. TEMPLE. That they were useless to the road. I know the property and have gone through it a good deal, as I have had business with the Harrises at different times, and I can say that the car sheds would make a most valuable freight shed for the use of the road. It is a good building, well put up. I hear it stated that it is 125 feet long, but it could be used as a freight shed to the extent of 150 feet, and I call it a valuable property. I judge it will be 150 feet long, and it is, at all events, a most

valuable and useful building for railway purposes. A track runs alongside of it, and also one through the shed, where cars were built. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has stated that he was correct in all the statements he made except the one respecting which he apologized to the Minister of Militia. There is another statement in which he will admit he was wrong, viz., with respect to the property being nothing more than a swamp.

Mr. DAVIES(P.E.I.) I said the property next to the road was swampy land—and I speak from instructions—that the buildings were built on piles because it was swampy land. Will the hon. gentleman contradict that statement?

Mr. TEMPLE. The hon. gentleman speaks of instructions. If the hon. gentleman had been on the ground and seen for himself, he would not need the instructions he has received. The hon. gentleman has been misled, and if all his statements are of the same character, there is no truth in them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it low land or not?

Mr. TEMPLE. No, it is not low land.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are the buildings built on piles?

Mr. TEMPLE. No, they are built on posts. I have been through them several times, and I know what they are. I hope the hon. gentleman will retract his statements and withdraw his opposition.

Mr. McLEOD. With respect to the question of the land being low, I desire to say that the construction shop is right alongside the track, that it is on a level with the street, that there is a track right through where cars were completed. Moreover the wharves connected with the Intercolonial Railway are within 15 or 17 feet of this shop, which is a brick building. I think these facts are sufficient to convince the hon. gentleman, as they certainly would convince any reasonable man, that his statements are entirely inaccurate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do they alter the valuation?

Mr. McLEOD. Let us get rid of this misstatement in the beginning. The hon. gentleman must admit that his information is inaccurate, because I acquit him of any wilful intention to be inaccurate himself. I must confess that when he read the valuations of the building in the first place, I thought it was some official statement, but I am satisfied now by whom it was made, and I will explain it to the committee, so that they will see how much value to attach to it. The person who made the statement is one of the parties who claimed to be paid $25,000, and the hon. gentleman has said, but I think that he first asked, as I am informed, only $20,000 or $22,000. The whole rental of these leases is $198 a year and this is one of the men who claimed these leases, but the lots themselves are the furthest away from the station and the least use to the railway. He claimed that these lots were worth $22,000, and because the Messrs. Harris would not give him that, he stated on the street, and I am prepared to prove it: "If you do not do that I will make trouble for you." They offered to capitalize his rent at any reasonable figure, but he would not accept that. I am satisfied that the paper read by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is from that same party and is not worth anything at all. The builders who made this valuation are well known in St. John to be honourable men, and Mr. Bates is a builder of repute whose word may be taken. Any one looking at the plan will see that this property is more valuable for the railway than the Moore property, which is at the corner of Mill street and could not be used conveniently. For practical railway purposes the Harris property is by far the most valuable, yet the Government did not give for it nearly the amount paid for the Moore property. The Moore property fronts on Mill street as the hon. gentleman says, but the Harris property has two entrances on Paradise Row, and it fronts on Souther street and on Lombard street, both more convenient for the delivery of freight than Mill street. It also has an entrance on Mill street and is parallel with the railway tracks. With reference to the valuation of the buildings, the only fixtures which the Minister spoke of were boilers and ovens.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) All the plant and machinery is excepted.

Mr. McLEOD. The boilers and ovens are built in and they have to be left there, but of course the valuation of these is comparatively small and is only worth $4,000 or $5,000. The valuation of the buildings on the strip that has to be taken, is in the vicinity of $30,000 as made by disinterested valuators. I have explained with reference to the $93,000; and with reference to the $175,000, Mr. Armstrong does not know whether the plant was included or not, but he says in his letter "he understood it was included," and he underlines that. As I said this property was being turned into a joint stock company and they did not go there to make a valuation. They simply put it in at a certain valuation, not the actual valuation of the property. The capital of the joint stock company was about $300,000, but it was not put in anywhere as to the valuation of the property there at all. I do not see that there is anything further for me to say.

Mr. ADAMS. The representative of the City of St. John (Mr. McLeod) has not touched the question before this committee, and that question is simply, whether that valuation is correct or not. I am quite clear that this property has been purchased for three times its value beyond all question, and all the statements made by my friend from the City of St. John (Mr. McLeod) cannot carry any person away from the truthfulness of the sale, or the valuation of the property as shown on the assessment roll. The roll proves that this property is equal to about $80,000 in the city of St. John, and yet it has been sold for $200,000, or $120,000 in excess of the vote of last session. It is all very nice to-night for hon. gentlemen to talk in reference to the city of St. John, and the reasons which have moved members of this Parliament to pass a vote, but, Mr. Chairman, let us come down to the plain matter of fact of it. I have listened to the statements made by the Minister of Railways in this House as to the reasons which guided him to economy in the administration of the Intercolonial Railway. I listened to him with pleasure, because I thought to myself that we had a gentleman who nowadays was going to work the railway on pure matter of fact business principles. Well, if the labourer can be deprived of his ten or twelve hours a day hard work, if dismissals of employés should occur every day, if the rates of freight can be increased, if work cannot be given to the toiler

and to the bread-earner, and if all this is done for the purpose of economy, and for the purpose of securing a system by which no deficit shall occur at the end of the fiscal year; will you, Mr. Chairman, tell me why we are justified in paying out $200,000 in the city of St. John for a property that is only worth $80,000? Add to this the memorial which was sent to the Government the other day from this city of beggars by the sea, as I call it, for a grain elevator. They are every day sending memorials to the Government, and now they want $120,000 more from the tax-payers of the country in order to satisfy the ambition of the citizens of St. John who are too indolent to do anything for themselves. They demanded the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway to their doors, knowing the results that would follow as well as I did. They knew that it would be a competitive line against our great national highway which formed part of the compact under which we entered the Union; yet they demanded it, thus diverting traffic from our great national highway to the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, it is no use mincing this matter. I am not here simply because I am a Conservative, believing in and admiring the policy of the Conservative party. I do not suppose there is a man who more fully believes in the Conservative party and its policy than I do. But if I have to vote in favour of a grant of $200,000 for the purchase of the Harris property in St. John, then I want to go back to my people and tender to them my resignation, saying to them: I cannot any longer represent you in an honest way, and you must select some other man to carry out your ideas. I must do that before I can justify such a vote as my friends are trying to justify to-night. I know the city of St. John as well as my friend.

Mr. McLEOD. No, you don't.

Mr. ADAMS. I do. Time and again I have helped to elect you, and you cannot win an election on the policy you are pursuing to-night. You are to-night committing a public crime against the people of our province. You are attempting to force an opinion upon this legislature which is not true. There is no principle upon which it can be justified. You cannot produce any evidence to justify this legislature voting $200,000 for the purchase of this property. My hon. friend knows it; he is acquainted with all the facts; he has all the evidence around him, and I can appeal to the evidence. If I go to the Ministers on my bended knees and present an honest claim on behalf of my county, I am told: We desire to exercise economy at present, and I agree to that. Well, if that be the answer to me, then I say to my hon. friend here: Do not ask the Government to vote $200,000 for the purchase of property which is not required, which no practical man, from the chief engineer of the Government down to any workman on the railway, will say is required for the convenience of the railway or the public. For these reasons, I am constrained, if I have to vote alone to-night, to vote against the resolution for appropriating $120,000 for this purpose.

Mr. BOWERS. I was in St. John four or five weeks ago, and in conversation with some gentlemen there this matter was brought up. Some of the citizens asked me if the Government thought of paying $200,000 for this land. I told them I had not heard much about it beyond what I had seen in the newspapers. Well, they said it was an outrage for the Government to pay $200,000 for this piece of land; and some of my friends there, men with whom I am well acquainted, told me that the outside value of it without buildings was from $35,000 to $45,000. One of these gentlemen, a man of integrity, who would not tell an untruth, is Thomas Gorman, of the South Ward. He is a man of as good a character as any member of this House, a man with whom I have traded for fifteen or twenty years, and whose word is as good as any man's bond. I also conversed with a large marble dealer, who told me that this land was not worth more than $40,000 or $50,000 without the buildings. Taking the land and the buildings together, I would consider that their value would not be more than from $75,000 to $90,000.

Mr. FLINT. There is a phase of this question which I think has not been dwelt upon with as much impressiveness as it ought to be, that is, the action of the Government in undertaking to make a bargain of this extensive character without previously obtaining the assent of Parliament to the expenditure; and I think that to a large degree the difficulty in which this committee is involved in judging of the wisdom or the unwisdom of the amount now asked for, has arisen from the unparliamentary, at any rate, the unstatesman-like manner in which the Government undertook to deal with so large a purchase. The committee are at a great disadvantage in endeavouring to act as a board of assessors in ascertaining the value of a certain number of square feet of land in the heart of a large city—land encumbered with old buildings, dwelling houses, old workshops and new workshops of various sizes and patterns. Every hon. gentleman present must be aware that to assess with any reasonable degree of certainty the value of property of this kind, requires technical knowledge, an intimate local knowledge of the place and a knowledge of the requirements of the railway. Now, this committee is not in a position, owing to the lack of information furnished by the Minister of Railways, to weigh all the arguments presented here as to the value of this property and as to the wisdom of voting the $120,000 now asked for in addition to the sum granted last session. In the first place, we are confronted with the assessable value, which is placed at $66,000. In order to judge whether that is too high or too low we have nothing but the unsupported opinion of one of the hon. gentlemen representing the district of St. John; and although he is a gentleman of legal acumen and of as fair a degree of intelligence as any hon. gentleman in the House, yet his opinion on that subject is of scarcely any value, simply because he gives us no other reason for supposing the assessment to be too low than the general impression which he has in his mind that the assessors are disposed to value manufacturing property rather lower than other property in the city. We know very well that the tendency of assessors in our towns and cities is and has been for a great many years to overvalue rather than to undervalue. In the city of St. John, where a large amount of taxation is required for carrying on these public works, the draining of new streets, &c., and paying interest upon its public debt, we know as a matter of fact the assessment is by no means low.

I am personally acquainted with many residents of St. John, and I know they are always under the impression that they are as well assessed with regard to valuation and pay as high a rate as they think they ought to pay. Here we have the assessors value this property at $66,000. Well, the Government have made a private bargain with the owners by which they agreed to pay $200,000 for it. Therefore, the transaction, upon its face, shows a great amount of generosity on the part of the Minister or Deputy Minister or whoever made this bargain. Admitting, then, that the assessment is rather low, and that owing to local circumstances and the desire to press not unduly on manufacturers, the assessors have valued this property lower than they do general property throughout the city, we have still the valuation placed upon it by the owners in the litigation which took place recently in St. John, and in negotiations with the bank for further accommodation and assistance, and that valuation, though larger than that of the local assessors, is only $100,000, or less than one-half the amount which a generous government have agreed to pay these owners. It is contended by gentlemen who have been active in connection with these negotiations, and who appear to be anxious that the Intercolonial Railway should get the extra accommodation which they profess to believe is required in the city of St. John, that this representation of the company to the bank and the affirmations by, I believe, the majority of the company in litigation, as to the value of the property are altogether too low. Without combatting their assertions, I complain, as a member of this committee, that we are not placed in a position to verify the truth of these observations made by the hon. gentleman or the correctness of the statement made by the owners and their representatives in this litigation and these negotiations. There is another point I desire to call attention to, and that is the character of the bargain made on the part of the Government with the owner or owners of this property. It seems that there is a considerable section of the property located in the centre or very near the centre, which does not belong to the Harris Company, but to other owners or estates, and which has been for a longer or a shorter period of time under lease to this manufacturing company; but the bargain which the Government has made has been with persons professing to represent the ownership of these leased lands. They did not negotiate or make any terms with the owners of the Mackenzie and DeVeber estate property, but with the persons who have this property only subject to a lease, to sell them the remainder of the DeVeber estate for an amount not yet ascertained. Did not this afford an opportunity for an improper exercise of their influence with the Government on the part of persons who have been negotiating with the Government? Let us suppose this matter went through without any discussion, and supposing there were scheming persons, persons intending to make an improper use of the position they occupy with reference to this property, and let us see what opportunity has been given them by the form which the negotiations have taken. We will suppose a private agreement between the controllers of the Harris estate or any outside parties that the Government should pay $200,000, and then they undertake to make a private agreement with the owners of this estate to obtain the property for a sum perhaps much less than these parties might obtain for it by a fair arbitration through the Exchequer Court or any other means by which land is expropriated for public purposes. The contract may have been secured by a bond or some other obligation from the owners to sell at a certain price; and then these parties could set the machinery of the law in operation and obtain from the Government a sum much larger than they agreed to pay the real owners. I think the transaction, while it may have been perfectly honest on the part of the Minister of Railways, considering he is dealing with an enormous sum of money and with public interests, has not been conducted in the form which the spirit and intention of the law requires. I think all such transactions as the expropriation of land belonging to estates should be done in an open manner, and that the arbitrators, no matter how estimable they may be as citizens, should not be the private friends and supporters of the Administration negotiating in this matter. Admitting that the character and reputation of the gentlemen alluded to by the hon. member for St. John to-night are all that he described, admitting they are men of long standing in the community and high personal character, we have no guarantee that their judgment on this question is of any more value than would be the judgment of any hon. member in this House. I know there are hon. gentlemen on the other side and on this whose characters stand high, whose reputations are in every way equal to that eulogized by the hon. member for St. John, and yet their estimation of the value of a certain number of square feet of land covered with buildings of different character would not be worth the paper it is written on. What the committee ought to have is an estimate based upon a fair arbitration with full opportunity given for investigation through the courts. This seems to me merely the private opinion of two merchants of the city of St. John, not especially qualified to give a valuation. Let us look at the valuation they gave. If their opinions is of any value at all, the Government should have offered the Harris Company $60,000 more than they did. Their estimates seem to me enormous, in the light of the opinion thrown upon this question by the hon. member for Northumberland and the estimates given by this other gentleman who was referred to by the hon. member for Queen's. One of these arbitrators valued this property at something like $319,000; another valued it at about $349,000; and yet we find the owners of the estate glad to take $200,000. Compared with the one valuation there is a falling off of $119,000 and with the other a falling off of something like $150,000. Take out the value of the buildings, and even then the owners have been gratified to accept a sum far below the estimates made by these gentlemen, upon whose knowledge such great reliance appears to be placed. The very fact that they made an excessive estimate is as much against their standing as valuators as if they had made an absurdly low estimate. It simply shows that they had not the sufficient knowledge to make a reasonable estimate of the value. When such a great discrepancy of opinion is manifested as shown by the evidence we have had before the House, when such a great difference of opinion is given by ordinary residents of St.

John, one claiming that the property is not worth over $45,000, and another claiming that it is worth something like $300,000, does not this wide divergence on the part of men of ordinary intelligence and good business capacity show that the Government has proceeded by wrong methods in securing the land which they propose to acquire for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway in that district? The Minister did not lay before the House any very detailed reasons why this extraordinary accommodation is required. I know that there has been a great falling off of the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway. I know that there are extraordinary efforts to be made during the next year or two to cut down the expenses of running that road. If additional accommodation is required it seems to me that very strong reasons, at any rate stronger than I have heard so far in this discussion, should be given to the House to show why this land is required. Last session we were asked for $80,000 for this purpose, and reasons were then given which the committee seemed to think fair, and the sum was appropriated. At that time, it was only in contemplation to take a strip of this land, and $80,000 was deemed to be sufficient for that purpose. Why this sudden change, and the desire to get a larger quantity of land on the northern part of the road? I think hon. members must come to the conclusion that behind this there are reasons that cannot be given to the House. Of course, it is difficult to seriously charge members of the Government or members of the House sitting behind them with corrupt and improper purposes in carrying out a bargain which appears to be so absurd and so extortionate, but knowing the complaints which have been made for so many years in regard to the way in which public funds have been used, are we not justified in assuming until the proof to the contrary is clearly laid before us that the lands are fully worth the amount asked for, that there is something behind the transaction which is not in the public interest? At any rate, I think this difficulty has arisen from the Government undertaking to carry out so large a purchase as a mere private transaction. Members of the Ministry, heads of departments ought not to deal with matters of this kind as if they were private transactions. There was no great public emergency demanding that this land should be secured upon a moment's notice. There was no wild rush of English speculators or manufacturing concerns anxious to buy this property in at a tremendous sacrifice. Steps could have been taken to secure this property by expropriation, and all the necessary proceedings should have been taken fairly and above board; but by this action, so very hasty and so very unwise, I think the Government has laid itself open to censure, and, from the information they have themselves given, they have given reasons to conclude that the undue speculative haste which they used showed that there was something behind this transaction which has not been disclosed. Had the Government asked the committee for an appropriation for this purpose, the question could have been discussed by members on both sides, and the Government could have been guided by the opinion of their own supporters, because I do not suppose that they were guided by the opinions of members on this side of the House, previous to the bargain being made, but, having once made the bargain, they feel bound to carry it out by a false sense of responsibility to those with whom they made the bargain, and unless they take a step backwards, which they think would be hostile to their dignity, they are not in a position to retreat from an ill-advised bargain into which they have solemnly entered. Thus, they place themselves and the House in a false position, and they call upon their supporters to sustain them in that false position in which they would not have been if they had proceeded by way of expropriation.

Mr. LISTER. This is a matter which effects not only the Maritime Provinces, but all the rest of the Dominion, and it is a subject upon which I think no member who takes exception to the conduct of the Minister of Railways should remain silent. One naturally asks himself, when this proposition is laid before the House, why is it that the Government should at this particular period ask the House to vote enormous sums of money for the purpose of adding to the property of the Intercolonial Railway when it is well understood that at this very moment the Government is negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the turning over of the Intercolonial Railway property to that company. I ask the hon. gentleman to deny that if he can.

Mr. HAGGART. I do deny it most emphatically.

Mr. LISTER. Then the organ of the Government, or of three of the Ministers, has stated in plain terms that such negotiations are being carried on, and it is somewhat remarkable that the Government should come down and ask for an additional appropriation for station accommodation for these two large cities. Yesterday the Minister of Railways asked the House to grant, and it did grant, $152,000 for additional station accommodation at Halifax, and we have his statement that before that work is completed the country may expect to expend an additional $500,000 or $600,000, and he has already spent $900,000. To-day he comes down and asks the House to sanction the purchase of this property in the city of St. John which has been purchased, to put it in the mildest terms, under the most suspicious circumstances. This House has not been made aware who are the real owners of this property, but I take it for granted that the owners are infants, and if the hon. gentleman wanted to carry out a transaction which would bear the light of day, it was his duty to have an expropriation by legal process, and not to leave it to the friends of the Government in the city of St. John to place a valuation on that property. These people may be interested in that property or they may not be, but at all events the Minister should have had valuators appointed about whose interest there could be no question. The property is valued and the Government takes the property at a price which, according to a statement of a gentleman supporting the Government, is double what it it worth. The Minister need not imagine that this matter was not heard of before his estimates were brought down here. It has been talked of ever since the commencement of the session. Gentlemen from St. John have talked about it, and it has been the subject of discussion and conversation elsewhere than in St. John. All the circumstances connected with it raise the suspicion that everything

about it is not perfectly clear and straight. I am bound to say to one hon. gentleman who supports the Government—I think the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. McLeod)—that there are rumours that that gentleman interested himself very deeply in getting the Government to purchase this property. I am bound to say that if there is no truth in that statement, if the rumours are entirely unfounded, it is the privilege of that hon. gentleman to deny entirely the statement and to say that his motive in promoting the sale to the Government was solely in the interests of the country, and that he had no personal motive in forwarding the transaction. Now, the evidence shows that this property was valued by the owners of it at $93,000, and we find the Government paying, upon a valuation of their own friends, the enormous sum of $200,000 for the property, a price, as stated by a supporter of the Government, double its actual value. This is a matter that should be enquired into, it should not be hastily voted upon. The Government owes it to the country to show that in this transaction, a voluntary purchase as it was, they took every precaution which a shrewd business man would take if he was making the purchase for himself. I submit that the evidence does not show that, and I feel that this committee would be failing in its duty did it permit this item to pass unquestioned, and without hon. gentlemen carrying it by a majority of the votes of this House.

Mr. McLEOD. I was out while the hon. gentleman was speaking, but I am just now told that he made some reference to me. I would ask him to repeat it.

Mr. LISTER. I said that this matter was a subject of comment, was a subject of conversation, since the session opened, by hon. gentlemen who come from his own province, nay more, who come from his own town; and the statement has been broadly made that the interest the hon. gentleman took in promoting this transaction, was not entirely an unselfish one.

Mr. McLEOD. Well, Sir, all I can say is that whether the statement is made by the hon. gentleman himself on his own responsibility, or made by him on the responsibility of somebody else, or made by anybody else, the statement that I have any interest in the matter at all, is entirely and absolutely untrue from beginning to end, and I give it an unqualified and absolute denial. The hon. gentleman says he has been told so by men from my own town; I do not know who they are. I know there is one party who has been going round there slandering everybody in connection with this matter; it may be some party like that. All I can say is that I give the statement a most absolute and unqualified denial. I am connected with the Messrs. Harris & Co. as their counsel and solicitor, and have advised them in their case against the Halifax Banking Company which circumstance brought me into connection with this matter. I advised them in taking their case against the Halifax Banking Company before the Supreme Court, and have been paid as counsel and solicitor. But I have no more interest in this matter than the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. LISTER. I desire to say, after hearing the statement of the hon. gentleman, that so far as I am concerned, I do not credit the rumour or the statement I have mentioned.

Mr. BOWELL. Before this item is carried, in justice to the Government and in justice to myself, I should make some explanation of the reasons which induced the Government to purchase the property at the price agreed upon. Before doing so, however, I may say to my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Adams) that he is in error when he states that we took a vote in this House for $80,000 to pay for the property which we purchased. Whether he was acquainted with the whole facts, I am not prepared to say, but I have no doubt that when he made that statement he made it in good faith. The $80,000 voted by this House was, as I explained at the time, to purchase the triangular strip running from Lombard street until it intersected the Moore property, which had been purchased some time previously; and the chief engineer was under the impression at the time that, for the present wants of the railway that quantity of land would answer our purposes; that portion of land is about one-quarter of the quantity purchased for which the $80,000 was voted. I may add that on looking at the record I find I stated that in asking for that appropriation, when the question was put as to whether any value had been placed upon the property, I answered something to this effect: That a great deal more had been asked for the property than the Government ever thought of paying for it, and until some arrangement could be arrived at, or some step taken by which the real value of the property could be ascertained, no purchase would be made. In order that the committee may fully understand this question, I will read a few remarks I made when this item was under the consideration of the House last year. After examining the record I am surprised to hear the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) say no explanation was ever given of the reasons why that property was required. I am not finding fault that objections are taken to the price paid; hon. gentlemen may think the property is not required, that is a matter of opinion which every member has a right to express. All I object to in this discussion, and the only portion of the speech made by the hon. member for Yarmouth to which I think any one can take the slightest objection, is the insinuation that there was something behind it which was not right, and that it bore upon its face, to use a common expression, the appearance of a "gross job." For my own part I repudiate that insinuation in the plainest possible language. Last session when the sum was asked for to purchase the piece of property to which I alluded, I made these remarks:

"Although I am not a practical railway man, I was satisfied, when I visited St. John, that the accommodation was altogether too small. A high fence running close to the station on the Harris property suggested that the adjoining property should be acquired for railway purposes."

I also read at the time the recommendation which had been made by those connected with the Railway Department, that we should acquire further accommodation; and I also pointed out that in the opinion of the chief engineer further additional property would not be required if the Canadian Pacific Railway had not made that point its terminus; but that the number of trains which were constantly arriving in that city, and the increased quantity of freight arriving over the two roads making that point their terminus, made ad-

ditional accommodation necessary. I examined the property personally, and although not being, as I said before, a railway man, I was convinced that additional room was required in order to carry on the railway business properly at that station. Another reason which induced me to urge upon my colleagues the purchase of additional property, was the fact that fires were constantly maintained in these workshops, and that these wooden buildings in which manufacturing operations were carried on, were a constant menace to the entire property of the Intercolonial Railway in that city; that was one of the reasons that induced me to suggest to my colleagues the necessity of acquiring additional property. I may inform the hon. member for Lambton that those interested are tolerably well grown infants, that in fact there are no infants interested in this estate so far as I know. I suggested the propriety of selecting two responsible men in the city of St. John upon whose judgment reliance could be placed in estimating the value of the property. Their valuations have been given, and notwithstanding—and I do not say it offensively—the special pleading of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) I think the interpretation placed upon these valuations is not correct as given by him. What Mr. Everett says is this:

"I consider that the sale of the entire property, extinguishing their rights, should be for a sum which would give them per square foot as much as was given for the purchase of the Moore estate fronting on Mill street."

If that is not a deliberate expression of opinion as to the value of that property, I know not what the English language means. But he goes further. He says:

"I think that the losses that must accrue to them from such a diversion of the property would warrant payment for such property taken as would equal 10 per cent per square foot beyond the price paid for the Moore estate."

He first states, in the plainest possible language, that he considers as much should be paid for the Harris property as the Moore property. Then he goes on to say that, if you are to consider the damage done to them by taking from them their property and destroying their business, they should have at least 10 per cent more. Mr. Fairweather, to whom I referred a few moments ago, used this language:

"I am of opinion that the land proposed to be taken from the Harris estate is of equal value square foot by square foot with the land purchased and formerly occupied by Moore, fronting on Mill street (exclusive of the buildings)."

Then he goes on to say:

"The balance of the property, exclusive of all erections, would in my opinion be 20 per cent less. The two added together would make the total value of the Harris estate, exclusive of buildings and machinery."

The value of the land as estimated by those two gentlemen has been already given to the House: By Mr. Fairweather, $131,153 for one piece of property, and the total property $313,437; and by Mr. Everett, $141,617 for one piece of property, and for the total property $349,666. The property we proposed to buy when we asked for a vote of $80,000, was the property which has been valued by these two gentlemen, by Mr. Fairweather at $131,153 and by Mr. Everett at $141,617. Whether these gentlemen were actuated by the feelings insinuated by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) I will not insult them by discussing, that the Harris people might be indebted to these gentlemen, and they required to obtain a large sum in order to pay their indebtedness. Whether the Harris property is indebted to these gentlemen or not, I know not; but I want to point out this fact, that if they were venal enough to make an improper valuation on these properties, and if the case had gone to the Exchequer Court, would they not have verified their valuations by their affidavits?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My point was this, that people taken from the city of St. John were not desirable parties to value.

Mr. BOWELL. That may have been your intention, but it was not your language. I admit you did not say they were so actuated. Your language was that the committee did not know whether those gentlemen were actuated by a feeling of that kind, that they might or might not have been. What I say is, that if they were actuated by a feeling of that kind in making a valuation, then would they have hestitated about going into court to verify it under oath? For my own part I do not believe either of those gentlemen, from their respectability and standing in the community, both as business men and as men who are held in respect by everybody who knows them, would have given an opinion other than that they firmly believed to be true. I had another reason for my action. It has been said, and more particularly stated by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), that is was our duty to have gone into court. When I recollect the sums that have been paid through the Exchequer Court, particularly for the St. Charles branch and land in other parts of the country, I would hesitate for a long time before I would go into court against any private individual, who could bring his neighbours as witnesses to value land and damages done him. I do not wish to be understood as imputing the slightest insinuation that the judge of that court would do wrong. If I understand the duty of a judge it is to weigh the evidence brought before him and render judgment upon that evidence, no matter what his individual opinion may be. If the parties had gone into court and sworn to the value of this land, as they have placed it on paper, would not the judge have been compelled under the circumstances to have rendered judgment in accordance with the evidence, and the country might have been mulcted out of double the amount we paid for the property? Not only is that feeling entertained by myself, but the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) used this language in regard to the Exchequer Court:

"Mr. MULOCK. Does the engineer recommend the purchase of this particular piece of land for which money is voted?

"Mr. BOWELL. All he says is that further accommodation is required. That is the only land that can be purchased, and consequently if he recommends anything it involves the purchase of that land.

"Mr. MULOCK. Does he assent to that statement?

"Mr. BOWELL. Yes, he assents to that statement, or I would not have made it. He says more, that if the Canadian Pacific Railway were not there, we would not require it.

"Mr. MULOCK. I hope the Exchequer Court will see that the award is no more than it should be.

"An hon. MEMBER. Tell that to the Exchequer Court judge.

"Mr. MULOCK. I would not hesitate to tell that to the judge of the Exchequer Court. There is very serious ground for questioning the findings of that court in regard

to values of land. Enormous verdicts are rendered by the Exchequer Court for lands expropriated by the Dominion. There is no use mincing matters. The judge of the Exchequer Court, if he is not experienced or had dealings in land, may be very easily misled by testimony as to values."

With the experience which the Government has had, and remembering as I do the enormous sums that have been given for land which were supposed a few years ago to be worthless, I use the word advisedly, along the St. Lawrence, next to Quebec, Point Lévis and below Quebec, the Government would be justified in giving even a larger sum than they might think the actual value of the land rather than submit the case to a court in which witnesses could be placed in the box, not one but a dozen of them, to testify to values and thereby mulct the Government out of enormous sums of money. These were two of the reasons why I suggested, that it would be better to buy the land in the manner in which it has been purchased. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) called my attention the other evening to the fact that enormous costs had attended the North-West Rebellion claims. There were one or two cases to which he very properly called the attention of the House, where the expenses were 50 per cent more than the award paid to the claimant. With these experiences before us, so far as going to the court is concerned under the circumstances that I have detailed to the House, I think the committee will see that if it were necessary for the Government to have the land we were justified in purchasing the property in the way it was done. Neither I, nor any member of the Government, so far as I know, have any personal knowledge of the value of this land, beyond the valuation placed upon it by the gentlemen who reside in that city, and who ought to know the value. I take exception to the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that these are not the parties to value the land. I question very much whether my hon. friend from Bothwell or the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) or I myself, would be the proper persons to go to St. John and place a value upon the property. The only way we could possibly arrive at a correct valuation would be to ascertain from the owners of property of a similar character, what sum their land in the neighbourhood had been sold for. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) gave as examples of what prices had been extorted from the bridge company for land that certainly did not lie in as favourable position for business or for value as this. Any one who has visited St. John must know that to be a fact, and yet for small strips of land enormous sums were paid by the bridge company, and I dare say that if the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) or most other gentlemen looked at the property, they would not think it was worth half the amount that was paid. Let me give the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) an illustration of the value of land in Charlottetown. He knows that there is a small piece of land that was required for the building of a spur down to the wharf in that city, and which spur passing the mills as it did, added to the value of the property rather than detracted from it. Yet the Government had to pay some $3,000 for that property which was supposed to be worth only $300 or $400. I walked over that land last fall when I had the pleasure of visiting the Island, and I do not hesitate to say that if I had my individual way, I would have closed up the road and pulled up the rails rather than pay that amount of money. I give that as an illustration of the evidence which is submitted to a court of justice in order to obtain a larger amount for property than I believe, or that my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Welsh) believes, or that this House would believe, it to be worth if they saw it. I am quite sure that my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) has not seen the land in St. John or he would not have called it a swamp, I walked over every foot of it, and one of the objections I had to the purchase of the property was, that portions of it were too high, and that if we wanted to use that portion which lies along Paradise Row, we would have to excavate and blast the rocks. So far as the portion on which the buildings are erected is concerned, it is on a level with the main street of the city, and on a level with the track of the Intercolonial Railway, and it has no more appearance of a swamp than has Sparks street in the city of Ottawa. There is a spur running from the Intercolonial Railway on a perfect level right into the car shop, and another one to take the lumber and whatever materiai may be required in these workshops. These are the facts connected with the purchase of that property. It was argued that although we might not want the whole property at the present moment, yet considering the price we would have to pay for the triangular piece needed, it was much better to secure the whole property. If we only took the triangular piece of land we should thereby destroy the whole business of the Harris firm, and if they went into court, with the evidence they would produce, I am satisfied they would be awarded a large amount of damages for the destruction of their business. I do not hesitate to say, though I repeat I am not a railway man, that any one who will look at the situation of that property, and who had any business capacity at all, would say at once, that a large proportion of the Harris property ought to have been acquired. It is the only property in the whole neighbourhood that is suitable for railway purposes. The fact that it lies alongside the railway, and that the railway buildings are next to it, made it necessary, not only in the interests of the road but for the safety of Government property, that certain portions of it should be purchased. I do not desire to prolong this discussion, but I thought it due to myself and to the Government that I should have made this explanation as frank and free as it should be made. If we have paid too much for it, then there must be a great diversity of opinion among those who value property in the city of St. John. If my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Adams) thinks we are paying $120,000 more for the property than that for which we took a vote last year, he is labouring under a misapprehension. From what I have heard of the value of property in that city similarly situated, I believe that, under all the circumstances, the bargain was a cheap one for the Government, and that we would have had to pay a very much larger sum had we taken the matter into court. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that one of the inferences to be drawn from the transation is: That if the valuation placed upon the property by the owner is correct, or if the valuation placed upon it by Messrs. Fairweather and Everett be correct, then we drove a hard bargain with the Harris estate and that they

must have been compelled to sell the property. Well, we might just as well be frank about that matter. The Harris estate, so far as I can learn, were obliged to sell the property, and they asked a much larger sum than we paid, and after dickering, if I may use the expression, for a week or two, we made them an offer to take the whole property for $200,000, believing it to be, not in their interest, but in the interest of the country, the interest of the railway, the interest of the business section of that country, and believing that it was cheaper than we could by any possibility obtain it under any other circumstances. I repeat that we believed that if we had taken the piece of property required, and if they had gone to the Exchequer Court, we would pay nearly as much for that portion of the land as we paid for the whole property. I may say to the hon. gentleman that he is altogether incorrect in supposing that this land is cut off from outlets. It has outlets upon three streets.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is, lanes.

Mr. BOWELL. No, there is one lane which gives the right of way to the Harris people to reach Paradise Row. The property faces on two other streets.

Mr. LISTER. From whom did the Government buy this property? Who negotiated the sale?

Mr. BOWELL. It was bought from the Harris estate. Mr. Robertson himself came to this city with the solicitor, Mr. McLeod.

Mr. LISTER. Was Mr. Robertson the owner of the estate?

Mr. BOWELL. He was the executor of the estate. He is Mr. Harris's son-in-law.

Mr. ADAMS. I am reminded that I voted for a grant of $80,000 for the purchase of this property last year. I wish to say that I did vote for it, and I clearly understood that vote; but I never understood by any means that $120,000 was to be added. The argument presented to the House is this, that the Minister of Railways, for reasons of his own, from certain memorials given and certain testimony taken in a peculiar way, arrived at the value of this piece of real estate. It is a peculiar idea to submit to this Parliament, that the testimony of certain men shall be accepted as to its value, and an approximate amount shall be given, instead of following out the law. If I go to the Government to ask for the adjustment of the claim of a poor man, I am told we have expropriated the land under the law, and the proper place for you to go is the Exchequer Court; fight out your battle there. But to-night they have the most ingenious method of determining the value of property taken for public uses that ever was heard of in this Parliament of Canada. What does my hon. friend the Minister of Militia say? He says that the property may be found to be required by virtue of his examination. Suppose the property were required by the railway; suppose the very essence of intelligence governed the department; suppose the public utility demanded the property for the accommodation of the people; do you mean to tell me that that puts the value upon the land? Is that the way that the Minister of Railways sits down to ascertain its value? I rather assume that he possesses some knowledge of public works; I rather assume, by virtue of the position he holds, and by virtue of the completeness of every detail of his department, that no transfer or title shall be given by a private individual to the Crown, unless it is thoroughly examined. The very essence of the position is as to the practical or merchantable worth of a piece of property which the Crown intends to have. The Crown is only an individual after all. It is only a trustee for me and for every one else who lives in the country; and it has no more right to pay out $200,000 than I would have as a trustee for a private estate. The Government must stand at the bar of public opinion to answer for their action. The very price paid for this land stamps it as such that no man in the Dominion, be he a Minister or be he a citizen, can justify voting $200,000 for the purpose. No Conservative, no Liberal, no Grit or Tory, can justify it. The meanest Tory that sits here to-night cannot put out his hand and state that the $200,000 paid for this land is an equitable price, by reason of common sense, prudence or justice. It stands unparalleled in the history of purchases under any Government. There can be no possible reason submitted in the presence of Parliament or in the presence of a great people, or in the presence of any railway man in this country, to justify it. The men who labour day in and day out, the bread-winners of the land, the toilers, those who have to work from five to seven, you meanly put on bread and water; practically, when they ask you for bread you give them stones; you are crowding them out of the country now: on the bulletin board from north to south, and from east to west, you issue your proclamation, as the old saying was in Ireland, "to hell or to Connaught." The labourer cannot get his pay from the Government, because it was stated the other night by the brilliant young orator from the City of St. John, that the agent of the Intercolonial Railway in that city handled $200,000 a year, and received $60 per month, of which $28 was paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Intercolonial Railway is managed in such a way that its officials have to be starved unless they can make up for their unsufficient salaries by earning private commissions. Is that why my young friend the orator of the City of St. John advocates this vote to-night? The fact is, this sale is wrong. No Government should ever have submitted to this Parliament a vote for $120,000 in addition to the $80,000 which was taken last year. Let the railway be managed on business principles, and do not let the Canadian Pacific Railway Company issue their show cards and affix them to every public post throughout the country from Halifax to Point Lévis, paying their commissions to men who are the paid servants of the Government of the country. Every man you have to-day in your employ from Halifax to Point Lévis is advertised by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as the agent of the Pacific Railway, and not the agent of our national highway. Is that the way to run your road? No wonder the Ontario men abuse us in this Parliament. No wonder I hear words dropping from their tongues which scorch and bite and make me angry when I hear them hurled at the Maritime Provinces. It is not the fault of the Maritime Provinces or the railroad; it is the mismanagement of the railroad from end to end which has caused the deficit, and it is no panacea to

abuse the officials. The officials have nothing to do with the matter. Let us get down to plain business principles. If this were done I would guarantee that you would not pay $200,000 for this property in the city of St. John. Let any man in this House to-night read the report of the Pacific Railway Company. Look at the great octopus of Canada, and what do you find? You find them with a surplus of $4,000,000 in the hollow of their hand; and yet we are paying out money for the support of a railway which can pay every day it runs if only properly, and all the result we have to show is a heavy deficit. I submit that is an answer to my hon. friend.

Mr. BOWELL. It is no answer at all.

Mr. ADAMS. I do not think the statement the hon. Minister of Militia made requires any answer, because it has not even the merit of plausibility, and I submit with much deference that the hon. gentleman is much superior to me so far as that is concerned. I submit that there is no ground whatever for our voting, to-night, this $120,000.

Mr. PERRY. I think this is a matter upon which hon. members of this House should express their opinion. I have not heard it proved that there is really any increased accommodation required for the Intercolonial Railway at St. John. We are told by the Minister of Railways that the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway is lessening. In the name of common sense, I ask, why then should increased accommodation be required at St. John? Where is the increased traffic to come from for which we are asked to put our hands into the treasury and take $200,000 from the pockets of the poor rate-payers of this country? I have not yet learned that this increased accommodation is needed. The Minister of Railways has not told us that it is. The Minister of Militia, in all his elaborate speech which he made awhile ago—and I think it is the longest one he ever made in this House—has not told us why the increased accommodation is required. He has not told us where the great traffic is to come from which is going to fill up this great station house. I am not aware how much land he expects to take, whether it will be one acre or ten acres; but I know that while he proposes to pay $200,000 of the people's money for property in St. John which is not wanted, and which may be not more than one acre of land, he is far from following the same course in Prince Edward Island. I am aware that when the Government want land in Prince Edward Island they do not even ask a man what he will take for it but run a snow fence against his house and take his land and give him about $50 an acre. That is the way they use the people in the Island. Although the Minister of Railways and although the Minister of Militia seem to be annoyed because of the doubt we cast on the honesty of the transaction, they have not been able to satisfy my mind that there is anything honest in it. The fact that the hon. gentlemen concerned in it get so very hot over the matter is a pretty sure sign that they feel the truth of the criticism on this side, because when the truth is told it goes home and touches the parties affected. If hon. gentlemen could show us that spending this money would lessen the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway a-half or a-quarter or any reasonable amount, we would be prepared to grant this increased accommodation, but we have not been shown where the increased traffic is to come from. It may be an accommodation to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I am not much acquainted in St. John, but I think there is only one station there, and I suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway will have the benefit of this $200,000 which the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Militia propose to take from the tax-payers of this country. Perhaps the Government may make a present of the whole road to the Canadian Pacific Railway in a year or two, as I see in the Government papers opinions are expressed in that direction. The one question before us is whether the accommodation is required at St. John, and the other is, if the accommodation is required there, are we not paying more for the property than it is worth? Have the Government made an honest transaction? I am not prepared to say that they have not, but they may have made a very loose one and a very imprudent one. They may have done business with the owners of this land in such a loose manner that the owners got perhaps 100 per cent more than they should; and certainly it has not been shown to us that the Government has got this property for what it is not worth. I believe they have paid a great deal more than what it is worth. We ought to be very jealous in seeing that the money of the people is not squandered but is appropriated for a good purpose; we ought to be very careful to see that the people get a hundred cents in value for every dollar taken from the public chest, and in this case I am afraid the people have not the worth of their money. I am afraid they have not even fifty cents in the dollar, and, therefore, it is I am not prepared to give a silent vote on this question and allow the Government to squander the money of the people without raising my voice to protest against it. Some years ago, when times were far better in St. John than they are now, when the population was increasing instead of decreasing as it is now, and we know that the trade is decreasing as well as the population of St. John, the railway accommodation was sufficient; yet in the face of that decrease of trade and population, the Minister of Railways comes down here, without much ceremony, and asks this House to vote $200,000 for property to accommodate the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway in St. John, and does not give one word of explanation to show that the extra accommodation is required. I do not know how long the people are going to put up with such behaviour. I am sure that the electors of this country will not be very well satisfied with this expenditure. I am sure they will come to the conclusion that this vote is not to be given on the score of justice. The people in other parts of New Brunswick and in Prince Edward Island know that when a house is burned by the sparks that fly from an Intercolonial Railway locomotive, the owner has a poor chance of getting redress. They know that if a horse gets killed by the railway it is impossible for the owner to get paid unless he happens to be a Conservative. That has been my experience for the last eighteen years. The Government do not follow out the same principle at St. John. What is the reason? Is it because representatives from there are Conservatives? Must they do as the Government tells them, and must the Government do as they tell it? There is one decent spot in New

Brunswick and that is the County of Northumberland, and I am glad the representative of that fine county is prepared to give an independent vote and is not ashamed to call a spade a spade. He gives utterance to his convictions, and I can see very well by the appearance of hon. gentlemen opposite that the Ministers of the Crown did not like it a bit too well. But, as badly as they liked it, they had to put up with it. I do not believe they will have the courage to get up and castigate the hon. gentleman for the wholesome and truthful lesson he has given them. He has drawn a comparison between the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Customs and the poor tax-payers of his county. They are taking hundreds of millions which do not belong to them but to the overtaxed people of the country. If this was their own money, they would be more careful. I contend that these gentlemen who receive $8,000 a year do not pay as much taxes into the treasury as the poor fishermen on the shores of Northumberland, and on the shores of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. Those fishermen pay more than the Minister of Railways or the Minister of Militia or even the Minister of Justice. My hon. friend may laugh, but there are a great many poor people in Cape Breton who do not earn their money as easily as he does, and if his constituents were here to-night he would not laugh. I contend that, before this committee gives its assent to this vote, it should be satisfied by proper explanation of the justice of it, and should not simply have the miserable excuse which is given that the extra accommodation is required in St. John. It should be proved that a reasonably fair and just amount has been paid for this property, if it is required at all. Until I am aware that the Government have a right to this extra accommodation, and have made an honest transaction in purchasing the property, I shall record my vote against the appropriation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am the last man in the world to object to the reasonable decisions of the judiciary, but, if the statements made to-night by the Minister of Militia, in his place and on his responsibility as a Minister, are correct, the sooner the House votes to repeal the Exchequer Court Act the better. A few years ago it was contended that the appraisers and assessors who were appointed under the Railway Act and the Public Works Act awarded too large sums against the Crown, and in order to overcome that, a Bill was introduced constituting an Exchequer Court, and appointing a judge of that court, and yet to-night we have the Minister of Militia stating in unmistakable and clear language that rather than refer a question between the Crown and a subject to the Exchequer Court, he would make a private contract with the parties, though the amount might be larger than it should be, because of the risk he would run of paying excessive damages by the decision of the court. If this impeachment of the judge of the Exchequer Court is correct, the sooner the hon. gentleman introduces a Bill to repeal the Exchequer Court Act the better. Hon. gentlemen have had the answer to all their charges and insinuations and slurs from an hon. gentleman who sits amongst them, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Adams). He told them, for I took down his words, that all their sophistry cannot conceal the fact that they are paying three times too much for this property. He said: "You are committing a crime against the public of Canada in asking the House to support this vote." Further, he said: "If my constituents ask me to support this vote, I would hand them my resignation rather than do it." If we argued here for hours, we could not make the answer to the Government as clearly and concisely as one of their own supporters has done, and I think, in view of that statement, some members will pause before voting for this grant. It has been stated that the referees, Messrs. Everett and Fairweather, put a valuation upon this land, but I call attention to the fact that they put no valuation upon it, but simply suggested a rule to be applied to it, and the Minister of Railways was as capable to decide upon that question here as any citizen of St. John. They said that as so much money had been paid for the Moore property, the same rule ought to be applied to the Harris property. The Minister could have come to that conclusion without the assistance of the witnesses. They simply said that the rule applied to the Moore property should be applied to the Harris property—*non constant* that the money paid for the Moore property was a correct sum. They do not say it was fair or just or a proper sum to be paid for that property, and therefore the committee is asked to pass this vote without a scintilla of evidence that the amount is just or fair.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to allow language to be put in my mouth which I never uttered. It is the habit of the hon. gentleman to put interpretations on language which was never used. I never impeached the judge directly or indirectly. I studiously guarded myself against that. I said the judges had no alternative but to render judgment upon the evidence; then why should the hon. gentleman say that I impeached the judges? I have as high an opinion of the judge of the Exchequer Court as the hon. gentleman, both personally and as a lawyer. I believe the judge of the Exchequer Court to be as honourable a man as there is in Canada, but, though I am not a lawyer, I think I am possessed of a little common sense, and I know that, when witnesses give their opinions as to the value of property, the judges have no way of deciding except upon the evidence before them. If that is an impeachment of the judge, I was guilty of it. If the hon. gentleman will read my remarks as they will appear in *Hansard*, he will see that I did not impeach the judge or the court. When the hon. gentleman coolly reads the statements of Messrs. Everett and Fairweather, he will come to the conclusion that he is just as wrong in the interpretation he has given to their language as he was in attributing to me the misleading of this House in the language which I used, for the language I used was so clear that, if a boy of ten years of age made such a mistake as the hon. gentleman has made in regard to it, he would be spanked and sent to bed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is extremely fine language for a Minister of the Crown. The hon. gentleman is improving. We are accustomed to his petulance, but I think, in consideration of the position he is in, and of the office he holds, he might adapt his language a little to the situation.

Mr. BOWELL. I have been sitting opposite you too long.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you have not profited, as you ought to have done, by the lessons I have given you. Now, with reference to this statement made by these referees. Mr. Fairweather and Mr. Everett, we are perfectly capable of estimating the rule they have laid down. To all intents and purposes the rule they have laid down is this, that property having a very small frontage is to be rated equally valuable with property which has a comparatively large frontage on streets in the city of St. John. Now, we all know enough of the rules that govern the value of properties to know that a couple of gentlemen, be their respectability what you please, who proceed to value property upon that rule, are not competent parties to be trusted by the Government with valuations. Any man who will take this sketch that is laid before us, and will look at the position of the Moore property, and will look at the position of this other property with a very small frontage and a great depth, will see that it is an entirely false principle to apply. I have got this to say, that neither the Minister of Railways, nor the Minister of Militia, nor any other hon. gentleman who has spoken on that side, has given an intelligible or satisfactory explanation of the enormous discrepancy between the assessed value of these properties and the sum paid by the Government. I can understand a moderate difference between the assessment of properties and the price paid, but when I find that land is valued for taxable purposes at $66,000, and that the Government paid $200,000 cash for it, it does not require a great deal of proof to show that there is a strong *primâ facie* case made out to support the assertion of my hon. friend that a monstrously excessive price has been paid for this land. Nor did I hear from the hon. member from St. John (Mr. McLeod), or any of the Ministers, a sufficient explanation of the sworn evidence submitted by my hon. friend to the House, that these men had handed in a statement—because that is the declaration made in the affidavit—to their creditors, to the Banking Company of Halifax, whoever they may be, in which they themselves had estimated this property at $93,400. Until they can show more clearly than they have yet attempted to do, that there is good ground for disputing the statement these men are reputed to have made; or until they can give a better explanation than they have done of the enormous discrepancy between the assessed value and the sum we are asked to pay, I say that everything that my hon. friend has stated as to the excessive value proposed to be paid, is more than justified.

Harbours and Rivers—New Brunswick—Cape Tormentine Harbour.... $30,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain what position this work is in?

Mr. OUIMET. This is only a revote of part of the amount that was voted last year to complete that work. This work has been done in order to give the best and shortest communication with Prince Edward Island at Cape Traverse.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We desire to know whether this vote will complete the Cape Tormentine wharf?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, if it did not complete it, we would ask for more. The work will probably be completed by the 1st of July. But as we are not sure of the amount we may have to pay out, and as the contract may not be completed on the 1st of July, we thought it would be safer to have a revote.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the hon. gentleman tell us whether this sum will complete the work, and what the total cost of the work will be?

Mr. OUIMET. The cost of the work until the 31st December last, was $171,954.11. It will take $36,045.89 to complete the work, which will make a total of $208,000. That will be the total cost of the work.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman tell me what the contract price was; that is the present? The original contract, I know, was broken.

Mr. OUIMET. The present contract is $185,000. The first contract was given to Messrs. Perkins & Strong, but it was taken over from them and given to Mr. E. D. Murphy, of Toronto. It was a contract on schedule prices, and not for a lump sum.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It cost $20,000 or $40,000 more than the estimated cost?

Mr. OUIMET. No; I think it was very near the estimate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman said that $185,000 was the estimated amount of their contract?

Mr. OUIMET. No; I said that $185,000 was the amount of the last contract with Mr. Murphy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether this wharf is part of the scheme for connecting Prince Edward Island with the main land which was adopted some years ago. The intention, I understand, is to run a ferry when it is completed. We have spent $200,000 on the Cape Tormentine Wharf, but of course it is useless in itself until you have a corresponding wharf on the other side. I want to ask the hon. gentleman what steps have been taken to let the contract for the wharf on the other side?

Mr. OUIMET. There is a wharf there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is a very small one.

Mr. OUIMET. There is not sufficient depth of water at the end of the wharf. The question is under the consideration of the department, as what are the best means of obtaining sufficient water at the end of Cape Traverse pier, whether we should build an addition to that pier to deep water, or dredge at the end of the pier and mouth of the river. The sand has filled up the channel so that there is only five or six feet of water at low tide. The department is examining as to what scheme would be the best, and especially the cheapest. We shall either dredge at the end of the pier, or build an addition to it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I visited that locality some time ago and inspected the wharf, and although I am not a practical man myself, I had the opportunity of having a great many opinions given to me by local residents. I desire to know whether an engineer has made a survey and presented any plan to the department. If so, will the Minister bring this report down to the House?

We have already expended a large sum on building Cape Tormentine breakwater, and it is useless until a wharf is built on the other side, and a ferry is running. I desire to ascertain the exact position of affairs, what reports have been made, and what plans have been suggested?

Mr. OUIMET. A report has been made by one of our engineers, Mr. Brown. He is in favour of building an addition to the pier, which he estimates would cost $42,000. The department has not, however, decided to accept that suggestion, or to adopt the other method.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the Minister any objection to bringing the report down?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Mr. PERRY. I see no sum down in the Estimates for Cape Traverse wharf on the Island side. What is the good of spending hundreds of thousands to build a wharf at Cape Tormentine and nothing on the Island side? We have a right to understand the policy of the department with respect to Cape Traverse pier. The Minister admitted that there are only five feet of water there. A solid breakwater would be more profitable than dredging, and I do not believe dredging would be of much use. I doubt whether the engineer will report in favour of dredging rather than solid work. In the summer time a boat crosses there, but it is a small craft, and a large boat cannot approach Cape Traverse wharf. The trains running have carried a good many passengers and freight, but when the trains are taken off, I suppose the people will have to fall back upon their own resources. I have not opposed any grant to the Cape Tormentine breakwater, which is I suppose a necessity; but all the money should not be expended on one side, a portion of it should be expended on the Island, at Cape Traverse and other places, for, as we contribute our share to the Dominion treasury, we have a right to expect that the Government will expend some money on the Island and carry out works that have been projected 15 or 16 years and have not been yet completed.

River St. Lawrence $49,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What depth of water is there in the channel between Quebec and Montreal?

Mr. OUIMET. When the works are completed there will be a sufficient depth of water to allow vessels drawing 27½ feet to pass, and the channel will be 300 feet wide.

Mr. CHARLTON. The level of the lakes has been unusually low. Has this any effect on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. OUIMET. I am informed by my officers that a reduction in the height of water has taken place in the lakes, but not in the St. Lawrence.

River Kaministiquia..... $14,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that this is a revote. How is it that the money was not spent, and what is the position of the work?

Mr. OUIMET. It was too late last fall to proceed with the work. It will be finished this summer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost?

Mr. OUIMET. $14,000 will complete the dredging.

Mr. LISTER. Was any dredging done there last year?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Was there any appropriation for it?

Mr. OUIMET. In 1890-91, $25,201 were spent. In 1892, $15,000 were voted, but only $817 were spent.

Mr. LISTER. Was there any additional vote over and above the $14,000 voted last year?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Mr. LISTER. Then no dredging was done in the summer of 1891?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Mr. LISTER. Was the work done under contract?

Mr. OUIMET. The whole has been done under contract.

Mr. LISTER. How many years has the work been going on?

Mr. OUIMET. I understand it was commenced in 1874. Up to 1891, $152,994 have been expended. I have already stated that in 1890-91, $25,201 were spent. The whole amount has therefore been about $177,000.

Mr. LISTER. Did I understand the Minister to say that all the work had been done under contract?

Mr. OUIMET. The work has been going on since 1874, and I cannot say. In 1891 James Murray was the contractor, and the contract for this present year will be signed with Marks & McDonald in a few days.

Mr. LISTER. Captain Murray has been employed on the contract ever since 1874.

Mr. OUIMET. I cannot say.

Mr. LISTER. Can the Minister tell me who has been employed on the contract or otherwise from 1884 up?

Mr. OUIMET. In 1884-85, contractor C. S. Barker, amount paid $27,958.80; 1885-86, James Murray, contractor, amount paid $19,537.70; the contract with Barker was 23 cents a cubic yard and to James Murray 19 cents a cubic yard. In 1886-87, contractor James Murray, amount paid $21,401.60, contract price 18 cents; 1887-88 the amount paid to the same contractor was $22,506.30; 1888-89 the same contractor, amount paid $28,967.40, price 20 cents; 1889-90, amount paid $25,000, contract price 19 cents; 1890-91, amount paid $18,933.50, contract price 19 cents in the river, and 7 cents for dredging at the bar. The contract price for Messrs. Marks & McDonald this year is 12¾ cents.

Mr. LISTER. Was the contract let by tender, and did the lowest tenderer get the job last year?

Mr. OUIMET. In every case, I am told by my officer, the lowest tenderer got the contract.

Mr. LISTER. I may have been mistaken, but I have been informed differently. Will the Minister tell me what is the length and the width of the dredged channel?

Mr. OUIMET. The dredging was done up to the elevators, and beyond that point to what is called the turning basin, the whole length is about 2¾ miles from the river.

Mr. LISTER. What is the depth of the channel all the way to and at the turning basin?

Mr. OUIMET. Sixteen feet below low water mark. The turning basin will be 300 feet in diameter when finished, and it will be finished this summer.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the width of the channel dredged below this turning basin?

Mr. OUIMET. An average of 150 feet.

Mr. LISTER. Is all this dredging let by contract?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. How many dredges have we?

Mr. OUIMET. Sixteen dredges in all; five in Ontario, five in the Lower Provinces, five which have been working between Montreal and Quebec, and one in Quebec now.

Mr. LISTER. Have you any on Lake Huron?

Mr. OUIMET. There are two on the way.

Mr. LISTER. Where are they to work?

Mr. OUIMET. One at Goderich and one at Kincardine.

Mr. LISTER. Has any dredging been done at Point Edward this year?

Mr. OUIMET. Not by the department.

Mr. LISTER. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that the dredge has been working there for three or four years, and it might as well not work. Is it a Government dredge?

Mr. OUIMET. It was working for the department.

Mr. LISTER. I suppose the work is paid for by the yard?

Mr. OUIMET. No; by the hour.

Mr. LISTER. That is worse. For three or four years they have been working down with the current, and no sooner had they finished their season's work that the channel fills up again, and in the following year they have to do the work over again. The result has been that the same bar has formed there every year.

Mr. OUIMET. There are a great many places in Ontario in the same condition, and we shall have to continue dredging, or the harbours will soon fill up. This year we are not doing any dredging at Point Edward, but I am told that the Grand Trunk Railway Company are having dredging done at the same spot as we did last year.

Mr. LISTER. It is very likely that if they did any they would go to the same spot. There is a sand bar running out at the foot of Lake Huron for about half a mile. The docks constructed there seem to have turned the current so as to form a sand bar running diagonally into the river, forming an obstruction to navigation from which vessels have suffered considerable loss. This matter was represented to the late Minister of Public Works four or five years ago, and he sent up a dredge, which has been at work for three or four years without making any improvement in the channel, because the moment the dredge stops, the excavation it makes fills up again with solid sand. Experienced men say that if you dredge for a thousand years, you will never get the sand out by the method you are pursuing. I think myself that hiring a dredge by the hour is a somewhat expensive way of doing this work. I would ask if that is the custom of the department generally?

Mr. OUIMET. No. It is only done when we cannot do otherwise. It has not been done this year.

Mr. LISTER. I suppose the department has abandoned that system?

Mr. OUIMET. One of our dredges from the ship channel is going up, and when the ship channel is completed we expect to have some more to send to the western lakes, when we shall probably be able to dispense with other dredges than our own.

Mr. LISTER. Who had the contract for dredging at Point Edward?

Mr. OUIMET. Allan & Fleming, of this city.

Mr. LISTER. Was that job let by tender?

Mr. OUIMET. They were paid the usual amount which it is estimated to cost us when we use our own dredges—$8 an hour.

Mr. LISTER. Do you know what the capacity of the dredge was?

Mr. OUIMET. 600 yards a day, I am told.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to ask whether the channel in the Kaministiquia River, where the dredging is done, fills up every year, and whether it is necessary to continue this dredging year after year?

Mr. OUIMET. It will fill up a little at the bar, but it is expected that it can be kept clear at a very small expenditure each year.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is not expected that it will fill up at the turning basin very much?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is the channel protected at the mouth of the river by side piers?

Mr. OUIMET. It is not.

Mr. CHARLTON. I should think that if such piers were constructed the dredging each year would not be necessary, as the piers would keep the sand out of the channel.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask whether any steps are being taken to remove obstructions in the navigation of the River Sydenham. That river, though deep, is comparatively narrow, and when the water is high the trunks of trees are brought down into the river and sunk, and serious damage is done to steamers which navigate the river running to Sarnia and Detroit. The matter was brought to my attention immediately after the meeting of Parliament, and I call the attention of Parliament to it and would like to know what steps the Minister took to remove those obstructions.

Mr. FOSTER. The discussion has been going on as though we were at the item of dredging, but that comes later on, so that there is no use of having the discussion now.

Mr. OUIMET. The department has taken into consideration the demand made by the hon. gentle-

man, but I am sorry to say that our dredging plant will be insufficient to do the work this year.

Mr. CHARLTON. I merely want to draw attention to one or two points with reference to the hiring of dredges by the hour. This dredge at Point Edward is hired at $8 an hour or $160 for twenty hours. I do not suppose it cost more than $5,000, and it certainly does not require more than one-third the consumption of coal which would be used by a first-class upper lake tug, and these can be hired at $120. I think $8 an hour an excessive rate for this dredge. She receives higher pay than a first-class tug capable of towing five or six schooners up St. Clair River.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman is mistaken as to the value of the dredge. I may tell him it is worth $35,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. Do you know what the coal consumption is per day ?

Mr. OUIMET. When the item for dredging comes up I will have all the details.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What works are you doing in the River Thames ?

Mr. OUIMET. We are now spending $1,200 in order to give a channel to the good people of the Thames.

Mr. LISTER. Coming back to the Kaministiquia, I understand that Mr. Murray was the contractor last year and the year before.

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Does the hon. gentleman know whether Mr. Murray did the work himself or did he sublet it ?

Mr. OUIMET. I do not know. It was before my time.

Mr. LISTER. I know something about it, and I understand, as a matter of fact, that when other gentlemen came here for the purpose of putting in tenders for this particular work, all sorts of difficulties were thrown in their way, so far as getting information from the department is concerned. In fact they were given to understand that this was Mr. Murray's particular little nest egg and that it would not do to interfere, and they complained it was impossible for them to get information from the department to enable them to tender. As a matter of fact, they say that Mr. Murray got the contract without opposition or competition. I can say to the hon. gentleman that, from information which I have, Captain Murray hired the dredge ; in other words he sublet the work, the work being actually done at a considerably less price than the Government paid, Mr. Murray getting the difference as compensation for having acquired the contract. Furthermore the dredge was an American dredge brought into Canada free of duty. If that is the real state of affairs, all that I can say is that it is not particularly creditable to the department.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Before the item is adopted, I may say that a similar discussion took place on the same item in the Estimates last session. The hon. member for Kent then brought up the question, as the hon. member for Lambton brings it up to-night. The hon. gentleman is evidently under a misapprehension. I was one of those who bid on that work when it was advertised by the department, and I can say this conscientiously that Mr. Murray's tender was the lowest among a number of tenders. With regard to the dredge, Captain Murray, I understand, did some lifting work and there was not another dredge on Lake Superior to do that work. Now, the complaint that any one came to Ottawa and did not receive courtesy at the hands of the officials of the department cannot be correct, because I never heard of a contractor who came here to look over estimates or specifications who did not receive every courtesy. Last year the complaint was that there was not a plan in the department which the gentlemen mentioned by the hon. member for Kent could see. But there is no plan for this work. It is so much material to be excavated by the dredge on which you are paid by the yard. Some years it was widening a channel ; this year it is making and deepening basins and probably taking something off the sides of the channel ; and no engineer can make a plan upon which a contractor could give any weight intelligibly. As far as the contract is concerned, I think it was an honest deal. Captain Murray, being the lowest bidder, got the contract.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I remember this transaction was referred to last year when the circumstances were about as follows :—The work was advertised, and it was said in the advertisement that all information could be obtained from the Minister of Public Works at Ottawa. The Chatham Dredging Company, then having a large and powerful dredge for which they had little to do, sent their manager to Ottawa to look over the plans and specifications and ascertain the amount of work to be done and the price. There were two or three things necessary to enable a contractor to tender. First, there was the distance the earth would have to be carried before being dumped, and secondly the depth of the cut. It is well known that if the department required a dredge to only cut out say one foot deep they cannot do it as cheaply as though the cut was three or four feet deep. It was, therefore, absolutely necessary that the contractor, before he could tender intelligently, should know what the department wanted to take up.

Mr. OUIMET. The contractors visit the places themselves.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is true, but the Public Works Department have never let a contract without having a map or plan showing the work required.

Mr. OUIMET. Unfortunately there was no plan in this case.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I know that the Department of Public Works has never advertised for work to the extent of $25,000 or $30,000 without sending an engineer to make a plan or map. In regard to a little work done in my own county for which only $4,000 or $5,000 was appropriated, they had the full map of the whole thing, showing the depth of the water, the amount to be removed and all particulars before they advertised for tenders, and it would be strange if the depth would not follow the plan adopted by every business man. The manager of the Chatham Dredging Company came here last year in reference to this matter.

Mr. OUIMET. I hope the hon. gentleman is not going to give us a rehearsal of all the complaints of the contractors. If he asks for inform-

ation before the Public Accounts Committee he will be able to see that the officials of the department are not to blame.

Mr. HAGGART. And, as the hon. gentleman gave us a full speech on this subject last year, and the whole question was threshed out then, I hope he will not do it again.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has a perfect right to talk to this House, and you cannot shut him down.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not want to shut him down, but he is enquiring in reference to matters which took place two years ago, and it is not pertinent to the question now before the committee.

Mr. LISTER. It is pertinent.

Mr. HAGGART. This is a matter of two years ago.

Mr. LISTER. He has a perfect right to enquire into it and to find out all about it. He has a perfect right every session of Parliament to ascertain the facts in regard to it, and if hon. gentlemen think they can shut down discussion in this way, they are very much mistaken.

Mr. OUIMET. If the hon. gentleman wishes to proceed with business, this is not the best way to do it. I do not wish to prevent discussion, but this matter has been fully debated.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) brought it up first and justified himself in doing so.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Yes, and the hon. gentleman is using the same words that he used last session when this was under discussion. It is true that you cannot shut a member off, but I think it shows a great want of taste and is a waste of valuable time for him to go over word by word the same thing which he said in a previous session.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman himself has gone over the same thing that he stated word by word.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). In explanation to you.

Mr. LISTER. I do not ask any explanation from you. If I want any information, I will ask the Minister.

Mr. OUIMET. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that it is not fair to attack the officials of the department here where they cannot reply. The facts, as I have said, are not what have been alleged. If the officials have been guilty of any negligence, you may state that in the proper place, and I will give you every opportunity to investigate the matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is assuredly the proper place.

Mr. OUIMET. My officials cannot speak here, and it is not fair that the officials who cannot answer should be attacked here. The hon. gentleman's speeches will go to the public without explanations from my officials.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman misunderstands his position. Does he mean that there is to be no discussion here because it may reflect on the conduct of some of his officials?

Mr. OUIMET. These charges were refuted last session.

Mr. LISTER. Not refuted. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that, because he cannot answer or because these matters were not within his own knowledge, as he was not then at the head of the department, they are not to be discussed?

Mr. OUIMET. I did not say that I could not answer, but I said that my officials could not answer, and from my knowledge of my officials I am sure that what they say is correct, and I am ready to give the hon. gentleman any advantage or opportunity to prove the accusations he has made.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman is surely forgetting himself.

Mr. OUIMET. I am not forgetting myself, but I do not forget those who have a right to be protected here.

Mr. LISTER. No, they are not supposed to be here, and you are violating the law of Parliament by having them here, and you ought to know that that is the law.

Mr. OUIMET. That is a new law.

Mr. LISTER. No strangers have any right to be here. If any Minister were to say, I will not answer your question because it refers to matters of two or three years ago, and I do not remember anything about it, and I will ask my officials, we would get no answer at all unless the officials were here. Of course, the hon. gentleman has only been in his present position for a short time, and I do not suppose he has mastered all its details. But we have this, that the Chatham Dredging Company appeared here for the purpose of getting information to enable them to tender for this contract, and they claim that they were improperly used by officials in the Railway Department. They say they did not get fair-play, and my hon. friend who represents that county has an undoubted right to say wherein they did not get fair-play, to say wherein the country lost money by not giving them fair-play; because, if they had got the information that was given to other people, it is contended they would have got the contract, and they would not have sub-let it or brought in an American dredge to do it, because they had one of their own.

Mr. OUIMET. Who are the contractors who complained?

Mr. LISTER. The Chatham Dredging Company.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know what dredge the hon. gentleman refers to, neither did I understand him to say that he knew of his own knowledge that any dredge was admitted free. He said he had been informed it had been admitted free. I may state to the hon. gentleman that the practice of the department for a number of years has been that when contractors, no matter who they were, could not procure dredges for the work they were performing—and I may say here parenthetically that I have explained this to the House once or twice before—they have been permitted to bring dredges in from the United States and make a deposit of the duty upon the value of the dredge, and when taken out of Canada in the fall, they were paid back sometimes 80 and sometimes 90 per cent of the amount of such deposit. There was a seizure at Port Arthur a year or two ago, perhaps that is the dredge

to which the hon. gentleman referred. The seizure was made on the ground that the dredge had been brought into the country without even making an entry. I remember the case distinctly; a full investigation was made into all the circumstances, and it transpired that two or three dredges had been brought into the country that had paid full duty a year or two before—I am speaking from memory now—and that consequently it was merely a return of the dredge that had paid duty, and that no drawback had ever been made. Probably that was the case to which the hon. gentleman refers. I can assure the hon. gentleman that no dredge has been allowed to come in free.

Mr. LISTER. Not to come in free, I suppose, except in the sense that they deposited duty with the department, and on the property being returned to the States, 90 per cent of it is given back.

Mr. BOWELL. The facts are precisely as I have informed the hon. gentleman.

Mr. OUIMET. On the occasion referred to by my hon. friend there were five tenderers. The highest was 25 cents per cubic yard all round, and the lowest, that of Mr. Murray, was 19 cents for the dredging in the river itself, and 7 cents at the bar, as this is a sand bar. I am told that Mr. Martin was agent for the Chatham Dredging Company, and being a friend of one of the officials, he received all the information that could be given to any one; in fact, every tenderer received all the information possible.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not want the Minister to be led away with the opinion that I was making charges against his officials.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman himself will say that every one is well treated in our department.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not know how you treat others; you have always treated me well. Now, this complaint was made by Mr. Martin, who is manager of the Chatham Dredging Company; he complained that he could not get information from the department at all, not even a map of the locality, nor any other information in reference to the work that was being done, and I thought it right that the Minister—who is a new Minister of Public Works, and perhaps not acquainted with what went on last year,—should know what the facts are. I have every reason to believe that the statement of Mr. Martin was true; he is a man who would not make a statement that was not true. I would like to know from the Minister whether tenders were called for this year?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many tenders were received?

Mr. OUIMET. Seven.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Were they advertised, and how?

Mr. OUIMET. They were advertised in the newspapers.

Mr. LISTER. This River Kaministiquia seems to have cost a considerable amount of money. We remember that in 1876, when Mr. Mackenzie proposed to deepen that river in order that vessels might navigate it, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House contended that it was a great waste of money, and that we had no right to spend money there at all. A change seems to have come over their dreams since then, because they appear to have spent $170,000 in deepening this river.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman will see that the expenditure has been growing with the increasing trade coming from the west to that point.

Mr. LISTER. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not intend spending more money at Port Arthur?

Mr. OUIMET. We will see when the Estimates come down.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This 50,000 yards that was dredged out last year at 7 cents a yard, was the earth simply lifted up and thrown to one side, or was it taken away in a scow?

Mr. OUIMET. I am told it was carried away to deep water, four miles from the place where it was taken out.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is something wrong about this. I am told by those who know, that no dredge can work for 7 cents a yard. They cannot even nip the earth up and throw it to one side at that price; but when it is scowed away four miles, there must be something wrong.

Intercolonial Railway..... $3,450,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has been the custom in the past to give in the Estimates some details regarding this item.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think any details were ever given.

Mr. LAURIER. I observe there is a decrease of $250,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The amount asked for for 1891-92 was $3,700,000, for 1892-93 $3,450,000. The details are as follows: For locomotive power, $1,160,000; car expenses, $780,000; maintenance of way and water, $940,000; station expenses, $380,000; general charges, $190,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I thought the Minister said that the saving that would be effected, would be in the neighbourhood of $500,000. Now he comes to a reduction in the expenses of $250,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I consider it possible to make further decreases. The hon. gentleman must remember I told him that by taking off certain trains and reducing the number of employés, I estimated a saving of $513,000. If you take off freight cars and reduce the number of trains on the road, it may necessarily imply on the other side of the ledger a loss in business done on the road.

Mr. McGREGOR. The hon. gentleman showed that two-tenths of a cent per ton per mile was too low a rate for carrying freight, and the hon. gentleman could not therefore make the ledger balance very badly by reducing the tariff.

Mr. HAGGART. The expenditure last year was $3,700,000, and this year I ask for $3,450,000. That is my estimate of the amount of saving, and I want sufficient money to carry on the business.

Mr. LAURIER. Then the hon. gentleman is not quite sure of his position yesterday when he said he expected to effect a saving of half a million.

The hon. gentleman evidently expects to realize only a quarter of a million reduction.

Mr. WATSON. Does the hon. gentleman expect to have a portion of the rolling stock lying idle on account of the reduction in the number of trains?

Mr. HAGGART. No. I think we will be able to run the whole of it.

Windsor Branch Railway..... $30,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the receipts from the Windsor branch?

Mr. HAGGART. We receive only one-third of the earnings, $30,255. The expenses for maintenance were $28,931 for 1890-91. So we made a profit last year of $1,333.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who really work the Windsor branch?

Mr. HAGGART. The Windsor and Annapolis Railway work the traffic on that road in connection with their own road, and the Government maintain the road, the company paying to the Government one-third of the gross earnings.

Prince Edward Island Railway $259,000

Mr. PERRY. Is there any movement to lay the road with steel rails, or to afford further accommodations?

Mr. HAGGART. It is the intention to place a good quantity of steel rails on the road this summer.

Mr. PERRY. It was stated by the Minister a few days ago that he intended to reduce the number of trains running on the road. I understand two trains have been already taken off from Summerside to Charlottetown and return. If it is the intention of the Minister to curtail the accommodation, it is unfair to ask this House to vote this money. I do not see why the people after paying this money should be cut short in their train accommodation. There have been meetings held in Prince Edward Island on the subject. A large meeting was held in Charlottetown. The resolutions adopted are couched in very strong terms. They are signed by the Mayor of Charlottetown, Hon. Mr. Haviland, who was formerly Senator, and is an ex-governor. He is not a Liberal; and in a private letter to me he states that the meeting was composed of Conservatives as well as Liberals. The most important resolution was moved and seconded by Conservatives. Conservatives as well as Liberals will be badly used in the Island if the train accommodation is reduced. The Minister states that this will be done on the score of economy, as the road is not paying. How does the Minister expect to make the railway pay, if he takes the trains off? I have no doubt the Minister has been told that the Department of Railways of Prince Edward Island had to put on specials trains for the want of this regular train between Summerside and Charlottetown in order to clear the stations of the freight that had accumulated. When the mail steamer *Northumberland* arrived there, there was no train to meet her, and the consequence was Her Majesty's mail was delayed for two or three hours. The people of Prince Edward Island do not deserve treatment like that from him. If half the accommodation of the railway is to be taken off, why take the whole of it and do not humbug the people in that kind of way. The people on the Cape Traverse branch have been used to a daily train, but now it has been limited to three times a week. What is he going to have the men at Emerald Junction doing? They only get $1.25 a day now to support themselves and their families and it is little enough for them, and I hope he will continue it even though he has to pay them when they are idle. Why not run the train every day when it will cost very little extra expense? We have a right to know whether the regulations put in force for the train service on the Island are to be continued and the Minister ought to tell us whether it is or not. We were told in the Government press that the station at Miscouche was to be closed, but the Minister says to the contrary, and I am glad of that. We were also told that the station at Morell, in King's County, is not to be closed, although it has been ordered to be closed, but I suppose pressure was brought to bear on the Minister by the members for King's County, and Morell station is to be kept in operation. It is a most important station, and so is Miscouche, which is one of the most important on the line. We are told also that the station at Freetown is to be closed. If the Minister will take the poll books and see how many votes myself and my colleague got there, he will see we got a large vote, and that the Government candidate got a small vote, and I suppose that is the reason the people of Freetown are to be punished by having their station closed. I cannot see any other reason, because it is paying as well as any station on the line. I would also like to know from the Minister what part of the Prince Edward Island Railway does pay, and I would ask him to bring down the earnings of the road according to sections so that we can see that. I have no doubt that the order was given to close the station at Miscouche, which costs only $400 or $500 a year to operate, but some person very influential with the Government was here from that direction a few days ago, and no doubt he pulled them by the ears, and in order to send him home satisfied they told him that the station would be kept open. I had only 17 votes there, and the Government candidate had something like 150, and I suppose the Government were not aware of that, until this gentleman from Summerside told them, and informed them also that as sure as they would close the station, when they had a general election under the Gerrymander Bill, he would have no chance whatever of being returned. I have no doubt that is the kind of language used. However, I am glad Miscouche station is to be kept open. It is a beautiful settlement, and the people are nearly all French Acadians, countrymen of my own, and if they were only on the right side of politics I would be proud of them. There are more oysters shipped from that station than any station on the whole line; they ship a large amount of oats too, and they would ship potatoes, if they were only allowed to have a market, I hope Freetown station will be kept open, and if the Government do what is right to the people there, they may give them a good vote next election. I have no doubt that next election the Government will want all the stray votes they can get from Prince Edward Island and everywhere else. We have a right to know whether the Minister intends to take off the trains from Summerside to Charlottetown and Charlottetown to Summerside. I can tell the hon. gentleman that to-night there is

a great indignation meeting being held in the heart of a Conservative district, and he will have the result of that meeting here in a few days. I suppose there will be another meeting at Tignish, another at Port Hill, another at Miscouche, another at Morell, another at Freetown, another at Charlottetown. All over the Island there will be meetings held, and storms of thunder and hailstones will be falling on the heads of the Government.

Mr. YEO. I was sorry to hear the hon. Minister of Railways say the other night that he was going to take off the train that runs between Charlottetown and Summerside. I do not think he can be aware of the inconvenience this will be to the people of Queen's and Prince counties, or he would not carry out his intention. I hope the hon. Minister will not make this change until he has the opportunity of visiting the Island and judging for himself. If he carries out his intention, people living in the western part of the Island going to Charlottetown to do business, will be obliged to remain in Charlottetown two nights to do any business because they will only arrive there after the business hours of the day are over, and the train leaves early in the morning; whereas the people living at the most extreme points east of Charlottetown can leave their homes in the morning and do their business in the city and return on the same day. I do not see why the people living on both ends of the Island cannot be given equal convenience. I should be glad to see the Minister make any reductions in the expenses which can be made without interfering with the convenience of the people: but I think the change proposed is a breach of the contract made with the Island. We understood, when we entered Confederation, that the Dominion Government would run the railroad for the convenience of the public; but if this change is made it will not be so, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that people in the western part of the Island will be obliged to resort to the old way of travelling with horses and carriages. If we are to lose this train and to have the booking stations closed, the railway will be of very little use to us. These booking stations are not attended with very much expense. There is only one agent paid something like $360 a year. Near all these booking stations business places have been built up, owing to the convenience of the station and telegraph, and of these they will be deprived. I do not think the Minister named the stations which he intended to close, but I understand from the papers Freetown is one, and Miscouche another. I am glad to hear, however, that Miscouche is not to be closed, and I hope that the Minister will be able to say the same thing with regard to Freetown. I am rather surprised that the deficit of the Island Railway is as great as it is. I do not know why this should be so. The trains always seem to me to be well loaded, and there seems good traffic, and one thing is certain the officials are not overpaid. The conductors and other officials running the trains are paid very low salaries, and from my experience they are very competent and obliging men, and I do not think there are too many on the road. It is true, if politics were not allowed to interfere so much with the appointments of officials and the running of the road, it would be better. If the road were conducted more on business than on political principles, it might be for the benefit of the road. I may also say with regard to the branch line from Emerald to Cape Traverse, that if the hon. Minister makes that a tri-weekly service instead of a daily, it will result in great inconvenience and loss. Taking off these trains is going to lessen the traffic very much, indeed. If instead of doing this the rates were reduced, I believe there would be much more business on the road, and it might pay very much better. I understand the hon. Minister expects to reduce the expenses by $18,000. Well, considering this is the only public work we have in Prince Edward Island, I do not think we should be inconvenienced to such a great extent as we shall be by the stoppage of these trains for the sake of saving $18,000. I would like to hear definitely from the Minister whether he intends to close any of these booking stations, and I should like also to have his assurance that it is not his intention to take off the train running between Summerside and Charlottetown, which is, perhaps, the most convenient of all the trains we have.

Mr. HAGGART. I may state to the hon. gentleman that there were a short time ago three trains a day between Charlottetown and Summerside. These have been reduced to two trains a day, which it is thought by the department will be quite sufficient. The hon. gentleman states that the time at which they run is inconvenient. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the summer time table will be out soon, and from that he will learn that such arrangements will be made as I am sure will be satisfactory to all the travelling public between those points. The hon. gentleman makes a plea on behalf of keeping on the daily train from Cape Traverse? I am advised by the officers of my department that three days a week will fully serve all the requirements of business in that particular section. He then asks what are the men to do in the odd days? The same question struck me, and I asked the chief engineer who told me that there would be plenty of employment for the train hands in the shape of working at improvements on the road. That is one of the points I will particularly enquire into when I visit the Island, so as to see if it is possible at all to keep up the daily train for the convenience of that section. With regard to the three stations closed there is absolutely so little done, in fact nothing at all, that there is no reason for keeping them open, and I think if the hon. gentleman knew the receipts we get from them, he would himself urge upon the department to close them.

Mr. PERRY. Which of the stations does the hon. gentleman intend to close?

Mr. HAGGART. I think it was the intention to close five of them, but, on reconsideration two of them will not be closed. The only one I know of for certain is Miscouche which is not closed.

Mr. YEO. The hon. Minister says that two trains can give all the convenience needed in the western part of the Island. I would represent to him that people doing business in Charlottetown from points west will be obliged to remain two nights in Charlottetown which would be a very great disadvantage. As I said before, there are at present three trains running west, so that people can go to Charlottetown and do their business and return the same day to Summerside, and, although I am glad to know they have this convenience east of Charlottetown, I do not see why we should not be

treated in the same way as the eastern part of the Island. I should wish to know from the Minister if he can give us information as to receipts on the different divisions of the road ?

Mr. HAGGART. They are not kept separately.

Mr. YEO. I am convinced the best paying part of the road is from Charlottetown west. I can tell the Minister the taking off of this train between Charlottetown and Summerside is going to be ruinous. I should like to know the stations which the Minister proposes to close. I dare say there are some in which the receipts are not very large. Freetown station, which has been named, has not been very long opened, and it is in the midst of a fine country where the trade is increasing, so that it is a serious matter to those people who have built business establishments at this place with the expectation that the station would be kept open, to have it closed. If the closing of it were going to effect a large saving, there might be some reason for the Minister's action, but such will not be the case. The hon. gentleman spoke of dismissing officials the other night, and he stated that the officers of his department were best able to judge as to whether there were more officials on the road than are required. I only hope that any dismissals he makes will not be of the old hands. When the matter was spoken of a few evenings ago, the names of one or two gentlemen were mentioned as being upon the list. I might say that it would be a very great hardship to dismiss Mr. Macpherson, as he has been on the road ever since it was completed, and is a most efficient and faithful man. I do not say this because he is a political friend of mine, for the contrary is the case. If it is necessary to make any dismissals, they should be of younger men, who perhaps would not be so much inconvenienced. Instead of the closing of stations helping receipts, it will tend very much to reduce them, and would show the people of the Island that there is no inclination to deal fairly with them. I cannot see myself why all sections of the Island should not be put on an equal footing. It is true we have the same number of trains running west as east, but we are differently situated. It is a longer road and it is impossible with the present arrangements proposed by the Minister to give the accommodation which the people have a right to expect.

Mr. PERRY. I will read to the House the following resolution which was passed unanimously at a large and influential meeting of citizens at Charlottetown, to protest against the changes recently made in the Prince Edward Island Railway, and to ask the Government to restore the trains and stations which the people of the Island have hitherto had:

"Whereas a reduction has been made in the number of trains hitherto run on the Prince Edward Island Railway, and it is proposed to close several booking stations, which changes are detrimental to the interests of the people of this province:

"Therefore resolved that this meeting of citizens of Charlottetown regrets that the number of trains which have hitherto afforded accommodation on the Island Railway, has been reduced.

"Further resolved that inasmuch as the booking stations on the Island Railway have proved a great benefit to our farmers and business men, this meeting deplores the action of the Government in doing away with several of these much needed stations.

"Further resolved that the changes are unjust particularly in view of the fact that this province paid for the construction of the road and is entitled to the utmost benefit that can be derived therefrom, and we emphatically protest against the action of the Railway Department in thus seriously interfering with the trade of this province.

"Further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded by His Worship the Mayor to the Premier of the Dominion, the Minister of Railways, and to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Commons from this Island."

Mr. McLEAN. I notice the hon. member for Prince is trying to impress the House with the opinion that the changes on the railway have a political aspect, and that the stations closed were those in the vicinity of which the people are of Liberal politics and not Conservative. I would like to point out to the committee that the three stations which it is contemplated to close are situated one in each county, one in the county I have the honour to represent, one in the County of Queen's, and one in Prince County, so that I do not think the hon. gentleman can make that claim good, so far as these stations are concerned. At the same time I would be very well satisfied if the Minister of Railways could see his way clear to leaving these stations open. The expense of running them is very small, but at the same time if any stations are to be closed, it ought to be those three which pay the least revenue. The statement of the member for Prince County (Mr. Perry) that the trains running west from Charlottetown are the best paying, I deny, and I think I will be supported by the facts. I do not say that the receipts west are not greater than those east, but they have had three trains between Charlottetown and Summerside in the past, and a daily train from Emerald to Cape Traverse, and I claim that the cost of running these trains has been greater than the cost of the trains running east. I believe that two trains a day from Charlottetown to Summerside will give the people of that section of the country as much accommodation as those which are run east between Charlottetown and Georgetown and Souris give to the people of the eastern section. The senior member for Prince County (Mr. Perry) has been very jealous of the members for King's County going into his county and claiming money from the Government for public works in that county. I deny that I have waited upon any member of the Government for public works in that county. My colleague and myself have enough difficulty to get what we think we are entitled to for our own county, but perhaps the hon. gentleman, remembering the fate of his friend who lately represented the County of Pontiac, in regard to which county I believe he made a great speech asking that the people there should be relieved of $100,000 which they had subscribed for a railway, and remembering that the people of Prince Edward Island form one-fortieth of the people of the Dominion, thinks they should be taxed $2,500 for that purpose. I did not know that the hon. gentleman was particularly interested in the County of Pontiac, but probably he thinks that, after the redistribution, he will not be able to find a resting place, and he may be looking to the County of Pontiac. I only hope the Minister of Railways will see his way clear to keep open the five stations which it has been contemplated to close, but if, in the interest of economy, it is necessary to close three stations, I do not think he could have taken any stations less profitable than Freetown, Bedford and Bear River. At the same time, I hope he will keep them all open as in the past.

Mr. PERRY. It is not my fault that the hon. gentleman was not in his place when I spoke the other night. He should have been looking after his business, but he was not. He refers to my speaking in the County of Pontiac. I have been there three times. I like the people well, and I knew something about the people of Pontiac. I do not come here with my tongue tied. I am not simply a representative of Prince Edward Island, but I am a representative of the whole Dominion, and I represent the County of Pontiac as much as any other county. The hon. gentleman has reported in his paper published in Summerside that he interviewed the Minister of Public Works to get a new breakwater at Miminegash in Prince County. Did he ever see the place?

Mr. McLEAN. Yes.

Mr. PERRY. Has he any interest there? Has he a vote there? No, he has not. He knows nothing about Miminegash. Why, there is a breakwater there, and has been since 1879. The money for it was voted in 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie Government, and what is left of it is there yet. For two years, $2,500 has been voted, and, as we were told yesterday, no contract has been let. I suppose the hon. gentleman was not here yesterday when the Minister of Public Works stated, in reply to me, that no tenders had been asked for. I have a constituency in Prince County that would do honour to any hon. gentleman to represent on the floor of this House. They are not bought. They vote for honesty, and they send two honest men to this House. Is it because I have some French Acadiens there to vote for me that the hon. gentleman runs down that county? I can tell him that they would not vote for him. He is not the man for Galway. My friends would not vote for him. I do not know whether he has a mind of his own. He is not here when he ought to be, and although he has done his best to gerrymander me out, he cannot do it. He accuses me of looking for a constituency in Pontiac. Did I steal anything or boodle anything? I would challenge the hon. gentleman to say that to my face. I am as independent as he is in politics, and he had better keep these tirades at home.

Mr. McLEAN. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I do know where Miminegash is, and that I have as much interest in it as the hon. gentleman has. Whatever my chances in King's County may be, I have never required to have an Act of Parliament passed in this House, as the hon. gentleman has, to whitewash me and enable me to take my seat. That hon. gentleman was elected for the Local House and afterwards for this House, and he had to get an Act passed in this House to allow him to sit here. I was elected in my county at the head of the poll. I have run four elections and have never yet been defeated, and, when the time comes, I have no doubt I shall be elected again, as surely as I shall see the hon. gentleman's face here again.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not intend to prolong the discussion or to take part in the personal dispute between these two hon. gentlemen. If the hon. member who has last spoken (Mr. McLean) has passed successfully through some elections, my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Perry) has carried scores compared with his one. Since I was a small boy, Mr. Perry has been a prominent politician in Prince Edward Island, and the most popular man in his end of the county, and deservedly so, as he discharges his duties to his constituents as well as any member of this House. Now, on the question before the House I understand very few changes have been made by the hon. gentleman in the Island Railway. I did not take any part in the debate because I knew some changes were contemplated, and after reflection the hon. gentleman did not carry them out. The resolution which was carried at the meeting has been read by my hon. friend, and I need not refer to it. I can offer no reason why there should be a deficit on the road at all. I can not understand it, and I only rise to suggest that when the hon. gentleman visits the Maritime Provinces, he will make a personal examination of the road and see if he is able to discover wherein the causes of the deficit lie. The road runs through a well-settled country everywhere, and although I have talked with men who ought to know, I have never been able to discover a man who can tell me why there is a deficit on the road. I am not aware that it is over-manned; the men are not over-paid, the salaries are small, too many trains do not run—certainly not more than are sufficient to supply the requirements of the country; and if there is anywhere a loophole where money escapes, I do not know where it is, and I am unable to advise the hon. gentleman in what direction. But I do hope that before he makes any radical changes, he will make a personal investigation of the road.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 16th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 78) for the relief of James Albert Manning Aikins.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 79) for the relief of Ada Donigan.—(Mr. Taylor.)

RELIEF OF HERBERT R. MEAD.

Bill (No. 81) for the relief of Herbert Rimmington Mead was considered in Committee and reported.

Mr. TAYLOR moved third reading of the Bill.

Mr. LANGELIER. I am in principle opposed to all these divorce Bills; but there are peculiar reasons, I think, why this Bill should not be passed. I do not think any evidence has been submitted to this House to justify its passage. I read carefully some time ago the evidence taken in the case, and I am much surprised to see that the Bill is reported upon favourably, both by the Senate and by the Private Bills Committee of this House. The only evidence we have is that there were rumours derogatory to the honour of the wife of the gentleman

applying for relief, in the locality where they were living. There were rumours that there was too much intimacy between her and an inspector of the Mounted Police; but I do not see in the evidence any proof to justify even a separation. In the Province of Quebec no court of justice would grant even a separation on evidence such as that which we have before this House. Under the circumstances, I do not think the House would be justified in passing the Bill. To do so would be to show great looseness in granting divorces and in putting an end to such an important relationship as a marriage between these two persons.

House divided on motion of Mr. Taylor:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Mackintosh,
Bain (Wentworth),	McAlister,
Barnard,	McCarthy,
Bennett,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bowell,	McGregor,
Bowers,	McLean,
Bowman,	McLeod,
Boyle,	Madill,
Brown,	Mara,
Campbell,	Mills (Annapolis),
Cargill,	O'Brien,
Carling,	Patterson (Colchester),
Charlton,	Putnam,
Cochrane,	Rowan,
Colter,	Scriver,
Davies,	Semple,
Denison,	Somerville,
Dewdney,	Stairs,
Dickey,	Sutherland,
Flint,	Taylor,
Foster,	Temple,
Gordon,	Tisdale,
Guillet,	Tupper,
Haggart,	Tyrwhitt,
Hazen,	Wallace,
Henderson,	Watson,
Hughes,	Weldon,
Hutchins,	Welsh,
Innes,	White (Cardwell),
Lister,	White (Shelburne),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),	Yeo.—63.
Macdonell (Algoma),	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Langelier,
Béchard,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bergeron,	LaRivière,
Burns,	Laurier,
Cameron,	Lippé,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Macdonald (King's),
Carroll,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Choquette,	Mignault,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Perry,
Devlin,	Proulx,
Dupont,	Robillard,
Geoffrion,	Roome,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Simard,
Guay,	Thompson (Sir John),
Joncas,	Turcotte.—31.
Landerkin,	

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) The hon. member for Joliette did not vote.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. member for Joliette hear the question put?

Mr. LIPPÉ. (Translation.) I did not vote because I did not want to.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must vote unless excused from voting.

Mr. LIPPÉ. (Translation.) If I have to vote, I will vote against the motion.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I voted on this question forgetting that I had paired with the hon. member for Queen's, N.S.

MANITOBA NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WALLACE moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 80) respecting the Manitoba North-Western Railway Company of Canada.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I regret very much that this company has found itself unable to proceed with the construction of the twenty miles this year, but as I have been informed that the delay this year might have the result of the whole line being completed to its terminal point at an earlier date, I withdraw any opposition and let the Bill go on.

Motion agreed to, Bill considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

COMPLAINTS AGAINST THE BERTHIER (MONTMAGNY) POST OFFICE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (Translation) asked, Whether complaints have been made respecting the management of the post office at Berthier, in the County of Montmagny? If so, by whom; and is there to be an enquiry, and when?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) The Post Office Department has received no complaint against the management of the Berthier post office, in the County of Montmagny.

COLLECTOR AT BIC, RIMOUSKI.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, 1st. Whether there is a collector for the wharf at Bic, in the County of Rimouski? 2nd. What is his name; when was he appointed, and what is his salary or remuneration? 3rd. How much has he collected since his appointment, and how much has he been paid as salary or remuneration?

Mr. TUPPER. The only wharf in the County of Rimouski, under the Department of Marine, is the wharf at Ste. Cécile, and for this wharf Mr. Louis Napoléon was appointed wharfinger on 20th of April, 1891, his remuneration to be at the rate of 25 per cent of the rates collected as wharfinger. No returns have been received as to collection made since his appointment, but the wharfinger reported on the 20th of April that he found it impossible to collect the tolls due.

MR. J. S. VALLÉE, MONTMAGNY POST-MASTER.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether the Government are aware that Mr. J. S. Vallée, postmaster of Montmagny, is nearly 80 years old, sick, and unable to continue to perform his duties? If so, is it their intention to appoint a person in his place? Has there been correspondence on the subject between the said J. S. Vallée, or some person on his behalf, and the Government? Have applications been received by the Post Office Department, from any person or persons, asking to be appointed in place of the said J. S. Vallée? If so, who are the persons, and by whom are they recommended?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) The Post Office Department has been informed that Mr. Vallée is an old man, and that personally he is incapable of giving the necessary attention to the duties of his office; but it is also informed that the affairs of the office do not suffer therefrom, as they are carried on by other persons under his orders. The Government has now under consideration the advisability of appointing a successor to Mr. Vallée. Should he not resign of his own accord, if the Government come to the conclusion that he should be replaced, he will be invited to do so. No correspondence took place between the department and him or any other person on his behalf. No application appears to have been made for appointment in the place of Mr. Vallée as postmaster.

D. M. CAMERON—INLAND REVENUE, QUEBEC.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, 1. Whether there is in the Inland Revenue Office, Quebec, an official named D. M. Cameron? 2. What are his duties and functions, and does he discharge them to the satisfaction of the Government? 3. Is the Government aware that the said Cameron spends his time hunting smugglers, and acts like a pirate rather than a man of intelligence? 4. How many expeditions has he made during the last two years; how much have they cost, and what has been the result? 5. What is his salary? 6. Whence did he come, and on whose recommendation was he appointed?

Mr. BOWELL. There is an official in the Inland Revenue Office, Quebec, named D. M. Cameron. Mr. Cameron is a special class exciseman, having charge of the principal tobacco manufactories in the city of Quebec, and in addition was empowered by the department to go on such trips in the suppression of illicit whiskey distilling and whiskey smuggling as circumstances might warrant, and which were approved by the inspector of the district (Mr. Lemoine). His duties have been satisfactorily performed. The third question is not in order, and therefore I decline to answer it. He has made thirty-three trips, costing $1,366.27. Result, seizure of 1,100 proof gallons of spirits, 3,550 pounds of tobacco, also cutting machine, empty barrels and brandy. Mr. Cameron's salary is $1,400 per annum. He was transferred to Quebec from the division of Prescott, where he was chief officer in charge of the distillery of A. Whitney.

JUDICIARY OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. BRODEUR) asked, 1. Whether representations have been made by the Quebec Government to the Dominion Government expressing the intention of the former to modify, during the present session of the Legislature of the said province, any part of the present organization of the courts of the said province, and notably to abolish the Magistrates' Court of the city of Montreal, with a view to greater economy in the expenditure of the public moneys of the province, and a more effectual administration of justice? 2. Whether the Government have been consulted by the Government of the Province of Quebec as to whether the Dominion Government would be disposed, in the event of the abolition of the Magistrates' Court of the city of Montreal, to favour further legislation authorizing the appointment of additional judges, with a view to the more effectual administration of judicial business in two or more divisions of the Montreal Circuit Court, and to bring down an estimate for the salary of such judges during this session? 3. Have the Government been informed that the Government of the Province of Quebec have adopted an Order in Council putting in force the Act of the Legislature of that province, authorizing the appointment of two additional judges with jurisdiction in the Court of Queen's Bench for the said province, and of the intention to issue at an early day the official proclamation requisite to the final sanctioning of the said Act? 4. Have the Government been consulted as to the urgent necessity of the Government of the province requiring the appointment of additional judges for the Court of Queen's Bench and for the Superior Court in the said province, and in particular for the judicial district of Montreal? Have the Government been urged to take action in that direction, or not to do so, by the Quebec Government, or by the members of the magistracy; or (with and by the authorization of the latter) by members of Parliament, or by one or more sections of the bar of the province? 5. Is it the intention of the Government to include in the list of proposed changes for the increase in the salaries of judges, or in the Supplementary Estimates during this session, an amount sufficient to pay the salaries of the new judges whose appointment is already authorized or is about to be authorized during its present session by the Legislature of the Province of Quebec? 6. Have representations been made to the Government, with the authorization of the members of the magistracy, for or against the increase of the salaries of judges as proposed by the Government? 7. Is it the intention of the Government to allow the judges of the Dominion of Canada to sit as paid members of Royal Commissions, appointed by this Government or by the Provincial Governments, while continuing to discharge their permanent functions as judges within the respective limits of their jurisdiction, and to draw their salaries as such? If so, what means do the Government purpose to adopt with a view to obviate the drawbacks resulting with reference to the proper administration of justice, during the employment of judges on such commissions? 8. How many judges in the Province of Quebec and elsewhere in the Dominion of Canada, sat during the past year, or are now sitting, as commissioners appointed under Royal Commissions issued under the Great Seal of the Dominion, or of any of the provinces thereof? What are the names of the said judges, and the dates of appointment in each instance; to what judicial jurisdiction do they belong, and what is the amount of salary they received as commissioners?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In answer to the first question, I may state that there was an informal conversation with one member of the Quebec Government on this subject, but there was no announcement of the policy of that Government in the conversation. As to the second question, the Government of Quebec were told in the course of that conversation that an additional judge or judges

would be appointed when sufficient cause was shown therefor, and after Parliament provided the salary or salaries. The answer to the third question is, No. The answer to the fourth question is, No. The answer to the fifth question is, Not at present. As to the sixth question, we have heard nothing from the magistracy about the judges. As to the seventh question, the Government would remonstrate against judges sitting on commissions appointed under provincial authority if it appeared at any time that the public interest was affected by their so sitting. Generally speaking, the Provincial Government is supposed to be the best judge in that matter. As to the eighth question, I have not the information here, and I think it will have to be moved for.

MAILS FROM POINT TUPPER TO SYDNEY, N.S.

Mr. FLINT (for Mr. FRASER) asked, Whether the contract for carrying the mails from Point Tupper to Sydney has expired? If so, have new contracts been called for? If the mail is not carried under contract, what amount is paid, and is the amount equal to or larger than the amount paid under contract? What is the name of the party, or parties, now carrying the mails?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In regard to the first part of the question, if, as is presumed, the service referred to is that between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney, the contract has expired. As to the second part of the question, the answer is, No. As to the third part, the service is now performed under a temporary agreement at the rate of $750 per month. This rate is larger than was paid under the contract, as it was merely from month to month until the railway was completed. As to the fourth question, John Morrison is performing the service. We have given notice that the contract will be cancelled.

FISHING LICENSES ON THE NORTH SHORE OF THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. BÉCHARD (for Mr. BEAUSOLEIL) asked, Have fishing licenses been granted for the waters of more than one of the Counties of Berthier, Maskinongé, St. Maurice, Champlain, Nicolet, Yamaska and Richelieu, since January, 1892? If so, to whom, to what date, and for what consideration?

Mr. TUPPER. No, Sir.

EATONVILLE HARBOUR.

Mr. BÉCHARD asked, What has been the total amount expended on the harbour of Eatonville, Nova Scotia, since 1880.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The amount expended on this harbour, from 1st January, 1880, to 13th May, 1892, was $7,166.58.

PRINTING OF VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, For what number of electoral districts have the last revised voters' lists been printed? What are the names of the electoral districts for which the final lists have not been printed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The number of electoral districts for which the lists have been printed, is 96. The names of the districts for which final lists have not been printed are too numerous to mention, but they are shown in a list which I have here, and which I will send to the hon. gentleman.

RELEASE OF CONVICT EDWARD WILSON.

Mr. ARMSTRONG moved for:

Copies of all petitions, letters and other documents relating to the release of Edward Wilson, who was found guilty of arson, at the Essex Assizes, on the 4th day of October, 1884, and sentenced to confinement for a term of twenty years in the Kingston Penitentiary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suppose the hon. gentleman will give the reasons why he desires these papers.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The reasons why I ask for these documents are simply these: A resident of the County of Essex had his buildings burned in 1884. The insurance company, of which I had the honour of being president at that time, had to pay for the buildings: they also paid a reward for the apprehension and conviction of this Wilson. The man was sentenced to 20 years in the Kingston Penitentiary, and before much more than a quarter of his term had elapsed, he was released. Strange to say, the same man's buildings were burned again very shortly after, and we had to pay once more for the loss of the buildings. Now, we want to find out what induced the Government to release him after he had served so short a term of his sentence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press the motion. I will be very glad indeed to show him the file of papers connected with this matter, or to give him any other information; but I think it would be undesirable, without some important public reasons, that we should adopt the practice of moving for the papers in the case of every convict whose sentence it may be desired to review. As hon. members are aware, applications for release in convicts' cases are very numerous indeed, averaging three every day; they are always made at the instance of the convicts or their friends, and I think that we ought to consider carefully before adopting an order to bring down the papers in such cases. I will explain to the hon. gentleman, however, the particulars of the representations which led to executive interference with this case. The sentence, as the hon. gentleman has stated, was for 20 years, and that period was reduced by my recommendation to His Excellency, to a period of seven years, under circumstances which I will now explain. On the 3rd of April, 1888—and that was about four years after the sentence was pronounced—Sir Adam Wilson, who had tried the prisoner and had given him 20 years sentence, and had retired from the bench, felt some misgivings as to the severity of the sentence. He, therefore, wrote to the Secretary of State this letter:

"I have the honour to send you, for the information of His Excellency the Governor General, a copy of my notes of the trial of the convict Edward Wilson, for arson, taken at Sandwich on the 4th of October, 1884. There has been no application made to me by any one on his behalf, nor am I sure has any application been made to the Government for him. I make the present application at my own instance, because I thought immediately after passing the sentence that I had imposed too severe a punishment upon him. The value of the buildings was not stated at the time, but from the sentiment about that part of the country—although a very prosperous, it is not a progressive one—the prisoner showed a vindictive, malicious dis-

position against the parties whose property he destroyed. It was an act of revenge: it cannot be palliated. I should be more satisfied, nevertheless, if his imprisonment were reduced to one-half the period or to ten, seven years at the most. It may be that seven years would be too short a term. May I therefore request you to lay this application before His Excellency, and I hope it may meet with his favourable consideration. I desired the sheriff and county attorney of the County of Essex, shortly after the trial, to keep the prisoner in mind, so that if anything happened to me before I interceded for him they might see it done, as he appears to be a man without any friends."

That was referred for information as to the convict's conduct, and the report was that his conduct had been very good, that he had earned all possible remission. Therefore, on the 23rd June, 1888, I made a report to His Excellency that the sentence of seven years imprisonment, with remission, would probably meet the requirements of justice, and I recommended that after the convict had served seven years, he should be discharged. In the meantime, in the course of my visit to the prison, I had ascertained that the convict could only understand a very few words of English, and was probably quite unaware of what was testified to at his trial, where, it appears, he had no counsel to defend him. I was also very strongly impressed with the representations which were made by the Protestant chaplain at the prison, not merely as to his conduct while in prison, but as to his inability to understand what had taken place at his trial, and as to his state of mind as regards criminality. I was induced, therefore, to accept the recommendation which had been made by Sir Adam Wilson on his behalf, and to make the sentence seven years. I may mention, however, to the hon. gentleman that strong representations were made by the Swedish consul on behalf of the prisoner, on the grounds that he had not been properly tried, inasmuch as there had been no interpreter at the trial, and he was quite unable to understand the language in which he was tried and unaware of what was testified against him. At the request of the consul, and in order to ascertain what the facts were, the warden of the prison was instructed to report as to whether he really did understand English, and this was the warden's statement:

"In reply to your letter of the 26th instant, *re* convict Edward Wilson, I beg to say, that on his arrival here this man's knowledge of the English language was limited to a few words, and it was with difficulty that he could be made to understand what was required of him, or to make himself understood. His conduct here has always been very good, and so far as I can judge he seems to be striving to live as he should. Referring to his individual propensities, I would say that he appears to be a quiet, inoffensive fellow."

Then follows a strong remonstrance from the Swedish Consul, in which he alleges that it was contrary to fair administration of justice that this man should be condemned for such a serious offence without having had a trial which he understood, and upon that letter Sir Adam Wilson wrote these comments:

"TORONTO, 10th September, 1888.

"To the Honourable the Minister of Justice,
"Ottawa.

"SIR,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 6th instant relating to the case of the convict Edward Wilson, now in the Kingston Penitentiary for arson, and the accompanying documents, among which is the letter of Mr. Schwartz, the consul at Quebec for Sweden and Norway, of the 3rd instant.

"The papers just sent to me inform me for the first time that the convict is a foreigner—excepting the verbal statement made to me last April or May, by Mr. Murray, of this city, who is connected, I believe, with the Swedish Consulate at Quebec. I thought at the trial, as not a word

was said of his being a foreigner, that he was an Englishman of rather a low class.

"The consul, in his latest communication of the 3rd instant, says the warden of the penitentiary, in his certificate, has stated that the convict's knowledge of English is limited to a few words—and that a period of a few years from the date of the trial—and he continues: 'This common farm labourer, ignorant of the language, the law and the practice of the courts of this country, was apparently without having been afforded the assistance of a counsel,' which my legal adviser informs me is unheard of in this part of the Dominion—equally so in the native country of the prisoner, and I believe in any other country laying claim to an administration of justice based upon fair and just principles.

"The consul may not be aware that prisoners are repeatedly their counsel, and probably so sometimes for the reasons best known to themselves. If for any special cause it appears to the court that the prisoner requires legal assistance—or if he desires it himself—counsel is then assigned to defend him.

"But if there is no such special occasion appearing to the court to assign counsel, it is not done. Though whether there is a cause or not to assign counsel, yet it is done, nevertheless, if the prisoner desires it.

"At the trial I saw no special reason to assign counsel for the prisoner, for, as I have said, I did not know, and it was not stated he was a foreigner or that he did not understand the nature of the charge that was made against him or was not able to follow the evidence of the witnesses. The consul then concludes: 'Wilson, consequently, has had no defence—in fact, has been tried, found guilty and sentenced without a show of a hearing.'

"That is a very grave charge. He also says:

"'When, at a later date at the penitentiary, it was difficult that he could be made to understand what was required of him, it cannot be wondered at that he did not understand what was required of him at the court—that is to say, he made no statement and called no witnesses—where not the slightest pains have been taken for his information, his guidance and protection.'

"That the convict made no statement was, according to the evidence against him, the wisest course to adopt—and that he called no witnesses is not at all to be wondered at, for he had none to call.

"The consul has taken great pains to procure the release of the convict—not 'because his knowledge of English is limited to just a few words,' and because he did not understand what was said at the trial against him and so could not answer it,—and because he had no witnesses.

"The ignorance of English is not by any means established by the consul, it is disproved by the witnesses who were examined at the trial. The consul imagines the ignorance of English is established, because the convict, with a purpose to serve, now appears to the warden to know but a few words of it; this makes no allowance for the cunning and power of dissimulation of such persons who may be enjoying their success over the easy credulity of their interrogators.

"I take it as an undoubted fact that the convict was guilty of the arson charged against him. In all the consul's arguments it does not appear the convict denies his guilt. The consul says the conviction is 'solely and entirely based on the otherwise unsupported evidence of the witness, Constable McKee as to a conversation between the prisoner and himself, in which the former is said to have made a verbal statement or admission that he accidentally burned the barn and set fire to the house and at the same time so said a statement to this effect written by an officer of the guard.' And that it was not admissible evidence, because it was not shown the prisoner understood what had been written."

The learned judge goes on with his argument on that point, with which I need not trouble the House; but I thought it right, as I read the first letter, which was strongly in the prisoner's favour, to read the argument which Sir Adam Wilson made against the contention of the consul. The contention of the consul was not only that the prisoner should be released, but that he should be paid damages for his conviction and detention. I felt inclined to concur with the consul that the man had not been tried in a way in which we should like to see a person tried for so serious an offence, one to which so stringent a penalty was attached. The Chief Justice said—but I cannot follow his reasoning there—that the prisoner had

no witnesses to call, and that silence at a trial was his wisest course. I cannot see how that can be said in regard to any one tried in a language not one word of which he understood. I should be very sorry if I were tried in a foreign country, where I knew nothing of the language, to have it inferred that I was acting from caution and prudence in not making a defence in regard to an accusation which might deprive me of my liberty for life. I am sure, notwithstanding the argument which Sir Adam Wilson made in his second letter, if it had come to his knowledge at the trial that the man was a foreigner and did not understand English, he would have taken care that the prisoner should be provided with counsel and an interpreter. I, therefore, in view of all the circumstances, do not by any means regret that I had counselled His Excellency to reduce the sentence to seven years. I shall be happy to give the hon. gentleman any other information, but I presume that is sufficient.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am not now president of the company, but the manager wrote asking me to move this resolution. I have done so, and I must say, after hearing the explanation, that I am perfectly satisfied, and so far as my own personal feeling is concerned, I think the Minister of Justice did what perhaps any one of us would have done under the circumstances. I am perfectly satisfied with his action in the matter, and with the leave of the House I beg to withdraw the motion.

Mr. McGREGOR. It is quite true that this young man was a Swede and could not talk much English, yet he spoke French very well, I understand from all who knew him, and he was among the French. This young man was pardoned and released from the penitentiary at Kingston. He went straight back to Essex, settling very nearly in the same neighbourhood in which he was before, and within four or five days of his arrival there he again burnt out the same family. He burnt the barns, and so far as I know, he burnt all the buildings that the man owned.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is hardly fair to say he burnt them, for he was tried for the offence and it was not proved against him.

Mr. McGREGOR. I will put it in this way. It was proved that the man was on the ground the evening before, and it was proved exactly where he was just after the fire started ; but there was a small break in the chain of evidence, a very small one, and so the magistrate let him off. I feel from my knowledge of the whole matters, knowing the family as well as I do, knowing also the young man, that it is a serious matter to turn loose a man of that kind. I have heard the statement of the Minister of Justice in regard to this case, and no doubt he could not have acted otherwise. But this is a great loss to these people. I have not the least doubt in my mind that the man was guilty of the second act. Speaking the French language, he was not in the difficult position which my hon. friend thinks he occupied. In the second case it was with extreme difficulty that the farmer was able to save his wife and three children. The case was a very grievous one, for the man lost his barn, a house worth $2,000 and all the buildings attached to it. I feel that in a case of this kind great care should be exercised. The evidence in the first case was very clear. He not only had a counsel to defend him, but the counsel was a Frenchman, and the prisoner spoke the French language clearly and fairly well.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He had no counsel at the first trial.

Mr. McGREGOR. He may not have had a paid counsel, but Mr. Ouellette acted for him. He did not have money to pay a large amount, but he advised with him and gave him his opinion freely.

Motion withdrawn.

PROHIBITION—PLEBISCITE.

Mr. CHARLTON moved :

That the state of public opinion upon the question of the prohibition of the manufacturing, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, for beverage purposes, should be ascertained by a reference of the question to the electors of Canada at the polls.

He said : Since I have had the honour to have a seat in this House, Mr. Speaker, the prohibition question has occupied a large share of public attention and has frequently been discussed in Parliament. We have had, I think, manifested in the House upon almost, if not upon every occasion, when this question was raised, an indisposition on the part of members to face the question squarely and to go upon record as voting for or against prohibition. Various parliamentary expedients have been resorted to upon almost every occasion to shunt the question, and to place it in a position where it was not necessary to give a direct expression of opinion on it. We have had two Royal Commissions appointed, and action upon the question deferred in consequence of the appointment of these commissions until their report could be presented to the people. The first commission was appointed, if my memory serves me right, in 1874. The result of its deliberations and examinations and the testimony taken and information acquired was laid before Parliament and the people, but that Royal Commission was not productive of any legislative result. We have had pouring in upon us from time to time, petitions from the people asking for prohibition, and when the question was raised last session and had reached a stage where it seemed that Parliament would be obliged at last to give an expression of opinion by either voting that prohibition was desirable or that it was not, the expedient of the appointment of a Royal Commission was again resorted to. In that way the question was again set aside and we are waiting until that Royal Commission, with the utmost deference to its own requirements as to time and its own ease, makes its report.

We have had the most prominent gentlemen in this House who have agitated this question disposed of in various ways. We have my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who was once a very ardent prohibitionist, now in the position of Finance Minister, and he is not as anxious for the passage of the law as he formerly was. The hon. gentleman who presented resolutions in this House from time to time, year after year, has departed from the precincts of the House of Commons and has been made a judge, and his interference with the question has been disposed of. Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we may say that it is difficult to define the exact extent of the prohibition sentiment in Canada. The question has never been presented

to the people standing distinctly and squarely upon its own merits. It has always been mixed up to a certain extent with other political issues, and I doubt whether, if we were to face the question to-day,—if we were taking into consideration, honestly and seriously, the propriety of passing a prohibitory liquor law—we are in possession of the information that it would be necessary for us to have as to the state of public sentiment in the country, and as to whether the great majority of the people of Canada were actually in favour of such a measure. The temperance sentiment of the country has been of a character to produce mischievous consequences politically, and not of a character to promote very efficiently the temperance issue itself. It has always been felt, I presume, by politicians to be a dangerous thing to have the temperance question raised. If a candidate assumed a temperance position, he was certain to lose what might be termed the liquor vote in his own party, and was equally certain not to draw a single temperance vote from the other party. Many cases in my own knowledge have occurred, where temperance men who honestly avowed their sentiments have lost their elections in consequence of that avowal, simply through the failure of temperance men to come to their support, and by their losing on the other hand the anti-temperance vote of their own party. The presentation of this question has never been a fair one, and we never have secured definite knowledge as to the exact state of public sentiment upon it. We never had the presumable temperance sentiment of the country brought honestly and squarely to bear upon this issue, either before the people or in this House of Commons.

It may be said, Mr. Speaker, that the passage of the Scott Act in a great number of counties in this Dominion, is an unerring indication that there was a temperance sentiment that commanded a majority of votes in the country, and no doubt the bare passage of the Act in these various counties would seem to indicate that that assertion was true. But, following the passage of that Act, we have had the fact that it was repealed in almost all these counties, and we have the evidence, the surface evidence at least, of a revolution of feeling with regard to the question. Perhaps if we were to look deeply into that matter, it might be found that that reversal of the action of the people in voting for the Scott Act was due to their disgust with this Government in failing to provide a means for carrying that law into effect. It might be found that this was the case, but upon the surface the indication is that there has been to some extent a change in public sentiment with regard to the temperance question, indicated as it was in the first place by the passage of the law in so many counties, and in the second place by its almost universal repeal. Now, Mr. Speaker, the passage of a prohibitory liquor law would be in Canada, as it has proved to be in other countries, a useless piece of legislation if it were not backed and sustained by popular opinion. It requires, perhaps, more than a bare majority of the people, it requires an overwhelming popular opinion in favour of the law to secure its efficient operation and its being properly enforced. Without that public sentiment it is useless to put such a law upon the Statute-book, and I have always believed, as I believe to-day, that the first step to take, if we proceed to the consideration of this question in a business-like way, if we desire to lay the foundations properly, and establish our legislation upon a basis that will make it enduring and not a dead letter; the first step to take is to ascertain what is the state of public sentiment, and how large a proportion of the people of Canada are in favour of such a law. If the measures taken to secure that knowledge disclose the fact that not a majority of the people of this country are in favour of such a law, then it is useless to put such a law upon the Statute-book. If there proves to be a very large majority in favour of such a law, then we may reasonably say that it would be a proper thing to proceed to enact the legislation required.

But it may be said that the raising of the question of the reference of this matter to the people at the polls at the present time is inopportune, and is in a sense premature; because the House last session took action with reference to it, and the result of the action taken by the House has not yet been reached. It may be said that the House referred this question to a Royal Commission, that we are waiting for the report of that Royal Commission, and that we cannot take a single step until that report is received, and until that stage of the proceedings has terminated. Now, Sir, I may perhaps be uncharitable in the opinion that I entertain about this matter, but I do not believe that the Royal Commission was appointed simply on account of a sincere desire on the part of the Government to secure the information that was wanted before undertaking action upon this subject. I do not believe that the hon. Minister of Finance and his colleagues were so destitute of information upon this subject as to be in the dark as to what might be the proper course for Parliament to take. I do believe, Sir, that with that question staring them in the face, with the necessity existing on the part of the Government to meet the question in some way, they preferred to dispose of the question by referring it to a Royal Commission, thus postponing the necessity of meeting it, to the more open and frank course of meeting the question then and there by calling upon the House to divide, and each member to record his vote as to whether he was in favour of prohibition or against it. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose we need the report of this Royal Commission to inform us as to the character or extent of the evils of intemperance. I do not suppose that any intelligent man in this country needs its report in order to enable him to form an opinion as to whether intemperance produces such evils in the country as to render it advisable to mitigate or entirely to abolish those evils. We do not need the report for that. The state of public inteiligence in this country would enable the people to decide at once whether intemperance is an evil so great as to require legislative enactment to check it, or whether it is not. We do not need the deliverance of this commission to enable us to decide whether, if we are to pass an efficient prohibitory liquor law, there is a necessity for the prohibition of the manufacture as well as the sale of liquor. We do not need the finding of this commission to give us the information which is necessary to guide us in our action on either of these points. In fact, we do not need the information of this commission at all. We have the broad fact before us that intemperance is a great evil; we have the fact that we cannot cope with that evil by legislative restrictions

unless we put a stop to the manufacture as well as to the sale of liquor; and having these facts before us, I repeat, it is not necessary to wait for the finding of what I term a farcical commission—a commission appointed merely for the purpose of shunting off an awkward question instead of taking action upon it. If action in any event is necessary to be taken on this question, the finding of a Royal Commission is not in any sense essential. But I think we could refer this question to a Royal Commission whose decision would be much more reliable and would command much more deference and respect than the Royal Commission which was appointed last session. I think the Royal Commission to which we might refer this question is the entire electorate of Canada. If you want advice, refer the question to them as a Royal Commission, and ask their opinion upon it. Among these electors you will find men of every shade of belief and opinion, and possessed of every item of intelligence that can be acquired by the few Royal Commissioners whom the Government have appointed. And, Sir, having referred the question to this Royal Commission, a commission of the whole people, and having heard their decision, the Government would be in a position to know what its duty was, and what course it should take. But it may be objected that large expense would attend this course. Well, not necessarily. Of course we are not to reach the solution of this question in one day or in one session. It is a matter that will require some little time. It involves a momentous change. It involves the loss of a large amount of revenue. It involves various consequences which render it necessary to proceed cautiously and in a somewhat conservative way. It is not necessary, probably it is not possible, to refer the question immediately. The question might be referred as a separate question, to be voted on by a separate ballot at municipal elections, or it might be referred at the next general election, if the pressure of public sentiment did not demand the solution of the question at an earlier date. It could be referred in either of these ways. But in order to ascertain the state of public sentiment on this question, it must be referred as a separate and distinct question. It must not be complicated with any other political issue, and each elector must be called on to deposit his ballot on this single question alone, without mixing up with it his views on the National Policy or on any other question whatever.

But the objection may be urged, as it has been urged, that this method would not be constitutional. Whenever an awkward question arises, I find that a very handy way of getting around it is to raise the question of constitutionality or of provincial rights; and it may be said that this is an un-British or an unconstitutional way of proceeding. That objection has already been urged. If we took this course, we should be asking the advice of a certain body; that is all we should be doing, nothing more nor less. We are doing that in the case of this Royal Commission. We are referring the question to a body of men and asking those gentlemen to examine into it and give us their opinion for our guidance—simply that, nothing more, nothing less. We do not necessarily go any further than that in the case of a *referendum*. We refer to the people of Canada, the great body of the electors, this question, asking them to indicate their opinion upon it, and when their opinion is given, we can decide to what extent we shall be guided by it. Now, we have made provision of this character, though not so broadly or comprehensively, before. We have adopted provisions of this character in reference to the Scott Act. Here was an Act on the Statute-book which provided that in every county of this Dominion it might be referred to the electors of that county, who would decide either to accept or to reject that Act according to their pleasure. So we might devise a general prohibitory Act, and refer that Act with all its provisions to the people of Canada, asking them to decide the question: Will you have this Act to be the law of the land, yes or no? Or we might take the simpler and more limited course of asking the people whether or not they desire a law of this kind, setting forth in the *referendum* the consequences, such as the loss of revenue, that would follow its enactment. Now, Sir, the people of this country are the primary source of power. We might have this House dissolved to-morrow upon an issue which the people would be called upon to decide. The Government might go to the people on almost any conceivable question, and the people would be the last court of resort, and their decision would be final. Therefore, I think it is absurd to say that that body, which is the last court of resort in this country, that body to which Parliament refers and to which Parliament is accountable, that body before which Parliament must go at stated periods whether there is a dissolution or not, and to which every member must render an account of his stewardship, should not have referred to it a single question such as this. I think it is absurd to say that we have not the power or the right to refer a single question to the great body of the electorate, when we have to refer to them our very existence as a body of legislators, for their approval or disapproval, and to recognize their decision as final. Let us then, in my opinion, if we wish to deal with this question in a sensible, business-like way, if we wish to set our faces in the direction of ever arriving at legislation likely to deal with this question, proceed from the foundation and lay the first foundation stone by ascertaining whether there is a public sentiment in Canada which will warrant the Government in dealing with a question of this kind by legislation. If we ascertain that such a public sentiment exists, we will ascertain by that reference also how pronounced that sentiment is. We will ascertain whether it is an overwhelming sentiment or a bare majority, or whether there is no such majority at all, and the Government, with that information in its hands, will be in a better position to deal with this question than when moving in the dark without knowing how the electors of the country stand on it. I believe if we are to have a temperance legislation at all, the proper way to proceed is first to know whether we are meeting with popular approval in the step we are taking. If we find that there is a public sentiment which will not only justify the Government in placing such a law upon the Statute-book but in enforcing that law, then let us proceed with it; but if the state of public sentiment is such that would not warrant our adopting such a measure, if there is not a pronounced majority of the people in favour of it, it is folly to proceed with it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Every member of the House has in mind the action which was resolved upon last session with regard to this question. We had the question discussed in its various phases. We had several amendments proposed to a straight resolution in favour of prohibition, and at last the majority of this House concurred in the propriety of a Royal Commission issuing to obtain information upon a number of points which are closely connected with the adoption of any principle relating to the liquor traffic, whether the principle of high license, or of prohibition, or of plebiscite. When, therefore, the hon. member for Norfolk charges the Government with insincerity in issuing the commission, he is simply making an unwarranted charge against this House of insincerity in adopting the resolution; and I am afraid that the hon. gentleman lays himself open to grave suspicion of the offence with which he accuses us, when, the Royal Commission having issued under the authority of this House and at the request of this House, he seeks to forestall it by a resolution in favour of definite conclusion with regard to one of the questions on which the commission has to report. The information which the commission is seeking and has to prepare for this House, is information which will, to some extent, guide this House as to the state of public opinion on the question of prohibition; but the principal value of that information will be to inform public opinion itself. It will be to inform the public of this country on the various subjects into which the commission has to enquire, some of the most important of which are the results attending attempts to enforce prohibition in other countries, and the extent of the interests which would be immediately affected by the adoption of prohibition. Is it a matter of no importance whatever that the public should be instructed upon that question before their opinion is taken by vote, by a reference such as the hon. gentleman proposes? I am sure the majority of this House did not think so last year, when, for these reasons, they adopted the suggestion to have a commission issued; and while the commission is engaged in its work can it be that hon. gentleman contemplates appealing to the electorate for its opinion—before the evidence is laid before it? The hon. gentleman has no such idea, because, in the next breath, he tells us—and that is what makes it so difficult to understand his sincerity in proposing this resolution—that this may fairly be postponed until the next general election. Let us, in the meantime, ascertain what information the commission has been able to gather, and what lines of action the commission proposes, before we even decide that a reference to a public vote ought to be had, and it will be ample time then for the hon. gentleman, who will still have some sessions before him, to move for the adoption of the reference to a public vote; or it may be that the result of the labours of the commission will satisfy him that a measure in favour of prohibition may be adopted at once, because that is the tendency of his own wish, I have no doubt, from what we have heard from him on previous occasions. For my part, I have the strongest possible objection to a reference to a public vote, of the question as to any particular measure by which the country shall be governed in a matter of this kind. I am not submitting, as the hon. gentleman seemed to anticipate, that there are constitutional questions involved. I have no doubt we can change and mould our constitution in that respect as we please, but I feel very confident in the assertion that such a mode of action is utterly repugnant to the constitutional principles we have adopted and have followed with zeal down to the present time. It is the adoption of a method known to different forms of government, other forms of government, forms from which we have deliberately departed and from which our departure widens as our constitutional growth and development continues. It is not necessary in connection with this question that we should discuss the principles underlying an appeal to the vote of the people for or against any definite or indefinite proposal that may be submitted to the electorate. The question before the House is whether it will nullify what it did last session and stultify its own act by disregarding entirely the investigation which the commission is now carrying on, not only on the authority of the Crown, but on the authority of the Crown granted in accordance with the express wish of this House, and I, therefore, hope the House will not adopt the resolution. The hon. gentleman can see no definite good in his motion, because he admits that action on this resolution may be, with perfect propriety, postponed until years to come; but it will do indefinite mischief by establishing what I have said I believe to be a repugnant principle with regard to the Government of the country in seeking the adoption by the popular vote of a measure, irrespective of the choice of men to administer it, and besides it will convey to the public mind the impression that the labour on which the commission is engaged will be utterly worthless as regards conveying information to the public on which Parliament ought to take action.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has somewhat hotly presented the imputation of insincerity suggested by the mover of this motion with regard to the action of the Government in suggesting last year to appoint a commission to investigate this question. If the hon. gentleman on his behalf and on behalf of his colleagues resents that imputation and will not accept it, perhaps he will at all events agree that there was some foundation for my hon. friend bringing up this resolution. Because the hon. gentleman will, I am sure, himself agree that the people who did it were sincere in asking the Government to appoint that commission, but they have not shown any eagerness in appointing that commission after the authority was given to them. It was, I think, in July last that Parliament voted to have this subject investigated by a commission. Now, it is a matter of public notoriety that the commission was not appointed until after the opening of this session, which was on the 25th February last, so that five or six months were allowed to elapse after power had been obtained from Parliament before the commission was appointed. Since that, the commission has sat, as I am informed, twice, and the sittings have been of a purely formal character, and to the present day, though the commission was appointed more than three months ago, nothing serious has been done in the matter. Under such circumstances, the Government, though they may repel the imputation of insincerity, cannot say that the imputation is not without some cause; because, after all, if the Government had displayed on this question the same eagerness they have dis-

played upon other questions, I am sure the commission would have been appointed before February last, and would have received instructions to proceed more eagerly than they have hitherto. The question arises, under such circumstances, what is to be done? Last year I voted for an amendment to the motion of my hon. friend to refer this question to the people. I agree to a large extent with the Minister of Justice, that the system of referring such a question, or in fact any question, to a plebiscite is not in harmony with our institutions. I would rather see such a question, and all other questions, disposed of in the old British manner, that is, by Parliament itself. The hon. gentleman and all people who look at this question dispassionately must admit that in this instance there might be an exception made. Rules exist, but there are few rules to which there is not an exception. This question of temperance and prohibition is one which might be well disposed of in this manner. All attempts to deal with this question in the past, either by the Dunkin Act of 1874, or the provincial legislation before Confederation, or, since Confederation, by the Scott Act, have not been satisfactory to the people as an indication whether or not the people at large desire a prohibitory law. I believe this is largely a question of geography. There are sections of the country in which this matter is viewed in a different way from that in which it is regarded in other sections. I know that there are sections in the Province of Quebec where absolute prohibition exists under provincial laws. You may travel in Lotbinière, Megantic, Arthabaska and Nicolet and you will hardly find a license granted to sell liquor. If we had a plebiscite which would give the whole tenor of public opinion on this question, at all events we would have this advantage, that we would know where we stand and what is desired by the people of the country. I doubt if you can have any better mode than that for ascertaining the views of the country at large, and therefore I would favour the reference of this question to the people, not that I would do it as a general rule, but as an exception which might properly apply under the circumstances. But I am aware, also, that the commission is investigating this question now, and, whether they proceed slowly or expeditiously, I think it would be hardly wise to open the question again until we have received the report of that commission. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton), after bringing this before the House in order to show the Government that they must be diligent in reference to this matter, might allow it to stand for the present, intimating that, if the report of the commission is not laid before Parliament at an early stage of the next session, this resolution will be proposed again and pressed with vigour.

Mr. TAYLOR. The motion placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) reads as follows:—

"That the state of public opinion upon the question of the prohibition of the manufacturing, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, for beverage purposes, should be ascertained by a reference of the question to the electors of Canada at the polls."

Now, I want to ask that hon. gentleman what difference there is between that motion and the motion I placed in your hands last year, which reads as follows (Votes and Proceedings of 21st May, 1891; *Hansard*, page 355):—

"That all the words after the word 'That' in the original motion, and all the words of the proposed amendment be struck out, and the following words added instead thereof: 'this House renews the expression of its opinion, made in preceding Parliaments, as to the expediency of prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of alcoholic liquors for beverage purposes, but declares that in a question of such far-reaching importance, affecting long-established social and trade interests, involving the loss of many millions of necessary revenue and the consequent imposition of new and heavy taxation it is essential to the effectual working and permanent maintenance of such an enactment that the electorate of Canada should first pronounce a definite opinion upon the subject at the polls.'"

If the hon. gentleman can tell me any difference between the meaning of my motion and the motion he has made to-day, I will be willing to admit it; but, on looking up the record, I find that the hon. gentleman voted against my motion; and now, to-day, after we succeeded in pressing upon the Government the importance of having a commission appointed to investigate the state of the liquor traffic, he comes forward with a buncombe resolution.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Just like yours.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, mine accomplished the purposes for which it was intended. The Government have moved and a Government enquiry will be held. If the hon. gentleman can explain his vote of last year as being in accordance with his motion of to-day, I will take a back seat; but I think he will have to travel a long way to find a difference between those two motions. He intimates that he will leave this to the next general election. I had the same proposition in my motion of last year, but, at the request of the hon. gentleman who seconded the motion, we struck out those words, so that, if the motion had been carried, the Government would have had to submit the question at once to the country; but it is clear that the two motions are practically the same.

Mr. DICKEY. It is unnecessary, after my vote on this subject last session on the motion of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), for me to say that I would be opposed to the motion of the hon. gentleman to-day. I feel that it would be a serious constitutional innovation to adopt such a mode of procedure, and the temperance people of Canada have consistently opposed the adoption of such a method in reference to the question of prohibition. Whether they are right in that I will not discuss now, but they have consistently taken that position, and I feel bound to maintain it here, especially as it accords in this instance with my own views. I understood from the speech of the hon. gentleman in introducing this motion, that it was not so much for the purpose of getting at the sentiment of this House on this question, as for the purpose of expressing his distrust of the action of the Government with regard to the commission.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, it struck me in that way. I do not, of course, take any responsibility for the appointment of the commission by the Government, because I voted against the resolution, thinking it was not advisable in the interest of prohibition. But I wish to say, as a supporter of the Government, that I would like them to press that question before the commission in such a way as will satisfy the country that they are in earnest in get-

ting the information for which that commission purports to be appointed. I do not feel, up to the present time, that there is anything in the action of the Government, notwithstanding the delay that the leader of the Opposition has pointed out, to show want of good faith on their part; but I shall be very glad at a future time, if the hon. gentleman will propose the question squarely, to assist my hon. friends opposite in watching the Government on the question of this commission. At the same time I could not support this motion upon that ground, nor could I support it because it is opposed to my own view, and to the views of the temperance people.

Mr. CURRAN. It is not my intention to speak upon the principle of this motion, as I think the leader of the Opposition himself has clearly disposed of it. I think the mode is one which entails great expense upon those who are in favour of prohibition, and so far as I know, the consensus of opinion of the advocates of prohibition, has always been against plebiscite. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has stated that he knows certain sections in the Province of Quebec where there are no licenses and very little liquor. I know there are certain places where there are no licenses, but I cannot exactly agree that there is not a considerable amount of liquor sold, nevertheless.

Mr. LAURIER. In such counties as Lotbinière and Nicolet there is no liquor sold at all.

Mr. CURRAN. There are some places in the Province of Quebec where there are no licenses, and there are lots of liquor.

Mr. LANGELIER. In Montreal, I presume.

Mr. CURRAN. In Montreal, there are lots of licenses and lots of liquor, too. However, there is no doubt that after the labours of this commission have been completed, the people will be in a better position to know what the exact state of affairs is, and to pronounce a judgment on this question. Owing to the action of the Catholic temperance societies and total abstinence associations, I brought once or twice before the House, not only the platform of these associations, but more particularly I directed the attention of the Government to the fact that they asked for a rigid inspection of the liquors in this country; and it was promised on one or two occasions that the officers of the Inland Revenue would be instructed to take samples and to find out the quality of the liquors sold in this country, in order that the public might know what is offered for their consumption. I know that certain measures have been taken, and that samples have been procured in some places and submitted to the public analyst, and a report has been furnished to the public, I think, by Mr. Macfarlane, with regard to the quality of the liquors thus inspected. That report, if I remember aright, expresses the opinion that the liquors sold are, as a rule, good. I have not the slightest idea that there is anything incorrect in that report of the analyst, but in looking over the names of those from whose establishments these liquors were taken, I find that the officers have gone to such places as Messrs. Dufresne & Mongenais and J. E. Mullin, and other first-class business houses, where it would be quite natural to expect that the liquors obtained would be of good quality. But I do not see that any effort has been made to procure samples from those places where it would be likely that adulterated liquors would be sold. I know that, judging from the names of those from whom samples were taken, the liquor obtained in such places would more than likely be good, and consequently the report may be, to some extent, misleading. I bring this matter before the House in order that stricter measures may be adopted in procuring these samples, because, if the public analyst is placed in possession of samples of liquors taken from places that are likely to sell bad liquor, it would be a source of information to the Royal Commission, and would help them in making up their report. It is for that reason that I rose to make a few remarks, because, having scanned the report that I have alluded to, I thought that perhaps the officers who, no doubt, are doing their duty as conscientiously as possible, have not yet had time to reach the minor establishments, and I would suggest that in future such samples be furnished to the public analyst in order that the people may have a fair idea of what is offered them for consumption.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I agree with my hon. friend and leader beside me that although the Government may be very sincere in this matter of the commission, they have been very slow. But I do not wonder at the dissatisfaction exhibited by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) at the delay that has occurred in obtaining a report from the commission with regard to this important matter, especially after looking at the discussion that took place in the House on the subject last year, and remembering that the consideration of the policy to be adopted was expressly postponed on the ground that a commission would be appointed who should engage industriously in the enquiry, and report to the House at a very early day. Nearly a year has transpired and no report has yet been received, and a very long time elapsed between the intention expressed by the Administration and the actual appointment of the commission. I do not agree in the constitutional views expressed by the leader of the House; I entertain the same views upon that subject that I expressed when it was under the consideration of the House last year. I do not admit that the House is seeking to shirk any responsibility in asking for an expression of public opinion on this question. Those of us who favour a public vote upon the subject of prohibition are not asking the people to assume the responsibility of dealing with this question; for I am quite ready to admit that after that vote is taken it may be that the opinion expressed by it may not be one that the House, under the circumstances, would feel itself warranted in acting upon. I agree with the view that has been expressed by the hon. member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that you require a very decided expression of public opinion to warrant legislation of this kind. This is a species of sumptuary legislation, and under a representative system of government no such law could be effectively enforced without a very strong and active public opinion behind it. The object of the House, as I understand it, is not for the purpose of shirking any responsibility, but it is for the purpose of ascertaining what is the state of public opinion on this question. The House has again and again expressed an opinion that legislation is desirable, that a measure looking

to prohibition would be an advantageous measure, if it was a measure that could be effectively enforced; but the question whether it can be effectively enforced, is one upon which the House is not in a position to express an opinion. If the House was perfectly sure on that point, there would be no object whatever in a popular reference, because the House would know full well, if it carried the legislation on the subject, that legislation could be made successful. I agree with those who hold to the view that a measure put upon the Statute-book which cannot be enforced is not one which secures the respect of the law, it is not one that can advantageously in the interest of public morals be enacted, and so I think it is highly important that upon this question we should have an expression of opinion, and then having that opinion, we would know precisely what course ought to be adopted in legislating on the subject. Seeing that the Government have appointed a commission, with the sanction of the House, by, I believe, a considerable majority, and that that commission has been engaged in its labours for some time, I think it was not unreasonable that the House should be asked to delay expressing an opinion on this subject until that commission had reported; and so I agree with the view expressed by my hon. leader, that it would, under the circumstances, perhaps be better that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should not press his motion to a division. And the more especially should that be the case, if the Government can hold out to us any hope that this report will be made at an early day, so that should the session of this House continue for many weeks longer, we would have an opportunity of considering the subject before the session closed; or at all events, should the session come to a close sooner, then we might have an opportunity of considering it at an early period next session. These being the opinions which I entertain on the subject, I can see no violation of, no departure from the principles of responsible government when you are seeking to obtain a plebiscite on the question. On all questions on which the action of the House can be taken without regard to the actual state of public opinion, then I think the House should assume the responsibility without any such reference, and we do obtain, in an imperfect way, no doubt, when there is a general election and when important questions are put in issue between parties, the general expression of opinion on some portions of the respective policies of the two great parties in the state; but where you seek legislation on a social question, when you propose this sumptuary law, when you have expressed the opinion that legislation in a particular direction is desirable, and at the same time have admitted that it can only be made efficient by an energetic and strong public sense everywhere found in support of it, it seems to me to be a common-sense rule to ascertain what the opinion of the country is upon the question before you undertake to legislate.

Mr. CASEY. I regret very much to have to differ from any of those hon. members who sit around me, especially from such a high authority on constitutional law as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills); but I consider the present issue proposed to the House is so grave and important that where a difference of opinion does exist, it should be given expression to. I venture, therefore, to submit the reasons why I disagree with the hon gentleman in regard to submitting this question to the people. My objections have no reference to the submitting of this question in particular, but to the theory of a plebiscite in connection with any question, and I do not wish to be understood as arguing either for or against the passage of a prohibitive law, or for or against the proposal that the people are now ready for such a law. I say this, and it is where I differ from the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell, that any proposal to submit important legislation direct to the vote of the electorate is an attempt to evade the responsibility which our constitution places upon Ministers and members of Parliament. The theory of the constitution is that members of Parliament have the means of ascertaining public sentiment throughout the country, that even if they have not been directly elected on a certain issue, they are qualified by their general knowledge and intelligence to vote on any issue that may come up. They are not mere delegates who sit here with instructions given them beforehand, but representatives of their different constituents sent here to legislate to the best of their ability in the interests of their constituents and of the country at large. They are supposed to exercise their individual freedom of action, and their individual intelligence in forming an opinion. Ministers, again, are responsible to the members of Parliament, who are responsible directly to the electors; and I think any system which enabled Ministers to shield themselves from responsibility to Parliament, or enabled members to shield themselves from responsibility to their constituents, would directly weaken our Government and distinctly reduce the incentive to honest legislation in this House. The hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for North Norfolk seem to think, however, that this particular case does not come under the general rule of which I have spoken. They say that because this is a moral, sumptuary or social law it should form an exception to that rule, and that it is highly proper to consult the people upon it. I rather think that argument proves the very opposite. We know that the question of prohibition is an extremely intricate one, that a great many interests are involved on both sides, that we have already decided that the question requires more deliberate consideration and a greater amount of knowledge than even the Parliament of Canada can bring to bear on it, and therefore we have appointed a commission to consider it from all points of view. If it is a fact that Parliament was not sufficiently informed and sufficiently unbiassed to come to a conclusion on the question, how are we going to expect that the electors as a whole will be so informed and so unbiassed? My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that after we had submitted this question to the people we need not necessarily carry out their opinion. Well, if we do not intend to register their verdict why should we ask for it at all? We would be in a very embarrassing position, for instance, if the general theory of prohibition were carried by a small vote, and we were called upon to decide whether or not we should pass some Act enforcing prohibition. Some hon. gentlemen might contend that the majority of the people being prohibitionists, there should be legislation in that direction, while others might

argue that the vote was not sufficiently large in its favour to justify such legislation. We would be put on our individual responsibility as members of this House after all and would have to decide whether the state of public opinion as ascertained would justify the passing of such a law. I venture to say that every member of this House knows the state of public opinion in his own county sufficiently well to direct him in his vote upon this subject. The only trouble has been, as my friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) very well put it, that we have always been seeking parliamentary expedients to avoid dealing practically with the question, and my chief objection to the hon. gentleman's resolution is that it is simply another method of avoiding a direct dealing with prohibition. I think the House is ripe for a decision, so far as the question of ascertaining public opinion is concerned; although, perhaps, we may not have been informed as to the evidence on the questions submitted to the commission. There seems to be an objection to dealing with this subject in the House, and yet there seems to be a sort of itchiness to be treating it in some form or other. We cannot keep our tongues off the subject, and yet we cannot bring ourselves to deal with it finally. That argues a lack of moral courage on the part of members of this House, which I think would be further evidenced by the adoption of this proposal which takes the decision of the question out of our hands altogether. I am quite with my hon. friend the leader of the Government in objecting *in toto* to the principle of a *referendum* to the popular voice. We are told that it will give us a correct index of public feeling, but I doubt very much if it will give us even that. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) referred to the Scott Act as a law put upon the Statute-book in this House, but which was to be put in force locally by the direct vote of the people in certain parts of the country. The people in different parts of the country had here an opportunity to enforce local prohibition if they thought fit, and there have been plebiscites taken within the limits of certain counties in regard to that law. The result has been that in a great many of these counties where there were tremendous majorities in favour of the Scott Act when it was first proposed, there was a complete reversal by almost as large majorities on the other side after a short trial of the Act. I am not discussing the merits of that legislation, but I merely point to it to show that a direct popular vote by an overwhelming majority is no proof of the existence of such public opinion as will enable an Act of this kind to be carried out. In some of the strongest Scott Act counties the very large majorities for it in the first instance were turned into very large majorities against it in a very short while. That change was justified on the ground that it had not been found possible to enforce the Act; the public opinion had not been strong enough to enforce it although it had been strong enough to carry it. I say that we are in danger of being misled in the same way if we submit this matter to the electors of the whole Dominion. It does not follow that because there was an apparently large majority in favour of the Scott Act, that these electors who voted for prohibition at the polls would insist on the enforcing of prohibition after it became law. The members of this House, and the members of the Government will have to consider all such questions as that, before deciding to pass a law of this kind, interfering with the habits of the people. They must decide not only whether there is a passing desire for such legislation, but also whether it is likely that public opinion will stand by the Act after it is passed so as to secure the best results from it. I think, Sir, these points sum up the objection to this proposal: 1st, a direct *referendum* of legislation to the people is an evasion of our responsibility; 2nd, that in general such a *referendum* is not even likely to secure an exact expression of the will of the people; and, in the third place, that this particular class of legislation is least fit of all to be submitted to such a direct vote. For these reasons, I hope my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) will accept the suggestion of our leader, and be content with drawing the attention of the House to the slowness with which the commission has been working. In that respect he undoubtedly has ground for complaint. If we are ever to get rid of this question it is of vital importance that the commission should soon have something to report to us. Their duties are necessarily somewhat lengthy if the members of the commission do all that they have been charged to do by the resolution of the House, but the sooner they begin the sooner they will finish, and it certainly does not seem as if they had done much yet.

Mr. CHRISTIE. Mr. Speaker, I only intend to say a single word on this question in order to explain my vote, if it should be pressed to a division. I was very strongly in favour of the motion introduced last session by the then hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) because that motion was in favour of immediate prohibition. This question has been long before the country. It had been discussed in this House year after year, and resolutions had been passed again and again, all looking towards prohibition. But that was not all. The question had been brought more or less prominently before the electors, by the Dominion Alliance at every election, and before every constituency, and we know that last session the flood of petitions which were poured into this House showed that there was a strong public sentiment in favour of a prohibitory measure. My decided conviction was, that the time had come when a prohibitory law should be enacted. I was prepared to cast my vote in that direction, but seeing that the measure was then defeated by the Government, if this motion which is now being moved by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is pressed to a division, I will have pleasure in casting my vote in favour of it, believing it to be a step in the direction of prohibition, although I would prefer to vote in favour of immediate prohibition.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) made some reference to the Royal Commission as having sent to wholesale merchants in Montreal for the purpose of getting samples of liquors with a view of testing their quality.

Mr. CURRAN. No; I said that under the Food Inspection Act, the officers of the Inland Revenue themselves called to take samples of liquors and other commodities. These officers call at certain places and secure samples, amongst others those I mentioned, and I stated that you could not expect anything but what was good in those places. But

what I take exception to is, that there do not seem to be any samples taken at places where liquors are retailed by the glass.

Mr. McMULLEN. From the remarks of the hon. gentleman I was led to the opinion that the commission were instructed to examine the general character of the liquors that were sold. It appears that the hon. gentleman did not intend to lead the House to that conclusion. I did not quite understand him, but I think it would be well that we should be fully informed as to what was the nature of the commission issued to these men. Was it strictly within the lines laid down by the resolution of the House? There has been no report to the House as to the instructions given to these commissioners, and I naturally conclude that it must have been within the lines laid down in the resolution. I do not see that they could possibly be expected to examine the quality of liquors, or to report as to the purity or impurity of the liquors sold. I presume that will not come within the sphere of their duties at all. It might be well, however, that the Government should give the House some information as to the instructions which have been given to these men and on which they are proceeding.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the commission itself, I may say that although it has been urged that there has been great slowness, and that the commission have done very little work, that is scarcely well alleged. It is true that the vote which is spread upon the Journals of the House was passed early last summer, but it is also true that it was nearly impossible for the Government, during the hurry and turmoil of the session, to properly select and appoint a commission. That, I think, was not expected by the country, and could not be well expected to be done until the session had come to a close, and the Government had some leisure to examine the matter and make its selection. After the House was prorogued, some delay took place because of the difficulties of making a proper selection, and the commission was not ultimately appointed until just about the time the present session of Parliament began. The commission was organized almost immediately after its appointment. It is true, it has only had two meetings, a third meeting having been called for this month. But that does not argue at all that important work has not been done. The commission cannot be expected to go at its work and reach its conclusions from information that it itself possesses without collection and without examination and very careful thought, and although only two meetings of the commission have been held, those two meetings were taken up in the first place in deciding as to what documents should be called for and the lines upon which its investigations should be conducted, and in setting in train machinery for the collection of statistics, and the documentary evidence of the various sorts within the scope of the commission, which were essential for its work. These two very important things have been decided upon, and have been placed in way of being carried out; and when the commission meets again in the latter part of this month, it will have this foundation for its work, and will then proceed consecutively with its work. Now, as to the commission being slow, and therefore a report not being ready for this session, it would have made no difference if the commission had been appointed in July or August, directly after the vote passed, so far as getting a report of the commission for this session of the House is concerned. That was impossible. Hon. gentlemen will all admit that if we go to the expense of having a commission, and if we intend to get benefit from the commission, which was the intention of the Government, whatever may be said as to insincerity or the like, it was necessary that the work should be well done, and that whatever time was necessary to its being done should be given to the commissioners; and no commission can take up the line of investigation laid down in that resolution, and carry out the scope of the resolution, and give to this Parliament and the country such evidence and such conclusions as it would be necessary and fitting it should give, and as would be satisfactory to the country at large, without a very considerable time. I should think six months at least would be the shortest time in which a commission would do the very important work that is laid upon this commission under the terms of the instructions laid down. Just here I may say that the instructions issued to the commission were altogether within the scope of the vote of Parliament, as of course they must be. If, therefore, it had been appointed even at an earlier period, it would have been impossible for Parliament at this session to have had the conclusion of its labours in time to have discussed or to have come to any definite conclusion upon it; so that the commission is just as far ahead, in respect to presenting its labours to the House for the discussion and examination of the House, as if it had been appointed directly after the vote of the House authorizing the commission. There is, of course, no possibility of the commission completing its labours and giving its report to the House this session, unless the session lasts for a great many months; but it is within the possibilities, and I think within the probabilities, that its labours will be completed in time for its report to be presented to the House next session. At least it will, if it is possible for it to conclude its labours in time for that purpose; and no delay, suggested or actual, either on the part of the persons outside or from the commission itself, will take place between this time and the conclusion of the labours of the commission, so far as the carrying out of its work and the preparation of its report is concerned. Now, with reference to my hon. friend's motion, I think the whole House, or very nearly the whole House, will agree that the motion is inopportune. The only reason suggested for it at the present time is that of urgency. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that the motion was justified by the delay of the Government in issuing the commission, but that is not to be remedied by my hon. friend's motion. He himself in discussing the motion, intimated that it made no difference whether this vote were taken at a municipal election or whether it were taken at the next general election. So that the plea of urgency is entirely taken away, and my hon. friend has no excuse at all for not waiting until the action of Parliament last year has culminated in the report of the commission and the information that will be given in that report; and I think the sense of the House, as expressed by those who have spoken, is entirely in the line of that contention. My hon. friend said that there

was no need of this commission, and hinted, though he did not say outright, that the Government were insincere in proposing the commission, having done so in order to tide over a difficult question. If that were the idea of the Government, I think their action was shortsighted. I think it would have been much easier for the Government, if they had wished to tide over the difficulty, to have met the vote of last year than to have taken the decisive step of appointing a commission to make a thorough investigation into this matter, having that report given to the House and then having thrown upon it what is its inevitable duty of action upon the report of the commission after the information has been given the House. It seems to me that it could not have been a mere wish to tide over a difficulty, because the very step that was taken puts this question further to the front and nearer to the time when it must be seriously taken up by Parliament and decided, so far as the best sense of Parliament can decide it. The hon. member for Bothwell is in favour of the principle of a plebiscite, but neither he nor the mover of the motion has informed the House what they propose to refer to the people. Is it the mere principle of prohibition they propose to refer? If it is, it seems to me they can accomplish little by referring this to the people, as in so doing you get only an abstract opinion with no elected representatives responsible for it, and after all the main point in a prohibitory law is the settling of the details of the measure itself, and the responsibility for and the possibility of these details being carried out. The hon. member for Bothwell got nearer to the kernel of the subject when he said the point to be arrived at was not as to whether the principle of prohibition was good or not, but as to whether it could be enforced in this country, and I think it is upon this the whole question hinges. Grant that the evils of intemperance are great and require to be stopped, the question is as to the practical measure which will stop them, if possible, or which will mitigate them to the greatest extent, at any rate, and it is just in ascertaining this that I think the value of a commission is shown. I believe that the only test whether a prohibitory law can be carried out or not, is to be found in the experiment of conducting or carrying it out. And it is in order that we may see the measure of success which has attended prohibitory liquor legislation in other countries, and the measure of enforcement that has been given such laws, that the commission has been appointed to collect such information and lay it before Parliament and the people, and that, to my mind, would be the chief benefits of the commission.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is, you measure public opinion of Canada by what has taken place elsewhere.

Mr. FOSTER. I measure the public opinion of any one country, and very largely, by the test of experience as we find it in countries similarly situated and with similar characteristics. The hon. member for Bothwell is in favour of a plebiscite. Yes, but he is not in favour of carrying out the plebiscite. He wants to submit this question to the people, as to whether they want prohibition or not; but he will not bind himself to pass a prohibitory law although the people may be for it. He reserves to himself the right of saying that the people are wrong and that he is right. What good can result from putting the principle of prohibition before the people if we reserve to ourselves the right of saying whether or not, after this is done, a law shall be passed: and that is exactly where the weakness of a plebiscite comes in. Does my hon. friend propose to enact a law and refer it to the people for their adoption by a vote? No, by his *referendum* he simply proposes to submit the principle. But if we put the simple question of principle before the people and they vote upon it at the poll, who are the responsible persons to carry this into effect, and how are they to carry it into effect? But as to the question of the possibility of the enforcement of a prohibitory law, as to the question of the results of the enforcement of the law in other countries, as to the question of the experience of other countries and of this country under different degrees of prohibitory law, that is a matter upon which this Parliament—and I say it with deference to the members of Parliament—are not too well informed, and upon which the country itself in the main is not too well informed; and I think it will be a great advantage to have a commission, such as the one appointed, and which is now at work, to gather up this information and submit it to Parliament and the people of this country as the actual results of experience collected and brought together, which they may digest, and from which they may form their opinions with reference to their own actions in the matter. The hon. member for Bothwell objects to a prohibitory law as being a sumptuary law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not object to it.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it is a sumptuary law. I think the temperance people will not agree with him when he states that it is a sumptuary law. I think the sumptuary laws of old, from which alone he can draw a definition as to sumptuary laws, were something very different, founded on a principle altogether different from the principle on which the temperance people of the country ask that a prohibitory law shall pass and be founded and become operative in this country. However, so far as regards my hon. friend's motion I think he has failed entirely, as I said before, on the point of urgency, and as he has no particular desire that it shall be pressed to a vote before the people even for four years, I think he might very well wait at least until the commission shall have made its report, and submitted it to Parliament, and then it will be open for him to make any motion in the premises he may deem right. Until that commission has concluded its work and made its report I do not think we should take any further action such as is contemplated by my hon. friend.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman propose to be bound by the report of the commission?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am pleased to get the information that the hon. Minister of Finance has been good enough to give the House with regard to the commission appointed after a vote of the House on the 24th of June last. The reasons, however, assigned by that hon. gentleman for the slow progress made are not satisfactory to me at least. I am unable to understand why a Government of thirteen Ministers, who received authority to name a commission from the House of Commons on

the 24th of June, were unwilling to carry that authority into effect before the following February. I think the commission might have been appointed promptly. The six months time necessary to complete their labours would have expired long before this, and we would have had their report before us. The action of the Government in naming the commission eight or nine months after is rather significant, as showing that they are not very desirous to press this matter to a conclusion. I think I have been unintentionally misrepresented with having accused the Government of insincerity in this matter. I think they were very sincere indeed. They were sincerely desirous of avoiding meeting the question just as long as they could. They appointed a commission, and that was a dilatory movement. They were very dilatory in appointing, and the commission has been very dilatory in their movements. If they will get to work, it is possible we may get their report, though I do not believe in time for another session, but I would urge upon the Government the propriety of having the work of the commission proceeded with promptly, and not have the proceedings connected with the commission characterized by that delay which has characterized them so far. The hon. gentleman unintentionally, I think, misrepresented my position upon the matter of urgency in taking this vote. I do not intend to be understood as saying, when on my feet before, that it made no difference whether this vote was taken at the next municipal or general elections. That would hardly convey the idea I intended to convey. I intended to say that if the House decided this was the proper mode of procedure, that if the House decided to refer this question to the people at the poll, that decision might rid us of a considerable deal of discussion. The House might not be ready to arrive at that decision now, that the House might arrive at that decision at some future time, and that we could either refer the question to the people at the municipal elections, or, if we had not arrived at a decision before the next general election was held, we might do it then; but I did not intend to make the statement that in my opinion it was soon enough to refer the matter to the people at the next general election. On the contrary, I think the people should have the opportunity of giving their decision at the earliest possible day. Then the Minister of Finance asks me, What do you propose to refer? Your motion is indefinite. I think the motion is definife. It proposes to take the opinion of the people of Canada in reference to this question. The motion is:

"That the state of public opinion upon the question of the prohibition of the manufacturing, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, for beverage purposes, should be ascertained by a reference of the question to the electors of Canada at the polls."

Now, that is a definite proposition. That proposition is that we should ascertain the state of public sentiment in regard to this matter. In the course of my remarks in discussing this question, I said it might be better to place a definite proposition before the people in the shape of a law upon which they might give their opinion, but the proposal itself is plainly to take the opinion of the people of Canada on the subject, neither more nor less, and that is a definite proposition. In my opinion, if this commission propose to collate the information they intend to get together, and to measure the standing of the question here by the experience in other countries, they will not arrive at a conclusion which will be so reliable as a guide for the Government in its action as a *referendum* to the people for their opinion would be. I believe that in all the states where a prohibitory liquor law has been adopted, the question has never been referred directly to the people at the polls, but that the legislation has been carried through without its being definitely, known whether there was such a sentiment at the back of it as would sustain the Government in enforcing the law.

Mr. FOSTER. You are altogether wrong in that.

Mr. CHARLTON. If in Canada we passed that legislation without having a knowledge of the state of public sentiment in regard to it, we might measure our legislation by the legislation in the states of the Union where the law has failed, because then we will have placed a law on the Statute-book without knowing whether public sentiment demands it or will sustain it. In my opinion, the whole labour of the commission is unnecessary, and we are proceeding wide of the mark. I believe that, instead of appointing a commission to find out what has been done or is being done in various states in reference to prohibition, we should first make up our minds as to whether intemperance is an evil and whether it would be salutary on our parts to check that evil. The next thing would be to refer the question to the people, to find out, if we pass legislation on the subject, whether it is likely to prove a success and whether we have the sentiment of the people to support us. Although I shall not press this motion, at the suggestion of my leader, I still firmly believe that the proper step to be taken is to refer this question to the people, and that we should not take any step until we know whether it is in consonance with public sentiment and will be backed up by public sentiment. I, therefore, repeat that I hold that the appointment of the commission was unnecessary, and it was only carried by 19 votes. I also hold that the Government has taken dilatory action in this matter, that they were insincere in avoiding meeting this grave question when it was placed before the House, and that the proper course is to adopt the action set out in this resolution. I withdraw the motion, at the suggestion of my leader, for the time being, in order to give time for the presentation of the report of the commission to the House, but I still stand by the principle, whether we have the report or not, that the proper course is to ascertain the state of public sentiment in Canada before we legislate in regard to the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating drinks.

Mr. SCRIVER. I dissent entirely from the view of my hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Charlton), that we are never to legislate on such questions as this until we ascertain by the method he proposes what the public sentiment requires. I have an idea that there are other modes than that of a reference to a direct vote of the people, by which we may be guided; and, although I have no authority to speak for the temperance people of this country, I believe I know pretty well the general sentiment on that subject, and I think the time has arrived when the representatives of the

people in Parliament should deal with this question and deal with it effectively, not as the Government has dealt with it by a reference to a commission, but by direct legislation. I know of no better way of ascertaining the general sentiment of the community than the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of, and traffic in, intoxicating liquor. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) was pleased to say that, while we have a local prohibitory law in various parts of the Province of Quebec, abundance of liquor can be obtained in those neighbourhoods. I do not know whether he speaks from personal observation or not. I do not think he does. So far as the county I have the honour to represent is concerned, I know that the local option law has been carried out effectively. In some municipalities in that county licenses have been refused altogether, and the sale of intoxicating liquor has absolutely ceased, and the change for the better in the habits and practices of the people has been very marked. I am sorry to differ with my hon. friend in regard to this question, but I believe it would be inadvisable at any time, and particularly at this time, to pass any such motion as he has proposed to the House, and which, I am glad to hear, he is willing to withdraw.

Motion withdrawn.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. CHARLTON. Do we follow the Wednesday's Order Paper this evening and take up Public Bills and Orders?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; no change was made in that respect, and we go right on with the Monday's Order Paper.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then do we take up the Wednesday's Order next Monday?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The House will be able to judge for itself before then.

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

After Recess.

POST OFFICE AT CAP ST. IGNACE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the mayor of the parish of Cap St. Ignace, or other inhabitants of the parish, Mr. Philippe A. Choquette, member for Montmagny, and the Postmaster General of Canada, respecting the opening of a new post office at Cap St. Ignace station; and the appointment of a postmaster for that place.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I intended making a few remarks in connection with this motion, but having received on Saturday last from the Postmaster General the formal assurance that the post office in question is to be opened, and that Mr. Napoléon Dugal is to be appointed postmaster, I will only ask for the papers relating to the matter. This question has been dragging for several months, and I would rather not have to refer to it again. But with the statement which was made to me on Saturday last, I think I may rely upon the matter being settled, and consider that the office will be opened, and that the postmaster will be appointed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SCRIVER.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. McMULLEN moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the corps known as the North-West Mounted Police should be annually reduced in numbers."

He said: I desire to make a few remarks on the resolution I am about to place in your hands. The North-West Mounted Police has been in existence now well-nigh 20 years, and it has cost this country a great deal of money. At its inception it was, no doubt, a necessity for the peace of that district, from the fact that there was no other organization for the preservation of peace and the maintenance of law. But I contend that the time has arrived when we should seriously consider the propriety of very rapidly reducing its numbers. While I admit that it served a good purpose for many years, I claim that its term of necessity is, in my humble opinion, drawing very near to a close. For a number of years the force was composed of 500 men, but from the year 1885, after the rebellion, it was increased to a thousand strong, and has continued at that number down to the present time. When this force was organized we had no railways through that section of country, and we had little, if any, telegraph service. Under these circumstances, and in the condition in which we found that country when we took it into our hands, there was a necessity for the maintenance of that force; but after the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which gives us very convenient and rapid access from one portion of that country to another, from east to west, and after the construction of many other lines of railway through that territory, and the construction of telegraph lines in all directions, I maintain that, as a result of all these public works and improvements, the necessity for keeping that force at its present large dimensions has passed away. Take, for instance, Regina as a central point; from that point you can send a force of Mounted Police almost to any section of the Territories and Manitoba with forty-eight hours, by reason of the railway and telegraph facilities which have been established. Another cause for a reduction in the force is to be found in the influx of settlement. The country is being settled up, there are now very large agricultural districts occupied to a considerable extent by people who have gone in there, and the Indians and half-breeds, since the close of the rebellion, have shown no disposition to cause any disturbance so far as we know. They appear to have settled down to the feeling that they have got to submit to the new condition of things, and that condition of things should be very acceptable to them. They are undoubtedly well fed; I do not know that we are providing for them as amply as He that provides for all living, did before, but since we have banished the buffalo from that country the Government, I dare say, is making the best provision they possibly can for the Indians. It costs us an enormous amount of money to feed them, and it costs an enormous amount of money to maintain the force to keep them subject to the laws. Now, I have looked over the amounts of money that we have paid in this connection, and I would just give the expenditures for the last eight years. Beginning with 1884, when the Mounted Police was only 500 strong, that force cost us $404,333,12; in 1885 the force cost us $470,650.36; in 1886 it cost us

$1,354,369.20; in 1887 the force which was supposed to be of the strength of one thousand men, cost $781,644; in 1888, $862,985; 1889, $829,701; 1890, $753,093; 1891, $740,979. In all, for the eight years, the cost of the Mounted Police has been $6,197,756, or an average outlay of $774,179. This is a very large amount, and I do not know that I should have drawn the attention of the House to it had it not been brought to my notice by an advertisement that was published by the Interior Department I presume, for 100 recruits for the North-West Mounted Police. A bill calling for these recruits was published in the Toronto Immigration office for Manitoba. Surely the time has come when we can afford to reduce the force, and reduce it very materially. At least from 100 to 200 men could be struck from the list, or retired every year. We have had no evidence whatever of rebellion on the part of the Indians or half-breeds since 1885. Of course there may be other reasons for keeping the North-West Mounted Police there; if there are, it is right we should know them. When we consider the enormous amount that it has cost to feed the Indians and keep them loyal subjects by the force of the Mounted Police, it becomes a matter for very serious consideration. The accounts presented to Parliament yearly show an expenditure for feeding and maintaining Indians. In 1884, $1,025,765; 1885, $1,008,980; 1886, $1,097,934; 1887, $1,072,397; 1888, $879,364; 1889, $978,254; 1890, $940,261; 1891, $833,187; or in all during those 8 years $7,836,056. The number of Indians in 1885 was 20,170, and understand the census shows the number for 1890 to have been 15,105, or a reduction of over 5,000. These figures would give an average Indian population in the North-West during the last few years, of 17,587. It has cost this country to clothe and feed each Indian $55.70, or $278, for a family of five. To keep them loyal subjects by the Mounted Police, costs the country $44.50 each, or $220.50 for every family of five. Or putting the two items together, it has cost this country $501 a year to feed, clothe and keep in submission five Indians in the North-West, or a little over $100 for each member of the family. I contend that Canada at the present moment is not in a condition to meet this expenditure, and, further, that it is not necessary. There has been no evidence in recent years that the existence of the North-West Mounted Police is a necessity. The strength of the force at the present time is supposed to be 1,000 men. The advertisement calling for 100 new recruits, to which I have referred, was, I suppose, for men to take the places of those whose terms had run out and consequently were discharged. I understand there are on the reserves, Indian schools, Indian instructors, and also inspectors to look after the Indian schools, and see that order is maintained on each reserve. All the organizations tend very much to keep the Indians in subordination. They are now being taught industrial habits, they are growing certain commodities for their own subsistence, such as wheat and potatoes, and other articles which the North-West produces. They have also been supplied with implements of all kinds, with oxen and horses, with reapers and binders and all kinds of farm utensils, and these tend to make them settlers on the soil and producers of farm produce. Under this condition of affairs the idea of maintaining the force in its present strength at such an enormous cost to the country, requires further explanation than is has yet received. I believe the North-West Mounted Police do good service in the direction of preventing smuggling in the North-West. No doubt they have rendered admirable service in preventing the smuggling of liquors and goods over the American frontier. If that is the present use of the Mounted Police we want this item changed to Collection of Customs in place of North-West account. If the present condition of our fiscal system is such that we have to maintain a force of preventive officers from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the North-West Mounted Police has performed that duty in the North-West, it is proper that the Customs Revenue should be charged with the sum necessarily expended on the preventive officers. It is said if a community composed of 5,000,000 is to maintain an army of preventive officers to prevent smuggling along an extensive frontier of 3,000 miles against the community south of us consisting of 65,000,000, it would be highly desirable in the interest of this country, if this condition of affairs were reversed, for 65,000,000 are much better able to bear the cost of an army of preventive officers in preventing goods being smuggled from Canada into the United States than 5,000,000 Canadians are able to support a force of preventive officers to prevent goods being smuggled from the United States into Canada. I can well remember when the smuggling was all the other way. I can remember in the years 1868-69 and up to 1874-75 when goods in Canada were cheaper than they were in the United States, and then the smuggling was from our side to the other side of the line; but that condition of things is very seriously changed. In the United States now in a great many lines—there may be some lines in which we are cheaper than they—the goods in the United States are cheaper than they are here, and we are consequently compelled to keep an army of officers to prevent smuggling. Any person who lives on the frontier, any person who lives on the Niagara Peninsula, is aware that there is any amount of smuggling going on from the city of Buffalo every day, and I have no doubt there is a considerable amount of it going on in the North-West from the states south of the line. As these states increase in population and in facilities for laying down goods along our borders you will have to keep your officers within fingers' ends of each other to prevent smuggling into Canada. If we are to support the North-West Mounted Police to prevent smuggling it is well that our people should fully realize that it is because of the fiscal system that the force is necessary. They should know that the police are maintained for this purpose, and not for the nominal purpose of keeping the Indians in peace. As I have said, had we no railways or telegraph lines I could understand that the lives of people in that section of the country might perhaps be jeopardized by half-breeds and Indians; but having now every facility for transportation to that country and communication with it, I do not see any necessity for keeping up such an expensive force as we now have. I contend that instead of advertising for recruits for the North-West Mounted Police, the Government should take steps to reduce the number by not replacing the time-expired men, with a view of eventually abandoning the force. If a number of men have to be kept up to prevent smuggling on the

frontier, then let them be charged to the proper account. I believe also that the influx of settlers into the North-West will tend to remove the necessity for the police force. The Minister of Agriculture has told us that he expects a very large immigration this year, and every settler, in a certain sense, takes the place of a policeman as it were. He is there in defence of his own home and to assist to defend the homes of those with whom he lives in close communion. No doubt the North-West Mounted Police render more service to the ranching companies of the North-West than they do to the country itself. I have no doubt that the ranching companies highly appreciate the existence of that force. They lend a hand to prevent any interference with their horses or cattle, and they are no doubt an efficient and well equipped force to reclaim any animals they may have been stolen, and in that way are of great use to the ranching companies. If we are going to rent our ranching grounds for the miserable pittance of a cent an acre, and if we have to keep a police force at an expense of $750,000 yearly to protect the property of the ranchers, then I say, better let the ranching men take care of themselves by supplying the necessary men to look after their stock, rather than that the country should be called upon to support the Mounted Police force for that purpose. Taking the cost of the recent outbreak in the North-West Territories, which I believe amounted to something over $8,000,000, and taking the cost of feeding the Indians and the expense of the North-West Mounted Police, we find that we have spent during the last 8 years $22,033,812. That is to feed and clothe an average of 17,857 Indians it cost us for each Indian, $1,252 for 8 years. This amounts to $156.50 per year for each Indian including men, women and children. Now this is a very serious amount to spend in 8 years, and it is a matter for the very serious consideration of the Government how it should be reduced. We have, of course, taken from the Indians their prairies and their buffalo which Providence gave them, and we have to support them in return. I do not know whether we are treating them as well as they were before, but it is quite evident that they are fast diminishing, as the census shows that they are 5,000 less than in 1885. If the Indians are growing fewer, our Mounted Police force should also be reduced, and in view of the small number of Indians we now have in the North-West and Manitoba, I believe we should at once reduce the number of our Mounted Police and curtail the expense. When you look at the cost of North-West Government, for the North-West Council, the judges, the registrars, the officials of all kinds, the Land Board at Winnipeg, and other organizations throughout the North-West, you find that the expense to the country amounts to an enormous sum annually. I do believe that in the interests of the people of this country, and with a view of very materially reducing the annual expenditure, the Minister of the Interior ought to use the pruning knife, and, as his colleagues have promised to do with the Intercolonial Railway, he should cut off every item of expenditure possible in order to lighten the burden of taxation to the people of this country. Now, I am glad to know that some effort has been made to come to an understanding with some of the ranchmen in the North-West. I earnestly hope that the difficulties which the settlers have met with have been so adjusted between the ranchmen and the Minister of the Interior, that any person going in there and wishing to become an actual settler and to take up lands and farm them, will be permitted to settle wherever he thinks it will be most convenient for himself. The hon. First Minister some years ago, speaking on the settement of this country, said that in all cases the bulls would have to give place to the settlers. I think that was a very good rule to adopt, and I hope it will be determinedly and fully carried out. I think that wherever settlers want to go and take up land for agricultural purposes, the ranchmen should be required to recall their bulls and take them elsewhere. I do not think they should be allowed to place any impediment in the way of people who want to go in and cultivate the soil. It is often said that the North-West is bound to become the redeeming feature of the whole Dominion. Unless we can settle that country with thrifty and industrious settlers, we cannot hope to build up this Dominion as rapidly as we would like. It is all very well to tell people that a certain section of country held by a ranch company is not suitable for agricultural purposes. The best way is to leave the people free to settle the question for themselves. Let them go and settle wherever they like, and if they find that the place they have selected is not suitable for agricultural purposes, they will leave it and seek other locations, and will warn others against going there. So that if you give the people liberty to settle where they choose, they will soon find the best sections, and as a result there will be a large influx of settlers, without any discontent or complaints. One complaint going out, such as that in relation to the difficulty between the Waldron Ranch Company and those who objected to them, will do more harm to the country than all the good the Waldron Company would do if they were to raise a million bulls a year. It would be far better to pack them out of the country with all their bulls and horses and cows and stallions, than to allow them to drive away settlers. We do not want a repetition of the acts of cruelty which have been practised by that company in ejecting men from their homes, tearing their houses down, and driving them elsewhere. Such things should not be allowed to take place at all. No ranching company should be allowed to turn out settlers who went in and took up land in good faith. The settler who goes there should be like a king on his throne; if he likes to settle on a sand heap, that is his own choice, and he should not be interfered with. But these remarks may be looked on as wandering away from the subject. So far as the Mounted Police are concerned, I do hope that the Government, in place of advertising for additional recruits, will at once take into their serious consideration the necessity of reducing this force from year to year; and if a certain number have to be retained for the purpose of doing the duty of detectives in the interests of the Customs Department, let the Customs Department support them. If they are for that purpose, let us know it, and not charge the poor Indians with having such a rebellious disposition that we have to keep a force of 1,000 men to keep them in order. I believe that as long as you clothe and feed the Indians well, there will be no trouble with them. The public

accounts show that money enough has been spent on the Indians to keep them fairly well fed and clothed. When you consider the advantage they enjoy in the way of fishing and shooting, and also that every Indian, counting men, women and children, costs the country $55.70 a year, we must come to the conclusion that they ought to be fairly well fed and clothed. I do hope that the Minister of the Interior will announce to the House to-night that the Government have come to a definite decision to make an immediate and continued reduction in this force until such time as we cease to have such a force in the North-West as the Mounted Police. I admit that that force has rendered good service. I do not wish to say one word in disparagement of its efficiency or faithfulness. I have no doubt that it has rendered valuable service. But the time of its necessity has gone by, and now I do not think that a force even of 500 men is required, apart from the prevention of smuggling, which is the principal duty they perform. If that is their only duty, let it be charged to the Customs Department and let the Customs Department assume the expense of maintaining its own preventive officers, and do not charge it to the North-West under the guise of the Mounted Police to keep the Indians in subordination.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I was very glad to hear the hon. gentleman say in his closing remarks that he appreciated the work which the Mounted Police had done in our great western country. I regret, however, that the hon. gentleman should have thought it proper to place this resolution before the House, particularly in view of the fact that in the early days of this session he heard from the Finance Minister and myself that it was the intention of the Government to keep down the force to as low a number as possible compatible with the circumstances and the safety of the country. The hon. gentleman has stated that the Mounted Police have cost a great deal of money. We all know that. He gave us the figure from 1884 up to the present time. He might just as well have gone back to 1872, at the commencement of the force, and his figures would have looked very much larger. He has stated that he hopes that the force may be rapidly reduced in numbers, and he gives as one of his reasons that the country is rapidly settling up. For that reason he thinks there is no occasion for such a large force being kept as we have at present. He also states that the half-breeds and Indians have shown no desire to commit any depredations or to make any trouble since 1885. That is true. He also states that the Indians since 1885 have, according to a return which he has given, been reduced in numbers. I am not aware of what percentage of decrease the returns show with regard to our Indians. I have had a report with regard to that matter by which I could show how the apparently large decrease has taken place. In 1885, after the rebellion, when the number was 20,170, a great number of our Indians left, and crossed the line. A great number are still south of the line; some are returning slowly, but others are actively making their living south of the line, hunting in the mountains much to the annoyance of some of the people there; and we have had representations made lately asking us to endeavour to get the Indians to return to our own country. We have replied that if they can be brought to the boundary, we will send down our police and have them placed on the reserves. That will account to a great extent for the decrease the hon. gentleman mentioned. Before the House closes, I shall have the opportunity of giving him a memo. on that matter. The hon. gentleman also referred to the advertisement calling for 100 recruits. Where did he read that advertisement?

Mr. McMULLEN. I saw it in the Manitoba Immigration office at Toronto, yesterday, in a window.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman is able to give me information, because the department is not aware of it. The advertisement has not been put in there on their responsibility or in any of the papers. It may be, as an hon. gentleman behind me suggests, an old one, or it may be accounted for in this way: In order to save money and obviate the necessity of putting on a recuiting sergeant at Winnipeg, a gentleman there, who is interested in the employment of labour, has been asked to notify the department when he has any applications for recruits, and he gets $2 a head for those recruits, which is cheaper than keeping a man permanently out recruiting. This notice may have been put up by that gentleman. The force which was established in 1872-73, after a great deal of consideration as to what class of protection should be given our North-West Territories, was organized: and it has been found that from the day they entered the Territories to the present time, no better force could have been sent to that country to carry out the duties with which it has been entrusted. From 1872-73 the whole country was flooded with whiskey sellers and worthless characters from Montana and further south, who, when they found they could get into our country, came loaded with whiskey and did their trading in a great measure with that article; and so discreditable did the business become that representations were made by decent traders to the Government to ask that something might be done to stop that illicit traffic in whiskey and also to protect the Indians and white people from being ruined. At that time also it was expected that settlers would come in in the near future, and the force was sent there to satisfy the settlers that their lives and properties would be protected, and that they would be able to carry on their avocations in that country in peace. The Indians at that time had made no treaty with the Government. They were in continual war, one tribe with the other, and the police had to look after depredations not only from the Indians but from the white men, as some murderers had come in and shot down in their camps some of our Indians. The police, after a very few years, completely killed out that traffic and drove out a large number of those worthless people from the Territories. The Indians at that time were very warlike. They were acquainted with every stream and every coulée in every part of the country, they were expert at prairie warfare, and most formidable men to deal with. The duty of the police was also if possible, to gain the confidence of the Indians and endeavour to impress upon them that they came there as much for their protection as for that of the whites, and they succeeded, after being there three years, in gaining that confidence. I recollect, in 1875, when I first went to the North-West, my first interviews with the Indians, particularly the inter-

view with that great chief, Crowfoot, who was the friend of the Government from the first day I met him until his death last year. He told me that before the police came into the country the young men were clothed in rags, their furs taken from them for whiskey, their bands of horses reduced to a mere nothing, whereas, in 1879, only five years after the police had been there, they were comparatively well off, their bands of horses had increased in numbers, they were able to sleep at night without fearing their enemies. The Mounted Police, year after year, as every one knows who has been in that country, had great difficulties to contend with, and it was only by very great patience and kindness and by being initiated into the Indian life and customs and the Indian feeling that they were enabled to carry out what they did so successfully. No one who has not lived in that country in those times can realize what that police had to go through. They had to meet the Indians in large numbers. They had to stand before them and receive insults from them and keep their tempers. They were men of great pluck, which was illustrated in many instances, as, for instance, when they would enter the lodges and take a man out of a large band unassisted. Those young men who have constituted that force, young Canadians, have done more, after being instructed by their officers, to bring about peace and contentment among the Indians of our country than the United States have been able to do with their large army and immense expenditure. The hon. gentleman has stated in his resolution that the force should be annually reduced in numbers. I may state that the authorized strength of the force, including officers, surgeons and veterinary surgeons is 53—1,000 constables, 20 additional constables, and 50 scouts is 1,123, while the present strength is 1,015, so that we are 108 below the authorized strength. Every effort is being made to reduce the expenditure and the number of men employed in the outside detachments, but, as the outside settlements increase, we have to establish new depots, and consequently it is found very difficult to decrease in number the outposts which we now have in the Territories. The Indians have given very little trouble, but I fear that, if the force was to be curtailed in the way the hon. gentleman has suggested, we should not be so fortunate in the future as we have been in the past. The country which the police have under their jurisdiction extends 750 miles from east to west and 400 miles from north to south. Scattered over that country there are 50 Indian reserves, and I estimate that there are 20,000 Indians in that territory. The southern portion, 750 miles in length, is patrolled weekly and for the most part daily. This is the work going on in this country. The different settlements, the cattle ranges, the Indian reserves and the ordinary lines of travel are all patrolled. The total mileage, as the hon. gentleman may see from the report last year, exceeded 1,250,000 miles covered by these patrols. There is no doubt that the absence of crime may be attributed to this constant patrolling in our Territories, and I am sure it would be very unwise now to reduce the number of the force, because, if that were done, I believe in the near future we would have a recurrence of horse-stealing and other depredations along the frontier which we had in the past. There are eight divisions or central posts in the Territories, Regina, Maple Creek, Calgary, Lethbridge, Macleod, Edmonton, Battleford and Prince Albert, and 70 detachments. The hon. gentleman referred to the quiet state of the Territory at present, and made that one reason why there was no necessity for so large a force, and for the Government to try to reduce the force. I will tell him what occurred last year, and this is an instance which I think will convince him of the necessity of our keeping that force still intact. A small patrol force left last year to try to hunt up some whiskey smugglers. After being out for some time, they ran across a party of Indians who had evidently been killing cattle. They came across them when they were packing the fresh meat on their horses. Immediately they caught sight of the police they fired, and hit one of the police. His comrades, seeing him fall off his horse, shot at the Indians, one of whom was shot through the lungs. There was a good deal of excitement among the Indians about that. They returned to their reserves and there was frequent discussions between the Indian agents, the police force and the Indian chiefs who ultimately admitted that the young men were in the wrong. The result was that at last the young man who had been shot, to the astonishment of the doctor and every one else, came into the post and gave himself up to the police. I think that is a sign that, if there had been no police within easy reach of the Indians, the result would have been very different. There are about 5,000 Indians in that district, composed of Bloods, Blackfeet and Piegans, and, if they had not known that in a few hours 300 men could be concentrated at that point, it might have led to very disastrous results. It is very well known that a man can travel from one end of our Territories to the other in safety, and I am sure that, if the force were reduced, there would be a feeling of distrust, not only amongst the residents, but among the settlers going into that country, and I believe it would have a very disastrous effect on immigration. I will tell the hon. gentleman of another circumstance which occurred in 1890-91. People will all recollect what was known as the Messiah craze. The Indians south of the eastern portion of our country were having the ghost dances, and there was considerable excitement amongst the settlers, who fled from their country and came across the line into our country. The patrols were got together, the excitement was subdued, and the settlers ultimately returned to their own Territory. They tried afterwards to put the blame on our Indians. They said they were Canadian Indians, but the police were able to prove that our Indians were all the time working quietly on their own reserves. Among the duties which pertain to the Mounted Police, the most onerous are the duties of looking after the Indian business. But besides that they have a great deal of work to do in keeping order among the white population. I hold in my hand the report of the Mounted Police for last year in which it will be found there are nearly a thousand cases of offences against the law which had to be dealt with, cases of different kinds, among which I may mention shooting and wounding an ox belonging to an Indian, having a bar open on Sunday, illegal selling of liquor, drunk and disorderly, &c. If the hon. member will go through that list he will find that the large majority of those cases had to be tried and handled by the North-West Mounted

Police. Lately the license system has come into vogue in the North-West Territories, as the hon. gentleman knows, and we hope the force will be relieved of some of the disagreeable duties which they have had hitherto to perform in connection with looking after the permit system; but I think that until we find how the license system is going to work, it will be difficult for us to determine whether their duties in that respect will be continued or not. Under the present license system no private individual will be able to import liquor into the Territories, but there are no doubt plenty of men in that country who will be found willing to take whiskey into the territory and sell it to the Indians, if they think they can make money by it, and it may be that Indians will be able to get whiskey more easily now than they did heretofore; at any rate time will show, and I hope it may not be the case. But I think that the very strictest supervision in the mean time will have to be kept to prevent the Indians from getting whiskey. Now, there is another matter in which the people of the North-West, at any rate, have found the police force of great use, and that is in connection with prairie fires. It would be impossible to calculate the amount of property that has been saved through the instrumentality of the Mounted Police in the North-West Territories in keeping down prairie fires. Now, coming to the cost of the maintenance of the force, I may state that the pay of the men, including rations, horses' forage, equipment and clothing, does not exceed $700 per man and horse; and it is believed that this year we shall be able to reduce that to $650 per man and horse. A few years ago, hon. gentlemen will recollect, the cost of a man and horse was about $1,000 a year. We know that in the United States the cost of a man and horse in a cavalry regiment reaches, I think, $1,600 a year; so I think it will be seen that we are effecting great economies in carrying on that force. I think if we were to reduce the force to the extent the hon. gentleman suggests, we should have to find some other means of keeping the peace in that country, and we should have to send some military force up there to supplement and to assist the police force. Now, in the United States Territories, covering a territory in area as large as I have referred to, there are to-day, in two outposts, 6,000 men employed specially to watch the Indians, while in our own North-West, with 1,000 men, we are covering a territory of 750 miles long by 400 wide. In the United States one post where these soldiers are kept, costs twice as much as the whole of our police force. Now, perhaps, the hon. member has not read the section in the Police Act which gives authority to the Government to decide what number of men we shall engage. Section 6 of the Police Act, chapter 47 of the Revised Statutes, provides:

"The Governor in Council may from time to time authorize the appointment of, not exceeding in all, one thousand constables, and such number thereof shall be mounted as the Governor in Council may at any time direct."

So the hon. gentleman will see that the Government have in their own hands the power of determining what number of men shall be employed, and also what number of men shall be mounted; of course the less men are mounted, the less will be the expenditure for the force. The Governor in Council has also power to appoint supernumerary constables not exceeding in all 20 men, and the employment, not exceeding in all, of 50 scouts. This reduction can be made at any time by Order in Council, and I think it would be very unwise to lay down a hard and fast rule binding the Government to reduce from year to year the police force to anything like the extent which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. I think the hon. gentleman would be wise if he withdrew the resolution he has placed before the House. I am quite sure he has not moved this for the purpose of injuring our North-West country, or for the purpose of injuring, as I fear it would if carried, immigration going to that country. He has done it, I feel sure, from an economical point of view. I can assure him that the Government will take every means to keep the cost of that force down, and wherever they see any other means of reducing the expenditure it will be done. But until we are satisfied that the Indians are sufficiently civilized that we can trust them, I think it would be very unwise. I am sure it would be detrimental to the interest of the North-West, to reduce the force. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his remarks, referred to a great many matters not intimately connected with the police force. He referred to the ranchers, he referred to those few men who are engaged in the customs business. In regard to the customs, those men who have been employed on the southern boundary, principally in Manitoba, have been employed for the purpose of economy, and for the purpose of preventing a number of appointments being made in that country of men who would have very little work to do. With regard to the ranches, in which the hon. gentleman has taken so much interest, he states that every man should be allowed to go on these ranches and take up his section, whether it be a sand heap or anything else, if he thinks he can make his living on it; and I should have no objection to that if we had not already given privileges to men with whom we consider we must keep faith. Ranchers in the western country have invested an immense amount of money, they have kept their part of the bargain with the Government, and we certainly must treat them fairly, and I do not believe the hon. gentleman suggested for a moment we should do otherwise. We hope to be able to come to an understanding with them. I have for many years felt that the question at issue between settlers and ranchers must come to a head. I have known the question fought out in Australia and British Columbia, and I am quite sure we shall have to fight it out here, and all I trust is that whatever arrangement we may arrive at will be one satisfactory to the settlers, who I think are our first care, without doing injustice to men who have invested their capital in the country and have engaged in one of the most important businesses in the North-West.

Mr. WATSON. This is a matter that has occupied considerable attention in years gone by, and I had hoped the Minister would have given the House some encouragement to look for a reduction of the force. We have been expending large sums of money in the North-West in educating the Indians and endeavouring to civilize them. We have expended large sums in cash and land subsidies to railways to open up the country, and yet the Minister tells us there is no hope of reducing

the present number of men in the force. We must remember that the North-West police force is composed of probably the best class of mounted men that could be found in any country in the world, and if we go back to the years from 1873 to 1884, and particularly in the seventies, we will find that in those years about 300 mounted policemen kept the country in check. Whiskey smuggling was then going on, and the Indians had not come under treaty, and yet 300 mounted men were able to control the Indians. With all our advancement during the last 15 years the Minister now declares that we cannot do with less than 1,000 men. The Indians were not under treaty at that time, and from the treatment some of the bands have received no doubt some of them think that coming under treaty has not improved their condition. We have farm instructors there to educate the Indians, and some of them are doing good work. The regular force of the Mounted Police is 1,015 men. With the present railway accommodation and rapid transport the North-West should be controlled with half the number of men at present constituting the force, because in case an outbreak occurred men could be transported to any particular locality by railway, instead of by horse, as was the case formerly. I ventured to suggest to the Minister of the Interior some years ago a cheaper and more effective method of controlling the Indians, than by the present system of 1,000 mounted policemen. I suggested the establishment of a more efficient force for the maintenance of peace and order in the North-West, and one in which the people would have more confidence than they have in the Mounted Police, which is composed of a large number of raw recruits. My system is to establish at different centres, organized companies of mounted men, whose services could be procured for a small consideration. These might be stationed at Macleod, Lethbridge, Calgary, Regina, Moosomin, Edmonton, Prince Albert and other centres, and there would be no difficulty in organizing companies that would be ready to answer a call in case of any emergency and to defend the rights and interests of the people. These men could be secured from the settlers there, from the cowboys and ex-mounted policemen, and these companies would be composed of more efficient men than the raw recruits who go out there. They would know the county well and the Indians well, and the Minister would be acting wisely in reducing the Mounted Police and organizing these companies which might receive $100 per man, each furnishing his own mount and arms. Forty or fifty of these men could be secured at each of the different places as indicated. With such a force, the Mounted Police might be reduced to 300 men, as it was from 1873 to 1878. If it is possible to secure more efficient men for $100 than for $600 or $700 per man, then the Government should adopt this course. The Minister states that when the Indians become sufficiently civilized, a reduction might be made in the Mounted Police, but the Indians are not in that condition to-day. Surely in view of our present efforts to civilize them we might hope for some reduction in the force. The Mounted Police are maintained in the North-West for the purpose of keeping the Indians in subjection and guarding ranches against Indian raids. The Minister has informed the House that a large number of the Indians have gone south of the international boundary line. If they have gone out of the country he should not offer inducements to bring them back. If he could adopt any policy by which the balance of the Indians would go south of the line, we could then do without the Mounted Police altogether. With the present settlement, with the railway transport and with our present civilization there is no possible excuse for retaining a force of 1,000 men. Further protection is afforded to white settlers by the very fact of large settlements existing. There would be no danger to such settlers at Prince Albert, Edmonton, Macleod or Calgary or other centres. The hon. gentleman appears to entertain a much higher opinion of the bravery and determination of the Indians than I entertain. If the Indians were well looked after, and if the Government acted up to their treaty regulations and furnished supplies in the quantity agreed upon, there would be no trouble. We have heard of troubles, and the hon. gentleman has spoken of his interviews with Crowfoot, he might have told us of his interview with Piapot and Lone Lodge and other chiefs who complain that the Government are not giving rations which they undertook to give when they made the treaty, and they complain that the pork was killing their children and they would accept three quarters of a pound of beef, which costs 12 cents per pound, instead of pork which costs 19 cents. If the Indians were treated in a different way there would be no trouble. I can understand that the Indians are not as satisfied as they might have been. For years past we have heard that the Indians were not treated as they should have been by the Government. If you make a bargain with an Indian, he expects you to live up to it, and if we give an Indian what he has agreed to accept, he will be satisfied and will give no trouble, but if you promise one pound of good pork, and he receives rusty pork, we cannot expect that the Indian will quietly submit to dole this out to his family when he claims it is poisoning his children. We have now practically handed over the license system to the North-West Council, and abolished the permit system which will largely reduce the necessity for maintaining such a large force of police. The permit system was such that no amount of police could keep it within bounds, and now that the license system is organized it seems to me there should be no difficulty in regulating the liquor traffic. I believe that the Government could get a very efficient body of men who would be ready in case of emergency with the Indians, or for any other purpose, by organizing a force at the different points I have mentioned. It would cost but a mere trifle compared with the expense of the Mounted Police now. Let me point out to the Government that while they have been spending large sums of money drilling volunteer forces in eastern Canada we have volunteer battalions in the North-West organized for the rebellion of 1885, who have not been in camp since that date. We have two battalions of volunteers in the Province of Manitoba who have not been in camp since they saw active service in 1885, and yet we are maintaining a force of 1,000 mounted policemen at an enormous cost. If these volunteer companies were properly equipped and drilled, they would be ready to go out whenever called upon, and with the railway facilities to all parts of the Territories which we have now, they can be removed more easily to the scene

of trouble, than 100 mounted policemen could be removed a few years ago when there was no railway communication and when they had to travel on horse-back. If we drilled these volunteers and had them properly equipped, I believe that the Government might with benefit to the country reduce the Mounted Police force to at least one-third its present strength. In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, the Government should give us some encouragement to hope that they will in the near future do away with this very large expenditure. By adopting a system such as I have suggested, I believe that half the money that is spent on the Mounted Police force to-day could be saved, and that the safety of the people of the country would be the better provided for.

Mr. PERRY. This is a question which is very well worthy the consideration of the Government, involving as it does an expenditure of about three quarters of a million dollars a year which has to be paid by the tax-payers of Canada. The representatives of the people here have a right to expect that the members of the Government should give us some reasons to show that this money is properly expended, but I was sorry to hear the Minister of the Interior state that he had his mind made up to vote against this resolution. When my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) by his motion suggested a way in which they could economize, much better than they can economize on the Intercolonial Railway, I thought the Government would accept the resolution. The Minister of the Interior has not told us the utility of the North-West Mounted Police. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has stated that the police are more for the benefit of the ranchers, and perhaps also for protecting the revenue from smugglers from the United States, than for the protection of the people there, and the hon. Minister has not ventured to dispute this statement. He has not shown that the settlers in the North-West do require any protection against the Indian. Why, Sir, we find that when there were three Indians in the North-West to the one now, and when there ought to be 50 white settlers in the North-West to the one there was twenty years ago, the people of the North-West had no police protection. We find, also, that when the white people came to settle in the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario, and when the Indians were plentiful, and before any attempt had been made to civilize them, our forefathers got along with the Indians without the protection of Mounted Police. The very fact that the Government imagines they are obliged to keep a standing army of 1,015 soldiers in the shape of mounted policemen in the North-West, at a cost of $1,000,000 a year, for the alleged purpose of the protection of life and property, is enough to frighten settlers from coming here from civilized countries like England, Ireland, Scotland and France. We have been told by the Government that it is well worth our while to spend nearly a million a year to protect a few ranchers in the North-West and to prevent smuggling, but I would remind hon. gentlemen opposite that if they accepted the proposition of the Liberal party and established unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States it would not be necessary to have an army of Mounted Police to protect our revenue. I have no doubt that the people of the North-West would be better off without—I will not call it the protection—but the nuisance of this Mounted Police force. I do not mean to cast a slur on the men, I believe they are a fine body of men and would be glad of an opportunity to show their value, but tell me one instance since 1885, where the Mounted Police have been required. Even in 1885 the Mounted Police could not maintain peace and order in the North-West Territories without a special army having to be sent from the Eastern Provinces of Canada, and, in fact, I have heard no account that the Mounted Police ever took part in subduing the rebellion. I can tell the Government that if they had used the Indians as they should have been used there would have been no rebellion, and no need of Mounted Police, and no need of sending out regiments of volunteers up there at an immense cost to the country, and the loss of many precious lives. We are told that in so many years the Government of Canada have expended nearly $7,000,000 on this Mounted Police force. That is more than the cost of building a tunnel from Prince Edward Island to the mainland, according to Sir Charles Tupper's own estimate and the estimate of Sir Douglas Fox. By the estimate of Sir Douglas Fox is it is something less than $7,000,000. But the millions spent in the North-West are not considered; the Government think they are only a trifle. But we know well that these millions are not paid by the settlers in the North-West, but by the settlers in the Provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. I want the people of this country to understand that a large portion of their taxes are going to the North-West to protect nothing. I believe that the North-West is able to protect itself. What has become of the 900,000 people that the blue-books of the Government boasted a year ago had gone to the North-West to settle? Are they not there? If not, what is the reason? Did the Mounted Police drive them away? Were they afraid, because they could not see anything but bayonets on one side, muskets on the other, and daggers in front of them? Is that the reason these people are not there, or did they not go to that country? Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but it is no laughing matter. Hon. gentlemen may dance, but the poor people of the country have to pay the fiddler. I had hoped the Minister would have announced that the Government had determined to change their policy in this matter. But they are not going to change their policy. The 1,015 policemen must be maintained as before. A few minutes ago I saw the account of the expenditures for this force, and they are perfectly ridiculous. Potatoes have been charged at as high as $1 a bushel, meat at as much as 25 cents a pound. You can get potatoes a few miles from here for 15 cents a bushel; and I have no doubt that the accounts will show that the same prices are being charged this year. It is ridiculous. I do not believe the Government have an honest way of carrying on this force; I do not think they buy these supplies by tender. Where is the man in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island who will earn and receive in hard cash $750 a year and find himself? But those men are found, their board is paid, their bed supplied and their house-rent paid, so that the $750 a year which they get is clear money; and when they are making that, it is no

wonder that they love the country and stop there; and I believe that they have such a hold on the country now that the Minister is not able to drive them out of it. Well, for my own part, I would like to see a change. I contend that the resolution of my hon. friend is well worthy the consideration of this House. I am inclined to vote in its favour. I believe that less than one-half, yes, less than one-third, the present member of the North-West Mounted Police would be sufficient; and if the Government would give some consideration to the matter, I think they would come to the conclusion that we could do without any Mounted Police at all in the North-West. During the past twenty years the Government have been spending money in millions to settle the North-West; but the time must come when the people of the North-West must depend on their own resources and be their own defenders. We have been civilizing the Indians there for the last twenty-five years, and we are told that the number is 5,000 less to-day than it was a few years ago; and yet we are told that the same force is required to protect them. At that rate we must come to the conclusion that the Indians are more riotous than before, and that all the money we have spent in educating and civilizing them is lost. It is all moonshine. That is the only conclusion I can draw from what the Minister of the Interior has stated, that the Government have given all their consideration to the matter, and have come to the conclusion that they are not able to carry on the business of the North-West and protect the precious lives of the people there without 1,000 mounted policemen. When our forefathers came to this country, the Indians were as thick as grasshoppers, and the white people had no protection from them. I think some of them brought with them a few old rifles from France, but I think they were too rusty to fire off a shot. How did they get along with the Indians? The way they did was to become friendly with them, and christianize and civilize them by their own good behaviour and example. I remember quite well that a prominent clergyman in the North-West preached and published a sermon on the way in which the Mounted Police in the North-West had misbehaved. There was nothing of that in the case of the settlers who first came to this country, and that is why they got along well with the Indians—by showing them a good example and acting in accordance with the Gospel and the Scriptures. When the Indians asked the white men in those days to give them bread they did not give them a stone, but gave them bread. By the civility and the good example which they displayed, the white people were able to live on friendly terms with the Indians; and the same thing would happen in the North-West if the Indians were properly dealt with by the Government of the day. I do not expect that the Minister is going to change his policy to-day; but there is another session coming, and I hope that in the meantime he will see fit to do so, and reduce the number of the Mounted Police as well as the taxes which the poor people of this country have to pay to maintain them. The Mounted Police of the North-West are of no benefit to the people of Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces; but the Government are taking the money from these people to maintain them without giving them corresponding benefit. A little while ago the Minister said that it was not right for people to go and settle on ranches; but I believe that if the ranchmen had not trespassed on actual settlers in 1884, the rebellion would never have taken place. I believe that it was some of these ranchmen, backed up, I will not say by the Government, but by Government officials, who went and trespassed on the occupiers. They were tax-payers and residents of the country, they were a part of the population and they were driven out and the greatest system of hardship inflicted on them. The Government had been aware of this since 1885, as many complaints from different quarters came to them. There was even a complaint from Archbishop Taché of St. Boniface, who warned the Government what the consequences would be if the Government did not wake up and be equal to the occasion by redressing the injustices then practised in the North-West Territories against the half-breed and Indian population, through the connivance of some Indian officials. The Government slept upon their oars, but the evil day came at last, and we are all aware of what took place. I hope the Government will bring down a policy of retrenchment in the North-West before they close this session. If they intend closing this Parliament next week, I shall give them all the help I possibly can. I will not stand up here and talk against time, but will apply myself to the question before the House and I hope my hon. friend will bring down a policy of retrenchment in this matter as well as my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has tried to do in the eastern provinces by curtailing accommodation on the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. LAURIER. I did not expect, when my hon. friend brought up this question, that the Government would be prepared to agree to it. But I would have expected that the Minister of the Interior, when he spoke to the question, would have been ready to state that at some future day, not far distant, he would be able to agree to the proposition that the time would come when we should commence gradually reducing the force in number. He stated a time indeed when, in his opinion, it would be proper to reduce the force, but his statement was judiciously vague. He rather hinted that as long as we had not civilized the Indians, we could not dispense with the force. Statistics show we have not taken the proper way of civilizing the Indians so far. They show rather that we are killing off the Indians gradually, and if we are to wait until the last red man disappears, I am afraid the time of reducing the force is far off yet. At all events, the hon. gentleman paid a well-deserved compliment to the force, as there can be no question that the force has been a credit to Canada at large and to itself. But the hon. gentleman must remember that the force was not established to remain permanent and perennial. It was understood that one day it should cease. Seventeen years ago that force was organized, and its total number was 300 men. It has been increased to a standing of 1,000 men. We must admit that the condition of the country is not to-day what it was seventeen years ago, and if 300 men could keep the peace of the country then, now that we have towns and settlements dotted all over the prairies, the force could be reduced very effectively. I do not propose that we should do it all at once, but I would like the hon.

gentleman to consider the propriety of at some time or another, taking up the question offered by my hon. friend. The hon. member for Wellington approached the subject in a very temperate and quiet manner. He did not propose that the force should be at once reduced, but rather offered a question for the Government to consider, that the time has arrived when the Government must think seriously of reducing the force in numbers. He stated that the force was still necessary on account of smuggling. The hon. gentleman is aware that if there was at one time danger arising from the introduction of whiskey into the Territories, that time in the opinion of the Government passed away, because no longer than last year we did away with the permit system and introduced the system prevailing in the east, of free circulation of liquor under license. If, in the opinion of the Government, there is upon this one vital question no difference whatever between the east and the west, if the people can be trusted in the west as in the east with the sale of liquor, there can be no reason whatever to maintain the force. The hon. gentleman also hinted that the force was a necessity for the protection of ranchers. This is opening a question somewhat different from the main question. The hon. gentleman took issue with my hon. friend, who said that more importance should be attached to the settler than to the ranchman. As to that, it seems to me we have not had the proper policy. No leases should be given for ranches on arable land or land fit for settlement. I understand there are two kinds of land in the North-West, lands for grazing purposes and arable land for settlement all land fit for settlement ought to the kept for settlement. And when settlers have come upon land which had been leased for ranching purposes as we have the ranchmen on the one side and the settlers on the other, there can be no doubt in my opinion that the proper policy is in every instance to favour the settler at the expense of the ranchmen. There can be no comparison in the advantages which ranchmen produce and those which settlers produce. They are all on the side of the settler, and the well-settled policy of the Government ought to be to give him the preference. As to the present motion, I understand my hon. friend brings this not with the view of having exactly a vote upon it, but simply to bring up the question for the consideration of the Government. I think he has achieved this object, and would advise him not to press the question any further but to withdraw it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was greatly surprised at the remarks of the leader of the Opposition in which he referred to the hon. member for Wellington as having brought this matter to the attention of the Government by resolution, and indicated that he had not understood the Minister of the Interior to state that the Government had given a very great deal of consideration to the subject, or had adopted a policy with regard to it. I am under the impression that two or three weeks ago information was given by the Minister of Finance to the House that the Government were of opinion that the time had come when the Mounted Police force might be reduced. At some stage of the discussions on the estimates, I think, that information was given. At any rate the Minister of the Interior has said to-night, that, so far from standing firmly in opposition to the principle of any reduction in the force, a reduction had been effected during last year of over a hundred men. It is the intention of the Government gradually to reduce that force as circumstances will admit. We do not want to be bound by a rule of this House that that force shall grow less and less every year. It may reach a point within a few years at which it may be desirable it should stand for some years to come; but the maintenance of a considerable force, not at all as large as it is now, is, in the opinion of the Government, very necessary in the interests of the Territories and in the interests of all the provinces, notwithstanding the remarks of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island. I take it that it is to the greatest interest of all the provinces in Canada that the North-West keeps its reputation in other countries as a country in which law and order are perfectly observed and administered. There can be no greater attraction for settlers than to know it is a country of that description, and the uses which the Mounted Police have served, as described by the Minister of the Interior, seem to me of the greatest importance, leaving out of question for the moment the matter of protection of the revenue as to smuggling across the border line. We have the most important protection as to the smuggling of liquor on the Indian reserves and the dealing with the Indians by liquor. The hon. the leader of the Opposition has said that, now that the same system has been established in the Territories as that which prevails in the older provinces, the same mode of looking after things should also prevail, but the conditions are not the same. We have not in the older provinces large bodies of uncivilized Indians, and every one knows that the introduction of spirits among people of that condition is disastrous and demoralizing, not only to themselves but to all the communities around them. As long as we have large bodies of Indians in the uncivilized state in which they are now, we must have them policed in order to protect them from unprincipled whiskey dealers who endeavour to deal with them for no good purpose towards the Indians. As to the protection of the ranches, the leader of the Opposition put it as a question between the ranchman and the settler, and contended that every fair preference should be given to the settler, but it is not a question of protecting the ranchman against the settler or the settler against the ranchman, but of protecting both the settler and the ranchman against Indian raids, not of the most lawless kind, but in the way of trespass which, in a few years, if unchecked, would turn the Indians of the North-West into marauders against whom the people there would be powerless. The presence of the police keeps down trespasses and tends to make the Indians obey the law and submit to punishment if they disobey the law. While we admit that the force may be reduced in proper time, and may possibly be reduced every year, and while the numbers are now being kept down as low as possible, we still feel that for some years to come it will be necessary to keep a large force in that country to maintain order and to keep the law. Subject to that, we desire to retrench the expenditure as much as possible.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When the Minister of Justice speaks of the losses the revenue might sus-

tain if the police force were diminished, I suppose he rather refers to the mischiefs that would be done for the want of police restrictions on the reservations than to the actual monetary loss which might occur if there were no police supervision on the border, because I apprehend that the actual cost of the police force would be beyond the actual loss of revenue if there were no restriction on the border at all, looking at the number of people in the North-West and the amount of importations on which duties are paid. The hon. gentleman speaks of the Indian population as being a much less civilized population than in the older provinces. I suppose they have made some progress in the way of civilization; at all events, they are better than they were in 1885; and, if I remember aright, there was a very considerable struggle between the two sides of this House in that year to prevent these same Indians being put on the voters' lists. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues were for some weeks of the opinion that these Indians were qualified to exercise the franchise whether they were qualified to obey the law in other respect or not. From the observations the hon. gentleman has addressed to the House to-night, I should understand that he thinks those Indians are not qualified to be treated as an integral part of the community at large, and are therefore not qualified to have conferred upon them the rights and privileges of free men. It seems to me, when we look at the cost of the maintenance of the Indians in the North-West, that the policy in regard to them and in regard to the police force is an unsatisfactory one. The hon. gentleman who is now Minister of the Interior and who was a resident of the North-West for a number of years, and therefore has had excellent opportunities for the observation of the condition and habits of the Indian population, must, I think, know that the Indians at the present time are far more dependent and a far greater charge upon the public revenue than they were ten years ago. I think that in 1880, the cost of the Indian population of the North-West Territories and Manitoba to the public treasury was less than half a million dollars. To-day the cost is a good deal more than twice this sum, and, if you add to that the cost of maintaining the police force in these Territories it will be seen that the Indian population are costing the country nearly four times the amount they cost 12 years ago. That is a considerable increase. A large portion of the cost 12 years ago was due to the difficulties of transportation. When payment was made to the Indians, it was not possible to make the payment on the reservations. The Indians had to be fed during the period of payment, and a large amount of supplies had to be carried to them with the agent by whom payment was made. The result was that a very considerable expense was incurred in this way, which I apprehend to-day may be or ought to be at all events entirely dispensed with. Then, when we look at the way the expenditure is made up to the present time, we find that that expenditure is in the main not due to any obligation that has been incurred by the Dominion towards the Indians under any treaty that has been made, but is due to the fact that we in a large degree are compelled to support the Indians, to provide them with clothing and the necessary means of subsistence. This is a very unsatisfactory result of the efforts which have been made to make the Indians an industrious and self-supporting population. It seems to me, if you were to say to the Indians: You need do nothing, and were to employ the members of the Mounted Police as agriculturists to raise the necessary food for the Indians and give them the means of subsistence, the same amount of money would give the same employment to these people in the Mounted Police, and you would save the $1,000,000 which you are paying the Indians at the present time. I do not suggest that as a proper alternative policy, but I am pointing out this fact, that while you are at the present time feeding and clothing the Indians, the farmers of this country are contributing, out of their hard earnings, $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 a year to support the Indian population, and besides that they are contributing another million a year to compel these same Indians to keep the peace, and to let the white population, who go into the Territories, engage in peaceful pursuits, and devote a portion of their time towards the production of supplies necessary to maintain the Indians in idleness. I do not think that is a result of which any Minister need be proud. It does seem to me that a more vigorous effort ought to be made towards making the Indians better cultivators of the soil, or better herdsmen, so as to contribute, in some way or other, in a larger degree towards maintaining themselves. The doctrine of the survival of the fittest is a necessary law of human existence, but we make an effort to frustrate the operations of that law, so far as we can, by supporting a population that the Ministers, in their own defence, when pressed on account of their expenditure, declare are incorrigibly idle, and that nothing has been done in the past, or can be done, that will induce them, in any degree, to contribute towards their own maintenance. I think a more vigorous effort ought to be made in that direction, and just in proportion as the Indians are able to contribute to their own subsistence and to their own comforts, just in the same proportion will the Government be able to dispense with the police force. I quite admit that it may be imprudent to undertake to abolish this force at once, but I am strongly of opinion that it can be diminished year by year until, in a large degree, it disappears altogether. I am also of opinion that if the Minister of Militia and Defence does his duty he will be able, in a large degree, to supersede the police force by a trained volunteer force that can be supported at a comparatively small expense as compared with what is necessary to maintain a police force in the North-West Territories; and in proportion as the country becomes settled the facilities for doing so will be increased. But, however that may be, even though no such force could be raised, it would still be possible to diminish the police force by increasing the industrious habits of the Indian population. You have farming inspectors there, you have supplied the Indians with agricultural implements, you make purchases for them in this respect every year, you have done this far beyond what has been required by any treaty stipulation you have had with the Indians. One would suppose from what has been paid out in this way, that the Indians have not been taught, have not been impressed with the importance of taking proper care of the agricultural implements and of the animals which have been furnished them. At all events, just in proportion as you make it apparent that the maintenance of a considerable police force is necessary in that coun-

try, just in the same proportion do you make it clear that the Indian population are very poor, that they are suffering from want and that danger arises from their restlessness and discontent, induced from their want of food and clothing. I think that a more vigorous effort should be made than has ever yet been made by the Minister of the Interior to deal with the Indian problem successfully. I believe that although we boast of our better treatment of the Indians as compared with our neighbours across the border, they have succeeded in a larger degree than we in making the Indians an industrious population; and whatever may be necessary to this end I think would be a proper proceeding; in fact, if it were necessary to deal with the Indians as wards of the Government, and to exercise over them more careful supervision than has hitherto been done, it would be justified in view of the extent to which they have become absolute paupers of the state. In 1878, when the last treaty was made with the Indian population, the whole cost of initiating these treaties and providing the Indians with annuities and supplies was less than $300,000; and now we expend four times that amount yearly. I think it is a most unsatisfactory result, and the House will be wanting in its duty if it does not look in the future more carefully after the Indian expenditure, and look with greater minuteness into the efforts that have been put forward by the Minister of the Interior in seeking to make the Indians industrious herdsmen or industrious agriculturists.

Mr. BOWELL. The subject of treatment of the Indians not only in the new territories of Canada, but in the old provinces, has been a problem somewhat difficult to solve. Those of us who have lived in this country for many years and have watched the progress of civilization among the different tribes in Canada, the policy that has been pursued and the result which has followed the treatment by our neighbours of their Indian population, must have come to the conclusion that the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) are scarcely borne out by historical facts. It is well known, not only in Canada but among the more intelligent of the American people who have studied this question, that the policy of Canada, or in other words, as it is termed among the Indians, the policy of the Queen, towards the Indian tribes of Canada, has been of such a character as to keep them not only loyal to the Crown, but to make them peaceable subjects. It is very well for gentlemen to theorize upon the best and most prudent policy to pursue in dealing with a savage or semi-savage class of people. The reasoning of the member for Bothwell would apply better to men who have been born and lived in civilized countries, and who have received some education. He ought to know, and I think does know, that in dealing with the Indians, if you attempt to force them to work, as white men work, they will at once become unmanageable, and either leave the farms to which, according to his policy they would be obliged to go, or they would turn rebellious and give trouble. The leader of the Opposition and his first lieutenant (Mr. Mills) do not appear to be in accord as to the proper management of the Indian tribes in the North-West. The leader of the Opposition informed the House a few moments ago that the Government had adopted a policy which was likely to decrease their number rather than to maintain them as they exist, or to permit their increase. I scarcely know what a civilized community could do more than has been done by Canada to ameliorate the condition of the Indians of the North-West. An enormous amount of money has been spent, and the sum is appalling when you look at it, in supporting those tribes, in establishing schools among them, in the assistance indirectly of missionaries, for clergymen have been supported to a greater or less extent in different sections; money has also been expended in establishing schools and endeavouring to civilize the younger portion of the Indian tribes, both males and females, by giving them education which would enable them not only to earn their own living, but to assist in the maintenance of their fathers and mothers when they become old, for they will never settle down in a civilized manner and work for their own support. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) laid down abstract principles, as he always does, and theorized, repeating what we have often heard before, not only of Indian communities, but of all other communities, of the survival of the fittest. The only logical deduction that can be drawn from his reasoning is this: While his leader laid down the principle that we have not treated the Indians well, that we have not educated them as we should have done, that we have not taught them agriculture as we should have done, and have not fed them sufficiently, the survival of the fittest means to allow those people to pursue their own course on the prairie, although we have deprived them of the means of subsistence which they possessed before white men went among them, we have deprived them of game, the buffalo is gone, the lakes and the rivers are becoming depleted of fish, on which these people were in the habit of subsisting. Thus, if we are spending too much in keeping the people from starving at present, if we adopted the principle of the survival of the fittest there is no doubt that in a very short time the Indians would die of starvation or disease. That would be the result of the reasoning which the hon. member for Bothwell has pursued, if the Government adopted it. I am quite sure no civilized community would permit such a policy to be pursued, and any Government actuated by such principles would deserve the unmerited censure of the people of this country. I was a little surprised by the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition and also by one or two hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject. The Finance Minister, some time ago, announced the policy of the Government. It is possible the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) may not have heard my hon. friend or may have forgotten his remarks. It was also announced by the Minister of the Interior to-night, not that he regretted that he saw no prospect of reducing the force, but that it was the policy of the Government, as the circumstances of the country would permit, to decrease the expenditure under this head to the lowest possible extent. When you look at the work performed by the Mounted Police—and I appeal to those who know something of the country and have travelled through it and watched their operations, and have noticed the peaceful condition of the whole country, principally owing to this force, must come to the conclusion that though the amount paid for police maintenance is large, it has been money well spent. I

have travelled from Winnipeg along the whole border to the Rocky Mountains. I took particular pains to ascertain what had been done in the direction of the maintenance of peace along the boundary. I also paid particular attention to the results which had followed from keeping out of the country lawless men who came from the mines of Montana, and an equally bad class of the community, cattle thieves, murderers and men who, whenever they got into difficulty in their own country, flee across the border. One of the most pleasing circumstances that came under my observation was the fact of the cordial relations that existed between the Canadian police force and the American soldiers who are stationed all along the boundary from Idaho to Montana and Northern Dakota eastward to Minnesota. They rendered aid to each other, they acted as brothers in the prevention of crime. Those on the American side were ready at a moment's notice to send out files of soldiers in order to arrest criminals who fled from our side to theirs, and the Mounted Police were just as ready and acted in accord and in unity with the soldiers on the other side in returning the criminals who fled to the north of the line. It is true that in the whole North-West Territories, vast in extent as it is, we have maintained in the past about 1,000 Mounted Police, sometimes less, never more; and when we reflect that along the northern border of Montana and Northern Dakota the Americans have stationed at different posts from 3,000 to 4,000 soldiers in order to maintain peace in those sections; and to accomplish that which we have accomplished on our side by less than 1,000 mounted policemen, because our men are scattered as far north as Edmonton, we have reason to be proud of the policy we have pursued and we have ample reason to be proud of the Mounted Police force in our own country. If 3,000 or 4,000 men are required to look after American interests in the northern parts of Montana, Idaho and Dakota, surely we have not done too much by protecting our frontier with a few hundred of mounted policemen. Let me point out to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that he was not altogether correct in his reasonings in regard to the Customs Department along the frontier. Policemen were not placed upon that patrol of 700 or 800 miles, which is the length of their patrol as given by the Minister of the Interior, but they were sent in the first place to Wood Mountain and Turtle Mountain in order to prevent American Indians who were reported to be uniting together, making raids on our country. It was the bounden duty of the Government to see that precautionary measures were taken to prevent any raid from the other side of the boundary. We have had serious experience. I do not propose, however, to discuss the cause of the rebellion, though some hon. gentlemen have referred to it, but we have had some little experience of the enormous expense involved in putting down one little trouble. Is it not, therefore, much better that we should spend during times of peace a comparatively small sum of money in feeding the Indians and in preventing, as far as possible, raids from the other side, than that we should have to expend large sums of money in case of difficulty or trouble? I am sure the better judgment of every man in Canada who thinks on this question for a moment, will lead him to the conclusion that we had better spend millions of money a year, than have a disturbance by which the lives of any of our settlers could be sacrificed, and which would cost in order to subdue it, millions and millions of dollars. There is another point to which my hon. colleague the Minister of the Interior did not call the attention of the House. About three years ago it will be remembered, difficulties arose in the Kootenay district, not so much from the malcontents of the Canadian Indians, but from the fact that runners from Idaho came into our territory in order to stir up the feelings of the Indians, and probably through the instigation of traders who thought they would profit by it, to make them believe that they should cause trouble to the Government. So much was danger feared from the Indians that the British Columbia Government memorialized the Dominion Government to assist them in maintaining peace by sending a force into that territory. The result of sending 150 men to the Kootenay district who were quartered at what is known as Fort Steele, was that an uprising was prevented. In an interview which I had with the Indian tribes in the Kootenay some years ago I found that while they were somewhat sullen, that upon assurances given them that Canada—and speaking of Canada we always use the name of the Queen as a word they understand better as representing the Dominion Government—so long as they behaved themselves would protect them in their rights, I am glad to know that they expressed great confidence in their future and a disposition to remain peaceful. Having said this much in reference to the Indian tribes and the benefit which has arisen to the country from the services of the Mounted Police force, it is a grave question whether the reasons advanced by the leader of the Opposition are of a character that would justify the reduction of the force. The hon. gentleman pointed out that population was increasing in that country, and another gentleman behind him said that if the North-West Council were allowed to expend the money given to them as they pleased it would do away to a great extent with the necessity of maintaining that force. If they are to perform police duty the more rapidly population extends in that country, the greater the necessity for maintaining the force. We know that even in densely populated and civilized countries crime prevails, and if the Dominion Government did not maintain a police force in order to keep crime in check, the local authorities would have to do so. So long as the North-West Territories are under our immediate control, is it not better that we should maintain the police force in the manner which it is to-day, rather than to allow it to pass away piecemeal under local control into different portions of the Territories? When the population of that country becomes sufficiently large to enable the Territories to have the same system of government as in the other provinces, then, probably, the reasoning of hon. gentlemen opposite might have some force, but certainly to my mind they have no force whatever at present. I should mention further, that when the police force was sent to patrol the frontier, from the Rocky Mountains down to Manitoba, it was sent there for the purpose of maintaining the peace of the country, and I deemed it advisable to ask my colleagues to allow these men at the same time that they were performing police duty, to act in the prevention of the introduction into Canada

not only of whiskey and other spirits which would be given to the Indians contrary to law, but that they should act as preventive officers, thereby utilizing men who were placed there for other purposes to protect the revenue in that particular respect. If the police force were withdrawn from the border, and another force were substituted as indicated by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), it certainly would not be as effective, for the reason that the extent of country is so great that unless you organize a Mounted Customs Police you could not accomplish what the Mounted Police are accomplishing there to-day. I think this economical utilization of the police force is a matter that the Government should be commended for, rather than indirectly condemned as they have been by some hon. gentlemen. As the country progresses I look forward to a reduction of the force as has been intimated by the Minister of Finance; but not to the extent, however, that has been indicated by some gentlemen who have spoken. It will be necessary—and I am only repeating what my colleague said—for some time to come to keep up a force in the North-West Territories, but the policy of the Government is to be as economical as possible in the maintenance of that force; the expenditure having been reduced already from $1,000 per man to about $600. If the suggestions which have been made by hon. gentlemen who have spoken in reference to the volunteer force could be put into operation, probably a still further reduction can be made. Having given some little attention to that branch of the subject, I am not sure that the suggestions made by the hon. members for Marquette (Mr. Watson) and Bothwell (Mr. Mills) are of a practical character. These hon. gentlemen have said that we might abolish the police force to a great extent, and establish volunteer corps throughout the North-West which might be placed in the field to put down any insurrection. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we reflect upon the extent of that Territory, and the distances at which the settlers live apart, you would see that the habitations of 100 able-bodied men who would form a company of volunteers, would extend over hundreds, aye thousands of miles, and in case of immediate requirement to suppress a riot or an Indian raid, you would have to wait until you mobilized these men, and you would probably find that damage would have been committed during the delay which might have been prevented had you a trained body of men like the Mounted Police to send to the field at short notice. I am not a little surprised to hear one gentleman state that these policemen were raw recruits who could not be utilized, while immediately afterwards he eulogized the volunteer force of trained men which might be established. Now, during the discussion on the Militia Estimates in this House, we have heard the Major-General spoken of very highly for the frank manner in which he had presented the facts to the country as to the volunteer force in the civilized portion of Canada, more particularly in the populous districts of Ontario. Many members on the opposite side of the House, the very men who to-night advocate a volunteer force for the North-West in place of the Mounted Police, pointed out that even in cities in the settled portions of Canada, some of these corps are not as well trained as they should be; arising from the fact that they are not drilled long enough in each year. If there is not money to drill the forces in Ontario and Quebec and the other older provinces sufficiently long to have well trained men, who could be called into the field at a moment's notice, what could you expect in companies organized in the North-West, or even in Manitoba, where people live so far apart from each other that the men could not be called together for drill more than eight or ten days in each year? A city battalion may meet weekly or nightly if it chooses, and many do so simply for the love of the thing; but in the country districts you cannot get men to leave their farms and travel miles in order to drill once a week or once a month. The result would be that if the policy suggested were adopted, we should have a less effective force than we have to-day in the Mounted Police. I agree with the hon. gentleman who said that volunteer companies should be organized in the North-West; but I am of opinion that most of the companies, if not the whole of them, that are to be established in the future should be mounted infantry, which are somewhat expensive. If they are to be of any use at all in a country like that, they must be a force that can move rapidly, at the shortest possible notice; and we know that an ordinary volunteer rifle or infantry corps could not be as effective as has been represented to the House. I am not at all sorry that this question has had the consideration that has been given to it to-night. It only shows that the policy of the Government as already announced meets with the approval of the House. Whether it goes sufficiently far or not, of course we could not expect to please the Opposition, except to a very limited extent. Of course, the hon. member for Bothwell, in any remarks he makes, must always be a little facetious, and the Franchise Act seems to have been indelibly stamped, if not upon his brain, at least upon his heart; and if he likes to have a little badinage on that subject, no one would deny him the privilege of enjoying it. It seems to have haunted the hon. gentleman's imagination that the savages of the North-West were to have been placed on the voters' lists, but certainly such an idea never had a lodgment in the minds of those responsible for the measure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It had in the Bill.

Mr. BOWELL. Nor in the Bill either, and such was never the intention. But we can always stand a little badinage of that kind from the hon. gentleman, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that I shall not display that petulance which the hon. member for South Oxford said I was apt to do on a question of this kind. Petulance is never displayed, unless I have to meet unfounded charges which fall from the tongues of those who have very little respect for the honour of those whom they oppose.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This is a very important matter, and involves a considerable outlay. It has been discussed on several occasions in the House in view of the vast sums of money that are annually spent on the North-West Mounted Police. From the census we learn that the white population in the North-West has increased, while the Indian population has diminished, and yet we find that the increase in the expenditure for the Mounted Police continues. We have been spending for several years close on $1,000,000 a year upon that

force for the purpose of preserving order in the North-West. It is time, therefore, for this subject to be well considered by the House and the Government, and the hon. member for North Wellington deserves the thanks of the House for having brought forward a resolution on the subject. I have noticed on several occasions when the estimates for the Mounted Police have been discussed, that the Minister of the Interior always fears any reduction of the force, because he seems to dread the subtle nature of the Indian. He has not apparently taken the Indian into his confidence or trusted the Indian. He suspects the Indians, and fears that in time they may make an outbreak. I do not think that that is the proper disposition for the Government to display. I have heard that if the Indian is trusted he is not apt to betray the trust reposed in him, but that if he is treated with disdain, this is apt to engender in him a reciprocal feeling. I would like to see a different disposition shown to the Indian. I see by the reports of Mr. Herchmer, the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police, that the Indians have made considerable progress in raising cattle. They have also cultivated the land pretty extensively, and they should be encouraged by the Government instead of being suspected by them. It is true, when speaking of the Government we ought to be very tolerant of them, because they have many difficulties within as well as without, and we are told by one who is in a position to speak, that sometimes the junior members of the Cabinet have to be held as hostages for their good behaviour. When such is the case in the Cabinet itself, is it to be wondered that they suspect a poor Indian? When members of the Cabinet are not to be trusted, whose behaviour is doubted, and when appeals are made to the great ruling power behind the Throne to come to the rescue of the Premier to assist him to control the unruly junior members of the Cabinet, is this not a spectacle for Canada? Is there a hope for the Indian under such a Government as that? Under the regime of a Government whose policy is such as that, have you any hope of elevating the character of the Indian or white man in the North-West? I say it is a standing shame and a disgrace upon the civilization of the country that we have to keep 1,000 men to preserve the peace in this christian country, in this noonday of the nineteenth century. I say it is a reflection upon our civilization. The members of the Government are convinced as I am that it is totally unnecessary to keep on this force and to spend annually this $1,000,000 for its maintenance. I believe, if the votes of the Mounted Police were obliterated, we would not require a force of 100 men in the North-West to-day. I believe that one of the distinctive features for which they are preserved is not for the purpose of controlling the Indians, but for supporting gentlemen who come from the North-West to uphold this Government, whose junior members have to be held as hostages for their good behaviour. I believe this is one of the cardinal reasons why the force is maintained on so large a scale. Let me ask the members of the Government, in all kindness, for I would not say an unkind word to any one of them, why is it in the North-West the ballot is not given as in other parts of the Dominion? Why is it that they have not allowed the ballot as they have to people in all other places? Are they less intelligent? Or is this refusal to give the ballot a standing menace? This force alone is a standing menace. The Mounted Police are kept there as a standing army in time of peace, and they are a weak security in time of war. Speaking about the volunteers and the Indians, I say the policy of the Government is to trust the Indians. Show to the Indian that you are kind to him, that you do not betray his trust, that the moneys which are granted him are not divided among sharks and speculators in the North-West. Show him that you represent the Queen, and are honest and fair in your dealings with the red man, and I believe you will have very little trouble with him. Suspect him as the Minister of the Interior suspects him, doubt him if you will, cast reflections upon his loyalty to the Queen, and you will have continual trouble with him. Take the report and look over it. From one end of the report to the other it shows that the rumours and charges made against the Indians of the North-West are almost without data. They show that where they are charged with stealing cattle and horses, afterwards these cattle and horses said to have been stolen, have been reclaimed. In many other cases in which they have been suspected, the suspicion was found to have been unfounded. I read this in their own report, issued by the Minister of the Interior himself. Yet when we come to ask for a reduction of the police force, we are told that the Indian is not to be trusted, and is to be held as a hostage by the Mounted Police of the Dominion. Now, we are told again by the Minister of the Interior that the Mounted Police are valuable to assist us in preventing smuggling. What is the cause of smuggling? Is it not your high tariff? Did you lower the tariff there would not be such a temptation to smuggle. If the Government will study this question in all its lights, they will find it is the high tariff policy which is at the bottom of all the trouble in the North-West, and it is high time the Government looked closely into this thing. The Government should trust every class of people. In other parts of the Dominion they have conferred a franchise upon the Indians, but in the North-West Territories they keep a Mounted Police force to preserve order among them. I believe that is a libel upon the Indians. I believe that schools and churches and the other means used to reclaim the Indians and make them good citizens, are producing their effect, and if the Government will show the Indians that they are true to them and that the money they grant them is not to be divided among camp followers in the west but to be spent among the Indians, there will be no necessity for this police force. These are matters the Government should look into; and if they do they will not find it necessary to keep this standing army in the North-West. In addition to this standing army, we are spending in the neighbourhood of $2,250,000 for the preservation of order under this policy, which was to cause peace and prosperity to flow like a river throughout the country. It is well the Government should enquire into the best policy with which to govern the country, not from any partisan point but with regard to the effects flowing from the policy which they organized some years ago and which has been continued since. In this country protection is just producing the demoralizing results which have always followed protection. If the Government will take down these barriers, they

will not need this force. If they will trust the Indians they will not require this expenditure. If they have confidence in one another, if they are harmonious and united as a Cabinet should be, they are capable of doing great good to Canada, but if they are going too far in meeting local and provincial demands upon the treasury, the Government of Canada is calculated to do more injury to this country than was done by the Indians in a state of warfare in the North-West Territories. It is necessary to have the Government united, not to have one held up or another held up, one to be doubted and another to be trusted. And then the spectacle of this Government going to the purveyor general to ask for consolation and come to the rescue and harmonize these conflicting statesmen who are eating up the vitals of the people. It is time the people caused the Government to walk out. It is not the Indian that is troubling it; it is power that is troubling, not only the junior but the senior members of the Government. They are willing to sacrifice the people's money to keep placemen in the North-West Territories, if they can possibly retain power thereby. Their policy does not look as if they were duly enlightened or fully alive to their duties to this country. Place and power is what they are bound to maintain if the people's money will enable them to do it.

Mr. McGREGOR. There is a question which has been raised by the Minister of Militia in regard to mobilizing. If the Minister of Militia had delivered that speech two or three or four years ago, it might have been proper, but now the Canadian Pacific Railway is running through a great portion of the North-West Territories as well as through Manitoba. We have 300 miles running from Winnipeg to Souris and in the south-western direction, close to the boundary line, then we have to the north-west 225 miles of the road to Prince Albert, then we have 22 miles running into the interior to Qu'Appelle, then we have 180 miles from Regina towards Prince Albert, then we have a road from the Canadian Pacific Railway at Calgary to Edmonton of 180 miles, and we have a road now projected running south to Fort Macleod, besides the road running to Lethbridge. Now, with these roads running through the middle of our country and forming almost a network, there will be no difficulty whatever to mobilize, as the Minister of Militia said, a large number of military men in a few hours. In fact, if this country required an army quickly, the railway would have to be used to get from one part of the country to the other. This being the case, it would be better for the country to spend half this amount to induce immigrants to go into that portion of the territory to help to settle it and to build it up as they should, and, if that money were spent as it should be, that country would soon grow. It is a great country, it is a home for millions, and all we want is to put the millions there. This country has not been in earnest in reference to the immigrants. If we had been in earnest, we would have had more there than we have to-day. I think the first duty of the Government is to appoint a most vigorous man in the Department of Immigration, to take that and that alone. If that great North-West heritage is to be of the value we think it is to this country, it can only become so by filling it up. Let us reduce a large number of these expenses. Let us commence cutting, and use the money where it should be used with vigour, in filling the country, and that at once. Then you speak of keeping out the liquor traffic. Why, do you know that the Governors of that country have had the privilege of giving permits to a very large number and that the privilege was considerably used at an early day, and is even yet? The North-West Council to-day have the power to give certain licenses, and the liquor traffic is not looked upon as it was some years ago when there was a difficulty in getting the Mounted Police or an army from one end of the country to the other. If we had the settlers there, it would give us another advantage. It costs a good deal for provisions now for the Indians, and sometimes for the new settlers. If we had the settlers there as we should have them, we would be able to supply those articles from the country itself. Instead of importing from the east to the west, the people there would be exporting from the west to the east, because it is a fertile belt which will be heard from in the near future. The flour and feed for horses should not cost half what it did some few years ago. It is not long since we had to pay $1.25 a bushel for oats, $25 a barrel for pork, and $12 to $15 for flour. That was because they had to be carried in carts 800 or 900 miles. Now, they are carried almost to the very door by the railroads of that country. Why should this immense cost be kept up? When we remember the immense amount which has been spent in railroads why should we not take advantage of them? I will not further detain the House, because there will be another opportunity to speak upon this on the Estimates, but I think the Government should commence cutting at once, and should use the amount they save in bringing immigration into that country.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I understood the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to say that he understood the Indians were being fed by the Government as in years gone by and that they were not helping themselves, and he attributed that to the policy we had adopted of feeding them. He is aware that circumstances compelled us to feed those Indians. We commenced that in early days, and we have continued it, but, if the hon. gentleman had watched the expenditures in the last few years, he would have seen that the amount has been materially decreased. Last year the vote was decreased by $100,000. The hon. member who now sits opposite to me stated that, although he saw that decrease in the Estimates, he did not believe we would be able to carry on our work for the money we were asking, but that we would be asking for Supplementary Estimates at this time. I am glad to be able to say that we shall be well within our mark and that we shall have saved $100,000, as I stated then I hoped we would. This year the Estimates will show that we are going to make a further decrease. Then, in regard to the statement that the Indians are not progressing, I would like to read a return showing what the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories have done during the last year. They have now amongst them 5,599 horses, they have 2,018 barns and stables, they have 13,549 acres of land under crop and have broken 2,115 acres additional this last year. All this is done by the labour of the Indians themselves. Last year they raised 44,460 bushels of wheat, 12,401 bushels of oats, 166 bushels of pease, barley,

13,151; other grains, 3,303; potatoes, 72,186; turnips, 8,982; other roots, 676 bushels. They also cut 21,450 tons of hay. The total value of all these products, including their farm implements, is $240,333. The ploughs, harrows, waggons, fanning mills, threshing machines, cows, bulls, oxen, young cattle, horses, sheep and pigs, which I have here in very large numbers, are the personal property of the Indians. I think after that showing hon. gentlemen will agree with me that the Indians are advancing. I am glad to say that this year several of the reserves are off our hands and require no food supply either of meat or flour; I think the time is not far distant when the majority of our reserves will be in the same position, especially those in the northern part of the Territory.

Mr. McGREGOR. Do not these facts go to show that we can almost do away with the Mounted Police force now?

Mr. McMULLEN. After the remarks that have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the promise the Government have made to effect a reduction in the force as soon as possible, I have no objection to the suggestion of my leader, to withdraw the resolution. My reason for putting this notice upon the Paper was that I learned that the Government were asking for additional recruits. I could hardly believe that such was the case until I saw the bill myself, with the recruiting sergeant's name to it, in a window of the Manitoba exhibit, in Toronto. When I saw that I came to the conclusion that there must be something wrong in the Government asking for recruits, when we had the announcement of the Minister of Finance that they intended to reduce the expenditure. After we have heard to-night the declaration of the Government that they intend to continue the reduction as fast as they can consistently with the safety of the North-West, and the prevention of smuggling, I have no objection to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing the names of mail conductors superannuated: their number of years of service: the salary given to each of them during the last year of service: and also the names of those who have had several years added to their period of service.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

Copies of all correspondence between Mr. Philippe Auguste Choquette, member for Montmagny, or any other person, and the Department of Public Works, respecting certain works to be carried out on La Rivière du Sud, near the Intercolonial bridge, in the village of Montmagny.—(Mr. Choquette.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 17th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Buckingham and Lièvre River Railway Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. Curran.)

Mr. DEWDNEY.

Bill (No. 87) respecting the Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Railway Company.—(Mr. Beausoleil.)

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

James Alfred Lowell, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Welland; introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Gibson.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A number of members have enquired about a proposal to adjourn during next week, Tuesday and Thursday being statutory holidays. It is the intention of the Government that the House shall not sit on Tuesday and Thursday. A number of the members have expressed the wish that we should adjourn over Monday, but that being private members' day, it is in the hands of the House, and on that subject we defer to the wish of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has brought up this matter, as the same question was asked of me. I would suggest that it be brought up again to-morrow, and in the meantime we will think it over.

WRITS FOR L'ASSOMPTION AND PONTIAC.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the hon. gentleman if the writs for L'Assomption and Pontiac have been issued yet?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not aware that they have, but I will send and enquire.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not received the report of the judgment of the Supreme Court.

ROYAL COMMISSIONS.

Mr. LANDERKIN. An order was issued for a return of the Royal Commissions granted since Confederation. When will it be brought down? I have enquired several times for it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sorry the hon. member has had to enquire so often, but will ascertain from the Secretary of State as soon as I can. He is not in town, but by Thursday I will try to have the return.

POPULATION OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There was a return ordered last session of the populations in the different electoral districts. That has not yet been brought down. Application was made to me not later than yesterday for this return. I sent to the return office and found it had not been brought down. A number of members are anxious to see it, and it is desirable, when the House makes an order, that it should be complied with.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Do I understand the hon. gentleman's return is of the population of electoral districts?

Mr. LANDERKIN. As to the number of divisions and the population in each electoral division.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have brought that down in other forms. For instance, one of the census bulletins gives the population of each electoral district. Then I brought down a map showing the number of votes in each district, and

the number of votes polled in each district on each side. I think the information is all before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It would be very useful had we that compiled in the same return, and it was for that reason I moved for it. That was the reason no doubt why the House granted it. The information could be easily supplied. It was delayed last session because the census returns were not complete.

CRIMINAL CODE.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal law.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I stated to the House, on the second reading of this Bill, the principles upon which it was drafted, that, while we retained all the parts of our criminal law which are found in the Revised Statutes that seemed to be peculiarily applicable to Canada, we had in all the other portions of the measure followed the labours of the commission in Great Britain which was appointed to establish a criminal code, following particularly the latest revision of their work. The House having referred the matter to a special committee to confer with a committee of the Senate, I have much gratification in stating that the Bill has received very careful and very close consideration from the members of the committee, who have taken a deep interest in its provisions. The amendments made by that committee are not at all numerous, and they are principally of a verbal character, and I hope the House will expedite as far as possible the passage of the Bill.

On section 1,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The committee propose "the Criminal Code" as the short title of the Bill.

On section 2,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to let the Act go into operation on the 1st January next.

Mr. MULOCK. There may be some sections which should come into effect earlier, and I think there should be a qualification that this Act shall come into force on that date, unless otherwise stated.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will let that stand for the present.

On section 3,

Mr. LANGELIER. Sub-section (c) raises a very important question as to whether we may add anything to the jurisdiction of the courts created by the Provincial Legislatures. The Minister of Justice will remember the difficulties which have taken place in reference to the Insolvency Laws, and also in regard to the Controverted Elections Act, in which it was contended that the Parliament of Canada had no right to give any new jurisdiction to a court already in existence. The question was raised in the celebrated case of Valin and Langlois which went before the Privy Council, and the Privy Council decided in favour of the constitutionality of the law, but only on the ground that the law practically created a new court for the enforcement of the laws of the Dominion. I think we might do the same thing here. As the criminal law is within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, I think this Parliament would be able to create new courts for the better administration of that law, but we must enact the law in such a way as not to give added jurisdiction to the courts created by the Provincial Legislatures. I am afraid that, if this section were to be challenged in the courts, the jurisdiction of the courts to deal with these matters would not be sustained. It is a matter which requires close attention, because it would be very absurd to introduce important sections into the new code that are not constitutional, and that might lead to a miscarriage of justice.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When we come to deal with the subsequent enactments with regard to appeal courts, what the hon. member has said will require to be very carefully considered. We must be careful to keep our provisions within the line of criminal procedure, or else take care that we are merely using the courts already established by Provincial Legislatures.

Mr. LANGELIER. These sub-sections passed without any notice, but I called attention to them the other day when we came to the part relating to the jurisdiction of the courts. The two parts must go together. We must see that the one section does not clash with the other. The part concerning the jurisdiction of the courts was left over for future consideration by the committee.

Mr. AMYOT. Which part does the hon. gentleman mean? Because we have examined that very carefully in committee.

Mr. LANGELIER. Concerning jurisdiction.

Mr. AMYOT. We examined that, and we took out the words "appeal side" because they are of no use.

Mr. LANGELIER. My point is, whether we have a right to add to the jurisdiction of the provincial courts.

Mr. AMYOT. Of course not, but we do not add thereto by this clause.

Mr. LANGELIER. But this must be taken in connection with the other which gives jurisdiction to courts, and which defines which court shall have jurisdiction to try the offences mentioned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When we come to this provision later on we will refer back to this clause. I would submit to the committee whether it is necessary for the Chairman to read the whole Bill, or only those clauses to which the committee reported amendments.

Mr. LAURIER. I think we should hear the whole Bill read for the benefit of those members who were not on the committee.

On section 6,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the words:

"Or is deemed by international law to be within the territorial sovereignty of Her Majesty"

makes this very indefinite. We hardly know what that covers. I do not know, and I doubt if many members of this House could state, what international law would decide in reference to this matter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A land-locked bay might be twenty miles wide, but I do not think we

should repudiate our jurisdiction in regard to offences committed in that bay outside of the three-mile limit. The English Government in the time of Charles II gave a charter conveying the fee of Hudson Bay. It was recognized as property of the English by the French, but we have always claimed Hudson Bay to be within our jurisdiction. An offence might be committed in that bay 100 miles from the shore, and yet it would be difficult to say that the person committing that offence came under our jurisdiction unless we incorporate the rights of international law.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The clause is much more comprehensive than that, but I am anxious to see if any member of this committee can understand this provision as to international law. The law gives us jurisdiction within three miles from shore and over a British subject on a British ship anywhere, but the statement of jurisdiction being under international law appears to me to make the enactment very indefinite

Mr. WELDON. The Baie des Chaleurs is wider than six miles at the mouth.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What about the *Franconia* case?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is different.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In using the term: "within the territorial sovereignty of Her Majesty," we have reference to cases which arise beyond the three-mile limit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The doubt that arose in the *Franconia* case is settled by this definition, but international law is not a clearly defined or well understood law. One lawyer will say this case comes within it, and another will say it does not. There is no one who can lay down a definition, and I think you are introducing an element of uncertainty and of doubt by adopting this phrase.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The element of doubt exists now. I agree that in regard to the Hudson Bay it would be sufficient to speak of the territorial jurisdiction of Her Majesty, but we desire to make it clear that we include that portion of the high seas which is also, by international law, within the sovereignty of the Queen. There are doctrines established on the subject of international law which the courts must know and must take judicial cognizance of, and we desire to see that we include the territory over which Her Majesty claims the sovereignty, particularly the bays.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What I claim is that, by using the words "by international law," you are introducing an element of uncertainty, because there is no standard.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think so, because, by the other words of the clause, everything which is already clear is established beyond doubt. For instance, we could not include the waters of the Hudson Bay within the jurisdiction of Canada beyond the three-mile limit by our own enactment, but we do that by these words. We insert those words in order to cover all those waters which come within the territorial sovereignty of the Queen and are so recognized by international law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If you were to introduce the words suggested by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), when a case came up the court would at once enquire, by what right or under what authority this sovereignty is required. How came you to make a claim to sovereignty over these land-locked bays and overcertain waters? And you come back to just what you have put into the Bill, that is, international law. That is your only basis. You have no other foundation whatever for your claim than that which the law of nations gives. Our whole dispute with regard to our Atlantic waters arises under the question as to the extent of our international rights. In England they have held that the Bristol Channel is within the control of England.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Because it was held to be within the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was held to be within the country because the waters that are more than three miles from the shore are, by the law of nations, within the jurisdiction of that country, and that rule has been acquiesced in.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That was not the decision in the case.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The same rule was applied in a suit growing out of the laying of the cable on the coast of Newfoundland. Now, there are other words than these which I think are open to doubt, and which certainly will be made the subject of controversy, I apprehend, with the United Kingdom, namely, with regard to offences committed on board a British ship on the high seas or in a foreign port. I think some years ago the English Government objected to these words being included in the Canadian statute, and the rule is laid down in the case of Lowe *vs.* Routledge, in my opinion, where it was held that the moment you go beyond the limits of the country, the English law seizes you. If a vessel sails from Canada to Liverpool and a murder is committed on board in the midst of the Atlantic, although the vessel was registered at Canada it is not the criminal law of Canada, but it is the criminal law of the United Kingdom that would apply.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the force of the words "and of certain acts of the United Kingdom?" That is where jurisdiction is delegated to us.

Mr. CURRAN. Where the man is arrested.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Supposing that a murder is committed on board a vessel sailing from here to the West Indies, a Canadian registered vessel, that man would be tried under the law of England and not under the law of Canada.

Mr. CURRAN. If he reached Canada and is arrested here, he can be tried here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. All these things are now regulated by the statutes of the United Kingdom, and they are all in the line of this section.

Mr. LISTER. How would you make this section apply to the inland lakes? That would not apply to the great lakes, because the boundary of Canada, as far as they are concerned, is the centre of the lakes. The offence might have been committed twenty miles out.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will withdraw all my objection if the hon. gentleman will show me any rule of the international law to which he can appeal. I do not know where he is going to find it. International law is a vague and uncertain phrase. You find one nation laying down one rule and an-

other nation laying down another rule; on certain points where two nations agree, you can deduce a rule.

Mr. WELDON. Take a case where a land-locked bay is six miles or less wide at the mouth, and widens out to be twenty miles in width as you run up the bay. There is a perfect consensus amongst all international lawyers that that is a territorial bay. If we had not the words of this section we would not be able to deal with an offence committed within ten miles of the land. The law of nations is part of the law of England, and the judges have simply to construe the law of England.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand the United States make certain claims with reference to bays along their coast which are not recognized by other nations. England lays down a rule which is not the same rule as that laid down by the United States. I do not understand that there is any international law defining what bays form part of the territory and what do not. I understand the law to be vague, uncertain and unsettled, and it is for that reason I object to the insertion of these words here.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree to a great extent with what the member for Queen's says. It does not seem to me that by putting in these words we can possibly enlarge the territorial jurisdiction of Canada, but we ought to put in some words in order to make it clear that the criminal law does extend wherever our territorial rights extend. But take these words: "an offence is deemed by international law to be within the territorial sovereignty of Her Majesty." It is not limited to the neighbourhood of Canada. Do we assume here to lay down a law and say that the law of Canada is to govern? These are very wide expressions. Would it not be better if some words were put in to say that it shall apply wherever we have power to make law, wherever the territorial rights of Canada extend? "Or is deemed by international law to be within the territorial sovereignty of Her Majesty." What is the meaning of that? Take the Bristol Channel. Is not that deemed by international law and to be within the territorial sovereignty of Her Majesty? We ought to be careful about assuming to make law over a territory where we have no right to make a law. It appears to me these are the vaguest possible words, and will have much more effect than hon. gentlemen seem to anticipate.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are precisely a statement of the law as it is to-day. So I will run the risk of disallowance. It is a declaration of the criminal law of Canada which is in force by the virtue of the laws of Canada and of certain laws of the United Kingdom. The clause says: "The criminal law of Canada, by virtue of this Act and by certain Acts of the United Kingdom, extends to all offences committed by any person in Canada." It does not extend to the Bristol Channel, because the waters "within the territorial sovereignty of Her Majesty" are those adjacent to the coast of Canada; and the section says: "Or on such part of the sea adjacent to the coast of Canada as is within one marine league from ordinary low water mark, or is deemed by international law to be within the territorial sovereignty of Her Majesty." So we are only legislating in that regard as to offences committed on the seas adjacent to the coasts of Canada, which are by international law within the sovereignty of Her Majesty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the term "territorial sovereignty of Her Majesty" mean the territorial sovereignty of Her Majesty in Canada?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has reference to the seas adjacent to the coasts of Canada which are under the territorial sovereignty of Her Majesty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the meaning of the phrase, "on board any foreign ship, to which the offender does not belong." Is there no limitation as to where the foreign ship shall be?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is exactly in the words of the statute of the United Kingdom.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Suppose a foreign ship was in the port of New York, and an offence was committed by a person not a seaman on board that ship, could it be held that this Act would apply?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. For certain purposes of trial. In so far as this Act makes an enactment on the subject, the foreigner on board that ship to which he does not belong, could be tried here by virtue of the statutes of the United Kingdom.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the criminal legislation in England has conferred this power on Canada?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Supposing a British subject named Smith, on board a foreign ship in Constantinople, committed a murder and afterwards came to Canada, could he be tried here?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, he could be tried here by the United Kingdom statutes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the Minister know that under the Imperial Act the case would be tried according to the law of England, or according to Canadian law?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are given authority to try offences against common law.

Mr. MULOCK. We are by this section declaring that this legislation gives Canada certain jurisdiction. Suppose this declaration of the law is not correct.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Then it does not amount to anything.

Mr. MULOCK. I submit that this Parliament should not declare by an Act what is the meaning of the British Act, for the courts will declare its meaning, but we should add the words: "so far as authorized by Imperial legislation."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We do not profess to declare the meaning of the English Act, and we seek only to legislate within our own jurisdiction. If we should legislate in any respect outside of our jurisdiction by a mistaken view as to what the enactment of the United Kingdom is, it would amount to nothing; but we did not profess to be enacting otherwise than under the authority of the English Act.

Mr. MULOCK. The section states that we have jurisdiction under certain legislation, although it may subsequently turn out, according to the decision of the judges, that we have not such jurisdiction.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 12,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In this clause I think the hon. gentleman is simply embodying the report of the judges in the McNaughton case, and this has been frequently criticised and has not been very closely followed or the law would have been altered. It seems to me a very carefully considered rule of law is that laid down in the Guiteau case, and I think it would be well if that case were examined, and if it is thought proper, that this section should be altered accordingly. That was long a matter of discussion in the American courts and by writers of jurisprudence on insanity. I think that among scientific men the rule laid down by the judges in the report of the McNaughton case has never been accepted. I understand that the delivery by the district judge who tried the Guiteau case was very carefully considered and prepared by the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States. It seems to me that before we undertake to enact this section it would be well for hon. gentlemen of the legal profession to look at the charge in the Guiteau case and at the report of the judges in the McNaughton case, and revise this section. At all events, I would not like to see it embodied in a statute without very careful consideration, because I am strongly of opinion that it is not sound.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We can never expect to arrive at an agreement on scientific principles in legislating on insanity in criminal matters; but I always understood the rule laid down in the McNaughton case to be accepted without question. I will read the conclusion of the English criminal law commissioners on the subject:

"Section 22, which relates to insanity, expresses the existing law. The obscurity which hangs over the subject cannot be altogether dispelled until our existing ignorance as to the nature of the will and the mind, the nature of the organs by which they operate, the manner and degree in which those operations are interfered with by disease, and the nature of the diseases which interfere with them, are greatly diminished. The framing of the definition has caused as much labour and anxiety: and though we cannot deem the definition to be altogether satisfactory, we consider it as satisfactory as the nature of the subject admits of. Much latitude must in any case be left to the tribunal which has to apply the law to the facts in each particular case. The principal substantial difference between section 22 of the draft code and the corresponding section of the Bill is that the latter recognizes as an excuse the existence of an impulse to commit a crime so violent that the offender would not be prevented from doing the act by knowing that the greatest punishment committed by law for the offence would be instantly inflicted, the theory being that it is useless to threaten a person over whom by the supposition threats can exercise no influence. This provision of the Bill assumes that the accused would not be protected by the preceding part of the section, and, therefore, that he was at the time he did the act capable of appreciating its nature and quality, and knew that what he was doing was wrong. The test proposed for distinguishing between such a state of mind and a criminal motive, the offspring of revenge, hatred, or ungoverned passion, appears to us on the whole not to be practically safe, and we are unable to suggest one which would satisfy these requisites and obviate the risk of a jury being misled by considerations of so metaphysical a character. It must be borne in mind that, although insanity is a defence which is applicable to any criminal charge, it is most frequently put forward in trials for murder, and for this offence the law—and we think wisely—awards upon conviction a fixed punishment which the judge has no power to mitigate. In the case of any other offence, if it should appear that the offender was afflicted with some unsoundness of mind, but not to such a degree as to render him irresponsible—in other words, where the criminal element predominates, though mixed in a greater or less degree with the insane element—the judge can apportion the punishment to the degree of criminality, making allowance for the weakened or disordered intellect. But in a case of murder this can only be done by an appeal to the Executive, and we are of opinion that this difficulty cannot be successfully avoided by any definition of insanity which would be both safe and practicable, and that many cases must occur which cannot be satisfactorily dealt with otherwise than by such an appeal."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is this clause taken from the English report?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The words are the same as those of the English Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My objection is to the words: "Unless the delusions caused him to believe in the existence of some state of things, which, if it existed, would justify or excuse his act or omission." That is to assume that the man is perfectly rational with regard to his responsibility, but so irrational that he may altogether mistake the actual state of the facts that exist; and I think that is a rule that English practice has never followed, and that cannot be followed. It is an inhuman rule. You would say: Here is a person who is insane, and the crime he has committed is only justified on the assumption that if what he supposed to be the state of the facts were the state of the facts the act itself would be justified. Now, it is one of the characteristics of insanity that the insane man's rational faculties are so affected that his reasoning is in almost every instance inconsequential. I venture to say that if you go to any insane asylum and ask the physicians in charge what they consider one of the most marked characteristics of insanity, they will tell you that it is the inconsequential character of the insane man's reasoning. In most cases there seems to be little or no connection between the inferences he draws and the facts on which those inferences are professedly based. In the case of Bellingham in his statement of facts nothing like insanity can be discovered; but when he ventures to put forward those facts as the justification for what he does, then you find all the marks which any specialist who has given attention to this will tell you are the common marks of the intellect in an insane person. Now, it seems to me that that rule is an unsound rule. The hon. Minister himself admits that it is a rule which the executive Government of the country is obliged to disregard. Let any one, for instance, turn up the work of Mr. Rae, or the work of any other person who has written on insanity, and he will see that the rule recognized in a large degree in practice is the rule that a man's responsibility is diminished in proportion to the evidence of a diseased condition of the mind. We do not hold a man who is partially insane to the same degree of responsibility that we do a man who is in the possession of all his faculties; but under this rule of law we do hold him to exactly the same degree of responsibility. So your punishment will always be regarded as an unjust punishment by those who carefully consider the subject; and in many cases you will have a jury acquitting a man on a charge when he perhaps ought to be convicted, and when he would be convicted if they were assured that his punishment would be mitigated as the evidence of his insanity was more and more marked. The Home Secretary acts on that rule uniformly; he is obliged to act upon it in order to make the law conform to the present state of public opinion, and it does seem to me that when we are undertaking to frame a carefully considered statute, which is in a great mea-

sure a code upon the subject, we ought to consider this subject very carefully, and make that which is now an act of executive clemency an act of the court. It ought not to be a mere act of executive clemency; it ought to be an act of judicial determination; and this cannot be the case under the provisions of this law as it stands.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think, as far as I have little experience in these matters, that it is possible for us to define the nature of insanity, or the degree of insanity rather, which would entitle a person to immunity, in other words than those mentioned in the first part of the sub-section. A man ought not to be acquitted because of partial insanity unless it was that which caused his act or omission, and that is the rule laid down in civil cases. There is the well-known case of Banks and Goodfellow, which determines the rule regulating testamentary capacity. Plenty of men are capable of making wills who in many matters are insane; but unless the insanity has reference to the testamentary act, the testament may stand. If a man is labouring under specific delusions, which is of course a species of insanity——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is insanity.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; that ought not to entitle him to be acquitted, unless in addition these delusions created a belief on his part in the existence of things which caused him to commit the offence or render him irresponsible for the omission. That seems to be the only practical rule we can have. I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the latter part of sub-section 2. It seems to me it is unnecessary, and, therefore, perhaps more or less misleading:

"Insanity before or after the time when he committed or omitted the act, and insane delusions though only partial, may be evidence that the offender was, at the time when he committed or omitted to do the act, in such a condition of mind as to render him irresponsible for such act or omission."

In proving a case of insanity, that is exactly what you would prove. You would endeavour to establish he was insane. You propose to prove to establish that this man was insane, you prove his insanity as near as you possibly can to the time the offence was committed; but when you undertake to say what shall be evidence in a particular case, you will be met with the difficulty that no other evidence except this which you particularize here can be offered in support of the plea. The only objection I have to this, which is perfectly sound and right in itself, is that it is unnecessary; and if unnecessary it is calculated some time or other to be productive of danger.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Substitute the words "during" in lieu of "before or after."

Mr. LAURIER. The rule is altogether too restrictive, as the hon. gentleman states. Even without the law, applying the principle of common sense, a case coming within the purview of this rule would not amount to a case of murder. There was a case lately in Montreal where a man had killed his own children, and it was proved he did it under the delusion that he was doing right. The man was acquitted. Here is another case which the newspapers of Montreal have brought to light: A young woman, a mother, 22 or 23 years old, drowned her three months' old baby, and the only reason she gave was that she was living on an island and suffered so much from loneliness that she wanted to spare her child the same misery, and, therefore, drowned it. It seems to me that woman should be acquitted from murder, but she would not come under the provision of this section. Her mind was diseased, but she was not labouring under specific delusion. She simply drowned her child to prevent the child suffering as much as she had suffered. Under the circumstances, she clearly was not guilty of murder, but still the case would not come under this section.

Mr. McCARTHY. As an illustration of what I meant with regard to the latter part of the section, supposing you desire to prove, and it is perfectly good evidence, that the parents of the accused are insane, everybody knows that insanity is hereditary, you might be met with the objection that under this latter part of the clause that would not be evidence, since Parliament thought necessary to say what particular evidence may be received.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The case I referred to is the case of a party who believes he is being pursued by another, and that the other wishes to take his life. Labouring under the insane delusion, he takes that party's life. If you show that he was labouring under an insane delusion, and that the delusion was such as would justify him in doing what he did, if the facts were as he supposed them to be, he is protected under this section. But suppose he is labouring under the delusion that he was divinely directed to take another party's life and acted under what he believed to be the direction of heaven, one would suppose, assuming this delusion to be established, that that would be stronger evidence to acquit the accused on the ground of insanity, partial it may be, than the other. But it would be no defence at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. Why not?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are assuming, under this provision, that a man who is so insane as to imagine a state of things wholly contrary to the facts, is, nevertheless, so much in the possession of all his rational faculties as to be capable of drawing a correct conclusion. That is, while his perceptions are all wrong, nevertheless he must be held to have a perfectly sound, rational faculty, and be capable of drawing a proper deduction, and of appreciating the extent of his responsibility. Now, I say that that is contrary to all our notions of proper responsibility and I do not think we ought to embody it in a statute. We ought to carefully reconsider that and should frame the law in accordance with modern conceptions. Certainly the rule laid down by the judges in the McNaughton case, or by the great majority of them, was not so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The extent of the disease in that case might bring him under the first part of the section. If his mind were diseased to such an extent as to render him incapable of appreciating the nature and quality of the act or omission, if he believed he were under divine command and believed that to such an extent as to be incapable of appreciating the nature and quality of the act of the homicide he committed, he would of course be exonerated. He might, however, be labouring under specific delusion in other respects and not be acquitted on the ground of insanity

unless the delusions caused him to believe in the existence of some state of things, which, if it existed, would justify or excuse his act or omission.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the weak point in the provision. You assume that he reasons properly.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think it would be safe to legislate so far as to allow persons to plead their belief that they were authorized by divine power—a delusion so strong as to obscure their perceptions of the nature and quality of their act, or else so strong as to cause them to believe in the existence of some state or things which would, if they existed, justify or excuse the act or omission. The distinction is that the accused person would not be excused if it were a mere question of the impression on his mind as to his right to do a thing. But if he were impressed with a certain state of facts which entirely change in his perception the nature and quality of what he was doing or led him to suppose that a state of facts existed that would justify him in taking that course, then he is excusable, but not if he does it under the mere idea that he has authority for doing it. I should think that in a matter of such great difficulty and importance, it would be very difficult for us to do anything else than to follow the existing law in the mother country which has been examined and criticised lately by such eminent men as those who prepared this enactment, and that, though they were conscious of arriving at an unsatisfactory solution, still it is the best that can be devised. I would prefer that we should follow the English law on this subject instead of going to any foreign country for our law. In line 21 of this section, I propose to drop all from the word "insanity" down to the end of the sub-section.

On section 13,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the reason for altering the common law in that respect as to the responsibility of married women?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The presumption under the common law is in many cases a strained one. In many cases the wife commits an act of violence in spite of her husband, but under the common law it is presumed that she is acting under the compulsion of her husband if she does that in his presence. We now leave that to be a matter of evidence, to be proved in the court, whether she acted under the compulsion of her husband or in spite of her husband.

On section 22,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think that section may vest powers in constables which may be very oppressively used. All over the country we have these constables now necessarily appointed; very many of them are ignorant, and some of them are prejudiced men; and if you give them power to arrest a man without a warrant, and afterwards they may come in and say they heard the man had committed an offence and believed he had, you may vest powers in them which may be frightfully oppressive. If a citizen is hauled from his home in the middle of the night and dragged to a police cell, it is poor justification to have the officer come in afterwards and say, I heard so and so was guilty, and all kinds of similar trash.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the first place, there must be reasonable and proper cause, of the sufficiency of which the judge is to decide. In the next place it only applies to that class of offences for which arrests may be made without a warrant, that is, offences which are now felonies, although in this Bill we are dropping the word "felonies" and we declare that the arrest may be made without a warrant. We mean offences that are punishable by five years imprisonment or more. That is all defined afterwards. So that it is practically applying the existing law as regard felonies.

Mr. LAURIER. The Bill goes very far. It not only gives an officer power to arrest when an offence has been committed, but he may arrest a man who afterwards proves to be not guilty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think that where the officer does not catch the man in the act of committing the offence, he ought to be allowed to arrest without a warrant. I think the evils that would arise from this provision would be very much greater than the advantages.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think unless Parliament is satisfied that the existing law has failed in its execution, we ought not to take this leap in the dark. If it can be shown that offenders have escaped for want of a provision similar to this, then it might be some argument to justify vesting this enormous power in a common constable; but I have not heard a member of the committee state that in any part of Canada offenders have escaped because a constable could not get a warrant to arrest them.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I cannot agree in the view just expressed by my hon. friend from Queen's. I have in my mind a case that occurred in the County of Leeds within the past six months, the case of a very bestial offence committed upon the person of a small boy, and had it not been that the police officers were able to get at once in search of the offender just as soon as they had received information of the offence having been committed, the person would have escaped.

Mr. LAURIER. But here an offence may not be committed at all.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Even so, it will only be in very exceptional cases that injustice would result from the establishment of the law as is proposed by this section, because the police officer may have good and reasonable cause to believe that an offence has been committed. It may be that a lesser crime has been committed than that which would be involved in the larger offence, and he would have just and reasonable cause for believing he should act. Now, as pointed out by the Minister of Justice, whether he has reasonable cause is a question for the judge to decide, and if he has acted hastily without due forethought, then he is liable to punishment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose, if a man came and told another that an offence had been committed by a certain man, that would be sufficient justification for his arrest, even though there might be no foundation whatever for the statement. Much excitement might occur on election day, and a number of parties might be arrested and

held in custody until the election was over. Very serious abuses might grow up in every portion of the Dominion under this section. Under the old common law if a man was found committing a felony, every person who saw him was a police officer for the purpose of arresting him. I do not think any serious evil has grown up from the observance of any law of that kind, but I can see that the present section is open to very great abuse.

Mr. WELDON. I think the section as it stands is the present law as to felony. If the hon. gentleman will peruse the Bill he will find that this section applies to offences of a grave nature. I think there is no real change in the law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The case put by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) can hardly be considered a fair one. It would not be a justification that somebody had told the officer that a felony had been committed. It would be for the judge at the trial to decide whether that constituted reasonable and probable grounds, and whether it was sufficient to induce any reasonable man to believe that an offence had been committed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Supposing it had been committed, and forty or fifty people had been arrested for it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This section is merely to provide for the exoneration of the officer where an offence has not been committed—not for the arrest of the wrong person. It is intended to apply to a class of cases in which an offence has been attempted, but not completed. As for example, the well-known case, which has been decided both ways in England, of a man arrested for picking a pocket, when it turned out there was nothing in the pocket. In that case, without this principle of law—I am not saying whether it is the law now or not—the officer would be a trespasser. Again, an officer, as in the case mentioned by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), has reason to believe from what he hears and sees that a rape has been committed. It may turn out that the offender has only been guilty of an indecent assault, that the offence was not completed. Under this section the officer would be exonerated. Again, an officer going along a highway finds a homicide has been committed and he makes an arrest. It may turn out that the homicide was excusable. In all these cases the officer has acted promptly on information that would satisfy any reasonable man; and he does so at the peril of justification, which he can only obtain when a judge decides that he has had reasonable and probable grounds on which to make the arrest.

On section 25,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What distinction is there between this section and section 22?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This applies only where the offence has been committed; the other section is for cases where the offence has not been completed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We will divide the House on these sections before the Bill comes through, because I think they are monstrous. This section, No. 25, allows any man, whether a police officer or not, to arrest a person.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On reasonable and probable grounds.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is all very well to legislate in this direction, but there is the liberty of the subject which we ought to regard somewhat. There may be some little excuse, but not sufficient for vesting a police officer with this power, but when you give it to every one, in times of excitement such as at elections, it may be used for purposes of oppression to an extent that is perfectly appalling.

On section 26,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This section is in defiance of the common law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is the common law. The man making the arrest believes he found a person committing a felony, and this exempts the person making the arrest from criminal responsibility.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What would be the case on the other side? Suppose, under section 25, anybody who supposes he has reasonable grounds, arrests an innocent person, what would be the result to the innocent party who defended his liberty as a man has a right to do?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He would be justified.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, being innocent, he would be justified in shooting the man.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If this law is passed, we had better repeal the Blake Act and allow people to carry weapons.

On section 28,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think that is a very extraordinary section. Any citizen out of his house after nine o'clock at night may be hauled off to prison.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If it will help to get us home earlier at night there would not be much objection to it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it is your wish that any one found here after nine o'clock at night passing bad legislation should be arrested I will hold up both hands for it.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee on the Bill (No. 7.)

Committee rose and reported progress.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, a certificate of the fact that the appeal in the case of L'Assomption controverted election petition had been discontinued, and that by such discontinuance the judgment of

the judges in the trial in the court below remained unaffected. In conformity with chapter 9, section 46, of the Revised Statutes, I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Kingston Graving Dock—to complete.. $51,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Before this item is passed I think we should have some information as to the progress of the work and as to when the Government expect it will be completed.

Mr. OUIMET. This sum of $51,000 is asked for to make provision towards the completion of the Kingston Graving Dock during the next fiscal year, and to pay for the construction of coal sheds, workshops, electric plant, piling and fencing. The item is to cover the estimated balance or final estimate to M. & N. Connolly, $43,621.54; coal sheds, $1,500; electric plant, $5,500; fencing, $1,000; piling on each side of the dock, $800. These sums amount to a little over the $51,000, but with this we expect to complete the work. As to the question put by the hon. member, I may say that the dock proper is now completed, and vessels were received in it as late as the end of December last, and since the beginning of this season it has been in constant use, and we expect that it will be fully employed in future.

Mr. McMULLEN. What kind of fencing is it intended to put up?

Mr. OUIMET. The grounds surrounding the dock and belonging to the Government are pretty large, and it is intended to put up a substantial fence.

Mr. LISTER. What was the contract price of the work?

Mr. OUIMET. The contract price, according to the specifications extended on the schedule, was $260,000. Later on it was ascertained that the quantities had been underestimated, and the final estimates, showing the amount of work done, according to the prices mentioned in the tenders and in the schedules, amount to $344,268.77. This does not include all that must be paid to the Connollys. In addition, there is the expenditure incurred by the enlargement of the dock by 7 feet, amounting to $23,625.95; and the Connollys are also entitled to receive, according to the final estimates, another sum of $12,727.82, being the cost of hauling and worm gear and putting the same in position, besides divers extra works which had to be done in order to complete the dock, and which we thought would be done more cheaply by the contractors while their plant was there than otherwise. The amount to be paid to the Connollys would then be $379,621.54.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How does that correspond with the original estimate or contract?

Mr. OUIMET. There is $76,000 difference.

Mr. LISTER. More than that.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. OUIMET. That is as regard to the contract proper. I have given the amount they have received on the contract proper, $344,268, from which has to be deducted $260,000.

Mr. GIBSON. According to the statement of the hon. gentleman, the Connollys will be paid $379,621.54. This is $110,941.54 more than we were assured last session, the graving dock would cost.

Mr. OUIMET. I do not know if it is more than it was stated in this House would be paid to the Connollys.

Mr. GIBSON. Last year we were assured by the late Acting Minister of Public Works that the total amount to be paid to the Connollys in addition to the $260,000 they had received on their contract would be about $31,000. The acting chief engineer (Mr. Coste) reckoned that the additional amount required for the increased length of the lock would be $34,000, but, that being submitted to Council, they thought that the amount for rock excavation should be reduced by $1 per yard, so that the amount was brought down to the neighbourhood of $31,000. We were assured by the Minister that the fault which was found by members on this side of the House, and that the statement that we reckoned that the dock would cost $350,000 was without foundation. I made no such statement as that, but I was ridiculed by the member for Assiniboia, as being one of the tenderers, because the firm with which I was connected had tendered $109,000 higher than the firm of Bancrott and Company. I am pleased to say now that the amount of my tender and of fourteen others were all below the amount of the Bancroft contract, and that, instead of our trying to rob the country of $109,000, we were about $10,000 below the amount which is now being paid to the Connollys. At that time, I found fault with the discrepancies which the Minister now has to admit, upon which the tender of the Bancroft Company was based. I have had very little time to look into this, having only had the return since the other night, and the Minister having now given us another statement which is not included in that return, but it is evident that the amount, instead of being, as it appears in the Auditor General's Report, $370,901, was $379,621.54, or $118,000 more than the original contract was made with the Bancroft Company for. We now find that, instead of the Bancroft-Connolly tender being the lowest, there were fourteen others below them, and only five above them, and six of those below them, including the tender of the firm in which I was interested, are more than $10,000 below the sum which is being paid to the Bancroft Company, and some of those people are friends of the Government. So it is not fair to say that we were trying to rob the country. I also found fault last year as to the different quantities on which the Connollys are now being paid, and I would like to quote some of the measurements which have been taken in the counting up and counting down of this contract. The construction of a graving dock is a very simple piece of work. It is a sort of a box, so to speak. There might be some variation as to the rock or the earth excavation, but I find here some wonderful differences in the rock and earth excavation between the amount estimated by the acting chief engineer and the amount which is being paid for:

No.	Description of Work.	Estimated Quantities.	Quantities paid for.	Amount.	Increase.
				$ cts.	$ cts.
1	Earth excavation	14,000 cubic yds.	15,940 cubic yds	3,185 00	338 00
2	Rock "	20,000 "	30,504 " or 50 p.c.	30,504 00	10,504 00
4	Masonry	8,500 "	12,579 " or 50 p.c.	103,777 47	33,652 47
6	Pit wall and culverts—masonry	3,000 cubic ft.	19,226 cubic ft., or 600 p.c	7,734 59	4,334 40
7	Well—masonry	2,000 "	21,840 " or 80 p.c	9,828 20	8,658 00
10-14	Caisson and S & E walls-masonry	2,030 cubic yds.	3,402 cubic yds , or 50 p.c	22,779 00	13,353 00
27-28	Wrought iron	104,000 lbs.	161,772 lbs., or 50 p.c	9,070 64	3,871 04
35	Cast iron	25,000 "	126,100 " or 500 p.c	7,566 03	7,066 03
43	Hemlock		51,058 cubic ft	10,211 60	10,211 60
44	Red pine timber	90,000 cubic ft.	158,127 " or 75 p.c	28,462 86	12,262 86
	Additional due to 7' widening of dock				20,175 25
			Total		$124,426 63

That is what I would call the counting down process which was done when this contract was awarded. Then the counting up process is done in another way. For instance, in the matter of puddle the estimated quantity was 3,500 cubic yards, but they only had to pay for 1,100 in that case. And in screw bolts they must have had the idea of putting the dock together by screws instead of building it with cement. They must have had the idea of screwing all the masonry together with screw bolts, for they estimated 10,000 pounds of screw bolts, while they actually used only 296 pounds. They were very liberal in their estimate of grating, and it seemed as if they intended to make the whole bottom of the dock a perfect sieve, as the estimated quantity allowed on this particular item is 50,000 pounds of grating, while in reality the Government had only to pay for 1,970 pounds, or less than a ton. Then, in pine timber, the estimated quantity was 50,000 cubic feet of 12 x 12, but in reality they only had to pay for 13,615 cubic feet, making altogether $13,706.90 on counting up against the counting down, and we find that by this process of calculation the $109,000 increase is arrived at, now that the dock is completed. This is just one of the matters I found fault with during last session, when we were assured by some members of the Government at that time that the country was losing nothing by giving this contract to Bancroft, even if he was a myth. We find, however, he has been a costly myth, or rather a sad reality as far as the Government is concerned, when settling up the matter of the Kingston graving dock. The Minister of Railways and Canals, then Postmaster General, stated that the cost of the dock, according to the contract with Connolly & Co., or Bancroft & Connolly, was to be $260,000 and the amount of extras $31,000. Thus the total amount those parties would be entitled to was $291,000. If this is all they were entitled to, upon the assurance of the then Postmaster General, now Minister of Railways and Canals, how can the Minister of Public Works account for paying the Connollys $379,621? I will not elaborate on this, as I intend making a few remarks after hearing the explanation of the Minister of Public Works. I know he has not had the department under charge very long, and I do not lay blame on him, but I do say that if the Government had taken the suggestion I gave them last year, to appoint a couple of independent engineers to go up and review the work done on the dock and report the reasons for this increase of expenditure, we would have known how the matter really stood. I am afraid that either there was evident negligence on the part of the engineer who estimated the work at the time it was let, or he was altogether incapable. It is not as if a graving dock were a new experiment in Canada, because this is the third one built by this Government. We have had one built at Quebec, one at British Columbia, and this one in Kingston; and I cannot see, as a practical man, how such errors could be committed by a man who professes to be the engineer above all others in the country. I am at a loss to know how he could have undervalued the work to be done, as he did in this case. I find in every instance the estimate given by the engineer to tenderers has been increased fifty per cent, and in some cases over six hundred per cent. I venture to say that no first-class engineer would allow himself to place before the Minister of his department an estimate based on such uncertain quantities as was done in this case. I am quite familiar with public works, and I know, as a rule, that engineers who value their reputation always provide ample quantities for contingencies of all kinds and everything required in the construction of a great public work of this kind. It does not say very much for whoever has been acting as chief engineer in the Department of Public Works to come down after the dock is completed, and ask for an increased expenditure of $118,891 on the simple construction of the dock alone. There are other estimates. We have not received the final estimates upon the iron work, machinery, pumping houses and other incidental works in connection with the completion of this dock, but I venture to say if the other portions of the work have been conducted in the same way as the building of the masonry in the Kingston graving dock, the graving dock when completed will cost far in excess of the estimate given the House.

Mr. OUIMET. I am very sorry that the hon. gentleman, who is a practical contractor himself, should be so severe on my officers, who, I consider, do not deserve the blame he is throwing upon them, and I think I can explain, to the satisfaction of this committee, that all the complaint he is now making is not founded. As to what was stated last year by the Postmaster General, now Minister of Railways, I could not say; but I think I can explain, to the satisfaction of this House, that neither the country nor the contractors have been deceived or cheated in this work. The figures now given by the hon. gentleman are not reliable, not through any fault of his, but because he has taken them from an authority which does not give the complete figures. I say this, with regard to the quantities estimated before the contract was given, that if these quantities had proved correct, there is no doubt that Bancroft & Connolly would have been

the lowest tenderers, and I am going to show now, even as the quantities have turned out to have been increased on account of the mistakes then made by the chief engineer in figuring them up, that at present, according to the final estimates, the tender of Bancroft & Connolly would still be the lowest. I am going to prove it by this statement which I had very carefully made up on the final estimates upon which the Connollys have been paid.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman says that the information I have given is not correct. Does he mean to say that the statement he has handed to the Auditor General, giving the quantities of each kind and class, the number of articles in the schedules, and the prices there paid, and the extension made therein, is incorrect?

Mr. OUIMET. I do not say they are incorrect, but they are incomplete. The hon. gentleman knows that the report of the Auditor General only goes to the 1st July, 1891; since then the work has been going on.

Mr. GIBSON. With the kindness of the House in granting the order I asked for, I have the final returns added to that by the Auditor General's Report, and if two and two make four, I cannot be very far wrong.

Mr. OUIMET. In many instances, two and two do not make four according to the calculation of the hon. gentleman. The House will remember that these tenders were on schedule prices, so that if the quantities were increased, the proportionate prices paid on them were not changed. The tender of A. C. Bancroft was $260,980.75. The next lowest was the tender of R. Macdonald and J. Aylmer, which figured up at the time to $265,810, but instead of that it ought to be $272,560, on account of a mistake which was made in the extension of 750 cubic yards of masonry at $10 which would make $7,500, while it was only extended by mistake to $750. Curiously enough, and what will surprise the House, no doubt, the only mistake which was made in favour of these tenderers was not made in favour of Brancroft or the Connollys, but it was made in favour of a third party. That was the only mistake made in the extension of the original quantities. The tender of the hon. gentleman, that is of Messrs. Fuller & Gibson, was $369,761. The highest tenderer—I will not mention the others, there are fifteen of them—was that of Ross & McRae for $540,436.97 Now, if these quantities had been applied on schedule prices correctly, and had been just exactly what they turned out to be after the work was completed, each of these tenders would stand as follows:—A. C. Bancroft, $344,397.36; the next lowest would be Macdonald & Aylmer, and they would stand at $353,408.99; the tender of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) would stand at $501,038.97; and the highest, that of Ross & McRae, would stand at $620,662. So the committee will see that if these quantities had been estimated up to the figures at which they turned out after the whole work was done, Bancroft would still be the lowest tenderer, and Macdonald & Aylmer would be the next lowest tenderers, and would be still $7,000 higher, and the hon. gentleman's tender would be about $160,000 above the lowest tender, and the highest tender would be $280,000 over the lowest tender, that is the amount which was actually paid Bancroft and the Connollys. So, Mr. Chairman, I think this committee and the public will be satisfied that no act of injustice was done: that from these figures, and from the fact that the only mistake that was made in the extension, was made in favour of another tenderer than Bancroft and the Connollys, it will be clear to the committee that not only was no injustice done, but it turned out to be a benefit to the country that the tender of Bancroft was accepted. Now, while dealing with the hon. gentleman's statements, I may be allowed to refer to a statement made by him last year during the discussion. That statement was not answered then; unfortunately at the time the air was full of rumours, every one was panic-stricken, and every one believed that the country was being robbed right and left, and especially in connection with the graving dock in Kingston, and I think really that an injustice was then done to the department and to the hon. gentleman who was at the head of it. I think the statement which did the most injury to the department in the eyes of the public was made by the hon. gentleman on the 20th August, 1891, when he said:

"Now, Sir, as will be seen by the letter, Macdonald & Aylmer offered to construct a dam at the cost of $17,000 in place of the crib dam and pile dam combined, for which they ask the sum of $53,000. Now, to take their plan at $53,000, would reduce their estimate to $36,000."

The hon. gentleman was trying to show to the House that after Macdonald & Aylmer had sent in their tender and asked $53,000 for that crib work and pile dam combined, he offered to make that same dam for $17,000, which would reduce the tender by $26,000, and he intended, I suppose he succeeded in showing to the House that practically Macdonald & Aylmer were the lowest tenderers, and that it was by fraud that the contract was given to Bancroft. I hold in my hands the different tenders, and among them the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer. In their tender the amount they ask for plant was not $53,000, but only $26,000, while Bancroft asked $25,000. This will show that a reduction of $26,000 would not have been effected in giving Macdonald & Aylmer the contract. On the contrary, even if it had been made, Bancroft's tender would yet have been $2,579 less than the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer. I hope this statement will convince the committee that the famous process, which was so much talked of last year, of counting up and counting down the quantities, did not take place in this particular case. I trust that by the figures submitted, I have answered the charge that the quantities were not miscalculated for the purpose of giving an undue advantage to Bancroft and the Connollys, that while the figures given were certainly mistaken ones, they were given as the result of an error made in the quantities by the chief engineer, and they actually turned out not to be an injustice to the tenderers, for, if the quantities had been correctly stated, the position of the different tenderers would have been exactly the same as it was at first, and Bancroft would still have been the lowest tenderer.

Mr. GIBSON. The Minister has made an explanation of all the contracts and of the basis on which Bancroft and the Connollys were paid, but he forgot to state to the committee that no consideration was given to Macdonald & Aylmer when they submitted their contract to the department,

because, attached to their contract was a letter, which will be found to immediately precede the one which the Minister has read. It reads as follows :—

"We hereby certify that we have visited the site of the proposed dry dock at Kingston, carefully examined the locality, and have satisfied ourselves as to the nature of materials to be removed, the foundation of coffer dams and probable cost as required by advertisement. Besides the sum placed in our tenders for pile and cribwork dams (in accordance with plans exhibited), we beg to submit you an offer for construction, maintenance and renewal of a puddle clay or earth dam in place of those called for (a section of which we enclose), for the sum of $17,000."

What I complained of last year, and what I complain of now, is that no consideration was given to Aylmer & Macdonald. They were never sent for, but a mythical man, who associated himself with the Connollys and entered into partnership with them—on the same day the Connollys wrote to the Minister that they had joined forces with Bancroft—received the contract. The Minister did not inform the House that on the original tenders there was a tell-tale mark, which doubtless would not come under the eyes of the ordinary individual who examined them. On the tenders of Aylmer & Macdonald and of Macfarlane & Murphy, the totals were run up in pencil, and in no other case were they run up, showing conclusively that come weal come woe it was the intention of the department, I am not prepared to say at whose instigation, to give the contract to the Connollys, knowing very well their liberality in the past and their probable liberality in the future. The Minister has placed the whole blame upon the late engineer, and has said that it was a mistake. I think this mistake is so great that it is hardly possible for an intelligent body of men to believe that an engineer of such fame and name as the late engineer of Public Works could possibly commit such an error, involving $110,000, in connection with a public work of this kind. I claim there was connivance, and I make this statement now, as I made it one year ago, and the parties were successful in arranging that the contract should be awarded to the Connollys, who were not the lowest tenderers. I submit that if Aylmer & Macdonald had received justice at the hands of the department, they would have been declared the lowest tenderers. The Minister forgot that I pointed out a mistake which occurred in Aylmer & Macdonald's tender, for if he reads further on he will find I said as follows :—

"It is only fair to say that in the schedule an error occurs in the extension of 750 cubic yards of masonry at $10, which reads only $750, whereas it should read $7,500, making an addition to their contract of $6,850. If you add that to the $229,810, that would make Macdonald & Aylmer's net contract $236,660. Taking that from the Bancroft offer of $260,680.75, we find that the Macdonald & Aylmer tender was $24,020.75 less than the Bancroft & Connolly tender."

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman seems to make a very great argument in regard to certain figures made in pencil and red ink.

Mr. GIBSON. I never mentioned red ink.

Mr. OUIMET. I hold these tenders and the extensions of them in my hand. On the first page, under letter "H," which means the tender of Macfarlane & Murphy, there are figures in pencil underneath the regular figures, which show there is an error of $2 in the additions. Then it is written above in red ink. The hon. gentleman has stated, if I understand him correctly, that because there were pencil figures below the name of Bancroft, this showed that the intention of the department was to give him the contract, weal or woe. I beg to inform him that figures in pencil are to be found underneath several other tenders. This only shows that after the extensions had been made by my officers, the figures were looked over again, and if mistakes were found they were corrected in pencil and then written above in red ink. Certainly this could not prove to the committee that there was an apparent intention on the part of the department to give the contract to Bancroft at all hazards. It shows how, as I said before, you can impugn the honesty of officers in a department, especially when there is no Minister who has had practical experience to contradict these statements, and to show their inaccuracy to the House. The hon. gentleman makes a great deal of the argument put forward last year, that Bancroft was a mythical person. I think he was, and I believe that Bancroft was a name assumed by another man, but that does not prove premeditated intention to defraud the Government. It only proves that in this particular case this mythical person built the graving dock at about $160,000 less than the hon. gentleman from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) in his tender sought to build it for. It may be a very bad practice to ask for a tender in a false name, but the House cannot condemn the department for it unless they can show that it was known to the department. This person came to the department to sign the contract ; he went by the name of Bancroft and no one could say it was not his name. Surely the hon. member is too honourable to believe or to insinuate that that assumed name was accepted by the department with the knowledge and with the complicity of the officers of the department. So long as he cannot prove that, it is not fair for him to repeat that false statement in order to blind the public.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What false statement ?

Mr. OUIMET. The statement that this man assumed a false name with the knowledge of the officers of the department.

Mr. LISTER. How much does the Government owe this firm ?

Mr. OUIMET. $43,000 odd.

Mr. LISTER. How much has been paid since last session of Parliament ?

Mr. OUIMET. $62,000.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister resents the statement of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) because he says that it throws blame upon his officers. I think that the less the Minister says about the conduct of his officers in connection with this and other contracts, the better. What are the plain facts in this matter ? We find that this individual known as A. C. Bancroft, a workman of Connolly & Co., tendered for the Kingston graving dock, and Connolly & Co. also tendered for the same work. I say that when Bancroft came to sign the contract, and when the department had a letter from Connolly & Co. and also from Bancroft, that they intended entering into the contract with A. C. Bancroft, there were sufficient grounds to have awakened a suspicion of the department. I find that the department in their letter say, that they know that Connolly & Co. are contractors capable of carrying out this work because of their large ex-

perience and of their complete plant. Sir, I think that very little investigation would have satisfied the Government that Bancroft was not a man who was in a position to carry out the contract, and that at once, and the manner in which the Government entered into the contract with these people, raises a suspicion in the mind of any sensible person. It looks as if the Government did not want to know who A. C. Bancroft was, or whether or not he was able to carry out the contract he had tendered for. We find that at that time, according to the investigations of last session, the predecessor of the hon. gentleman in the Department of Public Works was compromised with Thomas McGreevy, and Thomas McGreevy had compromised himself with the Connollys. There is evidence now before the country which shows unmistakably and indisputably that Thomas McGreevy was receiving from the Connollys moneys which were handed over for the purpose of assisting the Government and their supporters in carrying the election of their friends to this House. The whole management of the Department of Public Works for three years has been a disgrace and a scandal upon the Government and the country. It is no use for my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works to stand up here and say: You must not blame my officers, because they are innocent. I say that the evidence has shown that the officers in the department were guilty, or else this contract would never have been entered into. It has been a system of figuring up and figuring down for years, so that favourite contractors should get a contract, as against men who honestly tender. The system was that they would reduce the quantities where the price was large, and they would increase the quantities where the price was low, for the purpose of giving the contracts to favoured tenderers in the department. This was an injustice to the other tenderers. It is all very well for my hon. friend the Minister to say that the country or the contractors have not been deceived. I take it for granted that the Minister, or the chief of his department, when tenders are asked for, are prepared with an estimate as to quantities, and upon this estimate the contractors of this country tender; and the result of this figuring up and down has been to prevent men who honestly tender and who are entitled to the work from getting the contract, which were placed in the hands of favourite contractors and friends of the Government. That is the case in this instance, and that has been the case for very many years. We find that these men tendered at $260,000 to do the work which the Government had to do, and the work which they were to do under the contract; but instead of their being paid $260,000, Bancroft & Connolly have received $344,268, and in addition to all that extras have been allowed them. We find on looking over the contracts given by the Government for public buildings throughout the country, that not one single public building has been built at the contract price. There has been a system, well understood by favoured contractors, of taking contracts at a low price, knowing that what they lost on the contracts would be made up to them by changes in the plans and in extras generally. These people took the contract for this graving dock at $260,000, and the Government paid them $344,268. And what is worse than all: this firm of contractors the Government admit to be indebted to the country to the extent of between $600,000 and $700,000 upon the works in Quebec and British Columbia, and we have the assurance of the Government last session that this money would be withheld until the claims of the country against these men had been satisfied by suit or otherwise. But in the face of the pledge deliberately made to this House and the country, the Minister of Public Works admits that since Parliament was prorogued last session the Government have paid these men $62,000. When was that money paid? A large portion of it was paid on the eve of the Kingston election. Hon. gentlemen can well understand where a large portion of that money went. They can well understand how the hon. Minister was urged to make advances on this contract which he or his colleagues had promised should not be paid until the debt which the Government claimed the Connollys owed to the country on account of the other contracts, had been satisfied, or until the rights of the Government had been determined by the courts. Yet, Sir, on the eve of an election the Minister of Public Works, newly installed in office, had apparently got over the fright which he had received last session; because there is no doubt that he was frightened. As he said here, the Government were in a state of dismay. They were afraid that these scandals would injuriously affect them, and the hon. gentleman, at the time of the Kingston election, probably had recovered from the fright under which he was suffering during the session, and he made up his mind to pay the Connollys at that time $62,000.

Mr. OUIMET. $32,000.

Mr. LISTER. No, $62,000 was the total amount and it was paid before the last Kingston election.

Mr. OUIMET. I do not know the date of the Kingston election.

Mr. LISTER. Now, there is another suspicious circumstance connected with these men. The hon. gentleman knows that the chief engineer of his department had reported to Council that a widening of the entrance to that dry dock to 60 feet would cost nothing extra.

Mr. OUIMET. How can you establish that?

Mr. LISTER. The return brought down to this House established it.

Mr. OUIMET. It has never been established, and the contrary is the truth.

Mr. LISTER. There is the report to the Council which was in the return brought down last session.

Mr. OUIMET. I will show it to you in a short time.

Mr. LISTER. All I can say is that the return contained the letters of the chief engineer and the report of the Minister upon these letters, showing that the chief engineer had reported to his chief that an enlargement of the entrance to 60 feet would not cost anything extra; and within two weeks afterwards another report was made recommending that the size of the entrance be 55 feet, and stating that the extra cost of that would be $35,000. There is no doubt at all as to that, notwithstanding what my hon. friend says, and I believe as a matter of fact that instead of its costing

$35,000, it cost something like $42,000 extra. So that we have these contractors, who are favoured by the Government for some reason, persuading the chief of the department or his chief engineer to send in a second report, the effect of which was to place a large additional sum in their pockets. Then, one naturally asks, why it is that the Government treated these men in the way they did? One wonders why it is that the Government did not keep the promise they made to Parliament last session, and refuse to pay these contractors anything until the matter in dispute between them had been settled by the courts of this country. Sir, the Minister of Justice was most expeditious in bringing his actions against the Connollys; but we do not know that these actions have proceeded with very much expedition, and the common rumour throughout the country is that it is not the intention of the Government to force on these actions to a trial, but that the suits which have been commenced against them will be discontinued. How much truth there is in that rumour, the hon. Minister of Public Works will probably be able to say. Then, we find that it was necessary to enlarge this dock. Surely, if you have skilful engineers in your department, tried and trusted men who know their business, they would have known, before this contract was let at all, what the proper length of the dock ought to be. But we find that that dock is seven feet too short after the contract has been signed and the specifications delivered; and, of course, the Connollys must have the extra work to do at a cost of $22,675; and then they must have the entrance enlarged at a cost of $35,000; and, in addition to that, instead of receiving $260,000, the price of their contract, they are entitled to receive $344,268, or altogether $379,621. The conduct of the department in letting these contracts is an outrage upon the others contractors. It is a complete and perfect farce. If the Government are not prepared to deal honestly by men who tendered for public works, let them say so, and let them give the contract to their friends without going through the empty form of inviting men to tender. I repeat the statement that I made before, and I challenge contradiction, that there has not been one public work in this country for the last ten years on which there has not been allowed large sums to contractors in the shape of extras. I repeat the statement that no public works have been commenced and finished in the way contemplated when the contract was first let, and that this has been to the prejudice and loss of the country and the advantage and profit of the contractor, and to the advantage, perhaps, ultimately of the party. That is the condition of affairs as we all know, and the Minister would have done more credit to himself had he repudiated the management of the Public Works Department before he took charge of it, because he was bound to say that these men had made mistakes to the extent of $100,000. He cannot have forgotten what took place last session; he cannot have forgotten the circumstances that led to his being made Minister of Public Works instead of remaining an ordinary, common member of Parliament. Sir, it was the disclosures of last year that turned out the Minister of Public Works and placed the present incumbent in the position he now occupies, for which the hon. gentleman must be very sorry. I hope that, under present management, the country will not have to complain of a continuance of the system which has existed for so many years in the Public Works Department, although, at the same time, I am bound to say that the hon. gentleman cannot escape the responsibility for this by the reason that the former Minister of Public Works, who was proven guilty, has been removed. The Government, as a whole, are responsible for the action of every member of it, and every successor is just as much responsible to Parliament as the gentleman who occupied the office before him. Such being the position, I feel that, notwithstanding the lame explanation which the Minister of Public Works has given, and which is no explanation at all, the conclusion is undeniable that there is some corrupt work in the letting of these contracts, and that these men were treated as favoured contractors by the Government to the detriment of other contractors, and as my hon. friend from Lincoln has said, to the loss of the country generally.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to read to the Minister a certified copy of a report of a committee of the hon. the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the 3rd July, 1890:

"On a memorandum dated 2nd July, 1890, from the Minister of Public Works submitting that the plans and specifications prepared for the construction of the dry dock at Kingston, Ontario, which is now under contract, provide for an entrance to the dock 48 feet wide.

"The Minister states that attention having being called to the fact that the entrance to the Kingston dock as proposed is not of sufficient width to accommodate all the steamers and propellers plying on Lake Ontario and the River St. Lawrence and which will, hereafter, use this dock for repairs, some of which have a breadth of beam of nearly 55 feet, such as the *Cibola* of the Niagara River line, the Chief Engineer advises that the width of the entrance be increased from 48 to 60 feet.

"The Minister further states this alteration will not entail any modification of the present contract as far as prices are concerned."

Again, we have a further report of the same committee, similarly approved on the 7th of August, 1890, in which it was stated that the chief engineer of Public Works had caused further examination to be made into the matter and now submitted the following additional report about widening the dock:—

"In a former report made after rapid examination of the plans, I stated that the alteration in the width of the entrance would not entail any modification of the present contract as far as prices were concerned, the only change being in the mode of construction of the masonry which would have to be built to suit a caisson 12 feet longer than originally intended.

"I now beg to state that after a more thorough examination of the locality and plans with more information furnished by Mr. W. O. Strong, the engineer in charge at Kingston, I have arrived at the conclusion that it is not necessary to widen the entrance to 60 feet, 55 feet being ample width to permit of all vessels now built or likely to be built on Lake Ontario, to enter the dock.

"The widest Canadian vessel now afloat is the *Cibola* of the Niagara River line, whose beam is 53 feet.

"The detailed examination of the plans shows, however, that this change in width will entail an extra expenditure of about $34,000."

Now, we are told that to increase the width of the dock to 60 feet would cost nothing, but any one who knows anything about masonry knows that if you build a house with only one gable there will be less masonry than in a house with two gables. As a matter of fact, there is less masonry in a 60 feet entrance as against a 55 feet entrance. I submitted last year that the opening diminished the quantity of masonry, as far as the end of the dock is concerned, and the Minister is incorrect

when he says that no report was ever made that a 60 foot opening would not cost more than the smaller entrance. The hon. member for Lambton is quite right when he states that the first recommendation to the House was that the increased opening of the dock would entail no extra expenditure on the country. We were assured last year that, notwithstanding all the accusations hurled against the Government, Bancroft was the lowest contractor, and the country was saving something in the neighbourhood of $109,000 compared with the other contractors. I hold that with the exception of one or two very low contractors, six or seven of the strongest contractors who tendered for this work were in the neighbourhood of $6,000, from the highest to the lowest amongst them, and every one of them strong personal friends of the Government: and I am sure the Minister is doing them an injustice. I find that Capt. Murray, of Murray & Cleveland, whose contract was next to our own, was only some $300 above the Gibson & Fuller contract, and no one will accuse Capt. Murray of wanting to rob the country of $109,000. I remember how the hon. member for Assiniboia stood up to ridicule my criticism, because I happened to be one of the parties who tendered for the work, but it is not from that standpoint I criticise the expenditure, because I need only point out that the tender of Mr. John Ross, who was Master of Construction on the Pacific Railway, and the Minister of Public Works will bear me out in saying that a more competent man and a more excellent contractor could not be found, was nearly double the Bancroft contract. What these men did, and what all honest men should do, was to tender upon the work without any idea of getting extras. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I had the pleasure of doing a piece of work for Mr. Page on the Welland Canal, amounting to nearly $150,000, and our extras were within $3,000 all told, and it was a matter of repairs or we would not have had that amount. The Government quote many English precedents. Why don't they, when contracts are to be let, provide a schedule of the quantities and materials, and let the contractors fill in their own prices and extend their own quantities, and then fix a day for the opening of the tenders, as is done in England and the States, and let the tenders be read out, so that each man will know how he stands in relation to the other contractors. If this was done, I venture to say there would be none of this jobbing or counting up or counting down which is now being done in this country.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). There is no doubt that fair criticism is allowable to every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House when the estimates are under discussion. But an unfair criticism is not just, is not honest, is not manly and is not in keeping with the dignity which those gentlemen should maintain. Now, I am going to point out the unfair and unjust criticisms which have taken place in reference to this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). He who laughs last will laugh longest.

An hon. MEMBER. That will do.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I have not done with you yet. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) says the lengthening of the graving dock at Kingston has cost over $40,000. I will refer him to the papers which are on the Table of the House, and he will find that the widening of the dock cost only $22,695.

Mr. LISTER. You are mistaken. That is the enlargement of the dock.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). You said the enlargement of the dock.

Mr. LISTER. I said the enlargement of the dock had cost $22,975, but the widening of the entrance cost over $40,000.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). No sensible man can divide the cost between the widening of the dock and the widening of the entrance. The widening of the entrance is a part and parcel of the widening of the whole dry dock. As to the extra cost of widening the dry dock, I find that a reference was made to the engineer, and he reported to Council on the 2nd July. It had been stated, and dwelt on very strongly by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, that the widening of this dry dock was not going to cost anything, but would you for one moment suppose that a contract let at schedule prices out of which you took 7 feet extra would not cost anything? Would that be common sense? Why, you would be worse than common boys at school, who would easily understand that contractors who are doing work by the yard would have to be paid extra for the increased quantity. No one knows better than my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Gibson) that no contractors would do that for nothing. What was reported to Council was that there would be no material increase in the prices I will quote from the report of the engineer:

"That alteration will not entail any modification in the present contract as far as prices are concerned, the only change being in the mode of construction of the masonry, which will have to be made to set 12 feet longer than originally intended."

Now, once and for all, let us hear the end of that nonsense as to a work 7 feet longer than was originally intended being done by the contractors for nothing. I do not think there is anything more to answer in the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister). We are all accustomed to hear the exaggerated statements about the corruption of the Government, about the villainy which is being perpetrated from time to time by the hon. gentlemen who sit on the front benches on this side, but we take no stock in that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). You may laugh, but those who laugh last laugh the longest, and only the other day, we had a corroboration of the statement I have made. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) was evidently put up as a practical exponent of matters of this kind. One of my hon. friends says, as an expert, but I cannot agree with him, because I find his statements are so much at variance with those of experts that I would hesitate to call him an expert. I find in the *Hansard* of last session these remarks, reported as having been made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson):

"Now, I submit that Bancroft's tender was not the lowest tender by $24,000."

That report went to the country. No hon. gentle-

man on this side of the House had any opportunity to contradict it because, by a peculiar action of circumstances, the very documents disappeared from the Table of the House and were not replaced until five days before the House adjourned. Looking over the remarks which were made, it struck me as an instance of temerity on the part of the hon. gentleman to make that statement. If the Bancroft tender was $24,000 more than any other tender, then any Minister of Public Works acting at the time, or any Minister acting now, if that remark were true, would undoubtedly bring the blush of shame not only to the face of the Minister himself, but to the faces of the humble followers who sit behind him. But there is no truth in that as I will prove. The Minister has dealt with that question to some extent. I will give the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) this credit, that he did point out that in another tender there was a clerical error of about $6,950. That was in connection with tender "M" which was the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer. Let me say right here that in connection with the increased cost of this work a mistake has been found and the mistake has been attributed to the chief engineer, but the chief engineer disputes that the accusation lies. These quantities were figured out from information furnished to the chief engineer at that time by the engineer in charge of the graving dock at Kingston. The quantities have certainly overrun that estimate, but are you surprised at that fact? The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara stated to the House to-night that you can figure out certain quantities. You can, but I will tell you what the Mackenzie Government figured out during their regime. They let a contract upon the Canadian Pacific Railway for $442,000, and how much do you suppose it cost before they got through figuring out the actual quantities in that work? It cost $750,000. There is no engineer, I care not who he is, who can set down and figure out accurately the quantities in connection with any work that is to be done. Very often quicksand is found, very often upheavals take place, there are a variety of causes why the quantity should differ, But let us come down to the true basis of this contract; let us come down to the tender upon the actual quantities, and let us see whether the statement in *Hansard* on page 4458 by the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara, is a true statement; and did he know at that time that it was true, or that it was untrue? Now, with regard to the contract that you are all familiar with, which is called the Bancroft contract. Here let me say one word in connection with this contract. I have been in the business myself and hon. gentlemen surrounding me have been in the business, and to-day if I was outside this House I feel perfectly satisfied that I can justify to myself the fact that I can put in one, two, three or four tenders for work for this Government, if I choose, I can put in a tender in my own name provided I put up my deposit; I can put in a tender in the name of three or four other individuals if I choose, provided I put up a deposit with these tenders; so I feel that there is nothing wrong in connection with the Bancroft tender, so far as the individual Bancroft was concerned. Now, with regard to the character of this tender, let me draw your attention to a few facts in connection with the discussion that took place last session in this House. The hon. gentleman says that the Bancroft tender was not the lowest tender by $24,000. Now, I will tell you how he proceeds to make this up, and if you agree with him I am perfectly satisfied, but I think before I get through with the subject you will certainly agree with me. He has quoted in the House to-night a letter from Macdonald & Aylmer offering to build a dam for $17,000. Well, I will ask you to bear with me while I turn to the specifications in connection with this work, as asked for by the Government. No. 57 of the specifications says:

"A coffer dam as per plans and paragraph in the specification referring thereto, including its construction, maintenance and removal."

Now, Sir, all contractors tendering for this work were asked by this specification to make an offer for the dam. I find in connection with the Bancroft tender that the sum of $25,000 was placed in the schedule of quantities; I find that in Macdonald & Aylmer's tender the sum of $26,000 was placed in the schedule of quantities. We also find connected with the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer a letter that the hon. gentleman has read to the House to-night, and which it is needless for me further to read. That letter is a practical offer to build a dam according to their own ideas. Now, I maintain that if that letter had been considered by the Department of Public Works, every individual that tendered upon this contract would be entitled to withdraw his tender and tender over again upon the very same dam that Macdonald & Aylmer tendered upon. Well, the hon. gentleman goes on to show that the offer to build this dam at $17,000, would reduce their estimate to $36,000. Now, I give the hon. gentleman this credit that he evidently made a mistake about that, he certainly never did it wilfully, because the sum of $53,000 was never charged by the Department of Public Works against this tender of Macdonald & Aylmer. There is no one sharper than the hon. gentleman himself to perceive that that was not the case, but, nevertheless, in the *Hansard* the statement is made that if from $53,000 you take the two amounts $27,000 and $26,000, such as they tendered for two dams according to the specifications, you get the sum of $36,000. Now, that was not a fair criticism of the facts; the record does not bear out his statement; the record actually refutes his statement, and says most positively, that that was an unfair and an unjust criticism of this work. Let me make myself plain. The hon. gentleman pretends to say that the two amounts which appear here in the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer, one of $26,000 and the other of $27,000, were charged up in the sum total going to make up the bulk of their tender. As a matter of fact that did not occur. The sum of $26,000 only was charged up in the schedule of the quantities going to make up the bulk sum of their tender. Therefore, I say, that when you take the sum of $17,000, such as was stated by my hon. friend, from the $36,000, you do not at all have $36,000 left. You would have if you were figuring an ordinary sum, but such was not the case. In other words, Macdonald & Aylmer's tender, which was the next tender to Bancroft, instead of being $53,000 charged up to make the bulk sum, as a matter of fact, it was only $26,000. Now, let me show you how the matter stands. In the first place, Macdonald & Aylmer's bulk sum tender was $265,810, and the hon. gentleman has been fair enough to admit that there was a mistake

made in extending the schedule quantity of this tender, a mistake to the extent of $6,970; because 750 yards of rock at $10 was only extended at $1 a yard. That made $272,760, that was tender *m* of the schedule of Macdonald & Aylmer's tender. Now, let us see what the other tender was. The other tender was $260,680, call it what you will, Bancroft's or Connolly. You may say that my ideas of morality in contracting are rather vague, but, nevertheless, I maintain that were I in Bancroft or Connolly's place, I would not be one whit ashamed of putting in tenders in the name of Bancroft or any other man, if I wanted to get the contract. Suppose for one moment the hon. gentleman did tell the truth, and in opening my remarks I said we were never afraid of a fair discussion of the subject, suppose Macdonald & Aylmer were entitled to consideration to the extent of $36,000, or $17,000 were taken off their tender, we would find that from $272,760, the amount of their tender, the difference between their letter and their quantity tender on the specification would amount to $9,000, which would make their tender $263,760, or, in other words, they would even then exceed by $3,079 Bancroft's tender. Yet we find the statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite and published in *Hansard* and circulated throughout the length and breadth of the country, that Bancroft's tender was not the lowest by $24,900. Is that fair, honest and just criticism by hon. gentlemen opposite? I do not think it is. It is most unfair and most unjust criticism; but it is only in keeping with the statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite that within one month the Government would be tottering to its fall. It is tottering, but it is tottering to prosperity as the bye-elections have shown; it is tottering in a way which hon. gentlemen opposite do not like.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is a small totter.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). It is so small we did not perceive it, but unfortunately the little colony opposite, who are continually aggrieved and are constantly attacking hon. gentlemen on this side, perceive it, and until these questions are debated in a fair, honest and liberal spirit, you cannot expect anything else. A statement such as I have mentioned going out to the country carries on its own face its falsity. You cannot expect intelligent people to believe such a story. I trust I have made myself intelligible to the committee. If not, I will go on and endeavour, so far as I am able, to explain the arguments I have endeavoured to bring before the House, and, if I have not made myself plain and intelligible, that was my fault.

Mr. GIBSON. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has said he will be prepared to explain his position in a more intelligible manner, if hon. members do not already understand his remarks. He has shown that he knows nothing about building dry docks. He may have been a railway contractor, but as regards building docks and canals he does not know anything about the work. He has spoken about quicksands and extra quantities required.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I have spoken about the subject under discussion.

Mr. GIBSON. That is exactly what I am doing, speaking to the subject under discussion. In regard to excavation for Kingston Graving Dock, the work was simply that of digging a trench, because the quantities of earth excavation were only increased by some 1,500 yards, whereas the rock excavation was increased by 10,000 yards. There certainly should not have been a great deal of room for much extra work at Kingston, and in order to draw a herring across the track, the hon. gentleman spoke of an enormous expenditure made on public works in the North-West by the Mackenzie Government. There is no comparison to be made between the work on graving docks and railway works, for it is well known that in the latter the ground is very uncertain and the contractor may meet with quagmires, which it is almost impossible to fill; but, even then, it is very unusual to find the estimate of the engineer so sadly at variance with the facts as they were in connection with the Kingston Graving Dock. I will tell the hon. gentleman for his special benefit, that no engineer would consider himself an authority if he submitted, either to a company or to the Government, estimates for work that would not cover all contingencies that might arise. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) has stated that he is at variance with the Minister of Public Works, and that the Minister is wrong in laying the blame at the door of the chief engineer. The hon. gentleman says the error was made by the resident engineer in Kingston. That is adding insult to injury, because the resident engineer in Kingston is, I believe, the gentleman who reported the necessity of widening the dock. No Government is justified in having officers in their employ to revise their recommendations in regard to public works costing $500,000, and who did not know when the construction of the dock was entered upon that they were not providing ample accommodation for the vessels plying on our inland waters. They went to work haphazard, and built the dock according to the plans and specification drawn up, which proved wholly inadequate to the requirements of the country. But after the work had been let, and after it had been commenced according to the plans and quantities on which the contract was based, a recommendation was made to the Government that the entrance to the dock was too small and that it must be enlarged in order to provide the necessary accommodation. It is thus obvious that the Government acted wrongly in not looking into the requirements of our merchant marine in order to provide ample accommodation for vessels in the dock as at first designed, and thus have left no opening for increased expenditure. No one except the Minister has ventured to say that this was simply an error on the part of the chief engineer in giving wrong quantities. All I can say is that it is the most outrageous discrepancy I ever heard of. The idea of a man being 600 per cent out in his quantities, and taking the whole contract, the additional cost on masonry alone was 45 per cent, $379,000, or $119,000 more than the estimate of the engineer. Then the hon. gentleman spoke about the dam, and said that if Macdonald & Aylmer's communication had been accepted and the suggestion adopted, it would have left room for all the contractors to have amended their tenders. But we find the Government were not at all disposed to listen to any arrangement proposed by any one except Bancroft and the Connollys. Moreover, the hon. gentleman will find, if he turns up the specifications, that the Government were not

responsible for the construction of the dam. They left the construction of the dam to the contractors, and although the Government prepared plans for a dam, they declared they would not hold themselves responsible for the construction and maintenance of such dam. I hold that if any consideration had been given to the Macdonald-Aylmer tender, I am quite sure they would have been awarded the contract because they were the lowest. I may have been mistaken in adding both the dams together, and I am not in a position, for want of necessary information, to dispute the figures given by the Minister of Public Works to-night, because I would have to take the twenty separate tenders and extend them upon the same basis as his officers have done, in order to arrive at the calculation. With reference to the paper which the hon. gentleman speaks of as having been stolen or mislaid, I can tell him it was my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) who had it. I dare say he was looking for Bancroft, and failing to find him on this side of the House he has gone back to the people of his first love in the hopes of finding him there. That gentleman was in possession of all the papers, and no one else had charge of them, because the return was made in his name. I fortunately happened to take a copy of the list of tenders last year, and I asked for a copy of the return this year, and sent it back to the Minister to-day. Probably if the Minister will lend me all the papers he has in his possession I will be able to figure them out myself. I have given the figures as detailed in the papers which have been placed in my hands, and I have no doubt that the Minister of Public Works will give me credit for not having any intention of deceiving the House. No man could possibly stand in his place in the House and discuss 50 or 60 items in each of 20 tenders, and say intelligently that one tender was lower or higher than the other, without having all the papers before him, which I have not had the opportunity of having. There is, however, one item about which there can be no dispute, and to which I call the attention of the House. Whereas the Bancroft-Connolly tender for masonry was only $8.50 a yard, the Government assumed that there was only 8,500 yards of masonry and the Macdonald-Aylmer tender, if I remember, was $10 a yard. This was one of the processes of figuring up and figuring down. Let the figures be what they may, the country has paid to-day $379,621 for the Kingston Graving Dock, which we were assured at the time when the Bancroft & Connolly contract was awarded would only cost the country something over $260,000 together with the additional $31,000 for the increased opening. The Minister was not aware that the dock was widened, as I was informed by the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), 7 feet throughout its entire length, and if he will turn up the Auditor General's Report, page C-119, he will find that the additional items due to the 7 feet widening are kept separate and distinct from the other portions of the work; so that the additional earth and rock excavation, and so on, together with the dam, was $20,175.23. No matter under what circumstances the Government may excuse themselves, there is this to be said about the subject: that we realize the fact that notwithstanding all that was said from the Government side of the House, and the assurances given last year that this contract would not exceed $300,000, yet Bancroft & Connolly alone have been paid $379,621.54, and the other works have to be paid for after that.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). When the hon. gentleman rose I supposed it was to apologize to the House for the misrepresentation made last session, but I found that his purpose was to state to this committee that he had not sufficiently gone over the papers to be prepared to speak intelligently upon the subject. Let me draw the attention of the committee to this fact: There is the file that was brought down to this House on the 4th May last year, and there is the file that was in keeping of the hon. gentleman until the 25th of September. That same file was taken out of the records office by the hon. gentleman some two or three weeks ago, and it was only to-night I was able to get it from the record office.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You have not seen it long enough to speak intelligently on it.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I am speaking so intelligently, my friend, that you cannot answer me. If he has not had it sufficiently long to speak intelligently about it, then why is he taking up the valuable time of this House in debating a question of which he knows nothing?

Mr. GIBSON. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me for a moment I would like to correct him. I think he is trying to misrepresent what I said to the House. What I said was this; and the Minister can tell whether I am correct in so stating or not. I said that the final return which the member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell), apparently does not know anything about, came down to me on Friday. I had to go home on Friday night and I returned to-day, and what I stated was that I was not prepared to discuss intelligently the whole twenty tenders, and neither was I in a position, for want of the total quantities, to say that the extension was made on all the other tenders according to the quantities now paid for. It would be a moral impossibility for myself or any man in the House to extend the total tenders without time and study as they are reported by the Minister of Public Works to-night. It would be impossible for any man to do so, because there are some fifty items in each of the twenty tenders, and it would be a work of several days to show just exactly, as to the quantities now paid for, what was the relative position of each tender as reported on by the Minister of Public Works to-night. That is what I said.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). If the hon. gentleman's abilities to extend the quantities in that paper are as bad as his ability to extend the quantities such as I hold in my hand here, and as appeared in *Hansard* last session, I do not wonder that he is not able to speak intelligently upon this question.

An hon. MEMBER. What do you say?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I say that if your ability is not any better to understand quantities, than you did last session, when you placed upon *Hansard* the statement I have read to this committee to-night, I do not wonder you cannot speak intelligently upon the subject. Whether you choose to acknowledge it or whether you choose to remain quietly passive, and sit down under the lash and say nothing, I say that the statements that went forth through *Hansard* to the public during last session, were statements that

were not borne out by the record, and statements that should not be made by any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Give it in French.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I will give it to you in English. It is good enough for you, and a good deal better than you deserve.

An hon. MEMBER. Order. Address the Chair.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I can speak longer than you can shout "order." With regard to the Macdonald & Aylmer tender, and their letter put in with it, I leave it to any man who has been engaged in public works, I care not whether he may be getting extras out of the Grand Trunk Railway Company for tunnels or engaged in railway works in the North-West or building graving docks for the Government or making contracts with private individuals or corporations, whether the letter which accompanied the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer was entitled to any consideration from an institution that was letting a contract. That letter was entitled to no consideration whatever; and I repeat what I said before, and my hon. friend knows it well, only he will not admit it, that had he been in the place of the people competing with Macdonald & Aylmer, and had that letter formed a portion of the papers that went to secure the contract, he would have been the first to object and to say that the specifications did not ask for any letters, but simply for a tender for building the coffer dams. He knows perfectly well that they put in two prices, the lowest of which has been figured out in the schedules that appear in this paper; and according to these papers the Bancroft tender was undoubtedly the lowest, notwithstanding the statements made in *Hansard* during the last session of Parliament.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the hon. gentleman explain how it came about that in consequence of the letter which was sent with Bancroft's tender, stating that he had associated himself with the Connollys, the Bancroft tender got the contract?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). The hon. gentleman is only hedging. Let him come down to the straight issue. Here is the statement the hon. gentleman makes, that the Macdonald & Aylmer tender is $24,000 lower than any other. I think I have shown to this committee to-night that the Macdonald & Aylmer tender was not as a matter of fact $24,000 lower, but that by a curious transposition of figures it was represented to be so last session, when, as a matter of fact, if we give it credit for $17,000 for the coffer dam, the Macdonald & Aylmer tender was $3,000 higher.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, the Government must have mixed up their original figures, something like the man who last session said in regard to myself and other members that we were indulging in tangle-leg. I think there has been a good deal of tangle-leg in what he has been saying to-night. I say that no officer is justified in presenting to the Minister such ridiculous statements as I find here, on which the contract was let. It was by counting up and counting down that they succeeded in changing the aspect of the work so much that we now find that they have received $118,000 more than the original amount.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). As the hon. member has referred to a remark that was made by myself during the last session of Parliament with regard to tangle-leg, though he did not add the benzine part of it. I may say that my information on that occasion was of the very best. It was the greatest prohibitionist in this House who informed me of the circumstance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). The gentleman is out of the House now, and I will not give his name. But with regard to tangling figures, does the hon. gentleman admit that he was caught in his own trap? Does he deny the correctness of my statement with regard to the analysis of these figures, or does he not? Or is it necessary for me to make any plainer to this committee the statement made by the hon. gentleman last session? I could not say it after the debate closed last session, but fortunately I can say it now. Does it turn out that he is caught in his own trap, or shall I be obliged to ask him to apologize to this House for making a wilful misrepresentation? If he is a practical man, it must be so; but if he is ignorant, he may have done it ignorantly, and he may crawl through the hole if he chooses; but if he made it wilfully, I must certainly ask him to apologize to this House for misrepresenting the facts and figures such as they appear in *Hansard* of last session.

Mr. GIBSON. If I want a father confessor, I do not think I will apply to the hon. member for Algoma.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Then the hon. gentleman refuses to answer, and we can only conclude that he is guilty of a breach of etiquette in apologizing to the House.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for Algoma has evidently been loading up for this discussion for a week or two past, and he has been to-night discharging the duty which the Minister of Public Works should have discharged. If we are to take his own explanation, he knows infinitely more about this work than the Minister of Public Works ever did or ever will. He has been also loading up the officers of the department, and has no doubt had control of all the figures of the department.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Not at all.

Mr. LISTER. And he has succeeded to-night in the most admirable way in confusing this whole subject by getting away altogether from the question really at issue. He starts, as gentlemen usually do who want to draw a herring across the path, with charging me with making most exaggerated statements and indulging in unfair criticisms, not in conformity with the dignity, and so on, and so on, of this House. I would ask the hon. gentleman if it is at all possible to exaggerate the actual facts connected with the management and administration of the Public Works Department of this country. Does not the hon. gentleman know that it was proved last session that the Connolly Brothers, whom he so eloquently defends, and in statements about whom he says he will not take any stock, have been proceeded against by the Government for $600,000 odd?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Has that any connection with the Kingston dry dock?

Mr. LISTER. Undoubtedly it is connected with the Kingston dry dock. These are the same men.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). They are not the same men.

Mr. LISTER. They are, because Bancroft was a myth. The real men at the back of the contract were Connolly Brothers and what we are contending for here to-night, and what we have always contended for, is that the awarding of contracts by the Government should be done in a fair way, fair to the contractors and honest to the country. The hon. gentleman cannot be ignorant of the fact that at this moment an action is pending against the Connolly Brothers for the recovery of $600,000 which the Government say was taken illegally by them from the treasury of this country, through Mr. McGreevy. That action is now pending. Is not the hon. gentleman aware that Mr. McGreevy was a member of this House, that he was the bosom friend of the then Minister of Public Works, and that his brother was interested in that contract and drew out of it $170,000 of profit, although he never put a fraction into the undertaking? Does he not know that Mr. McGreevy admitted a large portion of the money went into the fund for the purpose of sending supporters here to the Government? Is it not shown by the ex-Minister of Public Works that the money which the Government paid to the Connollys was paid by the Connollys to Mr. McGreevy and used to corrupt the electorate of this country? And is it not on record that twenty-four hon. gentlemen hold their seats to-day, or did during last session, on the strength of this?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. LISTER. That twenty-four hon. gentlemen hold their seats through the influence of money which was given to Mr. McGreevy by the Connolly Brothers. The Connolly Brothers were the friends of Mr. McGreevy. Mr. McGreevy was the friend of Sir Hector Langevin, and Sir Hector Langevin was Minister of the Crown; and for the purpose of sustaining his influence, and giving him a preponderance in the council of the Government, he felt it was necessary he should have a strong support in the county. And we find that battle raged between him and the present Minister of Customs. We find that there was a quarrel between the present Minister of Customs and Sir Hector Langevin and the present Postmaster General, the Minister of Customs being held as a hostage for his good behaviour as a junior member of the cabinet. Does he not know that this money was used by a Minister of the Crown, for Sir Hector Langevin could not have supposed that money grew out of the ground? He knew it came from some source, and the evidence is pretty strong that he had a good idea of the source from which it came. That being the case, is it at all to be wondered at that the contract at Kingston was carried out in the same way as the other contracts had been. My hon. friend pointed out to-night that in certain items, where they could be figured down, there were enormous quantities placed on other items; on the other hand there were small items placed for the manifest purpose of making Connolly Brothers or Bancroft, the lowest tenderer, and giving them the contract. It may be said that the Minister of Public Works is not responsible for that. I admit in a moral sense he is not, but I say that as a member of the Government he must in a parliamentary sense be held responsible for the conduct of his predecessor, and it is a proper subject for comment. We would not be discharging our duty if we did not lay bare those facts and see what the probabilities are. They are that the same condition of affairs which existed in Quebec and which existed in British Columbia exist in the city of Kingston, that the same circumstances which cause a contract to be let to these men at these other places had equal influence in Kingston, because, so far as Kingston in concerned, there is the broad fact standing out that other tenders, if there had been a fair mode of contracting, were lower. What is the plain fact? $260,000 was the contract price of Connolly Brothers. They have received or are going to receive $344,276, besides $35,000 which the Minister speaks of granting, making $379,000 in all upon a contract of $260,000. The correspondence and the returns show that wherever these men could be favoured, they were favoured by the engineer. We have another point which my hon. friend has not touched, that is that the Government promised last session that no money should be paid the Connolly Brothers until the matter in dispute between the Government and them were closed up. How is it that despite this promise the Government have paid to these men something like $62,000 during the past year since Parliament last prorogued? I have stated to the Minister of Public Works that my information was that $32,000 of that money or, a very considerable portion of the $62,000, had been paid a few days before the Kingston election. I have told him to-day that it is rumoured throughout the country that the charges against the Minister of Railways and Canals are not to be brought. I ask if that is the case or not. I ask if this action brought by the Government is a mere sham or an honest action brought to recover money the Government honestly believed these men owe them? The evidence in the committee last year and the report of that committee showed conclusively that these men are indebted to the Government to the extent of $600,000. It is a shame that any money should be paid to the contractors until the claim the Government says it has against them is settled. We find these gentlemen, having got this money just before the election, took a very active part in support of the Government. Of course they were animated by purely patriotic motives, believing entirely that this was such a good, righteous and honest Government that for their country's sake they should stand up in defence of that Government.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). The hon. member for Lambton accused me of drawing a red herring across the track to take the scent off the subject-matter under discussion. I need not appeal to the committee whether I was specific or not, whether I gave the figures and asked a contradiction of those figures, and that contradiction I yet wait for. It is the hon. gentleman himself who is drawing the red herring across the track, because he does not want the subject discussed intelligently and honestly. He wants to dive off into imaginary scenes like Jules Verne, to dive away into probabilities. Because so and so occurred at one time, is it not probable these other things should happen. Now, I have not heard of the subjects the hon. gentleman mentioned here except by hearsay, but when I read the daily *Globe*, when I read the speeches of the hon. gentleman and his friends, then I read of

the imaginary things that are bound to happen. Now, the hon. gentleman repeats knowingly, and I say with malice prepense, the very statement made by the member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Gibson), and he says that, had the Government given the contract to the lowest tenderer, it would not have gone to Bancroft. I ask him or any other hon. gentleman on that side of the House who is not a visionary, who is not a man who knows nothing in regard to these works, who is not one who could not figure out these quantities, but any fair, candid criticiser to get into these figures and refute my statement that the contract was given to the lowest tenderer, and that was the Bancroft Company, notwithstanding that the hon. member for Lincoln, in his usual blustering, bullying manner gets up and says that, if this was let to the lowest tenderer a large amount of money would have been saved to the country. Here are the papers, which only came into my hands about two hours ago. Let any hon. gentleman get up and repeat the statement of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) which was made last session—and I was willing then charitably to attribute it to ignorance—but now I assert that it must be made with malice prepense, and I say, and I will stake my reputation upon it, that any one who chooses to figure out the quantities will see that this was let to the lowest tenderer, and not, as has been stated here, to a tenderer higher than the lowest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the Minister had better give my hon. friend some information in regard to this subject. My recollection is that a distinct declaration was made last session as to the action which the Government would take in reference to the Connollys, and that that declaration was afterwards distinctly violated, because the moneys were afterwards paid on the Kingston dry dock.

Mr. OUIMET. I do not recollect that the statement was made, but at all events that was acted upon. After the session there was an estimate that the balance due to the Connollys was $64,000. They were then informed that no more money would be paid to them. After receiving that information, they naturally answered that, according to their contract, they were entitled to receive money as the estimates came down, that the work had been done, that they wanted money to complete the work, and that, unless the money was paid to them, they would give up the work and sue the Government for the amount due and also for the damages resulting from the failure of the Government to pay them according to the condition of their contract. The then Acting Minister of Public Works, the Hon. Frank Smith, had also to consider the fact that, if the Connollys were to abandon the work, the completion of the dock would be delayed for a long time, that new tenders would have to be called for, and new plant procured, and this committee knows that the quantity of plant required to carry out such works as these would certainly amount to a value of over $100,000. During that time, vessels were waiting to get into the dock to be repaired.

Mr. LISTER. There has only been one vessel in the year.

Mr. OUIMET. Last year, no doubt, but since the spring the dock has been used continuously. The then Acting Minister—I do not speak from

personal knowledge, but I hope the hon. gentleman will accept my statement as being true—agreed with the Connollys that, if they were to complete the dock, he would see that they would be paid for all the work that would be done from the date of the last estimates. On that agreement the Connollys went to work and completed the dock. The $32,000 was paid according to that agreement, which I think will be accepted by this committee as being an agreement based on sound business principles. I think there is not one hon. member here who will say that this agreement can be blamed on any business principle. After this was done, there was a large amount due to the Connollys, that is, $73,000. The Connollys applied to the Government for that balance, and besides that there was $20,000 still in the hands of the department on deposit belonging to them. The action taken against the Connollys does not in any way refer to the work on the graving dock.

Mr. LISTER. You were to pay them no money.

Mr. OUIMET. There was no such arrangement. The Government thought that should be the course adopted. But, when they applied *de novo* for a further amount, it was agreed that the further amount of $30,000 would be paid, on the Connollys giving good security that they would pay the Government every dollar for which they might be condemned in the action now pending against them. To carry out that agreement, the Connollys have made a sale to the Government of all their plant, their dredges, and all the plant they had at Kingston to carry out these works, which is valued at $96,000, as a security that the Government shall be paid every dollar that they may be entitled to get. The security is over the amount the Government had in their hands, that is, $43,000 and $30,000, or a total of $73,000. They have transferred all that to the department, and under that arrangement, the Government decided to give them the further amount of $30,000. These are the circumstances correctly stated, and I think they are of such a character as to satisfy the committee that nothing has been done that could not be approved of by thorough business men. It happened that I entered the department on the very day when the cheque for the $32,000 was given.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The cheque went out before you came in?

Mr. OUIMET. No, but I came in on that day. I do not want to shirk responsibility for anything done in the department. I do not think I would do credit to myself by trying to shirk any responsibility that the department has taken, and which, as a member of the Government, though not then as the Minister of Public Works, I have myself approved of. The hon. gentleman says it was on the eve of the election in Kingston. I think he is right. But the question is not as to whether that money was paid on the eve of this particular election, it is as to whether the Government was bound by the agreement of the Acting Minister to pay that amount. Now, if it was fair and equitable for the Government to pay that amount at all, according to the agreement entered into between the Connollys and the Acting Minister, the Government would have been very much to blame if they had not paid it. Of course if the Government had done something wrong, it might have injured the pros-

pects of our candidate in Kingston and helped our opponents; but surely the least the Government can do is not to do any wrong that will injure the prospects of our candidates in our own country.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is very much to be regretted that the looseness and extravagance which have been shown to exist in connection with the letting and carrying on to completion of contracts for public works, should have had any existence. It is quite clear that the whole history of this job goes to show that the Government intended at first that the Connollys should be the contractors. Now, I do not for a moment pretend to say that the Connollys were at all dishonest in the matter; I do not think so. I have not the slightest doubt that when the Connollys first became contractors under this Government, they were honourable and upright men, and I dare say they would have remained so had hon. gentlemen opposite used them in an honourable and upright manner. But I think the evidence given before a committee of this House clearly shows that the Department of Public Works is responsible for any dishonesty, if dishonesty exists. We had last year an exhibition that is very much to be regretted in the interests of this young country. We saw a man occupying the position of Minister of Public Works deposed from that position. He has been virtually characterized as a scapegoat for hon. gentlemen opposite. He now sits upon this side of the House and gazes wistfully across to the man who is now permitted to wear his cloak, and probably will be permitted to feed on the flesh pots of Canada and eat to the full for the next few years, in the place of the hon. gentleman that has been consigned to this side of the House and deprived of the privilege that he enjoyed for the past ten years in his own interest and that of his followers. I do not think from my own observation and knowledge that the mantle of the Minister of Public Works could have fallen upon better shoulders. I have not the slightest doubt but that that hon. gentleman will come up to the full expectations of those with whom he is associated, and I dare say that in ten or fifteen years from now, when further revelations come to be made, we may possibly find something in connection with the Department of Public Works in accordance with what has been exposed in that department during the last year. Now, I think it is time that this condition of things should be put a stop to. If hon. gentlemen opposite cannot find men that are more efficient and better able to make a careful estimate of the probable cost of public works, so as to give the people of this country a better service than the engineers of the Public Works Department have rendered them, I think it is not very creditable to this country. We have had the evidence produced to-night by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) that we have paid 45 per cent more for this public work than the original cost at which it was estimated by the Government engineers. Take the Napanee post office, for instance. That job was let for $26,000, and it cost $54,000 before it was completed. When is that going to stop? I suppose we shall have some little experience with the new Minister of Public Works, and we will be better able to judge in two or three years as to whether he is going to conduct matters in the very loose way that they have been conducted in the past. It is greatly to be desired that some more honest and upright men should be found to occupy the Treasury benches and to conduct the affairs of the people of this country in a more honest and economical manner. We have had from session to session sickening exhibitions made of the looseness and recklessness of the manner in which public works have been let and completed. I do not know that things are getting any better, I am afraid they are getting worse; but as long as the people of this country are willing to put up with such things, they will have to bear the consequences.

Mr. GIBSON. Before this item is adopted I would like to make one remark. The Minister has courteously furnished me a copy of the tenders as extended, with the quantities in each class, and I find that according to the manner in which our quantities were extended, instead of being $354.50 above Murray & Cleveland's tender, we are now $82,136.17 above, showing the wrong done to Hunter & Murray more especially than to us. Here are two tenders said to be within $354.50 of one another, yet by the change of a presumed quantity, not an actual one, you create a difference of $82,136.17. I would recommend to the Government, if they are going to follow English precedents in the letting of public works, that they should give the approximate quantities, at all events, of each class and kind of work to be done, so that the contractors might know for themselves for how much they could afford to do the work.

Halifax Public Buildings..... $1,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what is this expenditure to be incurred?

Mr. OUIMET. Improvements on three public buildings, post office, including customs house and inland revenue office, examining warehouse and immigrant building, are estimated by the chief architect to cost this sum.

Mr. McMULLEN. For what purpose is the amount required? Last year a granolithic pavement was put down at the post office, at a cost of $2,000, and the previous year there was a grant for improvements to these buildings. The granolithic pavement was let to a Montreal firm.

Mr. OUIMET. The firm of Forsyth & Co. was the only one which had a patent for that pavement. Since then there have been several companies formed to lay pavements of a similar nature, and when any pavement is required for any public building, tenders will be asked from every one of the different companies.

Dartmouth Post Office..... $15,000

Mr. McMULLEN. We have in this case a sample of the cases that were brought under our consideration and were discussed last session. The rent of the post office in Dartmouth was $80 a year, the entire receipts last year, according to the Postmaster General's Report, were $2,019. There are not less than 37 places in Ontario where the post office receipts are over $4,000 annually, and there are over 83 places in the province where the receipts are in excess of those at Dartmouth. Still we have no post office building erected at those places. Woodstock, with receipts from $13,000 to $15,000, has no public post office building. At Ingersoll, where the receipts are over $8,000, there is no

public post office buildings, because the people send a Reformer to represent them here. It is a scandalous exhibition of political selfishness on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite that permits them to carry on this system of erecting public buildings at a cost to this country of from $25,000 to $50,000 respectively in such places as Dartmouth, where the receipts are only $2.052, and where the rental paid is $80 a year, and where the salary paid the postmaster is $540. This is a scandalous system of Tory tactics and it is quite clear that some of the people of Nova Scotia are wise in their generation, for they insist in getting something in return for giving support to the Government. It is no use for the Minister of Public Works to fish for the constituencies in Nova Scotia without baiting his hook with something, if with nothing else than a post office building. But when he goes to my province, his Tory friends will swallow even a bare hook, and be prepared to do anything to keep the party in power. My hon. friend from South Grey has several post offices in his constituency which have revenues far in excess of $2,000, but so long as he represents the constituency they will not obtain public buildings, and he will not yield in favour of his political opponents. There are plenty of other places in Ontario in the same position. This is another evidence of the view adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite in holding out to constituencies the money of this Dominion improperly and unfairly, on a principle that is positively unjust, in the form of votes for public buildings in order to induce those constituencies to return members who will support the Government.

Mr. OUIMET. I understand this matter was fully ventilated last year, and that a long discussion took place on items of this character. I am very glad to say that the hon. gentleman's speech is a very forcible and eloquent résumé of all the arguments that were addressed to the House last year. I may point out that in the main Estimates not a single item calls for a new building. Perhaps, therefore, we might pass these items and not renew the debate that took place last year, and when the Supplementary Estimates come down, if perchance there is a new building, I suggest that would be the time to discuss again the general subject of erecting these public buildings. Of course, it will be admitted by hon. members that the moment these buildings have been commenced it is the duty of the present Government, and especially of the Minister of Public Works, to see that they are completed. When a new building is to be erected and a vote is asked for, we might then very fairly discuss the subject.

Mr. LAURIER. Are there to be any?

Mr. OUIMET. I am afraid not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman truly says this subject was discussed last year. It was discussed to some extent.

Mr. OUIMET. To a great extent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was discussed because during the previous year the House adopted a resolution upon the subject without dissent. An amendment was moved on going into Supply, which was accepted by the late First Minister, and that amendment enunciated the principle which should govern the conduct of the Administration in asking appropriations of public money for buildings of this character. It stated that in undertaking to make appropriations for public buildings and other public works, regard should be had to the revenue derived from those places, and that the localities in which the largest amount of revenue were collected were the localities in which public buildings should be first constructed. The reason of the rule is perfectly obvious to every hon. gentleman in this House. The House appropriates money of which it is the public trustee, the money is contributed by the entire population of this country, wholly regardless of political differences, and for the purpose of serving the public interest, and not a party interest. That rule was agreed to, and the hon. gentleman knows that determination was a deliberate determination supported by the whole House, and that there was no motion on the part of the Administration for the purpose of reconsidering it. It is an insult to the intelligence of that side of the House, that, having agreed to such a resolution, they should permit it to be set at nought without any protest. I admit that if these are works the contracts for which were let in former years and upon which expenditures have already been made, the Government should go on and build them. There would then be no violation of the principle of the resolution to which I refer, but I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the contract for these buildings was let last year, or whether it was let at an earlier period. If the Government have departed from this rule since it was adopted, it is the business of the House to enter its protest and refuse the appropriation. Let me call the attention of the House to the very serious alteration that is being made in the cost of the Government of this country by this system of expending large sums of money on public buildings where the amount of revenue collected is comparatively small. It is in most cases, except in the larger towns and cities, in the public interest that buildings for custom house, excise and post office purposes should be rented. They could be obtained at a much smaller cost than the amount of interest that would have to be paid from the public treasury to meet the expenditure on capital account in the erection of these buildings. You have in addition large permanent charges for lighting, heating, caretaking and repairing these buildings. I will venture to say that if any one will take the trouble to make up the cost of these buildings erected during the past 12 years, and add the cost for continuing these buildings in operation, he will see that it amounts to a very large sum, the greater portion of which might not have been incurred if the expenditure had not been entered upon. If we are to have economical government in this country, I have no doubt whatever that there must be a radical change in the policy of the Government in this respect. When the resolution was agreed to last year the understanding was that the House had once more asserted its authority over public expenditure, which is one of the most ancient authorities which the House of Commons possesses, and if the House wishes to maintain the confidence and respect of the country, it ought to see that all expenditure on public works is in the public interest. I contend that the expenditure on public buildings, in comparatively small places, cannot be in the public interest, but is a useless waste of public money. We have had expenditures for post offices, in places of less than

1,000 of a population, where if you take the interest on the money, and the cost of maintaining the buildings, you have expended far in excess of the revenue you derive altogether from these places. If you erect public buildings in the several thousand places in this country, which are equally as well entitled to them as places in which you have erected such buildings, you will see how very large the permanent charge will be that you will place upon the country. Every man who chooses to exercise his common sense knows that the cost of governing this country, looking at our public liabilities, is far in excess of the cost of governing the country to the south of us. Is that condition of things to be made permanent? Your census tell you that you have been unable to retain your population, and that you have been unable to procure the settlement of the North-West which every person considers is desirable. You know right well that the fault is not in the soil or in the climate. You know that it is possible for men to live here as well as in the United States, and yet the discouraging fact remains that we are not merely unable to maintain our position in the race for the settlement of the country with our neighbours, but that we persist in the course which has produced the disasters which have befallen us. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that many of our people have left us and that the number leaving is increasing at an accelerated pace. The report comes from every part of the country to the east of this, that the constituencies are largely losing their population this year. What do hon. gentlemen opposite propose to do in order to put an end to that state of things, and in order to secure a moderate degree of prosperity and hope to the people of this country? I say, Sir, that nothing has been done by them, and that the interests of this country are being sacrificed. Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are considering simply how they are to remain in their present position, and they have acted upon the assumption that so long as there is a dollar in the pockets of the people of this country, that they themselves will not want, and that their positions shall be made secure. That is not the policy that ought to commend hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to the confidence of those who sit behind them. I venture to say that not one of these hon. gentlemen will say, if he speaks his candid sentiments, that he is satisfied with the condition of things or the outlook which this country has before it at the present time. He may hope that things will be better. I believe it is possible they can be better. I do not think this country has yet reached the condition out of which it is impossible for it to extricate itself by continuing on the broad and descending road on which the hon. gentlemen have been travelling for the past ten years. They cannot go on taking money out of the pockets of the people and spending it on profitless and useless enterprises, and at the same time promote the well-being of the people. You may depend on this, that the people of this country will make a better use of their money if you leave it in their hands than you can make for them, and what you refuse to do is to leave it in their possession. Has there been a single year during the past ten years in which the expenditure of this country has not exceeded $42,000,000? And what use has been made of that money, or a great portion of it, in the public interest? I say it has not been used in the public interest, and if the hon. gentleman cannot show that these buildings, for which appropriations are being sought, are not already in process of construction, and that the contracts were not let before the House deliberately adopted the policy of the resolution of two years ago, then I say the House ought not to make this appropriation. If the contracts have been let and the expenditure begun, it may be better to go forward than to retreat; but if the expenditure has not been begun, the money ought not to be appropriated; and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite who are not members of the Administration to see that the public treasury is properly guarded and that the public money is not wasted. The Government ought to take as little as possible from the people in the present state of the country, and ought to leave in their pockets every dollar that is not actually required in the public interest.

Mr. STAIRS. I think that probably the hon. member for Bothwell will not ask me to urge upon the Government that this expenditure should not be made or the construction of this building proceeded with. The hon. gentleman will probably admit that, when he said that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches were open to the charge of endeavouring to maintain themselves in their present position, he is open to the retort of endeavouring to take their position from them, and I think the country in the last few months has rather decided in favour of the gentlemen on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman in his speech touched on some very large questions indeed. I think we may say that he discussed the National Policy, unrestricted reciprocity and the exodus. I hardly see how a discussion of this sort is in order on a very small item in connection with the construction of a public building and a post office in the town of Dartmouth. However, it seems that we are to have a great deal of latitude in this regard, and, therefore, we cannot complain. As respects this public building, I desire to assure the committee that it has been before the House a long time. I wish to say to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who I feel convinced does not wish to make any unfair criticisms against the Government, that though I was not in the House in 1890, I believe the construction of this building was decided upon and the amount for the commencement of the work was placed in the Estimates before the amendment to which the hon. gentleman has referred was accepted by the then leader of the House. I am prepared to admit that the construction of the building had not commenced; but the Government had committed themselves to the policy of constructing the building there, and no doubt they felt themselves bound to go on with it. Since that time the site has been purchased, and I think it would be not only a breach of trust to the constituency, but also very unwise and impolitic not to go on with the building.

Mr. CAMPBELL. When was the first estimate made?

Mr. OUIMET. In 1890-91.

Mr. STAIRS. The estimate was taken in 1890, if my recollection is correct. It was voted again in 1891. Now, in regard to the locality in which it is proposed to construct this building, the town

of Dartmouth has a population of about 5,000 and is the centre of a very large settlement who to a very considerable extent use the post office of this town. Very possibly the revenue is not so large as it would be in a town farther away from Halifax, as some of the business of the post office is done in Halifax: but notwithstanding that, the building is required for the convenience of the public. Ever since 1887 my colleague has been pressing for the building in this town owing to representations from the people, in which both sides of politics joined, as to the inconvenience they were subject to in consequence of the insufficient accommodation and the poor arrangements of the post office there, and in 1890 the Government met his wishes and placed in the Estimates a sum sufficient to enable them to negotiate for a site and proceed with the construction of the building. I feel quite sure that the building is needed, and I can assure my hon. friend from Wellington that political considerations had nothing to do with the construction of this building. Whether they had or not in its inception, I am quite certain that its construction did not affect the vote either in the City or the County of Halifax. The people of the city did not care whether a post office was erected at Dartmouth any more than at Woodstock, it did not affect them in the slightest: and in the town of Dartmouth itself I am sure no votes were influenced by it, for the people there believed that they were entitled to a post office.

Mr. FLINT. If all the villages and towns having postal receipts of $2,000 or thereabouts are entitled to post offices, there can be no doubt that the town of Dartmouth is entitled to one; and I do not understand the objections taken by my hon. friends on this side to be directed particularly to that town. They are directed to the neglect of the Government and its violation of the sound principle laid down very recently by this House as to these public buildings. Personally I am aware that the town of Dartmouth did require better postal facilities, and any reasonable effort on the part of the Government to secure those facilities would I presume receive the support of gentlemen on this side. As far as that point is concerned, I presume that the discussion is directed rather to inducing the committee, and through it the hon. Minister of Public Works, to abide by some settled principle upon which appropriations for public buildings shall be granted. There can be no doubt that the lack of some well-defined line has been the cause of a considerable degree of demoralization among the electors in a great many towns and villages. It is certainly very undesirable that such a purely business matter as this should enter into political contests, and that gentlemen who are seeking electoral honours should be obliged, when supporting the Government, to impress upon any class of the electorate that, if he be chosen, he will secure some public work for their locality. In order that I may not be called upon to speak on the item which follows, I will allude to the case of the town of Lunenburg, which has a postal revenue similar in amount to that of Dartmouth, and I presume might have had more claim to increase its postal facilities than it had before, but I am personally aware that this was made a political matter in the county and great feeling aroused. The advocates of the National Policy made the demoralizing and ridiculous argument that if the advocates of a certain financial policy were elected they would not have sufficient influence to secure a public building for the capital town of the county. I believe the Government became convinced that this particular place had a good and reasonable business-like claim to a public building and placed a sum in the Estimates to purchase the land. But what occurred? An opponent of the Government happened to be elected, and nothing was done in the matter until after another election, when a very estimable gentleman of another political complexion was returned, and then this public building was proceeded with. What we complain of is, that the Government has not acceded to the resolution and does not appear likely to accede to it, although it was a reasonable one, intended to establish some definite line of demarcation as to when a public building shall be granted. It does seem somewhat strange that while Dartmouth is to be favoured with a public building, a large place in some other portion of the country which does not happen to return a supporter of the Government is refused a similar benefit. I think that the Government should lay down a principle with regard to opening up new post offices and act on that principle. At present most claims for public buildings are brought forward on the eve of elections and are used as an election cry. I think then that this question as to these two post offices in Nova Scotia should be discussed upon the general principle of the lines which the Government will lay down in regard to that subject in the future.

Mr. SPROULE. I would be glad to see the principle referred to by the hon. gentleman carried out, if it was expedient to follow such a cast-iron rule, but I think he is as far wide of the mark as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in claiming that we should strictly adhere to the principle which was laid down two years ago. There is no rule without an exception, and I suppose that applies to the building of post offices as to other matters. We cannot always decide as to the building of a post office in a place on account of the revenue derived there, but rather according to the necessities of the situation. In some places, though they may be large and a respectable revenue may be received from them, there are conveniences which are not to be found in other places for the purpose of a post office. Take, for instance, the town of Owen Sound, a town of 8,000 inhabitants, which certainly would be entitled to a post office building, but it happens that a private individual built a place there suitable for the purposes of a post office, and it is rented to the Government for a moderate sum, and costs less than the building of a new post office would. Yet the revenue derived in Owen Sound would certainly entitle that town to a post office built by the Government. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) appears to be as consistent in his logic and as logical in his reasoning on this subject as on many others. He started out by saying that it was clearly the intention of the Government to purchase voters by granting these post offices. Afterwards he asked why the hon. member for Grey did not get a post office, and said it was because I was always a supporter of the Government. And then, in regard to another

place, he says they do not get a post office because the member is not a supporter of the Government. There is no consistency in that. If the Government can secure a constituency by building a post office, why do they not build one in the town of Mount Forest, and so relieve the country and the House from the constant annoyance of hearing the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) delivering his addresses by hundreds? If that would accomplish the end which he says it would, it would be well-spent money for this country.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has kindly furnished me with an argument which I will address to the Minister of Public Works in order to obtain a post office in my own county. I have listened to the hon. gentleman with a great deal of pleasure, and, as he is a philosopher, sound in his doctrine, deep in his argument, I will take that argument as one which I believe is the only one likely to prevail with the Government. He said that the policy which should guide the Government in this matter was the necessity of the situation. Does he mean to affirm that this is the reason which is inducing the Government to grant the large sum of money we are about voting? He knows there are other causes behind that, but he thinks it more politic to throw insults across the floor at the hon. member for North Wellington than to state the other causes.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely there is no insult in saying that a town of 5,000 inhabitants is entitled to have a post office.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentlemen referred to the constant annoyance caused to the House by the speeches of the hon. member (Mr. McMullen.) He forgot to refer to the very long annoyance to which the House is subjected when he himself gets up to address it. Perhaps he has filled more pages of *Hansard* during last session than any other member.

Mr. SPROULE. There is not one word of truth in that.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman cannot take his medicine like a man. He handles medicine, and he ought to be able to take it. However, I did not rise in the first place to pick a quarrel with the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), but to take up the statement of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), that there are many accommodations and facilities in postal matters in the Province of Nova Scotia. In the report of the Postmaster General, I find that, in the Province of Nova Scotia—and no one will pretend to say that the population of that province is equal to the population of the Province of Quebec—they have 1,431 post offices, while in the Province of Quebec, with a population of at least 1,000,000 more, they have only 1,441 post offices. This is in the Postmaster General's Report, page 9. The figures are really interesting, and I will quote them. The number of letters going through the post offices in Quebec is 23,100,000 in the year, whereas in Nova Scotia the number is only 7,100,000, and yet Nova Scotia has as many post offices as the large and populous Province of Quebec. Nearly 4,000,000 post cards are sent yearly in the Province of Quebec, and in Nova Scotia only 1,330,000. Of registered letters, 770,000 are sent in Quebec, and in Nova Scotia 166,000. We find that the business in mail matter in the Province of Nova Scotia is infinitely less than it is in the Province of Quebec, and yet Nova Scotia has as many post offices as the Province of Quebec. What a pity it would be if they would not find that they had good facilities and good accommodation. If you go through these Estimates, you will find large sums put here and there for these provinces, and year after year, whereas, in other places where money could well be expended none is voted. Let me call attention to one case to which I called attention last year. Over and over again and year after year deputations have come to the Government from a flourishing town across the river asking that suitable post office accommodation should be provided. No satisfactory reason could be given for a refusal. The revenue from that town is considerable. The revenue of this town, I believe, is at least equal to the revenue of towns which have post offices costing $30,000 or $40,000; and still the answer of the Government was: No, they could get no post office. A deputation has come from the town of Buckingham, a large business town across the river in the County of Ottawa, a town that requires post office accommodation, and it has been refused. Why? Is it because the town belongs to a county that sends a representative to this House not in sympathy with the Government? It looks very much like it. On the very same page of the Estimates on which this item occurs, I find towns receiving public works or grants that belong to constituencies which send to this House supporters of the Government. For instance, I find a sum put down for a public building at Halifax, for the Dartmouth post office, the Lunenburg post office, the Pictou post office, and so on. I for one deny that there is even justice or honesty in the manner in which the Government distribute their grants for public buildings.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Stairs), in the few observations he made with reference to the Dartmouth post office, stated that politics had nothing whatever to do with this matter of the construction of post offices. Well, it seems to me that if politics has nothing to do with it, it is pretty hard to tell what principle does guide the Government. No principle has been laid down, so far as I have ever heard, by the Government upon which these public buildings were to be constructed, by which a particular locality was to be chosen for the construction of a post office. It is a singular thing that nearly, if not all, the localities so chosen happen to be in constituencies at the time when the vote is asked for which are represented by supporters of the Administration.

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him—one supporter only. The vote was taken first.

Mr. BORDEN. One is sufficient, of course. I must congratulate my hon. friend, the late member for Halifax, Mr. Jones, upon the extraordinary influence which he has been able to exert on the Administration. I know that my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) will agree with me that Halifax county and city are very fortunate in having had a gentleman of the immense influence of Mr. Jones to represent them in Parliament. But I think there are very few instances of that kind. I had some experience recently in running a bye-election, and my experience taught

me that, whether inspired by the Government or not, the fact is that in bye-elections, at any rate, great use is made of promises to certain localities of benefits which will accrue if those localities will vote for a candidate in sympathy with the Administration. The argument was used against me, and in certain sections it proved a pretty strong argument, because I think it resulted in changing some votes. The people were told: If you wish to get such-and-such a benefit, you must send a man to support the Administration. Now, in a particular town in my county, the town of Kentville, there was a case in point. In 1886, when King's County was represented in this House by a supporter of the Administration, Parliament was asked to vote, and did vote, a sum of money for the construction of a post office in the town of Kentville. There was a general election in 1887, and the gentleman who had succeeded, I suppose, in getting the sum voted, was defeated, and I came here in his place, and immediately thereafter the vote disappeared from the Estimates. Of course, this was only a coincidence, according to my hon. friend from Halifax. I trust the Supplementary Estimates will contain a grant for Kentville.

Mr. OUIMET. It falls under the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. BORDEN. In view of the fact that this vote was carried long before his motion, I hope the hon. gentleman will take it into his careful and favourable consideration. But seriously, Mr. Chairman, what is the principle upon which the Administration proceeds with reference to these grants? I find that the postal revenue in the town of Dartmouth last year was $2,019; I find in the town of Kentville, the shire town of my county, the postal revenue was considerably larger, $2,270. There is another town in my county, Wolfville, with a postal revenue of $3,172. Why is it that the town of Dartmouth should be selected with a smaller revenue than these other towns? I have failed during all the years I have been in this House to hear the Administration state any sound and solid principle which governs them in asking Parliament to grant votes of money for the construction of public buildings.

Mr. BOWERS. I made a few remarks last year in regard to the Digby post office. Now, I am not of the opinion that these places should be treated only according to the revenue they contribute. As I stated last year, Digby is placed in a different situation from a great many of the general post offices. There is a large amount of mail matter that passes through the Digby post office. In the summer time there is a daily mail coming from St. John across the bay, and this mail has to be sorted and sent out to the different offices. There is something like 20 or 25 daily mails, the postmaster tells me, coming to the Digby post office, besides all the general mail passing from Halifax and St. John, and they have a very small place there, not large enough to permit of the business being conveniently done. I find here that the gross postal revenue of Digby is $30 more than that of the town of Dartmouth. The town of Dartmouth is near Halifax, and most of the mail matter can be handled in the Halifax post office, and they do not require a post office there of the same proportion as does the town of Digby and other places situated in the same way. I also find that the number of money orders issued in the Digby post office was 1,817, and the total amount of the money orders received was $24,212.73, and the total amount of money orders paid out was $11,736.47. You will see by this that Digby is quite an important place as regards the postal business. As I said before, I cannot agree with all that is said in regard to looking altogether at the total amount of money paid into the office, because a town like Digby requires extra postal accommodation on account of the large number of mails that come there every day. I hope the Postmaster General will remember this, for although I am not a supporter of the Government, I am not very cantankerous in opposition, and do not care to do anything for the sake of obstructing the Government. No doubt the hon. Minister has been in communication at different times with the postmaster at Digby on the subject, and he has told me he would like to have better accommodation.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am not exactly like the hon. member for Digby, and I take great pleasure in obstructing all legislation which I consider to be wrong. I am, at the same time, prepared to support good legislation, no matter where it emanates. With respect to the construction of public buildings, the policy pursued ever since Confederation, or at least for the last ten or twelve years, cannot be defended, and no hon. gentleman opposite can justify it. It is impossible to justify it on public grounds or in the public interests. View it in any light you please, it will be found that when public interests demand the erection of a public building this is not done unless political interests are conserved by the erection of such building. That has been the policy pursued, and although the House led by the late Premier decided that no public buildings should be erected except where the public interests demanded, yet the very first session afterwards public buildings were erected where political interests were to be conserved. There are differences in the character of supporters. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) does not get a post office for Meaford. There are reasons for this. There are supporters who have influence, and others who have less influence. Those who have influence and perhaps other means at their disposal secure the expenditure of public money in the erection of buildings in their ridings. I am not very much surprised that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has not succeeded in obtaining a post office for Meaford, a large and flourishing town on the Georgian Bay, while in the village of Cayuga, with a revenue not amounting to $1,000 probably, a post office has been erected at a very large expense. The supporter of the Government from that county is of a different class. He is one able to make his influence felt in the House and country, and he gets a post office erected at Cayuga, while Meaford stands overlooking the Georgian Bay, with her numerous population, but without a proper post office. The hon. gentleman for East Grey must understand there are different grades of supporters and different degrees of usefulness. I will read for the benefit of the House a list of the places that have not obtained post offices, with the amounts of revenue as furnished in the Postmaster General's report for the year ending 30th June, 1890: Alliston, Simcoe, $2,330; Amhersburg, Essex, $2,000; Arnprior, Renfrew,

$3,281; Aurora, York, $2,263; Aylmer West, Elgin, $4,201; Ayr, Waterloo, $2,107; Blenheim, Kent, $2,529; Bowmanville, Durham, $4,745; Brighton, Northumberland, $2,009; Brussels, Huron, $2,541; Campbellford, Northumberland, $3,298; Carleton Place, Lanark, $3,359; Chesley, Bruce, $2,613; Clinton, Huron, $4,541; Colborne, Northumberland, $2,911; Collingwood, Simcoe, $5,822; Deseronto, Hastings, $4,142; Dresden, Bothwell, $2,278; Dunnville, Monck, $2,028; Durham, Grey, $2,066; Elora, Wellington, $2,235; Essex Centre, Essex, $3,271; Exeter, Middlesex, $2,106; Fergus, Wellington, $2,873; Flesherton, Grey, $1,042; Forest, Lambton, $3,574; Georgetown, Halton, $2,749; Glencoe, Middlesex, $2,335; Gravenhurst, Simcoe, $2,872; Grimsby, Wentworth, $2,027; Hanover, Grey, $1,687; Harriston, Wellington, $3,092; Hespeler, Waterloo, $2,393; Huntsville, Muskoka and Parry Sound, $2,187; Ingersoll, Oxford, $8,556; Iroquois, Dundas, $2,056; Kincardine, Bruce, $4,135; Leamington, Essex, $2,716; Listowel, Perth, $4,129; Lucknow, Bruce, $2,349; Markdale, Grey, $1,649; Mattawa, Nipissing, $2,895; Meaford, Grey, $3,050; Midland, Simcoe, $2,458; Milton West, Halton, $2,370; Mitchell, Perth, $3,414; Morrisburg, Dundas, $3,888; Mount Forest, Wellington, $3,902; Newmarket, Ontario, $3,421; Niagara Falls, Welland, $3,856; North Bay, Nipissing, $2,919; Norwich, Oxford, $2,244; Oakville, Halton, $2,364; Oshawa, Ontario, $5,433; Owen Sound, Grey, $9,626; Paisley, Bruce, $2,777; Paris, Brant, $3,661; Park Hill, Middlesex, $2,850; Port Dover, Norfolk, $1,575; Port Elgin, Bruce, $2,181.26; Port Perry, Ontario, $2,806.02; Preston, Waterloo, $2,156.18; Rat Portage, Algoma, $2,675.96; Renfrew, Renfrew, $3,864.58; Ridgetown, Elgin, $3,593.28; Riverside, York, $2,215,54; St. Mary's, Perth, $5,850.03; Sarnia, Lambton, $8,505.62; Seaforth, Huron, $4,871.17; Shelburne, Grey, $2,357.42; Stayner, Simcoe, $2,006.70; Sudbury, Algoma, $2,844.57; Thorold, Welland, $2,864.98; Uxbridge, Ontario, $3,526.24; Wallaceburg, Bothwell, $2,831.03; Waterloo West, Waterloo, $4,263,58; Watford, Lambton, $2,479.08; Welland, Welland, $3,343,05; West Toronto Junction, York, $3,420.58; Whitby, Ontario, $4,235.26; Wiarton, Bruce, $2,770.15; Woodstock, Oxford, $15,432.06; Yorkville, York, $6,277.44. In every one of these places no public building has been erected, and there is scarcely one of them but has a larger revenue than Dartmouth. I cannot understand what justification the Minister or his supporters can put forward for the erection of buildings at places where the public interest does not demand them, when large centres like Woodstock, Bowmanville, Oshawa, Whitby, Ingersoll, Sarnia, Owen Sound, Meaford, Kincardine, Listowel and Mount Forest have no such buildings erected. The hon. member for Halifax probably let the cat out of the bag when he said that it was decided to erect a post office in Dartmouth in 1890. That was immediately before the election, and $5,000 was placed in the Estimates immediately after the election, but in the meantime the election was protested, and that probably accounts for the promise being fulfilled now. I presume that if the hon. member for Halifax had not been elected this item for Dartmouth would have been dropped out of the Estimates, as was done in respect to Kentville, in the County of Queen's, Nova Scotia, which returned an opponent of the Government. This shows that it is merely political ends that the Government intend to serve, and that they do not follow up business principles in spending this public money. It should be made a criminal offence for the Government to bribe a constituency by the erection of a public building in a place where there is no necessity for it. I think that every member of the Government and every supporter of the Government ought to be unseated and disqualified as well for such conduct. A member will be unseated if his agents spend half a dollar, but the Government can bribe constituencies by spending thousands of dollars in this way, and there is no punishment for them. The Ministers have taken an oath of office that they will be faithful stewards of the public money, and how can they reconcile such conduct as this with their consciences and with their oath. It appears that in this instance the Minister of Public Works had forgotten the serious obligation he took when he became a Privy Councillor, to be true and faithful to Her Majesty and the people over whom she reigns with so much grace and dignity. How can they reconcile their oath with the proposal to build a costly post office in a place like Dartmouth, with a revenue of $1,700 a year, while flourishing and large centres of population like Woodstock and Owen Sound, with a revenue of $15,000 each, are left without such a building? Is this the way the Government should squander public money? I declare that they will need another gerrymander to keep them in office if they pursue such a policy as this; because if there is any public opinion in this country, a free people will not stand the way in which they are lavishing the public money, and the way in which they are unfaithful to their oath of office in squandering public money for political purposes, buying electors with their own money, and neglecting the interests of the people in these large and flourishing towns which I have enumerated.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has treated the House to one of his characteristic speeches, full of buncombe or burlesque, but which is neither convincing to the House nor interesting to the country. His argument is that the member for East Grey has not done his duty because he did not get a post office in Meaford; while the argument of the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is that the Government are doing a great wrong because they are expending money building post offices in such places, and thereby saddling the country with a permanent expense for heating, lighting and caretaking of post offices in towns of that kind. Take the town of Meaford, for example. It only cost the country last year for allowance for rent, fuel and light $150, and yet they have a commodious and suitable building there, and if they had not that, through private enterprise they could get another one.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Could they not do that in Dartmouth?

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) keep quiet, if he is in that state that he can keep quiet.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What does the hon. member mean?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. member keep his place and be quiet?

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the statement you have made, sir?

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman keep quiet, if he has the courtesy to do so?

Mr. LANDERKIN. If you had any courtesy you would not make a mean insinuation, a contemptible insinuation, unworthy of a member of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not the first time the House has been treated to the same conduct by the hon. member, and in my opinion from the same cause.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What cause do you refer to? What insinuation do you mean, Sir? I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman has a right to make such an insinuation?

Mr. LISTER. I rise to a point of order. The point is that the language of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is disgraceful.

Mr. SPROULE. This complaint comes with good grace from a man who violates every principle of equity in this House and out of it. I say that the force of the argument of the hon. member for North Wellington was that the Minister of Public Works was saddling the country with permanent expense in those places where they were building post offices, because they would have to be maintained afterwards, and we would have to spend money for caretakers and wood and light; and now the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) condemns the action of the member for East Grey because he cannot get a post office for a place called Meaford, where the expense for rent, fuel and light is only $150, which is sufficient to secure postal conveniences for the people, but would not pay the interest on the money which would be required to build one, let alone the permanent cost for care, &c., afterwards. The hon. gentlemen are not consistent in their arguments. The hon. member for South Grey read out of the returns the names of a large number of places which in his opinion were entitled to post offices, because post offices had been built in other places which were not larger. I maintain that the reasons which I gave at first are the true reasons that should guide the Government in expenditures of this nature, that is, that where the public convenience can be secured at a smaller expense by private enterprise than it would cost the country to put up a suitable building, then the Government would not be justified in going to the expense of erecting a building; but in other places, where private enterprise has not supplied the convenience, and where there is a necessity for the building, that is a justification for the violation of the rule laid down by the hon. member for Bothwell by the Government in building post offices in many places where they have been built.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman says that in Meaford the post office pays only $150 a year, and consequently the people could not expect the Government to put up a post office there. But in Dartmouth the post office only pays $80 a year of rent, and how can the hon. gentleman reconcile the two cases?

Mr. SPROULE. I say that judging by the argument of the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. We do not expect order from the hon. member. He does not usually treat the House with courtesy. He is in the habit of interrupting every member when he gets up to speak.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not so.

Mr. McMULLEN. He was very uncourteous to my hon. friend from South Grey. As he is the last joint in the tail of the Tory party, we cannot expect anything better from him. He occupies that position in his party, and he realizes that he is in that position, for he has never got anything for his county and never will.

Mr. OUIMET. I would just come back to the suggestion which I made at the beginning: unless hon. gentlemen have decided not to allow any item to pass. Decidedly this item ought to pass.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It ought to be withdrawn.

Mr. OUIMET. Nobody would expect the Minister of Public Works to abandon works which have already been commenced. Decidedly the loss to the country would be much greater than any loss which the hon. gentlemen have referred to as likely to follow the construction of this building. Now that these buildings are commenced we must complete them, and nobody will find fault with me for bringing down an appropriation for that purpose. This one is just in that position. The first vote was taken in 1890, the site has been bought, the plans have been prepared, and I think the contract has been passed, and it ought to be finished. There is no way out of it, and I do not see why we should lose our time in discussing generalities which we discussed last year, unless it is understood that hon. gentlemen will not pass any items. If that is understood we will sit down calmly and wait till they are done.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that because this matter was discussed last year, therefore it should not be discussed again this year.

Mr. OUIMET. I certainly have a right to say that.

Mr. LISTER. The reason the hon. Minister gives why this matter should not be discussed this year, is that it was discussed last year. If that is a good reason in the abstract, he has a right to say it, but I do not think it is a valid reason why these estimates should not be discussed this year. So far as this policy of the Government is concerned in making appropriations for the construction of these public buildings, we have always contended and still contend that it has been and is a scandalous abuse of the power of the Administration. The hon. gentleman has stated that this work is now commenced, and that it will be a greater loss to the country to abandon it than to go on with it, which is equivalent to the confession on his part that this work should never have been commenced, and that if he had been the Minister of Public Works when the appropriation was made, it never would have been made.

Mr. OUIMET. I never said that.

Mr. LISTER. No, but that is the inference to be drawn; and to be frank and candid, I do not

believe, if he had been Minister of Public Works when the first appropriation was made, that the work would have been gone on with. Now, the hon. member for East Grey is talking with the steadiness of a babbling brook. There is never an opportunity whether in season or out of season that that hon. gentleman does not think it his duty to get up and talk on every possible question that presents itself; and not only that, but he feels, in the security of the seat he occupies, that he is justified in grossly insulting a man who is his superior in everything that constitutes manhood, and his senior in years. He is a constituent of my hon. friend; he has a vote in his riding; and this sort of enmity and animosity that he always exhibits to my hon. friend is not the conduct that one hon. gentleman ought to show towards another. What did he insinuate? Did he want to insinuate that my hon. friend was not in a position to address this House? If he did, he was guilty of the grossest insult which one can offer to another—conduct that is unbecoming of any person who claims to have the slightest elements of a gentleman in his composition. So far as the policy of the Government is concerned, in my judgment the voting of public moneys in this matter, in the way in which it has been voted, is a scandalous abuse. There can be no question, however vigorously the hon. gentleman may deny it, that the whole policy of the Government is to buy up constituencies by the erection of public buildings. We need only recall a few instances. For many years the town of Goderich, in the County of Huron, was represented by an hon. gentleman opposed to the present Administration, and year after year he pressed the claim of that town on the attention of the Government without getting any satisfaction. Suddenly, however, the county turned round and elected a supporter of the Administration, and at once a sum of money was placed in the Estimates for the construction of a public building in the town of Goderich. In the County of West Middlesex, the same experience was felt. Time and again representations had been made in vain, but as soon as the county returned a supporter of the Government a sum was placed in the Estimates for a public building there. Prior to election time it has always been held up to the electors that if they want any public buildings they must return a supporter of the Administration. If a man should pay fifty cents in corrupting an elector he is unseated and disqualified, but the Government can deliberately buy up an electorate by means of public buildings and there is no check to prevent that. Go down to Petrolea, which sent a representative opposed to the Government from 1882 to 1887, but in 1887 sent a representative as a supporter of the Government. At the second session he was here an appropriation was brought down for the erection of a public building. Take Walkerton, which is represented by my hon. friend from Bruce. So long as that county sent a representative here in opposition to the Administration, no vote could be obtained for the public building, but the moment it sent a representative to support the Government an amount for that purpose was put in the Estimates. The claim of Picton, in the County of Prince Edward, which always returned a Liberal, had been pressed on the Government session after session without effect, but as soon as the County of Prince Edward abandoned the principles its people had adhered to for so many years and returned a supporter of the Administration, it became of the first importance that a public building should be erected. Trenton was in exactly the same position. Then we come to Dartmouth, a little town represented by my hon. friend for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) who seems to have great power with the Administration. Notwithstanding the fact that binding twine is free in the States, he has been able to keep that on the tariff, and he has also been able to induce the Government to proceed with the building of a post office in the town of Dartmouth where the gross postal receipts are only $1,700. The Government think they must build a post office there which will cost in the neighbourhood of $15,000, exclusive of the land, so that the interest will amount to something like $1,000 a year rent, which the Government will have to pay, although only $1,700 is the gross revenue. Is not that a disgraceful, scandalous transaction? Apart from the rent, there will be the heating and all the other expenditures which necessarily attend a public building of this kind, so that when you come to figure up the cost at the end of the year you will find that the gross receipts will not be sufficient to cover it, and all this to secure the support of my hon. and respected friend, the junior member for the City of Halifax. Is this right? Is it not the duty of the Government to lay down some well-defined principle, and establish that when the revenue of a town has reached a certain amount then that town shall be entitled to a public building? Haldimand County was for 40 years Liberal, but in a moment of weakness it forgot its principles and returned its present member, and not only did the Government put up a public building there, but they built a bridge over the Grand River. Let us look at this for a moment. Cayuga has a population of 700 or 800 people and a post office revenue of $1,186, yet they have put up a public building there at a cost of $25,000 or $30,000. Does the Minister of Public Works say that the public buildings are to be erected on account of the revenue which is derived, or because the constituency has returned a supporter of the Government? Let him take one or the other position. If he takes the latter, we can understand it, but we cannot understand him, session after session, saying that this is done in the public interest, when it is evident that it is done in the interest of the Government. Goderich has a revenue of $5,629, and Goderich must have a public building, while Sarnia, which has a revenue of $9,351, is not to have one. Woodstock, with a revenue of $15,000 or $16,000, is not to have one, while Cayuga with a revenue of $1,186 is to have one, and my own town, with a population of 7,000 and a revenue of over $9,000, is denied a public building. Petrolea, with a revenue of $6,654 and a population of 2,400, is to have a public building. Walkerton with a revenue of $4,785 and a population of about 3,500, or perhaps less, is to have a building while Sarnia and Woodstock are refused. Then there is Cobourg, with a revenue of $6,714, Waterloo, $4,785, Carleton Place, $4,511, Smith's Falls, $6,206, Picton, $5,593, Trenton, $5,121. But bad as this showing is in the Province of Ontario, you have only to take up the Postmaster General's Report and the returns brought down to this House as to the public buildings in the Province of Quebec to see that it is much worse there, and, bad as that is, if you go to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick,

you will find the state of affairs infinitely worse. In New Brunswick in the county represented by the Minister of Finance, a small town, with a population of 300 or 400, has not only been supplied with a post office, but the House has also been asked to put a bell there.

Mr. WELDON. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not desire to misrepresent the Minister of Finance in his absence, and I may say that the appropriation for the town of Sussex was voted by this Parliament before Mr. Foster represented the county at all. It was Mr. Domville who got that appropriation and claimed the credit for it. I am speaking of my own native town, and I know the fact.

Mr. LISTER. What is the population of the town of Sussex?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). 6,000.

Mr. LISTER. No, not 600. At all events, whether it was the present Finance Minister or not, it was a supporter of the Administration who got that public building put up in a town which I venture to say has not as great a revenue as the town of Cayuga. If places with less than 2,000 inhabitants and producing less than $2,000 revenue in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are to have post offices and public buildings, then in Ontario, places where the revenue is over $2,000 or the population is greater than $2,000 will by parity of reasoning have the same right, and it will be the bounden duty of the Government to put up public buildings there. Where is this to stop? People have a perfect right to point out places like Sussex, and Cayuga, and Dartmouth, and to say that, if public buildings are needed there in the public interest, they are also entitled to have them, and there will be unquestionably influence brought to bear upon the Government by these smaller towns throughout the country to do for them what they have done for these other small towns throughout the Dominion. I think it is the duty of the Minister of Public Works to have some well-defined policy upon this question. I feel it does not reflect credit upon the Government to be constantly holding up these public buildings to the public of this country as a system of bribery which is of the very worst kind. It is bad enough to bribe an individual, but, when you attempt to bribe the whole people in a constituency, you are doing a great deal worse.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works would explain to the committee if he has any policy upon this subject.

Mr. OUIMET. I think the hon. gentleman must have been asleep when I made my explanation. I stated that our policy was to finish the buildings that were commenced already, and that, when we asked for any vote for new buildings, the Government would be bound to explain the reason, and we will do so; but, in the meantime, it would be only a matter of fairness for hon. gentlemen to proceed with business and go on with the Estimates. I shall be happy to give any information I am asked for, but I do not see how this general discussion is going to further the business of the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there is one thing which the hon. gentleman should make clear. He says this vote does not come within the rule which the whole House acquiesced in two years ago, because this was initiated before that rule was adopted. But he has not said whether the Government intend to carry out that rule in the future which was assented to by the whole House, and it is important that the Government should say whether they think that rule should be adhered to or should be amended. The whole of this discussion is important in this respect, that it shows that no rule has been adopted so far as these expenditures are concerned. I leave out of view now the question whether these works were initiated before or since the rule was adopted. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) says that in many cases the Government were able to rent buildings at a very much cheaper rate than to erect them. I say there is no exception to the rule that in all the places where a large revenue is not collected it is possible for the Government to obtain the necessary accommodation at a far lower rate than they are able to put up these buildings. I say the erection of these buildings in these places will create a precedent and will make a demand that will be impossible for the Government to resist, in all the constituencies represented by supporters of the Administration. I believe the resolution we adopted a few years ago was a wise one in the public interest, and the Government ought to adhere to it.

Mr. OUIMET. This vote was taken in 1890; that means that the building of this post office was determined upon by the House before this resolution of the member for Bothwell was adopted. So this is a particular case to which that resolution does not apply. Now, as to the next point the resolution reads:

> "That in the expenditure of public money the public interest and not party favouritism, should control, and in the choice of places for the erection of the public buildings for post office, customs house and inland revenue purposes, regard should be had to the amount of revenue collected and of public business done."

This resolution contains two parts. First, regard must be had for the public interest; and second, regard must be had for the revenue. I suppose the Government will be ready to show to the House when they ask for a new vote, that the vote is required in the public interest and also in consequence of the revenue collected where the building is to be erected. But as I said before, this resolution does not apply to the present case, as the building of this post office was decided upon before the resolution was passed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When was the land purchased for this building?

Mr. OUIMET. Only last year. But the order of the House was to have the post office erected. Hon. gentlemen opposite are always insisting that the Government must abide by every resolution passed in this House. Surely this resolution must be respected by themselves as well as by the Government.

Mr. CASEY. There is a great deal of difference between a vote of money for a certain purpose which has not been spent, and a resolution of the House defining a certain line of policy which must be followed. The Government need not spend money because it has been voted by the House.

Mr. OUIMET. If it was decided to spend money in the County of Elgin, you would argue just the reverse.

Mr. CASEY. It does not seem likely that any money is going to be voted for my county. Now, it is quite clear to everybody that this expenditure is simply a bribe to the locality. I understand that the revenue is about $1,700 a year; it is of such little importance that it is not even included in the list of accounting offices given in the Postmaster General's Report. It must be entirely for local reasons that the post office is put there. Now, I have had occasion several times to point out to the Government the injustice that is being done to the only considerable town in my riding, the town of Ridgetown.

Mr. OUIMET. Time cures everything.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, and I believe that time will even cure the evil of the present Ministers sitting on the Treasury benches. But it seems evident that so long as they retain their seats, time will not cure them of the habit of expending public money for political purposes. To-night we had an assertion from the Minister himself that no expenditure of money that will help a friend of the Government is to be looked upon as wrong.

Mr. OUIMET. I did not say that.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, the hon. gentleman said so at the end of his speech, when he turned round and addressed his own friends. Now, I want to call the attention of the Government to the case of Ridgetown where there is $3,624 of postal revenue collected, and a population of about 4,000 inhabitants. The postal revenue is more than twice as much as the revenue collected in this place where we are asked to build a post office. Ridgetown is the centre of a very wealthy and thickly settled agricultural country, where a great deal of mail matter is received. There is also a considerable customs revenue collected there. The post office and customs business might be conducted in the same building, as is usually done in other cases. If the Ministers can say with sincerity that the post office is necessary at Dartmouth in the public interest, then a building is far more necessary in Ridgetown for the post office and customs business combined. I had hoped that with the advent of a new Minister we should receive some consideration; I had hoped that a new broom might sweep clean, and that a new Minister might be more willing to consider a serious claim of this kind than one who had grown old in the routine of that office. The customs are collected under the heading of the outport of Morpeth, a small village near by, which was the original port of customs, although now the principal part of the business is done at Ridgetown. I believe an expenditure there on a customs and post office would not only be doing justice to the locality, but would actually be an economy on the part of the Government.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). To whom is due the credit of having secured a post office at St. Thomas?

Mr. CASEY. It was attributed to the exertion of the gentleman who was formerly the member for the County of East Elgin, Mr. Arkell. St. Thomas is not in my riding. Mr. Arkell obtained the post office, and became clerk of works on the building after he had ceased to be member of Parliament; and notwithstanding the fact, Mr. Arkell feels the ingratitude of his party, for although he secured this large expenditure of public money, his claims as far as regards an official position open at a later date, were not recognized.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Public Works has stated that one reason for pressing this item is that he requires the money to complete an unfinished work. The hon. gentleman advanced the argument that already the land had been purchased and money expended in the preparation of plans, and therefore the committee had nothing to do with the decision, but had simply formally to grant this money; in fact the work having been so far proceeded with, there was no possible escape from the transaction. If that is the case, it is the duty of the committee to grant the amount. I thought the very fact that an item appeared in the Estimates was a sufficient justification for the discussion of the item. I assumed that the committee was here to determine whether, having regard to all the circumstances, certain moneys should be voted. If that is not the position, the committee never made the discovery until now. The Minister has commenced to inaugurate a very extraordinary principle, that items are placed before the committee on which we are simply called to vote. He surely was not serious when he said the committee had nothing to do with the matter but vote the money. I take a different view. I do not care what steps have been taken, we have a right to decide in regard to voting items under any circumstances. What is going to be the total cost of the structure when completed?

Mr. OUIMET. It is considered that $15,000 will complete the building.

Mr. McMULLEN. Including all the fittings?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Having heard the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) give credit to Mr. Arkell for securing the post office for St. Thomas, I must say I am much pleased to have that information and explanation. Dr. Wilson has claimed credit for it, and he deliberately misrepresented the case to the electors of East Elgin.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for East Elgin should not go out of his way to libel his late opponent, for the statement he has made is an unqualified libel on that gentleman. Dr. Wilson never pretended that he obtained the location or the grant for the post office in St. Thomas. It would be absurd to pretend he did so, seeing that Mr. Arkell was member for the riding at the time, and a supporter of the Conservative Government, and that Dr. Wilson was not in Parliament. Mr. Arkell obtained that grant distinctly as an election move in the interest of himself and the Conservative party in St. Thomas and East Elgin. No persons ever pretended that Dr. Wilson secured that grant of money.

Mr. INGRAM. I say they did.

Mr. CASEY. But the hon. gentleman has made a great many statements he cannot prove, and he cannot prove that one. Dr. Wilson never said he obtained the grant. Dr. Wilson was not in Parliament at the time. He defeated Mr. Arkell in 1882; but Mr. Arkell had obtained the grant or promise of the grant before he was defeated, and the building was proceeded with subsequently. I am quite willing to give Mr. Arkell full credit for what he did. He made a very good move for his own party. The present representative of East Elgin has reaped the benefit of Mr. Arkell's astute-

ness in getting that grant, and he is not willing to do Mr. Arkell justice in return for the services he has given.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to find out what amount has been actually expended in acquiring land and preparing plans?

Mr. OUIMET. $4,500.

Mr. MULOCK. How much was the cost of the land?

Mr. OUIMET. For the site, and so forth, $4,500.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister tells us we have simply to vote the money, and not to exercise independent judgment as to whether it would be wise or not to carry out the project.

Mr. OUIMET. It was not my business. I found the vote there and the Order of the House to expend the money. I bought the site, as it was the duty of the department to do. If we had not carried out the decision of the House, the department would have been open to blame. As regards the question of maintaining the building, I estimate $100 for fuel, $50 for lighting, and in a building where there is only a post office, I think the postmaster himself ought to be the caretaker. I do not see why the annual cost of maintenance should exceed $200 or $250 a year.

Mr. MULOCK. Then we understand $4,000 has been paid for the land and the other $500 for other purposes, and assuming the Minister made a wise purchase of land, we have good value for the $4,000. So what it really amounts to is, that the amount expended up to the present time is $500. It is a question whether we expend $15,000 or lose $500, and the Minister of Public Works was not putting the matter squarely before the committee when he represented we had a large amount of capital embarked in this enterprise. Assuming that he made an honest purchase of the ground in Dartmouth—and I hope it was nothing like the purchase the Minister of Militia made in St. John—this question is entirely at large. The Minister has told us that it would cost $400 a year for maintaining the building, but he ought to know that there are other expenditures connected with it, especially about election times when the heelers in the town will want to be employed. Your painter will want to paint it once or twice a year, and I want to know what is the estimate of the Minister of Public Works for repairs of this character?

Mr. OUIMET. I gave you all the estimates that can reasonably be expected from me, but I suppose it won't prevent you from going on and speaking again.

Mr. MULOCK. It will not, and I propose to discuss this question. The Minister of Public Works, for a new man in his office, is assuming a very arbitrary position. He is assuming to be the owner of the public treasury, and he is not much of an improvement on his predecessor. Does he think he is?

Mr. OUIMET. I never said so.

Mr. MULOCK. We removed his predecessor because he was a failure and as he admits he is no better, he is a failure also. This whole transaction, so to speak, is *in futuro*, and therefore we have a right to look upon it as a new scheme. There is to be a cost of $400 or $500 a year for maintenance, and $600 a year for interest at 4 per cent, but the Minister will not tell us what he is going to pay his party heelers for painting and jobbing around the building. We know, at all events, that he is going to throw away the gross receipts of the post office at Dartmouth in order to serve some political purpose. If that is a sample of the new policy of the Minister of Public Works, what is the end of it going to be like? The public conscience, if there is such a thing, and I hope there is, is shocked at the transactions this Administration has carried on. Bad as the past has been, there has never been anything so shameless as the transactions under the auspices of the present Administration. The purchase of the Harris property at St. John, which the Minister of Militia takes a large portion of the responsibility for, has shocked the public conscience. I had pinned my faith to the honesty of the Minister of Militia, at all events until this transaction came to light. Until that I had always put the Minister of Militia down as personally pure.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down; order.

Mr. MULOCK. I propose to discuss this question, and hon. members will have to hear me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Chairman, if you do not preserve order, I think there ought to be some person that will. I am entitled to your protection and to the enjoyment of my rights here.

Mr. TAYLOR. Speak to the question.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for Leeds need not set himself up as an example of good conduct. I say that the Government have disregarded all respect for propriety when they lent themselves to such a transaction as the purchase of the Harris property.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I am perfectly in order, and you are in error when you are interrupting me and inviting interruptions from the committee as a whole.

Mr. BOWELL. I rise to a point of order. I do think that we have already, to say the least of it, discussed almost every conceivable question on the item of $15,000 for a post office at Dartmouth. It is now nearly two o'clock. I think it is about time that we should ask gentlemen who are discussing this question to confine themselves to the item. I have no objection to wait till daylight. We have been four hours on this item to-night; no particular objection has been made to it; and now, after we have received all the condemnation which can be bestowed upon us in the English language by hon. gentlemen opposite, I think we should try to stick to the point at issue. I do not desire, and I am sure the Minister of Public Works does not desire, to interfere with free discussion. We have waited very patiently, and I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to rule that in discussing this question hon. members should at least try to stick to it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am sure that nobody is more desirous than the Chairman that hon. members should, as much as possible, stick to the item under discussion. We have been four hours discussing the whole policy of the Administration; but if the hon. member for North York wants to

discuss the item he is free to do so, though if he wants to discuss matters which were settled three or four days ago, he knows that he is out of order.

Mr. MULOCK. I have not referred to any debate in this House at all. I have referred to transactions.

Mr. BOWELL. That was not my objection. I made no allusion to the hon. gentleman referring to a former debate. But he has discussed questions altogether irrelevant to this item.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Every hon. member knows that on the Estimates members can talk very widely. If the committee will sustain the Chair, I will keep the members in order, but unless the committee sustain me, I cannot do so.

Mr. MULOCK. The point of order has been lost sight of, if there was one, and I come back to the point with which I began. I want the hon. Minister of Public Works to tell this committee before we vote this money what in his opinion it is going to cost this country on the average to maintain the building which he proposes to erect? It will not do for him to give us a partial estimate, which is all he has given us yet. He has simply treated us to a little guess-work. If he is not to-night prepared to give us the definite information, the item should stand over until he does. I would remind him of a few precedents which will enable him to make up his mind, if he has not come to any conclusion. I will illustrate it by referring to the case of the Cobourg post office, by which he will see that the figures he has given us to-night are far from sufficient to meet the case. If he takes the last transaction of the kind by his predecessor, whom he says he seeks to imitate, and looks at the fruits of it, he will probably be able to tell us to-morrow what this thing is going to cost.

Mr. OUIMET. I have already stated that $250 or $300 ought to be on the average sufficient to maintain that post office.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister says that the figures he has given us are enough to keep this post office going, and yet he is paying enormously in excess of those figures in Cobourg. So that he is either negligent in this matter or incompetent, and he can take either horn of the dilemma. I believe he has still the capacity to grapple with this little question if he brings his intellect to bear upon it. But until he can give us the information the item should not be pressed. I acquit him, of course, of any intention to neglect his duty; nevertheless, I consider it my duty to try to get that information, and therefore I do not think the item should pass until he gives it.

Mr. LISTER. Does the $15,000, which the Minister says this building is to cost, include the land?

Mr. OUIMET. It is $15,000 besides the $5,000.

Mr. LISTER. Then it will cost $20,000. That makes $800 for interest alone. The Minister has not considered that in making an estimate of the cost of the building, because that will be a permanent charge on the country of $800 a year for interest alone. From whom did the Government buy this land? Was it expropriated or purchased voluntarily?

Mr. OUIMET. It was bought from the ferry commissioners of the town.

Mr. LISTER. Was the land expropriated or purchased?

Mr. OUIMET. It was bought by private sale after valuation.

Mr. LISTER. Who valued it?

Mr. OUIMET. I could not tell.

Mr. LISTER. Was there any evidence in the department to satisfy the Minister that the price paid was a reasonable one.

Mr. OUIMET. There was the report of the architect.

Mr. LISTER. Surely he would not value the land?

Mr. OUIMET. The property was bought before I was in the office; but what I can say is this, that the report of the architect is there, saying that the price was reasonable.

Mr. LISTER. The architect would have nothing to do with the land. Is it the architect of the department?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Living in Ottawa?

Mr. OUIMET. He took his information from local people.

Mr. LISTER. Did he make a report?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Will the hon. gentleman lay that report on the Table?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes; I have no objection to place it on the Table to-morrow.

Mr. LISTER. I have some reason for asking for it. Did the architect get any evidence except the mere statement of individuals in darkness?

Mr. OUIMET. Perhaps the hon. gentleman might wait until the report is laid on the Table.

Mr. LISTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow the item to stand? I do not like this transaction at all. In view of the fact that the member for Halifax was so deeply interested, and could get the Government to put up a public building in a place so exceedingly small, I do not think it can be a place in which land is very valuable. How much land is there?

Mr. OUIMET. I could not tell.

Mr. LISTER. The post office only yields a revenue of $1,700. Surely the land in that town cannot be dear.

Mr. OUIMET. When that item was discussed last year that information was given.

Mr. LISTER. But you say you bought the land since. The House had ordered this business to be gone on with, and in pursuance of that mandate we bought this land. I have no doubt the hon. member for Halifax knows all about it. If the Minister cannot tell us, I think the hon. gentleman could, if he would.

Mr. STAIRS. I am not here to answer questions.

Mr. LISTER. You are not bound to incriminate yourself.

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. gentleman is out of order. He has no right to imply that if I said anything I would incriminate myself.

Mr. LISTER. If the hon. gentleman takes my remark as offensive, I will withdraw it. He knows

it is a rule of law that no man need incriminate himself. Of course there is an inference to be drawn, but if the hon. gentleman says there is none, I have nothing to say about that. The committee has a right to know the quantity of land purchased.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Public Works should remember that on all previous occasions such information has been given as a matter of course. I do not think any discussion took place last year as to the particular parcel of land purchased. If the information was given then, it can be obtained from *Hansard*; but in any case it is most undoubtedly the custom, and rightly, that all details should be given.

Mr. OUIMET. The information asked for has been promised for to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to insist on anything unreasonable, but this information should be given when the item is under discussion, and if it is not forthcoming the item should stand over.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman will see that we are asking a vote of $15,000 for a building to be erected, and I am ready to give all the details in that connection.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the information was given last year. The land was not bought nor the site selected then, and I understand the hon. gentleman himself concluded this transaction: but whether he did or not, the information ought to be in the hands of the officers of his department. I am not censuring the Minister, who is not very old in the department, but his officers ought to have the information in their possession.

Mr. LISTER. The former Minister of Public Works had a book in which everything was carefully entered, and he could answer every question by turning over the leaf. One would think these questions would suggest themselves at once to the Minister: How much land is bought? how much is paid for? The Minister has a supporter here who admits he can tell, but he will not tell.

Mr. STAIRS. I did not admit I could tell.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman said he was not bound to tell.

Mr. STAIRS. I never admitted I could tell. I have no objections to tell all I know, but do not admit the right of any hon. member to question me in the House. I did not answer the question as to the exact size of the piece of land which was bought because I do not recollect what it was, but I will tell the committee what I do know about it. The land was owned by a corporate body which was formed within two years past to run a ferry between Halifax and the town of Dartmouth. The land in question is opposite the ferry landing, and I think the purchase of that site was recommended by the city council, and the ferry commissioners were willing to sell for the price offered. I understand that the rents which were previously paid amounted to more than the interest on the money paid for the land.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What did the company pay for it?

Mr. STAIRS. They took it over in connection with the ferry boats and all the other ferry property, so that it would be impossible to say what was the amount paid for the land separately.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Was that after the appropriation was made for the post office.

Mr. STAIRS. No; before. They took over the whole under a local Act of Nova Scotia. It is practically the town of Dartmouth, though the ferry company has a separate corporate existence, being incorporated by an Act of the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia. There was nothing crooked about the transaction. People of both sides of politics in the town agreed to recommend this site to the Government as the best site for the office, and there was nothing underhanded in the transaction whatever.

Lunenburg Post Office, Custom House, &c..... $10,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Perhaps the Minister will give us some information in regard to this?

Mr. OUIMET. This is about the same thing as the last. The site has been bought and the architect is preparing the plans. No contract has yet been entered into for the building of the post office. Lunenburg is a very important place and a very progressive place. The harbour is very large.

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the receipts?

Mr. OUIMET. The postal receipts last year were only $2,053. The customs duties paid amounted to $14,203.83. The money orders issued reached the sum of $30,196.74. There is a large trade there. The exports amounted to $978,611 and the imports to $153,470. The goods entered for consumption were of the value of $154,451. The population in 1871 was 3,231, and it has grown to 4,894, and I understand that the port as well as the town is increasing rapidly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is there any building now owned by the Government for this purpose?

Mr. OUIMET. No, there is none. This is to be not only a post office but a custom house, and, as I have shown, the business is very considerable.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the entire cost to be?

Mr. OUIMET. As it is estimated here, it is to be $26,400, but there is an attempt to reduce that amount, though I cannot say if we will be able to reduce it.

Mr. CASEY. What is the cost of the present accommodation?

Mr. OUIMET. I cannot tell that. That information must have been given when the vote was first asked. I cannot be expected to bring down all the records of the department for the last ten years.

Mr. CASEY. Apart from all badinage or joking, the information which I ask for is proper and usual. It is proper at any time during the construction of a building to enquire into all the particulars in regard to it. We want to know what the present accommodation costs and what the new accommodation will cost, so that we may see whether there is to be any economy by the change or any increase in the cost. We should know what the present rental is, and then we could compare that with the interest which will have to be paid on this expenditure, and so we could compare the two plans. I would ask

when this was commenced, and has anything been done in the way of building?

Mr. OUIMET. No, nothing.

Mr. CASEY. When was the land purchased?

Mr. OUIMET. On 1st May, 1887.

Mr. CASEY. Why was it never gone on with until now?

Mr. OUIMET. I do not know.

Mr. CASEY. That is what we would like to know, because the money must have been voted before the land was bought, and that was before the general election of 1887. In spite of that, the people of Lunenburg saw fit to return a member at that election in opposition to the Government, and the hon. gentleman's predecessor evidently did not feel so much bound as he says he has been by the vote of the House to spend the money, because, though it was voted, it has not been expended. He says that, when money is voted by the House, it is his duty to go on and spend it. Why is it that the Government were not bound by the decision of the House in 1887 when Mr. Eisenhauer was the member for Lunenburg? I am afraid it was because Mr. Eisenhauer was the member for that county, and they have deliberately deprived the people of Lunenburg of the accommodation the House ordered to be given to them, because they returned a member to oppose the Government. I think the Government were justified in asking for a vote for that place, and I think the House was justified in voting the money, but the Government have no defence whatever to give for their course in depriving that place of the accommodation for five years as a punishment for the expression of the political views of the people there. Now, when Lunenburg has again changed its political complexion, the Government say they are bound to spend this money. They say: We have been keeping it here to see if you would be good boys, and we told you that if you were good boys we would build this post office, and now we will carry out our promise. It is a clear case of bribery: it is a clear case of infraction of the rule of the House that public buildings should be given for public purposes without regard to the political complexion of the place where they were put. This money had been actually voted and was lying at the credit of that undertaking in the treasury, and the Government refused to spend it until they got a supporter of their own from that county. What else can you call it but a corrupt transaction?

Mr. BOWERS. Here is a place that has a revenue only $4 more than the town of Digby, while the post office order and money business is not so much within $4,000 or $5,000. I would also remark with regard to the item for this post office, that the Government seem to be putting up too expensive buildings. We find the Government putting up buildings at a cost of $20,000 or $30,000 for little villages of 500 to 1,000 inhabitants. For a few thousand dollars you could put up a nice wooden building that would answer all the purpose, and there would not be so much said about it. But it is a waste of money to spend $20,000 or $25,000 on public buildings in places like Lunenburg and Dartmouth. The interest on $25,000 is more than it costs now to keep this building running, and pay the postmaster's salary. You will not get receipts enough out of the post office to pay for running expenses of the building.

Mr. BORDEN. I was glad to hear the Minister say that while he was not prepared to state the exact line of policy with reference to new buildings, he had decided that he considered himself under an obligation to proceed with any work that had received a grant by this House prior to the date at which the hon. member for Bothwell brought down his resolution two years ago.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). That has lapsed.

Mr. BORDEN. I pointed that out an hour ago, and if the hon. member for Annapolis had been in his place he would have heard it. I was going to say that a grant had been made for the town of Kentville in my county at the same time a grant was made for the post office in Lunenburg, and in view of the statement made by the Minister with reference to the policy of the Government, I would like to know whether he proposes to take into consideration a revote of the grant for Kentville?

Mr. OUIMET. That matter will be taken into consideration.

Mr. KAULBACH. I can hardly satisfy myself that hon. gentlemen opposite are serious in attempting to obstruct this item in the Estimates for the erection of a post office in the shire town of the county I have the honour to represent. A review of the Public Accounts or Trade and Navigation Returns will satisfy them that the town of Lunenburg is entitled to a public building. It appears to me that hon. gentlemen are not consistent. When my predecessor was here in the last Parliament they were voicing the sentiment to which I am giving utterance now, when they pointed out the necessity for a public building in the town of Lunenburg. Now, I want this House to understand that this building is very greatly needed. I can say with no proud spirit or boast, and with no desire to offer any egotistical remark, that there is no town outside the city of Halifax that does a larger trade than the town of Lunenburg. Its exports last year were nearly $1,000,000. But if we want to get at a fair representation of the exports of that town, I would have to add to this and make it something like $1,700,000, as the exports of that town are not represented in full, but only those passing through the customs: those going to Halifax, there to be transhipped, are not represented at all. This building is to be appropriated for other purposes than those of a post office. It will be used for a savings bank, for inland revenue, for customs, including tide-waiter and the shipping offices and bonding warehouse. I feel satisfied that the Government are fully justified in making this expenditure.

Mr. FLINT. When hon. gentlemen look at the revenues from the town of Lunenburg and compare the figures there given with places that are without accommodation of this kind in Ontario and Quebec they naturally complain that constituencies in Nova Scotia which send supporters of the Government receive greater consideration than towns in constituencies that send opponents of the Government in other portions of the Dominion. While we in Nova Scotia are naturally gratified at receiving appropriations for public buildings in towns where the postal receipts are about $3,000, while towns returning $10,000 or $15,000 in Ontario do

not receive this accommodation, yet we would find ourselves in a difficult position if we were called upon to defend these very appropriations in the absence of any recognized rule. But the point of complaint is in regard to the appropriation for the public building at Lunenburg, that while the necessity existed during the time the county was represented by Mr. Eisenhauer, and while the need was felt as much then as at the present time, the Government did not carry out the mandate of the House, and they gave no attention to the matter previous to the general election at which our friend was elected. While the necessity was being felt by the people of Lunenburg, so well represented by Mr. Eisenhauer, they were denied that accommodation; but immediately after another general election, in which the political complexion of the county was changed, then the Government proceeded to carry out the work. I disagree with by hon. friend on another point, which is not very important to hon. members present, but I think he has given undue prominence in the commercial world to the shire town of the county he represents, as compared with the shire town of the county I represent. I could show from the Trade and Navigations Returns as well as from other documents that while Lunenburg is a thriving and prosperous community, it does not in its relation to the public revenue occupy so prominent a position as another town in the same province.

Mr. BOWELL. You have a public building.

Mr. FLINT. Yes. This is a mere matter of local pride between the hon. gentleman and myself. I am not opposed to the construction of the public building at Lunenburg. I am commenting on the attitude taken by the Government in refusing to carry out the mandate of Parliament while the county was represented by a Liberal, and when after the election a Conservative was returned, the Government proceeded to carry out what they call the instructions of Parliament. The principle is unsound politically, and immoral, and we are doing our duty in protesting against it whenever an opportunity arises. A very good and commodious public building was erected at Yarmouth. That building was advocated during the elections. Claims were made that this building was granted to Yarmouth because it happened to be represented by a supporter of the Government and although the constituents took no stock in the report, yet desperate efforts were made by the supporters of the Government to influence the people to believe that to oppose the Government was to show ingratitude towards the Administration. On the platform and in the press we repelled with scorn every such claim, that we had any gratitude to offer to this Government for an expenditure of public money, that we only considered that our rights are weighed, and that we do not come before Parliament in a cringing or begging attitude when we are asking for our rights in regard to public works. That is the point which I take to be the turning point of the whole discussion this evening, it is to voice an emphatic and unanimous protest on the part of the Opposition against the Government in their expenditure of public funds to purchase electoral support. The time, I trust, is at hand, and we have the promise of the Minister, that within the next few days a principle will be laid down by the Government. I understand one has been laid down, but the Government has not yet fully acceded to it, which shall guide appropriations of this kind in future. I do not ask that population or revenue or any other one particular circumstance be made the dividing line on which public works shall be given or withheld. All we ask is that some line should be laid down which members of both sides should follow. But peddling around appropriations of $500, $1,000 or $20,000 among 200 constituencies is degrading to our people, unjust to every interest we hold dear, and I hope the time is at hand when we shall abolish it for ever.

Mr. LISTER. There has been laid down a line of principle, and it is the duty of members of this House to see that the Government observes the principle so laid down. The hon. Minister now says that the vote before the committee was approved by the House, and he is simply carrying out his duty in completing the structure. I desire to say that the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), who seems to resent an attack before any one attacked him, that he has misapprehended entirely the point of the discussion this evening. As regards a post office at Lunenburg, no doubt it is an important place and requires public buildings; but the objection made by this side of the House is that, although this money was voted in 1887, it was not until 1892 the Government made any move in the direction of commencing the construction of these buildings. The hon. gentleman was not a member from 1887 to 1891. His predecessor was Mr. Eisenhauer. I think if the hon. gentleman had earnestly assisted Mr. Eisenhauer in urging the Government to construct the new building, there would not have been the delay that occurred in the matter; but, if I were to look behind the scenes, I would find the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) advising the Government not to do anything until after the next general election. If the hon. gentleman told us exactly what took place, he would admit that this was the attitude he took towards the Government, and if the Government did not proceed with the work, perhaps they were not so much to blame as the hon. member for Lunenburg, because I feel as satisfied as I am on anything, without actually seeing it, that the hon. gentleman was most active in trying to prevent the then member for Lunenburg obtaining the credit of having secured this building, and it was through his exertions and efforts that the Government stayed their hand. So, after all, perhaps the Government are not so much to blame. If any person is to blame, let us put the blame on the right shoulders—let us blame the hon. member for Lunenburg. If this money was not expended, it was no doubt not expended through his efforts and representations. But there is a good deal of truth in what the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) has said. We people who live in Western Ontario and Quebec, when we learn that places in the Maritime Provinces having a population of 2,000 and a postal revenue of $2,000 receive the advantage of public buildings, which have at all events the effect of beautifying the town, we must feel that the expenditure is very frequently so much money lost to the people of this country. But, Sir, we feel that if such buildings are to be erected in the Maritime Provinces in towns where the revenue is $2,000 and even less per year, then we in the western portion of the Dominion have a right to

receive from the Government the same consideration. When we see small villages and towns in the Maritime Provinces favoured in this way, and large towns in the western country having no such chance of getting this advantage, then we feel that probably the Government is using this great power for the purpose of securing support for itself. The Government cannot be condemned too strongly, and their mode of proceeding in this matter cannot be exposed too much, and it is the duty of hon. members in this House, in season and out of season, to expose the Government in its nefarious work under this huge system of bribery. They are not satisfied with getting money from contractors to bribe the electors individually, but they must also hold out to the people the promise of public buildings in their midst in order to turn them over *en bloc*. There is no question about it, but that hon. gentlemen who have the reins of government are assuming great responsibilities, not only here but hereafter. What greater sin can be committed than bribing and debauching the electors of this country? Be it done by public works, or by a dollar or two paid to the voter, the moral effect is the same. This thing must stop, and the Liberals of this House would be forgetful of their duty if they did not day and night protest as strongly as it is possible for them to do, against the nefarious system which has been introduced by this Government in the erection of public buildings.

Mr. FORBES. It seems to be the fashion that the Government should expend public moneys in places other than where the public interest requires it. I find that there is in the County of Lunenburg a town called Bridgewater, which yielded to the revenue of the country $2,702, while the town of Lunenburg yielded $2,053, and there is no public building to be erected in Bridgewater. I should like to know from some member of the Government on what principle moneys are expended in this manner? There is a principle laid down by the House, but that is not necessarily followed by the Government. We have in the Province of Nova Scotia two instances where moneys have been voted for public buildings, but when a Liberal was returned to this House the votes were withdrawn and have never been reinstated in the Estimates since. A few months before the election of 1887 a sum was voted for a public building in Lunenburg, but it was withdrawn, I may say deliberately, by the Government when a Liberal was elected to represent that county. Now again, when a Conservative represents the county we are asked to ratify a vote which has lain dormant for the last five years. And again, for a public building in Kentville a sum was voted in 1886, and a year afterwards it was dropped and has never been revoted, and a Liberal has represented the county ever since the general elections of 1887. I want to say to the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) that as a Liberal from the Province of Nova Scotia, I do not obstruct this vote, nor do the Liberal party on principle obstruct the vote. We are pointing out to the Government, as is our duty, that the principle on which public buildings are erected is unjust and is not consistent with the rights of the several provinces. The County of Lunenburg has no more right to that $26,000, nor one-half as much right as the town of Liverpool, in the County of Queen's, and I ask now that the town of Liverpool should receive that same treatment that Lunenburg is receiving to-night. I can put forward a much stronger reason why this vote should be passed than the hon. member himself has put forward, and that is that Lunenburg is a thriving town in the Province of Nova Scotia and the people are entitled to this appropriation. I say also that the town of Liverpool has a revenue within a few dollars of the town of Lunenburg in postal revenue.

An hon. MEMBER. Get the customs and excise figures.

Mr. FORBES. I have not them at hand, but I should say they are nearly as large as those of the town of Lunenburg.

Mr. BOWELL. Just about one-half.

Mr. FORBES. The total amount of money orders in 1891 received in the town of Liverpool was $30,746, and in Lunenburg $21,800. The total amount of money orders paid in Liverpool was $13,300, and in Lunenburg $8,329. If you base the customs returns upon the amount of money distributed in money orders, the town of Liverpool is far ahead of the town of Lunenburg. The town of Lunenburg has not increased proportionately as much as the town of Liverpool. Although it has shown a fair increase, that is due to the fact that a number of suburbs have been added to it, which have helped to swell the population of 1891 as compared with that of 1881. Had the population of the same limits been taken in 1891 as in 1881, it would have shown hardly any or a very small increase—so I am informed by reliable persons in that town. I do not say this in derogation of the town of Lunenburg, because I trust that it will prosper more in the future than it has done in the past, and I know it will prosper if it can get relief from the restrictions of the present Government's fiscal policy. What I object to is the principle on which the Government vote these moneys. I simply want them to do what is fair and just. I simply say that the town of Liverpool needs a public building, and I trust that the Minister, out of the largeness of his heart, will consider its just claims.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman will understand that we cannot build public buildings for every place at the same time. Liverpool will have its turn as early as the revenue of the country will permit. It may be served last, but it is sure to be served.

Mr. FORBES. Of course I look upon the Minister's statement as a distinct and positive pledge that all towns requiring public buildings will receive them. I therefore press more strongly than ever the requirements of Liverpool for a public building. I could lay a plan before the Minister under which a building could be got to accommodate the public offices of that town for far less than that at Lunenberg is costing. There is no necessity for putting up a building costing $26,000. One costing one-half of that amount would fulfil all the requirements of the public offices. The towns along the south shore of Nova Scotia require special consideration at the present time. They are paying more *per capita* to the revenue of Canada than almost any other part of the Dominion; and there are none that require more consideration than the shire towns of Queen's and Shelburne. We only want the Government to give fair consideration to the

matter, and not endeavour by means of these appropriations to induce the electors of those counties to support them. The people of those counties believe that the public funds are in the hands of the Government as trustees to be expended only where they are needed in the interest of the people, no matter whether they return a Liberal or a Conservative to represent them on the question of trade policy. The hon. member for Yarmouth spoke of his opponent attempting to make capital against him by telling the people that the Government were spending money on public works as a matter of charity, and that the people should be thankful to them. That is a principle I denounce. The people of the south shore, at any rate, have always exhibited and always will exhibit the greatest spirit of British fair-play that you can find in the Dominion; they believe that the Government hold these funds as guardians, and should expend them not as a matter of right to those who support them, but for those who actually need them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I supposed when the hon. Minister of Public Works in the early part of the evening stated that he felt himself bound to go on with this work because the House had already pledged the Government to it on a former occasion by making an appropriation for it, he referred to something that had been done during the last session after the adoption of the resolution of 1890. But it has come out during this discussion that this appropriation was made on the eve of the election of 1887, and that the Government have allowed the matter to remain in abeyance for five years; and now the hon. gentleman comes forward to redeem the obligation which the House by its vote in 1887 imposed on the Government. How far back does the hon. gentleman propose to go? How long does he propose to continue this principle of redeeming pledges and fulfilling obligations imposed on the Government by the appropriations made by the House? The hon. gentleman has had called to his attention the appropriation that was made in the County of King's, N.S. Does he propose to redeem that pledge this session? That is as old a one as this, and was thought to be of sufficient importance by that distinguished and able Minister whom the hon. gentleman has succeeded and whom he declares it is his ambition humbly to follow, and that pledge was made at the same time as the pledge which the hon. gentleman has now undertaken to redeem. I suppose that there was something more important impressing itself on the attention of the hon. gentleman than the pledge of 1887. That was the obligation imposed upon the Government in 1890 by a resolution moved in amendment to going into Supply, and accepted by the Government, and sustained by the unanimous decision of the House. That is binding upon the hon. gentleman, and if he had said so earlier in the discussion we would have made greater progress, but the hon. gentleman must see that the Opposition are determined to hold the Government to the promise they made in 1890. It was no idle promise, it was not a promise to enable the Government to go on more rapidly with supply, but a promise intended on the part of the Opposition, and they supposed on the part of the Government, to lay down a line of public policy which would not be departed from. The revenues the hon. gentleman now proposes to appropriate are not the private property of the Administration, but public moneys held as a great public trust, and we ask that they fulfil their trust honestly. My hon. friends on this side say that over and over again in the elections Government supporters have said, if you will send your representative to support us, we will appropriate a certain sum out of the treasury for this and that purpose. I say that is an offence so serious that it would justify the impeachment of any man who would go before a constituency and make such a declaration on behalf of the Minister. It is nothing short of high crime. What was the object of establishing municipal institutions in this country? It was to divest the Local Legislatures of the power to tempt constituencies by making local appropriations for roads, bridges, &c., but the Government have undertaken to influence constituencies by withholding or granting public moneys to public works, according as these constituencies favour or disfavour the Administration. That is a monstrous state of things, which should not be tolerated where you have free institutions. Why does the Administration undertake to act in this partial manner to the detriment of the public service? You are increasing the burdens of the population. You are necessitating higher taxes. It has been pointed out again and again that where you undertake to engage in that expenditure, you increase the cost of the government of the country. For every public building you erect you impose on the country a heavier charge than existed in that locality before. There are places where private properties cannot be obtained and where the amount of public revenue collected justifies the expenditure of public money. Lunenberg may be a case in point; I am but simply calling attention to the point that the rule laid down is disregarded, and that the Government have not the courage to ask the House to set aside the rule and give them authority to administer the revenues of the country in the interests of party. That is a position which ought not to be sustained, and the Government should have time to consider whether they are going to stand by the policy settled by this House or whether they are going to depart from that policy; and to give them that opportunity it is only right to suggest that the committee should rise and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). It is evident that hon. gentlemen opposite want to talk against time.

Mr. FLINT. I rise to a point of order. Is it in order for an hon. member to accuse gentlemen on this side of speaking against time?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TAYLOR). There is nothing unparliamentary in that.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). We have been sitting here for five hours discussing one item in the Estimates.

Mr. FLINT. We will stay five hours longer.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). We will sit with you as long as you choose. It is evident hon. gentlemen opposite do not intend allowing one item to pass, as has been stated in the corridor.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not true; name.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Has it come to this that a handful of that forlorn little band are going to dictate to this side as to whether one item in the Estimates shall pass or not? Are we

going to allow ourselves to be dictated to by the little band over there?

Mr. FLINT. You cannot help yourself.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). See whether we can or not. Are we going to allow ourselves to be dictated to by that little band and not allow this item to pass? It is an item affecting only one particular portion of the Dominion and the amount is $1,500.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Your leader does not want it to pass to-night.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). By making the specious argument which the hon. gentleman did, he evidently does not want this item to pass. People expect business and not obstruction, and we are here to perform the functions that devolve upon the government of the country. When the people come to investigate the cause of the delay, they will find that it is the unnecessary talk on the part of the Opposition to-night. What is there in this item to prevent its passing?

Mr. McMULLEN. You have been told that a dozen times.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). You might be told twenty times and then you would not understand it. You ask me to give the name of an individual who said the item should not pass to-night. The fact of your interjection shows that I was right.

Mr. McMULLEN. Not at all.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Then let the item pass. Is there any objection to it? I wait for an answer and I fail to get it, then, unless this is obstruction, what is it?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Ask your own side?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). If you are determined the item shall not pass by means of obstruction, then the sooner the Government recognizes what its duties and its powers are, the better for the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) must be a sort of a Rip Van Winkle, and must have been sleeping for about four hours if he cannot understand why the Opposition desire that these items shall not pass, because it has been explained that an agreement was arrived at some years ago that public buildings would be erected in places which contributed the largest amount of revenue, and, in violation of that, the Government are asking the committee to pass these votes. If the hon. gentleman was not asleep, or if his upper story was not asleep, he would understand the objections we have made to these items. We have been criticising them because we are anxious to maintain the principle laid down two years ago, and yet the Government are pressing upon us the voting of money for post offices in places where only $2,000 of revenue is collected. If hon. gentlemen think we are going to allow them to peddle around the erection of public buildings, where and when and under what circumstances they please, in order to secure constituencies, we feel it our duty to oppose them as we are doing now. The Minister of Militia is looking at me as if I was a sort of serpent. The hon. Minister voted for this very principle he is now asking the committee to violate.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TAYLOR). I must adhere to the rule laid down by the Deputy Speaker before he left, that the items before the Chair must be discussed.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am discussing the item before the Chair.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say that the language which was used by the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Macdonell) was as far apart from the item before the House, and much further than the remarks of my hon. friend from North Wellington. Your duty is to attend to one as well as to the other. I say that your conduct was very partial in not calling attention to the language of the hon. gentleman from Algoma.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I appeal from the ruling of the Chairman to the Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I ask that the Speaker be sent for.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I demand that the Speaker shall be sent for. I accuse the Chairman of partiality.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is your duty to send for the Speaker.

Mr. LISTER. I move that the committee rise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried; lost.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TAYLOR). I think the nays have it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have a right to speak to that motion. We have been here for hours discussing an item, and we have a right to call the attention of the committee to that, and to endeavour to educate hon. gentlemen opposite to their duty in regard to it. I think it is proper that the committee should rise in order to allow the Government to meet to-morrow and decide whether or not they intend to adhere to the principle which was laid down two years ago. We have endeavoured to enlighten hon. gentlemen opposite on this subject.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). That is all right.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not mind what the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) says. We do not pay much attention to any man who talks in this House about tangle-leg and benzine, and matters of that kind. I think it is time the committee should rise. It is getting near daylight. I sympathize with the Minister of Militia, who has been sitting here for six or seven hours nearly boiling over, and he is not very young. I hope the refreshments he has been taking will enable him to stand the strain a little longer, but I hope the committee will soon rise, so that we may have a little rest. I think we should in all reason adjourn the House at this very late hour. I understand the Minister of War has refreshed himself, and is now disposed to enter upon war, is disposed to make war and encourage war. Our numbers may not be quite as great as his, but I think we are quite ready to meet him on his own ground.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). One word of explanation with regard to some remarks of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). Twice to-night he has insinuated that hon. gentlemen on this side have gone down to the bar and

made use of tangle-leg. Mr. Chairman, I did not go down with my mean little ten cent piece in my fingers like some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I go down with my friends, and more than that when I do go down I do not sing the "Irishman's Shanty." Now, Sir, with regard to the motion to adjourn the debate that has been made, it strikes me that we have done very little business to-night. We have been here for hours and what have we done? How much has been done for the country? It is true that during this session the hon. member for North Wellington has spoken about 799 times, and has cost the country about $12,000, but what has he accomplished either for his constituency or for the country generally? He has accomplished nothing in the world.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand there is a motion before this committee to rise. For once I am not in accord with my hon. friend on this side who has made that motion. My desire rather is to proceed with the business of the House and to continue this discussion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend had better withdraw the motion to adjourn the debate, and we can pass two or three items and then rise. It is close to three o'clock in the morning.

Motion to adjourn debate withdrawn.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is understood that items 141 and 142 will be passed and the committee will then rise.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not understand what objection can be made to No. 143 (Chatham post office).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood that after 141 and 142 were passed we should adjourn.

Mr. BOWELL. I said I thought we might adjourn after we had finished the page.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I mentioned the matter to the Minister of Public Works, and he agreed to this arrangement.

Mr. BOWELL. I should like to know whether I have the floor, or whether the hon. gentlemen not only arrogate to themselves the right to do all the talking, but also to retain possession of the floor. I desire to repeat what the Minister of Public Works said at the beginning of this discussion six hours ago, when the question was put to him by the hon. member for Bothwell, as to the policy of the Government in regard to the resolution passed a few years ago. My hon. friend then stated very properly that if there were any new item which might be supposed to affirm a new principle, the question might legitimately and properly come up, and in all probability that opportunity might present itself when the Supplementary Estimates were laid before the committee, or when we reached some new item on which the committee had not expressed an opinion. But notwithstanding that statement, we have had on the Lunenburg case the hon. member for Digby stating in a very clear way his objection. He was followed by the hon. member for King's, who did so more forcibly. He was followed at greater length by the hon. member for Yarmouth, then by the hon. member for Bothwell and still later by the hon. member for Wellington. Yet we are told that these members are trying to impress on us the necessity of observing a general principle, and are endeavouring to give us information. It may be that members on this side of the House are exceedingly dull, but I do not think it requires the assertion of a principle half a dozen or a dozen times in order to impress this view on the House. The hon. member for South Oxford was very indignant because it was suggested that hon. gentlemen opposite were trying to obstruct business. I will not say so; but the country, after reading the full report of to-night's debate, after reading the oft-repeated remarks on one point, when at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning some little business should be done, unless hon. gentlemen are determined to remain here all summer. I am not going to discuss the matter further, but I do not think the committee should rise until it has at least done something, so that the meeting of the House to-day will not have been altogether abortive.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was referring to the understanding and agreement I arrived at with the Minister of Public Works. When an arrangement is made across the floor it is always carried out. The Minister of Public Works agreed that if the items 141 and 142 were carried, the committee would then rise.

Mr. OUIMET. There is no doubt that the understanding was the items should be passed up to 143, and we should then adjourn.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was a clear understanding between the Minister of Public Works and myself, and I am quite sure he is not going back on the arrangement made. There would be an end to all arrangements made by both sides of the House unless we carry out all arrangements come to in this way.

Mr. OUIMET. I move that the committee rise and report the resolutions.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3 o'clock a. m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 18th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADJOURNMENT FOR HOLIDAYS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know whether the House is yet in a position to make up its mind as to the adjournment which will take place next week, but I will call the attention of the House to the fact that Tuesday and Thursday are statutory holidays, and as I mentioned yesterday, it has been suggested that Monday should be conceded also. As to that, we have no special wish. It is a private members' day, and we shall defer to the views of private members as to whether that day shall be

passed over or not. I have also been pressed to adjourn over Wednesday as well, but the Government are of opinion that we should sit on the two days in that week which are available for Government business at any rate.

Mr. LAURIER. As far as I have been able to learn the opinion of the House, I think an adjournment from Friday evening to Wednesday at three o'clock would be acceptable.

Mr. CHARLTON. Could we have any guarantee from the Government that they will not take Monday in the next week for Government business? It is the only day private members have left.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I do not propose to take the following Monday.

Mr. CHARLTON. I might also ask the Government whether they intend to adopt the Wednesday's Order for Monday, so as to give public Bills and Orders an opportunity of being taken up after six o'clock?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Subject to reconsideration, I may say it is proposed to alter the order of business for the Monday following.

Mr. CURRAN. A considerable number of members feel that we might, with a good deal of profit, adjourn from Friday till the following Friday, and sit on Saturday.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried. Lost.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P. E. I.) A considerable number of members are not in favour of any adjournment at all, and for the sake of those who cannot get to their homes which are very far away, there should be some kind of medium, and I am of the opinion that, if hon. gentlemen who live near by get an adjournment over Monday, it should be enough.

Mr. CURRAN. By sitting on Saturday there will be no time lost. We can get through the same amount of business.

Mr. LAURIER. I think, if we were to agree to adjourn from Friday to Friday, it would in point of fact amount to adjourning to the following Tuesday.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think we had better adhere to what was indicated yesterday, and I, therefore, move:

That when the House adjourns on Friday next, it will stand adjourned until Wednesday at three o'clock in the afternoon, and that when it adjourns on Wednesday, it will stand adjourned until the following Friday at three o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

DAIRIES AND CHEESE FACTORIES IN THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. DUGAS asked. Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint an officer to visit the various dairies and cheese factories of the Province of Quebec, especially those in the County of Montcalm, in order to give any required information respecting the making of these two articles, butter and cheese; and to teach the proper method of building the factories themselves for the purposes above mentioned?

Mr. CARLING. Under the direction of the dairy commissioner, his assistant for the French-speaking district made 54 visits in 34 counties in the Province of Quebec during 1891. He was accompanied by an expert cheese and butter-maker. They gave instructions to 142 cheese-makers, 26 butter-makers and 8 inspectors of syndicates. They also gave addresses on co-operative dairying and furnished information on the construction and management of cheese factories and creameries. Similar work is being undertaken this year in the Province of Quebec, and the County of Montcalm will be visited by one of the experts on the dairy commissioner's staff. A programme of the places and dates for every month is advertised about the middle of the preceding month. Montcalm is on the programme for July.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has not stated the names of the officers.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Chapais is the assistant dairy commissioner for the Province of Quebec, and these visits were made under his direction, and under the direction of the Chief Dairy Commissioner, Professor Robertson.

SEIZURES BY E. HAMMOND.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, What were the seizures effected by E. Hammond, of Montmagny, which earned for him, as his share in the transactions, the sum of $1,659.24? The whole as stated in the Auditor General's Report for the year ending the 30th June, 1891, at page A-8.

Mr. BOWELL. I think it would have been better, in matters involving so much, if the hon. gentleman had asked for this information by a notice of motion. However, I will give him the information now. I may say that the total amount of $1,659.24 is made up of seizures extending from the 13th May, 1889, to 5th October, 1890, as follows:—On 13th May, 1889, a seizure was made from one Thomas Riviere, on the schooner *Marie Anne*, twenty-five casks of spirits; amount awarded, $637.95. On 22nd July, 1890, a seizure from parties unknown, of three casks of alcohol, one cask of wine, two cases of cognac, one cask of Vermouth wine, and one case of elixir or assorted liquor: amount awarded, $119.51. On 2nd August, 1890, from parties unknown, one barrel of alcohol; amount awarded, $18.58. On 26th August, 1890, from parties unknown, one cask Jamaica rum: amount awarded, $8.83. On the same date, from parties unknown, two casks of alcohol: amount awarded, $51.49. On 5th October, 1890, from schooner (name unknown) forty barrels of American alcohol, eight barrels of rum, one quarter cask of whiskey, four half octaves of gin, and nine cases of assorted liquors: amount awarded, $822.84, making a total of $1,659.24.

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law.

(In the Committee.)

On section 38,

Mr. LAURIER. This section gives the very large power to a peace officer to arrest a man on suspicion that he is going to commit a wrong, without waiting until he has committed a wrong. A breach of the peace is not a very serious offence, and to place such powers as are contained in this

section in the hands of officers may sometimes lead to very serious abuse.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These sections are not an extension of the common law.

Mr. LAURIER. By introducing them into a statute, you deprive the judges of the latitude which they have hitherto enjoyed in dealing with these cases.

On section 39.

Mr. FLINT. This clause is almost a protection to persons taking part in a riot. It is too vague and general in its terms.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A riot of any considerable dimensions is not put down by the ordinary peace officers. Persons have to be called in to assist, and very often by outside persons who desire the preservation of the peace, but have no official authority, have to use their exertions to suppress the riot. The authority for this section is the code under the Bill of 1880, and the common law is considered to be exactly the same. This note is made by the authors of the code as to the limitation contained in the concluding words: "This limitation is not expressed by the authorities, but it appears to be implied from the nature of the law: that is, no more force is to be used than is absolutely necessary."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should be glad to know, in regard to all these clauses, on what they are founded. I see references made to the Bill of 1880. As a matter of fact, that Bill, although introduced a great many years ago, never became the law in England.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It did not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears *primâ facie* that if a Bill which had been introduced twelve years before into the English Parliament, with all the authority which the commissioners could give it, was not thought fit to become law, it is a very dangerous precedent for us to follow to take a thing which after all is little better than a mere draft, as the guide for our legislation. So far as I recollect, no attempt was ever made to re-introduce this Bill, which indicates that there must have been great objections raised to it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not aware of any objections to the code, other than those which will be raised in every legislature in the way of suggestions for its improvement. But the principles of this code and the efficiency of the work performed in framing it have never been doubted. It originated more than twenty years ago, but during that time the movement in favour of it has been gradually increasing in strength, and in 1879, there was the report of a Royal Commission composed of Lord Blackburn, Sir R. Barry, and Judges Lush and Fitz-James Stephen, all the very highest authorities. I have the code of 1879 before me. Their work was all revised later, in 1880, when a Bill was introduced which was almost word for word with the code. But the hon. gentleman will remember that since 1880, nothing has passed of any length, or which was likely to cause any great discussion. It was a matter of physical impossibility that the code could be passed in the present state of business in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and nothing else, except the pressure of legislative business, would have prevented the passage of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was adversely criticised by Sir Alexander Cockburn.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, and by a great many people who are opposed to seeing anything done by anybody but themselves. The Bill gathered up all opposition of that description; but the Bill was admitted to be a very useful one, and it was conceded that such a Bill should be adopted as soon as Parliament could pass it.

Mr. LAURIER. This is transferring our text books into a statute.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not altogether. But where it is useful to state the law and to state the details of the law, that course has been followed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I speak under correction, for it is utterly impossible for any one not a lawyer and not having experience in criminal law to offer an absolute opinion on clauses of this kind, but it appears to me that we run some risk in accepting a code which was prepared for a state of things different in a good many respects from ours. As the Minister perfectly well knows, the idea which appears to have been prominent in the minds of those gentlemen who drew this criminal code in England was to arm the recognized officer of the law with authority to deal with the regular criminal classes. I can understand that a great many provisions might be suitable, especially in the great cities of England which are happily not required here, and, speaking for myself, judging from what has passed in this House and what I see here, it does appear to me that we are conferring on police officers in this country who are not under any regular discipline or authority, powers which these English codifiers only intended to give to members of a regularly disciplined force under something very like military law, and who are obliged to deal with the regular criminal classes. The Minister of Justice knows that criminal classes in the sense that they exist in old countries like England do not exist at all here as yet, and I hope will not for a long time to come. It does appear to me that we are going very far in this matter.

Mr. MULOCK. I think these clauses will require very serious modification. Section 39 enacts that every one is justified in using whatever force is necessary in order to suppress a riot, and the only limitation to the extent of the force is that it shall not be greater than the unlawful force that is likely to be set in motion in case of a riot. For example, a number of persons may be gathered together, and if as an observer chooses to say: I believe that this gathering will develop a riot from which there will be loss of life, he can become a peace officer, and if in good faith he proceeds to suppress this riot by force, not slaying any more than he thinks would be slain in case of a riot, he is to be defended by this clause. That is the extent of the power you are conferring upon persons not in any way connected with the administration of the law. It is in fact legislating to make violence permissible by Act of Parliament. A few years ago we know that in the colony of Newfoundland there was a good deal of feeling between two classes of people. One class met another in procession. Suppose one class should proceed to imagine that the other was

going to cause a riot, in order to prevent this riot which would be accompanied by bloodshed, one might fall upon the other procession with the result that this action would be sanctioned by Act of Parliament. I do not think there ever has been such a law passed in modern times, and I do not believe that we should now give such powers to irresponsible persons. I hope that the clause will be withdrawn.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman although a lawyer entirely misapprehends this clause. It does not give power to commence action but to suppress a riot; presuming that the riot is actually in operation at the time of the interference.

Mr. FLINT. I apprehend that this is not a statement of the common law, because the common law requires persons to be acting under some authority. I should think that a few additional words like these would meet the criticisms which have been suggested against this clause:

"Every one who is called upon so to do by any magistrate or peace officer, is justified in using whatever force may be necessary."

I would submit that suggestion to the Minister of Justice as a fair statement of the common law and as a good reason for interfering to suppress a riot. The person interfering would then be placing himself under the guardianship of those whose duty it is to protect the peace, but as the clause stands, a person will be acting upon his own idea of what is right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose the intention of this clause is to embody the principles of law laid down by Lord Mansfield in the Lord George Gordon riots, and by another distinguished judge in the Bristol riots, but it seems to me that this clause would make the law very much more indefinite than it was made by the decision of Lord Mansfield, and by the decision of Justice Tyndall in the Bristol riots. In the Gordon riots there was a good deal of hesitation and cowardice exhibited by the Lord Mayor of London, and in the Bristol riots by the Mayor of Bristol. Judge Tyndall recognized the rule, that I suppose it is intended to set up, that any magistrate was entitled to call out parties and to control the military force for the purpose of re-establishing peace, and that all citizens would be to some extent peace officers for that purpose. In this section it is said:

"Every one is justified in using force necessary to suppress a riot, providing the force used is not disproportionate to the danger to be apprehended from the riot."

It is not the extent of force or of numbers that are called out upon which the responsibility depends, but it is upon the acts which the parties who are called out do after being so called out. There was a statement made by a military officer of distinction, one of the Napiers, who being examined before the committee of the House of Lords upon this subject, said that a military man in this case was in a very awkward position, because, if he disobeyed orders he was liable to be court-martialed and shot, and if he obeyed orders he was liable to be hanged by the civil authorities for excess of duty. Here it is provided that the force used is not to be disproportionate to the effect, but supposing the force used is not disproportionate to the danger, but the cause of it, does this clause aim at the cause or does it aim at the force, making the liability to arise whenever the force is greater than should be called for under the circumstances, and the number of persons called out would be taken as an indication of the illegal intention of the party who is acting. It seems to me that the clause as framed is not calculated to embody into statutory law the principles laid down in these two decisions I have referred to. The clause says:

"Every one is justified in using force necessary to suppress a riot, providing the force used is not disproportionate to the danger to be apprehended from the riot."

If the section provided that every one called out by some magistrate was justified in obeying the orders of the magistrate in the suppression of a riot, provided such orders did not exceed the actual requirements of the case, the section would be more acceptable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The section does not refer to the military or volunteer or police force, because it would be absurd to enact that every one is justified in using force as a police officer. It means that the acts of violence which one does to another in aiding to suppress a riot are justified if they do not exceed the danger to be apprehended from the continuance of the riot. As regards the argument that the provision may be abused, the same may be said of every enactment as fairly as of this. When we pass a section justifying a man in committing homicide in defence of his life, one might say that all a person has to do in order to take another's life is to imagine that his own is in danger. But his imagination is not the test. The tribunal must decide whether the force used is greater than what is necessary for the suppression of the riot. As regards what the hon. member for Yarmouth said, this is a strict statement of the common law, except the limitation following the word "provided," which is an inference, and I should think an irresistible inference from the state of the law. It is as laid down by Tyndall, Chief Justice, in the case of the Bristol riots in 1832.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the 40th and the 41st sections are all that is necessary. In them power to use force is conferred upon the police force, and upon every one else that the police officers call upon to assist in suppressing a riot. But in this particular case you justify anybody in interfering, whether called upon by a police officer or not, or whether he has any knowledge of the facts or not. The danger must be apprehended by the person using the force.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It must be so, because he must judge from the existing facts at the time he uses the force whether or not it is disproportioned to the danger to be apprehended, and he may apprehend very inaccurately and improperly the condition of matters. He may apprehend that a great deal of violence is necessary: he may be urged on by passionate feelings or by prejudices, and he may not be in a proper position to judge whether his apprehensions are approximately correct or not. I think we shall go far enough if we give the power to use such force as the police officers think necessary. You must give a police officer discretion of that kind, but I do not think it should be given to those whom he calls upon to assist him. I do not think we should confer on every citizen, rough or tough, the right to inter-

fere in order to suppress a riot, and to use such force as he apprehends to be necessary at the time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think great care and skill has been shown to frame the section so that it will not bear the interpretation my hon. friend puts upon it. The danger to be apprehended is quite a different thing from what the person using force apprehends to be the danger. The law is clear that any one may interfere and use force to prevent a breach of the peace, and I should be sorry if the House did not adopt a provision that any person may use force to put down a riot.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman I know is cognisant of the case that occurred in England a few months ago, where the Salvation Army marched in Eastport with drums and banners, and the police turned out to suppress the nuisance, as they called it; but when the matter came before the court, they determined that the police had not the right, even under the statute, to assume that there was to be a breach of the peace or to interfere until there was an actual breach of the peace, although the police, and I think the people themselves, thought that a breach of the peace was likely to take place.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That was a case of arrest. In this section there is nothing at all about arrest. Neither does it provide for the case of apprehension of a riot, but of an actual riot.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The police considered that that was an unlawful assembly, and that they had a right to interfere. I submit that it will be perfectly justifiable under this section for any man coming along while a riot is progressing, if he thinks A or B is likely to take part in it, to arrest him on the spot. My construction of the section is that the danger to be apprehended is that which exists in the apprehension of the person who uses the force.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the Minister say that the law now is that no person is justified in using whatever force is necessary to suppress a riot?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will give again the hon. gentleman the authority. The words of this clause are taken from a charge of Tyndall, Chief Justice, to the grand jury of Bristol, in 1882. They are given in a note to Regina *vs.* Penny, 3 Carrington & Penny, 261. It is quoted and approved in Phillips *vs.* Eyre, Law Reports 6, Queen's Bench 15.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman read the words again?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The writer says that the proper course in such cases is for the civil magistrate to direct and control what is done, but this is not absolutely necessary, and then this Act appears to be narrower—that is the Riot Act—than the common law, as laid down by Tyndall, Chief Justice.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like that clause to stand over until we can get that judgment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it had better pass, and we can come back to it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The whole doctrine is fully discussed by Lord Mansfield, in the House of Lords, after the Gordon riots.

Mr. MULOCK. Do I understand that we can go back to it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON, I will be very glad to revise it if the hon. gentleman sees any occasion to call the attention of the House to it.

On section 40,

Mr. McCARTHY. Ought there not to be some limitation of the power of these officials? Is it not intended to limit their authority within their local jurisdiction in some way?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that is always implied.

On section 41,

Mr. MULOCK. I would call the attention of the committee to this provision, which is found not only in this but many other clauses, doing away with a reference to the jury in many of these cases.

Mr. McCARTHY. This is right this time.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know that it is.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman will refer to 4 Foster and Finlayson, 763, he will see comment on that. I do not think it goes beyond the present law.

On section 42,

Mr. FLINT. This clause, it seems to me, does away with the necessity for clause 39.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is perfectly plain from this section that the apprehension is to be on the part of the person interfering, and it must be on reasonable grounds.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He may be a very unreasonable man.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is to judge what are the reasonable grounds?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The court. He must have reasonable grounds for his belief, and if he is not a reasonable man he must suffer for using force on other people without necessity.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a great distinction between the two sections 39 and 42. 39 says:

"Every one is justified in using force necessary to suppress a riot, provided the force used is not disproportionate to the danger to be apprehended from the continuance of the riot."

Section 42 says:

"Is justified in using such a force as he, in good faith and on reasonable and probable grounds, believes to be necessary for the suppression of such riot, and as is not disproportionate to the danger which he on reasonable grounds believes to be apprehended from the continuance of the riot."

No other human being could tell what he apprehended. There is a broad distinction between the two. In the one case the words are general, providing the force is not disproportionate to the danger to be apprehended; in the other case, it is the danger which he on reasonable grounds believes to be apprehended that gives him the right to use force.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My view of the two is this: that the first is a general statement of a general principle, and the second is an application of that principle. I do not think there is any difference at all except that the one is more minute

than the other; but I will meet the wishes of the members by striking out section 39.

Section 39 struck out.

On section 44,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose if the man is justified, he is justified civilly as well as criminally?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, as far as we can do it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think we are making a mistake in limiting the justification for criminal matters. Take for instance the 37th section. If we say it is lawful for a man to do a certain thing, we should protect him against a civil action as well as against an indictment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We do not want to relieve him from civil liability if he uses unnecessary force.

Mr. McCARTHY. But in that case we do not relieve him from criminal liability.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, we do.

On section 47,

Mr. McCARTHY. Is not the limitation very unusual? It seems to me that you should be at liberty to defend yourself against an assault, whether it is accompanied with insult or not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is provided for in the 45th section.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the distinction between the 47th section and the 45th section?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it is that, if the assault is accompanied with insult, he may use such force as is necessary to prevent repetition, or in regard to any one under his protection. The 45th section refers to his repelling force by force in his own case,

On section 51,

Mr. MULOCK. I hold that a man is entitled to defend his house against forcible entry, no matter what is the object of the trespasser. Here we are proposing to make the law so that a person may break into a man's house for any purpose, so long as it is not with the intent to commit any indictable offence therein.

Mr. McCARTHY. A man should be allowed to protect his house, whatever may be the object of the trespasser.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With the limitation "with the intent to commit an indictable offence therein," a person is not justified in resisting another person forcibly breaking into his house. We know it is common to try and make forcible entry of houses which people believe they own; but this is not permitted by law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of the proviso is to prevent an officer being resisted by force.

Mr. McCARTHY. Surely a party in peaceable possession has the right to defend his house against any forcible entry.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A man may break into a house for the purpose of saving life or preventing crime.

On section 53,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under the common law at present, if a man attempts to break into my house, I can resist him. What is going to be the position of the law after this section passes? I understand it will be this: that if a man comes in, I cannot resist him unless I have reasonable grounds to believe that his object is to commit some indictable offence. So this limits the right of the citizen.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The man cannot lift a latch or force a lock without the permission of the owner, without committing an indictable offence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any declaration of the existing law that a man has the right to protect his possession from any person attempting to forcibly enter?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These two sections.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) These two are limited to particular cases where the person attempting to enter is attempting to do so with the object of committing an indictable offence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The other is an indictable offence also.

Mr. MULOCK. It appears to me that under this clause it would have to be shown that the trespasser was entering with an intention to commit an indictable offence. Is there anything to make it an indictable offence if a man breaks into a house at night and, suppose when he enters he sits down peaceably?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman knows what is in the Bill. He has read it as well as I.

Mr. McCARTHY. The 53rd section seems to be a correct statement of the law, but why these clauses should be limited in the way they are is what I cannot understand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not understand why details are given in these sections, because you might suppose a hundred cases for which you might make out special provisions. It seems to me that if you had a general clause setting out the right of a party to resist in the defence of his own property, it would cover the whole ground.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If this code is to be accepted as a complete definition of possible offences, for which a man may be indictable, it will no longer be an indictable offence to commit a forcible entrance.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will come to a provision in that respect in a moment.

On section 55,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think this clause is very unjust, because if I have a right of way over a piece of land and I peaceably enter upon that land, I am within my legal rights; and if the person who claims the ownership of the land denies me the right and assaults me to prevent my exercising it, the section provides that I shall be deemed to have provoked the assault by exercising my own legal rights.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have always understood that to be the law. The section provides for notice being given by the person in position if he disputes the right of the person claiming the easement. The section does not interfere with his civil rights; but if he wants to take the law into his own hands and enforce his rights, instead of enforcing them by legal process, and an assault follows, it seems to me

very properly to provide that the assault is provoked by the person entering.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose a man has a right of way which he has used daily for a quarter of a century, and it is the only outlet or inlet to his property. This provision would put it in the power of the owner of the land to prevent his using the easement or obtaining access to his own property, and if he attempts ingress or egress to or from his own property, he will be considered an offender.

Mr. McCARTHY. He is only an offender if an assault is committed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It justifies the other party in committing the assault.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is as it ought to be. It is an easement which you are exercising over another man's property, and which he is disputing, and if you take the law into your own hands, and try to enforce your rights and an assault is committed, you are liable for assault. That, however, does not affect your civil right to the easement. I have always understood the law to be that way. That is just the distinction between civil and criminal law. You are in possession of my land without right. Still I cannot go and forcibly take it from you. Supposing I do, and an assault arises I am responsible. My remedy is to recover by legal means the possession you take from me. What is the difference with regard to easement?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has not stated the law accurately. If I am the owner of a piece of land and another man is in possession wrongfully, and I cross the fence and go on the land, there cannot be in the eye of the law two people in possession of the land at the same time; and when I once enter peaceably on the land, I am the possessor. However, I will not dispute with the hon. gentleman, because I do not think it is essential that we should dispute about that point. The hon. gentleman knows that an easement over land is a right as well known in law as any other right.

Mr. McCARTHY. Who is to be responsible for the breach of peace?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman declares that although a man is exercising his legal right, still the owner of that land can commit an assault upon him and drive him off, and the owner of the easement, who is exercising his legal right, would be considered the person who provoked the assault.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the law goes even further than my hon. friend states it. For instance, if a bridge is destroyed by a flood I am entitled to enter a man's field, and will not be a trespasser in doing so.

Mr. McCARTHY. No doubt about that—or in a snow storm.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). On what grounds? On the ground of necessity. In the same way, if I have acquired an easement in the property, it is a limited property, and no matter how I have acquired it, whether by prescription or grant, I have a right to the use of that easement just as much as the original proprietor had, and it is no trespass for me to go upon the property. I am going upon what is my property and not his. He has no right in law to forbid my going there. If I have easement, I have the right to be there.

Mr. McCARTHY. No doubt.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not a trespass, and no one has the right to come and resist my entering there; and the law has altered my rights, if it says I am to be regarded as the offender in case he does undertake to hinder me. What I complain of in this section is that it does not leave the criminal offence to depend upon the question as to who was the offender with regard to the civil right. It is upon the civil right that the question of criminality ought to depend, but the proposed law is not letting it rest there, but is shifting it upon the man who has the easement and who undertakes to exercise his right. It ought not to do that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The mistake of my hon. friends opposite is that they assume the criminality depends upon the legal right with regard to ownership. That is not the principle upon which the criminal law proceeds in these matters I may recover against you in ejectment if you hold my land; but although I have an absolute right and title to it and can recover on ejectment, I have no right to take possession by force..

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a different case.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is precisely the application of the same principle to an easement.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; the party is always in possession of an easement.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, not more than the holder of a deed is always in possession. If not in actual possession, the criminal law says he shall not go there by force. That is the difference. If I have an easement on the chairman's land, which he disputes, I shall not assert my right by force, even though it be clear and capable of establishment by law. If I do, I am deemed to have provoked an assault upon myself, if an assault should occur. The hon. gentleman will find, I am satisfied, that this is exactly the common law; with this difference, that it makes a change in favour of the person claiming the easement. My hon. friend thinks it takes away his right, but there is instead protection to him, inasmuch as instead of making complete the provocation in case he forcibly asserts his right, even though he has not had any notice, it says he shall only be deemed to be guilty of provocation if he has had notice that his enjoyment of the easement is to be resisted by force. Any change there is, is in favour of the person claiming the easement. I submit that the clause ought to pass, inasmuch as we find it reported as a statement of the common law by these eminent authorities: and if hon. gentlemen will look into the matter, for I presume they are speaking on first impressions, and if they then find that it is not the common law, we will go back to it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will see on reflection it is not the common law. Take the case stated by himself. Supposing A brought an action of ejectment against B, and recovered on it. If he went and got peaceable possession of the land, he would be all right. It is only when he

forcibly attempts to take possession that he would be committing a criminal offence. Is not this legislation entirely in favour of the rich man, by compelling the poor man, once he is notified not to go on this land, to resort to a court of law to enforce a right which he may have exercised for fifty years, and which may be his beyond doubt? The owner may put up a notice: Do not go on this land or I will assault you; and he would be justified in assaulting him. That is directly contrary to common law, as the owner has no right to assault a man in the exercise of a legal right. The hon. member for Simcoe says the man can go into court and get an injunction, but every poor man who claims a right of way over a piece of land cannot afford to run to court to get an injunction. If we are to lean in any way, and we should not lean to either side, we ought rather to lean in favour of poor people who are not so well able to vindicate their right in courts of justice as wealthy people are. I object to giving these men the right to say: If you come on here, we will kick you out, whether you have the right to come or not.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I understand, and as the Minister of Justice has stated, we are not laying down any law here but simply what is already the principle of the common law, which is that a person who insists upon getting his right in this way, knowing that it will be opposed, is the person who is guilty of the assault.

Mr. LAURIER. Then, if the proprietor puts up a notice, and the person who claims he has a right goes on the land, the man who has put up the notice has a right to commit an assault.

Mr. McCARTHY. He puts up a notice forbidding trespassing. The other man says this is his property. One thing leads to another and life may be lost, and what the law wants to provide is that the man, being warned, takes the consequences on his own head.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What we declare, and what we are supported in by these high authorities I have quoted, is that a man has a right to put another off his premises because he is coming with force to assert a right to the property, and that is what the law forbids, a man taking forcible possession of his own land. Though he may have a right under the civil law, he is an offender against the criminal law, and this is in fact intended to prevent people taking the law into their own hands. In England there may be some question of rich and poor in the case of those who insist upon hunting over the lands of poor people who seek to restrain them, but that does not apply here, and in fact it is not a question between rich and poor.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has not placed the case fairly. If a man is in peaceable possession of a piece of land, and the owner comes to take forcible possession of that which is in the actual possession of another, if he makes a forcible entry he is liable to be prosecuted; but, if he is exercising a right recognized by law such, as an easement or right of way over land, he is not doing anything unlawful; but it is his right to walk over the land in question. It is the same in England, but these matters have raised considerable political feeling there, and I, therefore prefer to discuss the question simply on its merits. Take the case of a man who is the owner of a piece of land in the rear of another, and on which no water is found in the summer season. He is obliged to drive his stock every day through his right of way over the other man's property. My hon. friend says he must go into court to establish his right, and all his personal property might be lost or destroyed before he would be capable of exercising that right. He would be at the absolute mercy of his neighbour, although he had purchased the right of way; and although it may have been registered as part of his title, he cannot be regarded as in possession. It is incorporeal property of which he may be divested under this section at any moment until he goes into court and establishes his claim.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It seems impossible to convince the hon. gentleman, although we think this has been the law for hundreds of years. But we are in hopes that reflection will accomplish the object we have in view, and so we will let this section stand at present.

On section 63, sub-section 2,

Mr. McCARTHY. Should not that be mutual? The wife should have a chance too.

Mr. MULOCK. The husband is compelled to bring his wife to justice or else he would become an accessory after the fact. Is that to be marital law?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The wife is not expected to give up her natural duty, which is to protect her husband; but that is not the duty of the husband to his wife.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There should be mutuality. Surely if one is to be protected the other should be. If the wife protects the husband the natural law would rather oblige the husband to protect the wife.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will let that stand so as to alter it.

On section 72,

Mr. MULOCK. This clause is more far reaching than would appear on the surface. If any person for any traitorous purpose seeks to induce a person to abandon the service of Her Majesty, he is liable to imprisonment for life. The second portion of the section deals simply with cases of those, who are not themselves in the service, inducing men to desert. If you ask one who has enlisted in the Imperial army, or any one in the volunteer service of Canada, to abandon the service, you are inducing that person in a traitorous way to desert. What is the meaning of traitorous? If you ask a person to abandon the service you are asking him for some traitorous purpose to do so. It does not follow that the object is that he shall make war upon Her Majesty; the word "mutinous" might cover that; but the word "traitorous" is much wider and I think it ought to come out.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not agree that the effect of this objection is to render any person liable w. , simply incites a soldier or sailor to desert, unless he does it in pursuance of a traitorous or mutinous purpose, and the traitorous purpose is defined by this Act. It must be for the purpose of forwarding some of the designs which are declared to be treasonable. It may be in consequence of sickness, or wounds, or from a wrong religious opinion, and therefore would not be

punishable by imprisonment for life. But if it is done for the purpose of weakening the authority of the Sovereign, and preventing the defence of her dominion against her enemies, then it would be traitorous.

Mr. MULOCK. The word "traitorous" has a larger meaning than that. I think you had better say treasonable instead of traitorous.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the same thing.

On section 74,

Mr. FLINT. In regard to the militia I think this should only apply to the time of war or disturbance, because it could not be a very serious crime to induce a militiaman to desert providing there is no war. Suppose one should induce a militiaman to go away to better his position.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Suppose a father should ask his own son to leave the force.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He could leave when he wished under the law, but that is a different thing from deserting.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose the troops are called out for the annual drill, and an employer should threaten an employé with dismissal if he should go; he would practically invite him to desert.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think so, but we will look into the matter.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Buckingham and Lièvre River Railway Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 87) respecting the Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Railway Company.—(Mr. Beausoleil.)

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law.

(In the Committee.)

On section 75,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister promised to consider the effect of this clause on the militia. I understand from the military men that if a man does not turn out when ordered and goes away, that is desertion in the meaning of the Militia Act; and it is a matter for consideration whether, in the peculiar position the militia force occupies in this country, this section is not too stringent in declaring that any man who persuades another not to turn out on a militia day is liable to six months' imprisonment. When an employer simply persuades a man not to go out on a certain day, his act might be conspired into a persuasion to desert.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the provision would not apply to the case of a person asking a member of the militia not to turn out on parade day, but only when the militia is called out for active service. In other cases I do not think it would be desertion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am told that the regulations based on the Militia Act governing the militia force define desertion to be abstaining from attendance when the force is called out in time of peace or otherwise.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that is only punishable by fine. But if this House will pass the section, I will examine it carefully, and if I find that it applies to turning out on parade, I will ask the House to review it. The Minister of Militia tells me that it is not so.

Mr. BOWELL. A refusal to turn out on ordinary parade is only punishable by fine under the Militia Act.

On section 87,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The committee considered this question very carefully, and we were unwilling to adopt the section to its full extent as it appears here. The clause was principally applicable to the old country, where drilling was sometimes connected with treasonable designs, but at some time it may be useful to have a provision by which unlawful drilling may be prevented, and the conclusion which was finally adopted was that drilling should be made unlawful when it was prohibited by the Governor in Council.

Mr. LAURIER. Then I understand that drilling will not be unlawful under this section?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. LAURIER. But the Governor in Council may make it unlawful.

On section 89,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not understand "forcible entry" as used here. I never understood it to mean what is defined in this section. "Forcible entry is where a person, whether entitled or not, enters in a manner likely to cause a breach of the peace, or reasonable apprehension thereof." I do not think that is the common law definition of forcible entry.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Where a person causes an assembly that is calculated to produce a breach of the peace, that is a forcible entry.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have the definition here given by Russell, and it is as I imagined:

"Forcible entry or forcible detainer is committed by violently taking or keeping possession of lands or tenements with menace, force and arms, and without authority of law."

That is well understood by everybody. If a man tries to eject another from land that he claims as his, and uses force or menaces, and attempts to take possession of that property, he is guilty of a forcible entry, but here you are creating a new offence altogether. This is a most important subject in many provinces, and there are cases constantly arising of people trying to take possession of lands and houses by force.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a very rough definition. I have carried on prosecutions myself where a person did not enter, but where the assembly for the purpose of entering was of such a character as would likely provoke a breach of the peace. This is what the commissioners say:

"Forcible entry and detainer are offences in the common law in section 95, which is transferred to this, and we believe correctly states the existing law."

In Burbidge's Digest he states it thus :

"Every one commits a misdemeanour called a forcible entry who, in order to take possession thereof, enters upon lands or tenements in a violent manner, whether such violence consists in actual force applied to any other person, or in threats, or in breaking open any house, or in collecting together an unusual number of persons for the purpose of making such entry."

He states authorities for that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Russell is generally accepted as pretty good authority in all the cases. It is the best I know off.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You have only read a fragment.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I remember a case some years ago, in which the question was thoroughly threshed out. My recollection is that the conclusion was that unless there was force and violence in the entry, you could not maintain your action, although the intention might have been to have entered by force, but the party could not see his way to do it, and the indictment failed. But here, if a man entitled to land enters on it in a manner likely to cause a breach of the peace, or reasonable apprehension thereof, he is punishable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman can look at these authorities, and if I am wrong, we can revise this section.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I look upon that as one of the sections of the Act that will be very apt to be used more than almost any other.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the Minister to the 3rd sub-section : "what amounts to actual possession or colour of right is a question of law." What amounts to actual possession is certainly a question of fact which ought to be left to the jury. We might just as well abolish trial by jury if we are not to leave the jury to decide what is actual possession.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As in all the sections which provide what shall be questions of law, the enactment does not refer to any disputed question of facts. The fact may be that somebody was in actual possession, it may be in a technical way by nobody else being in possession, it may be by some servant or agent being in possession, all of which facts are to be found by the jury ; but the effect is a question of law.

Mr. LAURIER. Even that way it would simply imply nothing new. In criminal law as well as in civil law, what is done by an agent in such a case as this is done by the master. It seems to me that you are removing something to the province of a judge which has been within the province of a jury.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not intended by the section, and if it were so, it would be a departure from the common law. For example, the actual owner is resident abroad, but his agent or his personal servant is in possession of the house. It is not the province of the jury to say that he was not in actual possession because only his agent or his servant was there. We reserve that as a question of law for the judge to decide.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I doubt very much whether this definition that Mr. Burbidge gives would justify the definition which is placed in the Act. I have every respect, of course, for Mr. Burbidge, but this is only a suggestion he makes as to what the article should contain. This is what Mr. Burbidge states :

"Forcible entry and detainer should be defined to be : Every one commits a misdemeanour called a forcible entry who, in order to take possession thereof, enters upon any lands or tenements in a violent manner, whether such violence consists in actual force applied to any other person, or in threats, or in breaking open any house, or in collecting together an unusual number of persons for the purpose of making such entry."

The hon. gentleman gave an Upper Canada case as an authority, Regina *vs.* Smith ; but he did not refer to any English authority. Our new code which we are now passing, goes further than that, because it says that if a man enters in a manner likely to cause reasonable apprehension of a breach of the peace, he is guilty of forcible entrance.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will look up the authorities, and bring up the matter to-morrow.

Mr. FLINT. I think that in Russell's definition the word "menaces" will be substantially what is meant here by breach of the peace.

On section 96,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is this not carrying the penalty for prize-fighting too far ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They fight just over the border.

Committee rose and reported progess.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Chatham Post Office, Custom House, &c....$15,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Be good enough to explain what is wanted here ?

Mr. OUIMET. This is to make provision for the erection of public buildings at Chatham, intended for the post office, custom house and inland revenue. The total cost is expected to be about $22,000. The first vote was in 1890, for $1,500, and last year $7,500 was voted. Only $104 has been expended up to date, and the site has not yet been secured.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought the Government had a post office and custom house there.

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the size of Chatham ?

Mr. OUIMET. Population in 1891, 5,646 ; postal revenue, $4,196 ; customs revenue, $19,505.17 ; excise revenue, $6,714.20 ; money orders issued and paid, $46,512.47 ; value of exports, $818,829 ; of imports, $86,561, and goods entered for consumption, $88,815. These figures will show that not only as to population but as to post office, customs and excise revenue this place ranks pretty high.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Was the old post office in Chatham burned down ?

Mr. OUIMET. No, but it cannot be used any more on account of its being in a state of ruin.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When was it built ?

Mr. OUIMET. It was purchased in 1872.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I was correct that the Government had buildings there. It appears very odd that buildings which were purchased only twenty years ago should be in a state of ruin. What did we pay for them?

Mr. OUIMET. The old post office is still in existence, and is used as such, but to repair it so as to give proper accommodation for the officers of Customs, Inland Revenue, Post Office and the Department of Marine a great deal of money will be required, and then we would have a very poor building. It was thought better to erect a new building to give the necessary accommodation, and then to sell the old building.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My impression is that a good many years ago we bought a post office here, and now we are told that it has become so dilapidated as to be worthless. Where does the hon. gentleman propose to build? Has the site been negotiated for?

Mr. OUIMET. We are negotiating now, but we have not yet got it. It is in the neighbourhood of the present site.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman expect to get for the present property?

Mr. OUIMET. Somewhere between $3,000 and $4,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman expect to pay for the new site?

Mr. OUIMET. About $4,000. The old building, I suppose, after being emptied will not be worth much beyond the value of the materials in it, which about represents the cost of demolition.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Of what material was the old building constructed?

Mr. OUIMET. Stone.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was built twenty years ago, and is it possible that the stone has decayed?

Mr. OUIMET. It was not built twenty years ago. It was purchased twenty years ago.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What was paid for it then?

Mr. OUIMET. About $10,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is a slight discrepancy between the Minister's statement and a return brought down a few years ago, in which the cost of the building was put at $14,121.64.

Mr. OUIMET. The building when purchased cost $10,000, but additions were made afterwards which brought up the cost to about $14,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It does seem extraordinary that this building should get out of repair so soon. I do not see the necessity of constructing another building here when there are other places yielding larger revenues that have no buildings at all. Would it not be possible to use the old building?

Mr. OUIMET. No. The architect says the building will soon go down. The walls are cracked, and it will have to be pulled down; it will be dangerous to leave it there.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the site of the present building a suitable site?

Mr. OUIMET. The new site has been reported to us as being the most suitable site for the purpose of this building.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there a purchaser in view for the old site?

Mr. OUIMET. No, not yet.

Mr. MULOCK. Then it is a mere guess whether or not we shall get $3,000 or $4,000 for the property.

Mr. OUIMET. To a certain extent. That is the actual value of land in that neighbourhood.

Mr. MULOCK. Has the new site a larger area than the old one?

Mr. OUIMET. It is a larger site, and it is contiguous to the water and to the principal landing place in the town, while the other is not.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would not the other be more central?

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman perhaps forgets that this is a seaport, and the commercial centre of the town must be near the place where the shipping is done.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But this site was selected by the hon. gentleman's predecessor, who no doubt had an opportunity of looking into the matter, and I presume the town is in about the same position that it was in then. I notice that it yields a revenue of only $4,000 a year. You had better take the old site and put up a new post office on it if it has to be built.

Mr. OUIMET. I am told that the old site is not large enough for a building to accommodate the trade there. I would remind the hon. gentleman, when he says that the revenue of the place is only $4,196, that that is only the post office revenue; but this building is to be not only for post office purposes, but also to accommodate the customs office, the inland revenue office, and, I think, the shipping office.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The return brought down states that the old building was not only for a post office, but I think also for the other departments. Who owns the ground you are going to buy?

Mr. OUIMET. The Fraser estate.

Mr. MULOCK. Has the price been fixed upon for the new site?

Mr. OUIMET. $4,000.

Mr. MULOCK. How was it arrived at?

Mr. OUIMET. By valuation approved by our own officers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This being a large shipping town, how is it land is not quite so valuable there as it is in St. John? You have the same quantity as was purchased in St. John the other day, for which you gave $200,000. Have you made a good bargain? Then you have the old post office on your hands, in which there is a crack. I fancy there is a crack in the whole business.

Mr. MULOCK. Who made the valuation of this land?

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. David Ewart, the architect in our department in Ottawa. He went there for that purpose and enquired from people there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When was the condition of the post office brought to the notice of the Minister of Public Works?

Mr. OUIMET. I do not know; it was before my time, three years ago.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was cracked before your time. It stood two years in this cracked condition. It does appear to me this is a peculiar transaction, and we ought to have the papers to show upon what grounds it is necessary to erect a new post office and select a new site in a town where the revenue of the post office is but $4,000, when we have already a building there which was only erected 20 years ago. We should have more information before passing this item.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say what is the size of the site and the assessed value.

Mr. OUIMET. The size is 61 feet front by 360 deep. I do not know the assessed value.

Public Buildings, Que.—Grosse Isle quarantine station $24,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is proposed to be done there?

Mr. OUIMET. $16,000 of this is a revote from last year and $8,200 is a new vote. It is to make provision towards the erection of disinfecting buildings and appliances, in order to make the service of the quarantine more efficient and rapid. The improvements consist of a large building erected on the wharf where the disinfecting process takes place, and then there is a large disinfecting apparatus in the shape of force pumps and cylinders. An upright boiler will cost $11,750, an exhaust pump $2,400, a wind-mill pump for wharf $1,460, a wind-mill pump for tank and wash-house $1,800.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I would like to know whether the Government have reached a conclusion about the extension of the Grosse Isle wharf as far as deep-water?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) This work of the extension of the Grosse Isle wharf is such an expensive one that the Government have not thought proper to ask for the necessary amount this year together with the sum now in the Estimates. I presume it will be the first matter that will be considered by the Government for next session.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) That is to say, the Government puts the thing off till next year. I believe that the wharf extension is vastly more important than these buildings, for the present buildings can do for the present. According to Dr. Montizambert it is almost impossible for things to remain as they are.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) This may be true, but it has been represented to us that this building is absolutely indispensable for the disinfection of the ships with contagious cases on board. We are to make the wharf so as to receive the building we are to erect. The money which we ask for is to be used for that purpose; we will not even have enough. When this work is finished the accommodation will be sufficient.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) It goes without saying that I do not oppose this item at all, for I know it will take a large sum to meet the requirements of this quarantine station. The extension of the wharf is an indispensable improvement, for now the vessels cannot land for want of water. Suppose a ship coming with contagious disease on board, she would have to lay off, and the sick to be transferred to small boats to be landed, as things now are, which would take a considerable time. Dr. Montizambert, with whom I talked this matter over a very short time ago, expresses himself very forcibly on this. I know that every year he has made a report on this subject, and asked the Government to put in the Estimates a sufficient sum for the extension of the wharf. If a ship should contain a large number of cases of contagious disease, they could be removed in a very short time, but for that the wharf has to be extended. As it is the wharf is insufficient. Dr. Montizambert does not understand why the Government does not do this work.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The building of the wharf extension will have to be undertaken as soon as this work is finished. The Department of Agriculture recommends it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) The Government should not say that they have no money. Everybody knows that money is easy for them to get. They should not put off the matter till next year. They should tell the House they are to attend to this work now, and ask the money necessary for it, when it is considered as indispensable for the protection of public health.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the estimated cost of this station and what degree of progress has been made?

Mr. OUIMET. I stated before that $35,400 would be probably required to complete the building.

Mr. MULOCK. And is that in addition to the $20,000 which was voted last year?

Mr. OUIMET. We expect that $4,000 of that will be expended before the 1st July next, and we have asked for a revote of $16,000, but now we are finishing the wharf, and these buildings will be proceeded with as soon as the wharf is finished.

Mr. MULOCK. What is this for—the wharf, or the building or both?

Mr. OUIMET. It is to erect, as I have already stated, a disinfecting apparatus on the wharf we are now building.

Laprairie Post Office (site to be furnished by local authorities free of cost)..... $6,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. What amount is going to be expended in the construction of this office?

Mr. OUIMET. The amount we expect to spend on that building is $16,000. The building is now under contract, and it is expected that it will be completed before the end of the year.

Mr. FLINT. What are the receipts of that office?

Mr. OUIMET. They are not very large. The statement I have here is $433.16.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that this is a most monstrous and disgraceful job. We are asked to spend $16,000, costing us in interest at least $640 a year, for the accommodation of a post office of which the total revenue is $433. We will have in addition to provide the salary of the postmaster, the fuel and light, the repairs and, as we are our own insurers, something should be allowed for that. So that to collect a revenue of $433, the country is going to be saddled with an annual charge of $1,400 or perhaps more.

There will be $400 for the salary of the postmaster, $640 interest on the money sunk in the building, and at least $400 will go to fuel and light and caretaker, so that it will cost $1,400 a year to erect a building for the lodging of a post office with a revenue of only $433. I think it is a scandalous proceeding and that this should be struck out forthwith. I do not see that there can be any possible excuse for this expenditure, except as a deliberate bribe to the electors of Laprairie in violation of the rule laid down in this House, and in violation of every proper rule which should govern the proceedings of Parliament. I should like to hear from the Minister if there is any possible reason he can give except that which I have alleged, for the expenditure of $1,400 a year for the accommodation of a post office of which the total revenue is a little over $400.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I wish to know on what principle this sum is requested for the Laprairie village post office? There must be a reason.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The principle upon which this money is asked for is that three years ago an Order of the House was passed deciding that a public building should be erected at Laprairie. In accordance with this order tenders were invited, a contract was passed, and we are now at work on the building. Does the hon. member wish that the work done be demolished?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Can the hon. Minister affirm that the work is begun?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Certainly.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) What is done?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The basement is up and the first story is now under progress.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think the hon. Minister of Public Works will do wisely to disclaim at once all responsibility for this work. I know the place well. I live not very far from it, and I venture to say that a more indefensible outlay has never been made by this or any other Government. We have figures before us to show the revenue of the office. The village is a small one, having about 1,200 inhabitants, and to my knowledge it is growing backwards rather than in the other direction. It has not increased in population for many years past. The only reason I can imagine for undertaking this work was the fact that the County of Laprairie was a very close county, and at the time this work was decided upon it was important that some influence should be brought to bear upon the electors, and the Government decided to bring an influence to bear by the construction of this work. I do not hesitate to pronounce it a gross and indefensible job.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure my hon. friend who has just spoken has given the true reason for the construction of this building. It was undertaken in order to carry the county for the Government. I am sure we ought to be spared another gerrymander of Laprairie.

Mr. OUIMET. I am sorry I do not possess the eloquence of the leader of the Opposition, because if I did I might expatiate on the merits of Laprairie and the glories of that historical place, which is really a landmark on the shores of the St. Lawrence, and likely to become in the near future a suburb of Montreal. Certainly, all good Canadians from Lower Canada will be glad that this old historical village of Laprairie is to be adorned with a monument in the shape of a public building which will show that the Government has a proper esteem for that place.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think in a matter of this kind, involving the expenditure of a considerable amount of money, the Minister of Public Works ought to deal with it in a serious manner, and not stand up here and treat in a jocular way such an outrage upon the public. This is a serious matter, and it ill-becomes the new Minister of Public Works to treat it in the light manner in which he has tried to do. If he has any defence to offer for this outrageous expenditure, he ought to offer it to this committee as becomes a man in his position, and I think this committee should require that such an explanation should be given before this money is voted. The policy the Government has adopted in times past with regard to public buildings, is well known all through the Dominion of Canada. It has been a regular system of bribing the electors in different constituencies in order to induce them to support the Government, and in many cases they have succeeded in securing the support of the electors by bribing them with public buildings. Now, I say that as the public funds are contributed by the public at large the Government ought to expend those funds in the erection of public buildings only in those places where they are required, and where the revenue shows that they are entitled to such buildings. For my part I believe that the old system which was in force years ago, that no public buildings of this character should be erected outside the cities or large towns, ought to be enforced to-day, and if that system were enforced we should no longer see the Government seeking to secure support for themselves by a system of petty bribery offered to the electors of the various constituencies. It is an unjust system, because there are many places in the different provinces of the Dominion that show a large postal revenue as compared with the revenue of the little village of Laprairie. where no effort is being made by the Government to erect public buildings. Now, let me contrast the receipts from this little post office at Laprairie with the receipts of another post office in the Province of Ontario, and after comparing the figures I am satisfied that the Minister of Public Works will be convinced in his own mind, at least, although he may not so express his opinion, that an injustice is being done to the public at large by squandering the people's money in such a way that the public at large can derive no benefit from the expenditure. Now, I find that the gross postal revenue of the village of Laprairie was $433.16 for one year; compare that with the gross postal revenue of the town of Woodstock, in Ontario, which was $15,399.32 for the year. The Government expend $16,000 to erect a post office at Laprairie, and they leave the town of Woodstock without any public buildings at all. Now, why is this done? It is done for the simple reason that Laprairie was in the hands of the Liberal party during the last Parliament, and the Government wanted to secure the return of a man from that county to support them in this House,

and so they offered this bribe to the electors of Laprairie, whereas in the County of Oxford, where they knew they could not possibly secure the return of one of their friends, they refuse to erect a public building although the revenue is more than thirty times greater than it is in the village of Laprairie. Yet we see men in this House supporting the Government who have the hardihood to stand up and make such an outrageous proposition as this—because we must expect they will vote for it, as they have voted for similar outrageous expenditures in the past. I say that no defence whatever can be offered by the Minister of Public Works, or by any member of the Government, or by any man sitting behind the Government, for the erection of this post office in the village of Laprairie. I think this House ought to come to a distinct understanding as to this kind of expenditure. We have on this side of the House frequently expressed the opinion that these expenditures ought to be made in such a way as to give equal justice to all parts of the country. We are not sent here to legislate for those who vote for the Tories, we are sent here, both Conservatives and Liberals, to legislate for the good of the whole Dominion of Canada, and I say it is a very wrong thing for the Government to persist in the system which they have adopted in times past, and which they still persist in continuing. It is high time that a halt should be called upon this class of expenditure, because, as I said before, it is a plain case of jobbery and bribery on the part of the Government. Why, every day we see evidence in the letters which are published in a journal in the city of Toronto to show how the members of this Government have been sustained in their places. They have been kept in power for so many years by trafficking with the people's money; for the last twelve or fourteen years they have been bribing constituencies and buying the people with the people's own money. Now, it is high time that the Liberals in this House should take a firm stand on this vote, and on every other vote of a similar character. We have done it in the past, but it does not seem to have had any effect upon the Government or upon their supporters. They come here to support the Government, they come here to support themselves. They come here to support those who support them in their constituencies, and the whole system of government in this country from one end to the other has been permeated by corruption for the last twelve or fourteen years. They have corrupted the electors, and have bribed them to send men to support them in this House by means of post offices, railway bonuses, and in every other way they could devise. We, as Liberals, have a duty to perform, and the people must be made aware in the future, as they have been made aware in the past, of these outrageous proceedings which the Government are enacting from day to day in order that they may maintain their places on the Treasury benches, and for no other purpose—not for the good of the people of the country, not in order that legislation of a just and proper character may be placed on the Statute-book, but simply for the purpose of enabling them to sit on the Treasury benches and draw their salaries as Ministers of the Crown and give pap and patronage to their supporters. That is the system of government which we have been living under for the last fourteen years, and I have no doubt the time must come, and that before a great while, when the people's eyes will be opened to the iniquitous practices in which Ministers have been indulging, and we have no fear but that the time will come before long when the people will awaken to the necessity of seeing that this class of legislation is no longer forced on the country.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) I should like to learn from the hon. Minister if the principle under which post offices are constructed is that of the revenue of such offices?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) That is not the only principle.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) I will remark that at Napierville, the county seat of the county which I represent here, and which never had a cent of favour from the Government, the revenue of the post office is $632.37, that is to say more than $200 over that of the Laprairie post office. I do not ask that such a post office be not given to Laprairie if that village is entitled to it, but I demand that the same treatment should be meted to Napierville, although I be a Liberal. I would not like it to be said that the department favours the County of Laprairie for the reason that the former is Conservative and the latter Liberal.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) It is not to the detriment of the County of Napierville.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) It is to the detriment of my county. If a post office is built at Laprairie where the revenue is only $436, it seems to me that one should be built at Napierville where the revenue is $200 more. Besides, the hon. Minister of Public Works said a moment ago that there must be an error in the returns from the Laprairie post office, and it seems to me that this item should not be voted now. He ought to be given an opportunity of finding out whether an error was made or not. It seems that to his mind also the revenue of the Laprairie post office such as given in the returns is not sufficient to warrant the building of a post office for that village.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) My hon. friend's conscience can remain perfectly tranquil. When the building of this post office was decided upon, three years ago, he was not a member of Parliament, and for my part I had no right to vote, being the Speaker. We are, therefore, both on the same footing; one is no more responsible for this than the other. But that question was discussed at length on that occasion. It was even the subject of a special division of votes. Since Parliament decided to build this post office, and that it is now under way, it is evident that the work must be proceeded with, and my hon. friend will agree with me that we are losing our time by beginning over the discussion of the question, and making points which were found of no avail against the voting of the item.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) I do not ask that this item he struck off, but I would like to know the principle under which these moneys are voted, so that next year I may ask for a vote for a post office for the village of Napierville, which gives a revenue greater than that received from the Laprairie post office.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of Public Works is too fond of using the argument, that because money has been already voted for a certain purpose,

he has not to defend the expenditure of that money and is not required to explain why he should get more funds for the same purposes. The hon. gentleman has been called upon two or three times to explain on what principle the Government have ascertained where public buildings should be placed, and of what value those buildings should be. He has been asked whether the Government in this matter are guided by the amount of postal revenue. He cannot tell, and he says they are not altogether guided by that. He has been asked whether the matter depends on the population. He says it does not altogether depend on that. He has been asked whether it is decided by the political complexion of the constituency. He shakes his head and laughs, and says nothing is wrong which benefits supporters of the Government. The time has come when we should arrive at a definite principle on which these expenditures of public moneys should be based. I am under the impression that this House has already decided that the Government shall be guided by the amount of revenue received and the general importance of the place where it is proposed to erect a public building. That is the common-sense rule, and it is one which should be followed. But there have been so many instances in which that rule has been grievously violated, that we cannot believe the Government take the amount of revenue or the size of the town or village into consideration for one moment. We have been reminded time and again across the floor that they are neglecting very large and important centres of population, where very large amounts of revenue are collected, in order to place post offices and other public buildings in places where the gross revenue will hardly pay interest on the money expended. This is one of those cases. It does not matter whether the money was voted last session for the purpose or not, the Government are responsible for the expenditure of that money. They cannot throw the responsibility off their shoulders on the plea that the House has voted the money. A vote of money by the House does not order the construction of a certain building. It simply places the money at the disposal of the Government to use for that purpose, if in their judgment they see fit to do so. It gives them a credit to that amount. No Government is bound to go on with an expenditure simply because the money has been voted, and therefore the argument of the Minister falls to the ground, and he must justify both the original proposition of the Government to ask for a vote for this purpose, and the proposal of the Government for a further vote, or admit that there is no justification for either course. The hon. gentleman has not attempted any justification this evening. He has not shown that Laprairie is entitled to a public building on the ground either of having a large population, or of importance as regards revenue received there. He has simply fallen back on the old argument that the money has been voted, and, therefore, it is no concern of his and no concern of this House whether the voting of this money can be justified or not, and he allows the item to go without explanation. The hon. gentleman will, however, have to explain the item to a great many residents of other places throughout the country. Taking the Province of Quebec itself, we find a large number of places returning a much larger revenue than Laprairie. Here are some examples. Acton Vale, $1,207; Agnes, Beauce, $492; Arthabaskaville, Arthabaska, $1,433—three times the population of Laprairie, but we do not expect to have a public building there, although it is a very important and prominent town in the Province of Quebec, especially on account of the hon. member (Mr. Laurier) whom it formerly returned to this House. There is the Beauharnois post office with a revenue of $1,054, and the Deputy Speaker informs me there is no public building there. The post office at Berthier *en haut* has a revenue of $1,332, and I think there is no post office there, although it has three times the revenue of Laprairie. The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) will have to see the Minister on the subject and enquire about that. The Bryson post office, in the County of Pontiac, yields a revenue of $465, which is also more than Laprairie. The last member but one for Pontiac does not seem to have cared for the interest of the post office which was named after himself sufficiently to get a grant for that. Chicoutimi has a revenue of $1,726; Coaticook, $3,466; Compton, $824; Cookshire, $1,450; Danville, $2,228; Freligksburg, $581, and surely it ought to have a post office, being a loyal place and having a larger revenue than Laprairie. Granby has a revenue of $2,014. Joliette gives $2,630, and I do not know whether they have a post office or not.

An hon. MEMBER. They have one.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They ought to have two there.

Mr. CASEY. The revenue is six times as much as Laprairie, and they ought to have six post offices in proportion. Kingsley Falls has a revenue of $488. I never heard of this place before, but it seems to be an important place, at all events it gives a larger revenue than Laprairie. Lachine, in the County of Jacques Cartier, gives a revenue of $856, which is twice as much as Laprairie, and I would ask the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) to explain why he has not a post office there.

Mr. MULOCK. He has only got one.

Mr. CASEY. I had forgotten that. The hon. member has done very well. Nothing like rewarding the loyal. Lachute has a revenue of $1,959, and Lachute, Argenteuil County, had, for some time, a loyal member here, but it has a better member now, and one who is not loyal to the present regime, I am happy to say. Lévis has a revenue of $1,563; Longueuil, $733; Montmagny, $1,687, nearly four times as much as Laprairie, and I do not suppose it has a post office. Murray Bay has a revenue of $536. Now, if we go by revenue, Murray Bay has certainly better claims than Laprairie, and if you go by the convenience to be served, your must remember that Murray Bay has a large influx of summer visitors, and it would be certainly a proper place to have a post office if places yielding no greater revenue than that are to have post offices. Notre Dame de Lévis has a revenue of $1,937, but I suppose Lévis is not sufficiently loyal to the powers that be to get a post office, although it has more than four times the revenue of Laprairie. I am afraid the district of Quebec is hardly getting justice in this matter. Pointe à Pic, where the summer residents get their mail at Murray Bay, has a revenue of $563, and yet

it has no post office. Point St. Charles has $3,924; has it a public building? Portage du Fort, in Pontiac, has $973; Quyon, in Pontiac, $756; Richmond East, $1,909, it has a post office. There is a little angel who sits up aloft and who looks after the interests of Richmond East. Rigaud, in Vaudreuil, has $846; Rimouski has $1,715; River David, in Yamaska, has $436, just $3 more than Laprairie. Rivière du Loup, *en bas*, has $1,922; is there one there? Rivière du Loup Station has $1,092. Robinson, in Compton County, has $536; Rock Island, in Stanstead, $437; Roxton Falls, in Shefford, has $845; St. Andrew's East, in Argenteuil, $919; Ste. Anne de la Pérade, in Champlain, $795; Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, in Kamouraska, $811; St. Athanase, in Iberville, $844; St. Barthélemi, in Berthier, $488; St. Casimir, in Portneuf, $763; St. Césaire, in Rouville, $926; St. Chrysostome, in Chateauguay, $579; Ste. Cunégonde, in Hochelaga, $2,506; St. Eustache, in Two Mountains, $593; St. Félix de Valois, in Joliette, $496; Ste. Flavie Station, in Rimouski, $629; Ste. Geneviève de Batiscan, in Champlain, $468; St. George East, in Beauce, $586; St. Grégoire, in Nicolet, $444; St. Henri de Montréal, in Hochelaga, $2,054; St. Hyacinthe, $5,817; St. Jérome, in Terrebonne, $1,473; St. John's East, $4,046; St. John Suburb, Quebec, $4,861; Ste. Marie de Monnoir, in Rouville, $774; St. Paul's Bay, in Charlevoix, $717; St. Raymond, in Portneuf, $581; St. Rémi, in Napierville, $546; St. Roch de Québec, $5,355; St. Sauveur de Québec, $2,447; St. Scholastique, in Two Mountains, $971; Ste. Thérèse de Blainville, in Terrebonne, $860; Scotstown, in Compton, $935; Shawville, in Pontiac, $803; Somerset, in Mégantic, $1,346; Sorel, in Richelieu, $2,691; South Durham, in Drummond, $548; Stanfold, in Arthabaska, $1,195; Stanstead, in Stanstead, $1,020; Sutton, in Brome, $904; Sweetsburg, in Missisquoi, $691; Terrebonne, in Terrebonne, $713; Thurso, in Ottawa County, $794; Trois Pistoles, in Témiscouata, $944; Valleyfield, in Beauharnois, $2,549; Victoriaville, in Arthabaska, $1,232; Waterloo East, in Shefford, $2,226; Windsor Mills, in Richmond, $1,673; Yamachiche, in St. Maurice, $726. Now, Sir, here are examples—I have not counted them, but they must number over a hundred—in the Province of Quebec alone, of places yielding a larger revenue than Laprairie which have not got post offices. I have simply gone through this tedious recital to show the Minister into what a gulf of debate and difficulty the Government has launched itself by building post offices at places of so little postal importance as Laprairie is shown to be by the returns. Any argument that would justify the erection of a post office at Laprairie would justify one at any of the places I have named. To go over a similar list in the Province of Ontario would take too long, and would come more properly in the discussion of the estimates for that province. This shows the necessity of honestly and fully carrying out the rule adopted by the House three years ago as to the basis on which public buildings should be distributed. It shows also, to put it in plain language, that this post office in Laprairie has been put there, not from economical reasons or on account of the importance of the place or its business, but for purely political reasons. We are justified in calling attention to the matter and complaining of it, and holding the present Minister as responsible for the expenditure as the Minister who first proposed the vote. It is time, I think, that he should explain to the House any reasons which he thinks he has to justify this vote. Not only is he called upon to explain it, but his supporters are required to explain why they support a vote of this kind. Many of them represent places more important than Laprairie that have no public buildings, and they will not only have to explain to this House, but they will have to explain to their constituents, why they have not obtained similar favours for their own counties. It is not right that this item should go through without sufficient explanation from the other side. It is a glaring impropriety, to use no stronger language, that this should be accepted by members on the other side without explanation as to why they should swallow it, or why, if this is the proper thing to do, the same thing should not be done in other districts.

Mr. MULOCK. I presume this public building is being erected in order to provide for the proper despatch of public business. It cannot be justified except on that basis, and I will just call the attention of the committee to the official return, showing the volume of business done in this village post office during the last fiscal year. The official return shows that the gross receipts from mail matter hardly exceeded $1 a day, the gross receipts for the year being $433.16, about $1.25 for every day in the year. About thirty or forty letters is the gross amount of correspondence per day which passes through this office, a volume of letters which could be put in a space of about six inches square, or that the Minister could carry in his grip-sack or any hon. gentleman in his waist pocket. And it is proposed to erect, at the cost of thousands of dollars, a public edifice to accommodate these postal requirements. The gross number of money orders they issued last year was 195, or not an average of one a day. The gross earnings of this village post office on money orders amounted to $24.12 for the year, not 50 cents a week, not 10 cents a day. The gross amount of commission paid to the postmaster on money orders was $9.19. That represents the volume of business done in the village, which is to be supplied at the public expense with this building. I ask the Minister of Public Works if he can stand up before the people and say that he considers this public work in Laprairie is necessary in the public interest. I pause for a reply. But no, the Minister is silent He dare not say that this work is necessary in the public interest. I challenge him to say whether it is or not. He has told us, as the only possible justification for this work, that it is to be a monument of the past glories of that district. It is intended to be a monument of the historical glories of Laprairie. Was there ever a greater farce? The Minister of Public Works ought to be a new broom, but if this is the way he is going to speak, what will the broom be like if it is a little worn. I remember well the Minister of Public Works on a former occasion trifling with the finances of Canada. I remember well some years ago when he formed a conspiracy in this House and a combine, retiring to No. 8——

Mr. OUIMET. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is not speaking to the question.

Mr. MULOCK. I am speaking to the question. I say it is history repeating itself; and whatever the people of Quebec may say who get this work, I, from the Province of Ontario, if I stand alone, will protest against this malversation of public money. I say it is a gross crime against our people to place the great spending department of our country in the hands of a Minister who has the audacity to ask Parliament to give him money for a work which he cannot defend, and the time has come when his record is a fair subject of criticism. The time has come for this Parliament to withdraw its confidence from a Minister whose record alone ought to have prevented his being selected for the office, and whose present record in office is sufficient to demand his early expulsion. It is pertinent to the enquiry that we should look back to the record of the hon. gentleman and point out that on a certain occasion he took the Government by the throat and wrung $5,000,000 out of the treasury to serve a party purpose. He took advantage of the exigency of his party at the time to commit that crime. And here we have him to-day, in a small way, repeating this. I say, Sir, that if there is one representative from the Province of Ontario who gives this matter honest consideration and feels that he is bound at some time or other to justify it before the country, let him raise his voice now before it is too late and aid in stemming this tide of wastefulness which is setting in. We were promised, when this Government was formed, that they would reform and serve the public honestly and that everything would be pure and right in their administration. The country, especially the Province of Ontario, took them at their word and gave them its confidence. They succeeded in getting an overwhelming majority at their back, and since then, intoxicated with power, they have thrown aside all regard for decency and have plunged their hands to the arm-pits into the public treasury. There is not a Minister of the Crown to-day, from the Minister of Justice down, who raises his voice before this Parliament in defence of the country, but one and all they seem to be engaged in the crime of looting the treasury. I, therefore, say for one that I protest against it, and I tell you, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Denison), that you cannot defend it before your own constituents when you go back to Toronto, and I tell the other representatives of that city, strong as it is known to be in loyalty to this Government, that there is not a representative of Toronto who can afford to defend this transaction before the people there. I believe there is no constituency in Ontario that will uphold this transaction. I, therefore, echo the sentiment of my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) when he said that, if the Government will not themselves do right, now is the time for their supporters to compel them to the right. A loyal support of the Administration does not mean that their followers are to support it when it is wrong as well as when it it right, and, if the solid majority at the back of the Government is not sufficient to curb the Government when they are proposing to do wrong, it is not true to itself. You cannot do a better service to a Government, if you are truly loyal to it, than to check it in wrong-doing, nor can you do a better service to the country than to bring the Government back to right principles. Unfortunately, public opinion in Canada has been so debauched that we know we are speaking to many deaf ears, but I hope there will be some in this House behind the Government sufficiently independent to condemn a transaction of this kind, which is so disgraceful in itself that the Minister of Public Works will not dare to tell the people of Canada that it is necessary in the public interest.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the Minister would delay this vote for a little while, considering the growth of the village of Laprairie, he would probably find that it would not be necessary to construct this building ten years hence. The population of Laprairie, under the fostering influence of the National Policy, has diminished 94 in the last ten years. It has about kept pace with almost all the other villages under the benign influence of the National Policy. In 1878, the revenue from Laprairie was $495.84. That is in the days when our friends used to tell us that there was nothing in the country but soup kitchens and the people could not afford even to buy postage stamps. In 1890, the revenue of Laprairie was $439.10. In one year after that time, it fell to $433.16. It fell no less than $6 in one year. Hon. gentlemen are attempting to prevent discussion. I do not think any hon. gentleman opposite would like openly to defend the construction of this building with so small a population and a revenue at a time when the people of Canada are suffering under so much depression. I do not wonder that they desire to stifle the expression of opinion by striking their desks and wearing out their boots, because they do not desire to defend this before their constituents. I do not oppose this vote because it is for a post office in the Province of Quebec. Last year I opposed the construction of needless buildings in Ontario, and I will oppose such expenditures in other provinces as readily as I oppose this. I will not defend or be responsible for the expenditure of money for a post office building where one is not required. It will be remembered that Mr. Doyon formerly represented this riding, and his election was protested. During that time overtures were made to the Government to buy this constituency, and the Government, in a moment of weakness, condescended to tell the people that, if they elected a supporter of theirs, the constituency should have the post office. However, that promise was not at once carried out, but it was kept dangling from time to time before the electors until, just before the last election, a grant of $16,000 was made for this building in a place where the revenue is only $439. Now we see that the Government are going on to carry out this bargain and sale and are presenting a spectacle to the people which is unworthy of any Government, they are taking a position which is indefensible and unjustifiable, and which involves their squandering the public money in a manner that no man in this House or in this country can justify. This money might better be thrown away, or it might be spent in many other ways to better advantage. What are you going to accomplish by this? You will have a building which will make the Government a laughing stock in that riding and all over the country, because, notwithstanding the influence of the National Policy and the historical associations which surround Laprairie, the population there is fast melting away, and the Government cannot bolster it up by such a proceeding as this. If the Government expect that the public sentiment is stifled, and that the public ear is deaf to atrocities

of this character, they may find at some time that that is not the fact, but that the public money will have to be accounted for to the people by those who are acting as their stewards. It is not necessary again to bring before the House the various places where the public interest demands that buildings should be put. I see the Minister of Militia has gone out of the House. He used to be the champion of economy, but now he sits silent and dumb as an oyster, or else he takes his hat and slinks out of the House. We would imagine that some member of the Government from Ontario would remain in the House when a matter of this kind was being discussed, but the Minister of Militia has gone away, and I do not see any other Minister from Ontario here.

An hon. MEMBER. Cockburn,

Mr. LANDERKIN. Cockburn is not here, and he is not yet in the Cabinet, nor is the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in the Cabinet, though memorials were presented to the Government asking that he might be taken in and made Minister of Agriculture. He does not defend it, and it is a pretty tough job that the member for East Grey will not defend on behalf of the Government. Why is he not in his seat? What has the Government done with those memorials that were presented? Why have they not acted upon them? Why did they select Honest John with his brewery instead of doubting Thomas with his silo in East Grey, to fill a position in the Cabinet? I am surprised that they ignored the memorials, no doubt promoted by the hon. member himself, brought to the Government by himself, conveyed by himself from the various associations, to make him Minister of Agriculture because he knew so much about silos. He knew more about silos than the member for London, and it is a wonderful thing that he will sit in the House and justify conduct like this. I did think that perhaps the Minister of Marine would raise his voice against this. He and his family have been known for economy through all their history; I am surprised that he has not a word to say in condemnation of this vote. The late Minister of Pubic Works, I believe, has shown his discretion and has left the House. The Minister of Justice has gone into his chamber, he has gone into hiding. The Minister of Finance sits quietly by, but he don't say a word. He is a very temperate man. He always was a very temperate man, he was the apostle of temperance at one time, but he don't say a word about this vote. He is willing to see the money frittered away on this post office.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DENISON). Please keep to the question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This is a tender point for the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The item we are discussing is the Laprairie post office.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I say that this is an indefensible transaction, it is an outrageous transaction; it is squandering the public money for the purpose of building up a party in this House that cannot secure the confidence of the people of this country except by using means like that. I say, Mr. Chairman, that you, as a gallant soldier, should raise your voice and leave that chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It may be that you are not a gallant soldier. I take that back. You should raise your voice against this outrageous waste of public money. This should be condemned by every honest man, and I believe you are an honest man—that is not too strong language to apply to you, I hope.

The CHAIRMAN. I have already directed your attention to the item that was under discussion. I would ask you, as a member of this House, to try to keep to the item we are discussing.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was just directing attention to the outrage on the people of Canada in constructing a post office at Laprairie, and I cannot understand why I am out of order in doing that. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that I am obstructing. I want to say here, and I want to say everywhere, that I glory in obstruction of this character, and I wish there were more men who would obstruct what is wrong. I do not want to see men bound down by party so that they dare not open their mouths against anything that is wrong. I am proud of being an obstructionist against this amount of $16,000 for a post office at Laprairie. Imagine Laprairie with a falling revenue—it fell off $6 in the last year—spending $16,000 for buildings there! Why, the Government will have to borrow more money soon, the Minister of Finance will have to go to England again and get money, and we shall have to pay $800 a year interest on $16,000 to build a post office at Laprairie for the purpose of collecting revenue that amounts to $432. This is a business-like transaction indeed! Is this something that will commend itself to hon. gentlemen over there who charge me with obstruction when I oppose it? I am glad I am obstructing, I want to be considered an obstructionist of everything of that character. I wonder that the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Pelletier) don't get up and defend this vote. He apparently has got too much good sense to do that. There are other places in his riding, I believe, larger than Laprairie, and if he defends this vote he is going to get into trouble with other places unless he gets post offices for them. What a position for the Government of the Dominion—going around and peddling the public money like a lot of hucksters for the purpose of gaining support; building a post office in order to buy votes! I say, as I said before, that the election law ought to be amended, and that the Ministers of the Crown who use public money in this way for the purpose of corrupting the electorate should be prosecuted and disqualified. Where a clear case can be shown, where they are frittering away public money for the purpose of gaining political support, they should be dealt with by the courts, if their supporters have not enough honesty to deal with them in the House. This is something that will mar the character of every member of the Government, and of every member who supports them.

Mr. DELISLE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the present session I had the honour to ask the Government whether it was their intention to build a post office in the parish of St. Raymond, in the County of Portneuf. I was answered that the matter was under consideration. I was much surprised, however, to find in the estimates presented to the House that the Government

have decided to build a post office in the village of Laprairie. I ask myself if some parishes of my county could not, with much more reason, claim the same treatment at the hands of the Minister of Public Works. Mr. Speaker, I had made my petition publicly, but the hon. member for Laprairie formulated his in the privacy of the Minister's office, and as the Government has more tenderness for him than for me, he obtained his wishes. I understand that the Government expects more from the devotion of the hon. member than from mine, and that in critical occasions they can depend on him more than on me. But I ask myself if the policy of the Government can be reasonably defended, and on what ground it can be upheld. The hon. member for Elgin has just put before the House very eloquent figures which must have convinced the hon. Minister that this vote is altogether unwarrantable. It is possible, Mr. Speaker, that promises may have been made during last election in order to keep or rather to acquire the confidence of the electors of Laprairie. It is quite possible that the hon. member of that county may have had to promise the post office to the electors of the village of Laprairie; but it is none the less true that the representatives of the people must see that the public moneys are expended with justice and reasonableness even if they have been voted for some years. I see by the public reports that last year the Laprairie post office has only given a revenue of $433.16. Now, it is proposed to build at this village a post office for which the House is asked to vote a sum of $16,000. I say that the thing is utterly unwarrantable from any point of view one may take. In my county, the parish of St. Raymond, according to the same reports, gave a revenue of $581.99. This parish is an important one and is constantly progressing. It is one of the richest villages of the Province of Quebec. I therefore ask the Government to extend its munificence to this parish and endow it with a post office. There is also the parish of St. Casimir —and, by the way, I may add that my hon. friends of the other side of the House have no reason to complain of this parish, since it gives their party a majority of 60 to 80 votes—well, this parish of St. Casimir gives a revenue of $763.81, that is to say, $300 more than the Laprairie post office, and it has no post office building. I also ask the Government to put one there. I can understand that the Government should wish to favour very particularly the hon. member for Laprairie, but I imagine also that the hon. member may have other interests in wishing to see the Government erect in the village of Laprairie a post office worthy of admiration. He is a fine looking fellow, and, no doubt, he thought that it was a proper thing that the post office be worthy of the fair hands who send the letters he receives. I am ready to receive from the Government all the liberalities which they may wish to extend to my county, and to forgive them any extravagance with which they may choose to treat these two parishes.

Mr. GUAY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have already taken occasion, since I have the honour to occupy a seat in this House, to ask the Government for the building of a post office in the town of Lévis, which I represent here. If I did not misunderstand the words of the hon. Minister of Public Works a moment ago, I believe he stated that he wanted to inaugurate his reign by endowing with public buildings the places which bear historical names. I congratulate him upon his very patriotic intentions, and I will add that if there is a name surrounded by a halo of glory it is truly that of Lévis, a name revered all over the Province of Quebec. Well, I will ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he does not think that the city which bears Lévis's name should by his munificence be endowed with a post office at least as respectable as that which he is giving to the village of Laprairie? This village, as has already been said, only gives the Post Office Department a revenue of some $400 per annum. I will tell the hon. Minister that the city of Lévis has—not a population of 1,200 inhabitants like the village of Laprairie—but a population of 8,000, and that it gives a revenue of $4,000 per year. There are four post offices in Lévis: one in the city proper, one at Notre-Dame de la Victoire, one at Hadlow, and the fourth at the Grand Trunk station. These four offices give, as I have stated, an aggregate revenue of $4,000. The town of Lévis is one of the most populous of the Province of Quebec. Every day more than twenty trains come in and leave the city. It is essentially a manufacturing town, and if there is any place in our province which deserves a post office it is truly the city of Lévis. I am very much pleased to notice that the hon. Postmaster General is now at his seat. Everybody remembers—and I particularly—that he cast a longing eye on the County of Lévis at the last election time.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) But the County of Lévis did not cast a longing eye on him.

Mr. GUAY. (Translation.) I think he would greatly advance his interests if he would use some of the great influence which he enjoys in the Cabinet to pursuade his colleague to put in the Supplementary Estimates an item that would secure the building of a post office in the city of Lévis. I will not dwell on this any longer, as this is not the first time that I have had the occasion to ask this, not a favour, but a justice, for the city which I have the honour of representing, thanks to the electors of the surrounding parishes. At each session I have urged this upon the ex-Minister of Public Works, and invariably I was answered that the matter was under consideration. But now I hope that the present hon. Minister of Public Works, who, as I mentioned in the beginning, has evinced an intention of endowing with post offices the places which can boast historical names, will not forget to have one built in the city of Lévis.

Mr. DEVLIN. I desire to invite attention to a very important subject, but, before proceeding to do so, I should like to answer, in a few words, the remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite. We have been accused of seeking to obstruct business. I can tell those hon. gentlemen that we have no desire whatever to obstruct the business of the House. What we desire is to discuss fairly public questions and we are equally desirous with themselves to get through the work of the session. Last evening I discussed the question as to the best means of securing post offices in a locality. The Minister of Public Works declared that if the necessity for a new post office was established it would be built; and I pointed out in regard to this town to which I referred at considerable length, Buckingham,

there was necessity for increased accommodation. In order to confirm the view I presented, I will draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a few figures given in the report of the Postmaster General which I had not in hand last evening, but which I have now. Buckingham is known as an important town in the County of Ottawa ; it is a town of over 2,000 population ; it is the centre of a large mining district and it promises to grow into greater importance than it possesses at this moment. I think I can establish a striking comparison between Laprairie and Buckingham. For instance, the revenue from Buckingham post office was $2,627, whereas the revenue from Laprairie post office was only $433. What can be the reason for the descrimination made against the one town of much more importance and in favour of the other of much less importance ? Where does the necessity come in for a town the postal revenue of which is only $400, having a post office erected costing $16,000, and this other town of very great importance from every point of view, being refused that accommodation which on many occasions has been promised ? Again, the number of money orders issued at Buckingham post office was 776 and at Laprairie post office only 55. Surely a smaller building than one costing $16,000 would do for the carrying of 55 letters. Again, the total amount of money orders issued last year was nearly $19,000 at Buckingham, whereas at Laprairie it was about $3,000. Thus it cannot be that the revenue from money orders requires a post office that will cost $16,000. Buckingham is a town of much importance, in which a robbery occurred some years ago owing to the fact that the post office was not suitable and could easily be broken into ; and still that town has not a post office. It must be remembered that applications asking for a new post office there, have reached the Government, and they have come from gentlemen of great prominence in municipal ranks of the town, and also from the political ranks supporting hon. gentlemen opposite. As I pointed out last evening, they have over and over again sent petitions to the Government. Promises were held out to them, but the fact remains that this town, with a postal revenue of about $3,000, is denied even a $1,000 building, while the town of Laprairie, with a postal revenue of only $400, is to have a post office costing $16,000. Something must be wrong. Is it because the member for Laprairie finds more favour in the eyes of the Minister of Public Works than the less fortunate member for Ottawa ? Is this not evidence of the fact, which has been placed before the House over and over again, that the rule is : support the Government and you will get your share of the spoil ? I have called attention to this fact on many occasions, and I am not afraid to call the attention of the House again to the same, that the departments of this country are run in the interests of the political party controlling them, more than in the interests of the country. It is not only in the Estimates we find high bribes offered to counties, but during a political campaign you will hear on the public platform the same offers made to the electors. A short time ago, when taking part in a campaign myself, an officer of one of the departments said : "Of what use can you be to the county since you do not get the favours of the Government ?" This is a doctrine which certainly is not in the interests of the country, and should not be tolerated, and when this doctrine is disputed, I can call attention to the Estimates which prove that it is being carried out generally. It cannot be disputed that when a county pronounces against the Government almost immediately any sums of money proposed to be expended will be stopped, or the vote will not be asked. I selected as an example, the town of Buckingham for two reasons ; first, it confirms the position I took on this matter last evening, that money is given to those towns belonging to counties which send to this House supporters of the Government ; and second, it emphasizes the injustice done to a locality of no inconsiderable importance. This is a matter on which the House should reflect. I do not come here to beg favours for the county which I have the honour to represent. If we never had a post office, we would be able to write our letters and send them still. I have called the attention to the various requirements of my county in the matter of postal services and my requests have not been granted, which confirms me in my belief that the departments of this country are administered, especially in connection with these matters, to suit the ends of the party and not to suit the interests of the country. How often is it the case when a member lays before the Government a certain matter, the Government will act upon the advice of favourites they may have in the county, and the ends of justice will be defeated in order to favour a political claim ? I have thought it proper to lay some stress upon this matter, in order to point out the injustice done to certain localities and the very great favours extended to others—I will not call them favours, but huge bribes. I took the case of Buckingham. How many towns are there in Quebec and Ontario in which similar acts of injustice have been perpetrated. It is well that the country should know these facts, and no doubt some day they will be remedied, and the matter will be so represented to the Administration that they cannot continue in the same path.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to suggest that probably the committee is of the opinion that hon. members have discussed the item at sufficient length to pass it. I would be sorry to break in on any fair discussion, but I want to call attention to the fact that we have been engaged nearly two hours on this item. We on this side of the House have been taunted with being silent. I should like hon. gentlemen who make that taunt to consider for a moment what are the classes of arguments addressed to us. It is not to be supposed that we are to go into campaign speeches, and refute all charges made from the beginning of the world politically speaking, up to the present time on every item that comes up in the Estimates. Is it to be supposed that members of the Government, or even supporters of the Government are bound in duty to arise and repel with indignation and warmth, and at more or less length, assertions which are chiefly remarkable for the hard language and the unfounded nature of the statements which are preferred ? Such for instance as when an hon. gentleman to-night declared that when a vote of Parliament was passed for a public building and that became an Act of Parliament and the law of the country and the money was expended, that it was simply the Minister putting his arm into the treasury up to the arm-pits for loot ; and as when another hon. gentleman, or perhaps the same,

charged one of the members of the Government with hatching a conspiracy, and so on through all the different charges which are made. Now that is hard language; it is a perversion of English, and it does no harm to any one, except to the persons who makes it and to the party in whose behalf it is made. I for one do not consider it my duty to arise on every occasion and repel these general partisan charges. Another hon. gentleman was surprised that we sat here so still. Well, we did sit still for a certain portion of the time that this discussion, if it may be called such, has been going on; and we sat still out of sheer astonishment that when hon. gentlemen spoke as far away from the subject as one pole is from the other, and brought in all kinds of irrelevant arguments and personal castigations of gentlemen with whom they differ, yet from the leader of the Opposition down to the humblest member, there seemed to be nothing but approval at that spectacle. Certainly the leader of the Opposition and his supporters are as responsible to a certain extent for good order and the good conduct of business as are the members of the Government or those who sit on this side of the House, and I think we ought not to turn this House—I am not reading a lecture to-night—we ought not to turn this House, for any long period at least, into a show of the kind which was so much applauded about 15 or 20 minutes ago. The item under discussion has been before the House previous to this. Is it a new issue or an old issue? Hon. gentlemen opposite say that there has not been a fair principle observed in this post office appropriation; that the town is small, so it is; that the revenue is small, no one doubts that; that it is possible that on a financial basis there is very little return for it, I admit that. I am not going to say that these statements are not true. Again there comes up another argument that a year or two ago a resolution was adopted unanimously by the House, and that that resolution said what? Not what a great many gentlemen opposite say that it said, but it said simply: That where post offices or public buildings were being erected and appropriations made for them regard should be had to the revenue and population of the place. But it did not say that sole regard should be had for that. I quite agree with the proposition, but let me point to the fact that hon. gentlemen look, and look in vain, for a single appropriation for a new public building in the items which are before the House. They cannot find one new item. Every one of the appropriations which are here are made in pursuance of votes that have been taken already in the House, and for works that have been begun so far as to be brought before this House and to receive the vote of the House. There is not a single new appropriation for a new building in the estimates now before Parliament. This present estimate started two years ago, when a vote was given for it. It was thoroughly discussed last year in the House, and after a thorough discussion in which the same arguments were gone over as have been gone over to-night, the House passed the vote and the contract is let, and the building is partly constructed, and yet in the face of facts of that kind, we are kept here for hours discussing this matter. If this were a new post office building, and under similar circumstances an appropriation was asked for it, hon. gentlemen would be perfectly right—they are in their right, of course, now—but they would be perfectly right from my point of view in causing all the discussion about it that they thought proper. This, however, is an issue which has been discussed before and which has been settled, and the Government is pledged—I think no person would care to break it at this time—to carry it out, and it will be carried out, and we propose to carry the vote. But here we are kept through all hours of last night and through all hours this morning upon an item or two, discussing matters which have been thoroughly discussed before. I simply recall this state of things to the House and ask whether there has not been sufficient discussion already upon an issue which has really been settled before, and whether it is not best that we should proceed to business and pass this item. When new appropriations are brought before this House for new public works, let them be discussed as to the principle upon which they are based and upon which the appropriation is asked. I do think that it would be better for us all if instead of every time that an item is brought up, it should be discussed fairly and fully rather than that hon. gentlemen should go into a series of election and stump charges and speeches. It would be better I say that we should devote ourselves more especially to the item in hand, and be reasonable in our methods of discussion.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman as well as his colleague is quite at liberty to talk or not to talk upon this or any other matter. That is a subject on which I have no opinion to offer, and he is the best judge as to whether he should speak or not speak. Upon the present occasion, however, I must tell him very candidly that if he did not speak I interpreted his silence as simply meaning that he had no argument to offer at all in answer to the charges which were made from this side of the House. The hon. gentleman says that this is a case which has been settled a year ago; no, this case has not been settled, and that is the reason why it is discussed with so much intensity on this side of the House. It is very true that last year these items were voted, but I deny that because a vote was carried last year the question was settled. It is because hon. gentlemen on that side of the House will not say that they will not cease to do as they have been doing, that they will not cease to violate a principle which they adopted on the floor of this House two years ago; it is because they will not say that they will adhere to that doctrine, as laid down in the resolution I referred to, that we are forced to discuss this matter again and again. There are no new items, I admit, on the present occasion, but this is asking an appropriation to continue the vicious policy enacted last year. Why are we debating it? It is simply because we cannot obtain the recognition of that principle which has been adopted by Parliament unless we impress it on the House and the country by repeated discussion. Let the hon. gentleman stand up and say that these appropriations will be henceforth made in the spirit of the resolution which was adopted two years ago, and then the discussion will cease at once.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the discussion going on until I do that?

Mr. LAURIER. I am afraid it will go on for some time unless we impress the country that we are in the right and the Government are in the wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. You are a long time impressing the country.

Mr. LAURIER. That may be, but after all there may be some time or other when the measure will overflow, and it cannot overflow until we show by repeated discussion the wrong that has been done. Has any argument been offered by the members of the Government either this year or last to support this vote? What justification has ever been made on the floor of this House to show on what principle a post office should be erected in a place which has a population 1,200 and a gross revenue of $432 a year? If the hon. gentleman can stand up and give any argument to justify asking Parliament to vote such an appropriation, I say the discussion will cease at once. But no argument has been offered, and the appropriation has been voted by Parliament for no other reason than that the Government have a large majority over the Opposition in this House. *Sic volo sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas;* that is the only reason that has been given to Parliament, and under such circumstances, so long as the Government will not adhere to the resolution voted two years ago in favour of having such appropriations made under a certain rule, they must be prepared to have such discussions as are now going on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may add this. The hon. gentleman appears to allege that because the vote for this building was made two years ago, therefore the Government were in a manner bound to go on with it; and the hon. Minister of Public Works took the same position. Yet, a few hours ago we had under consideration the case of the Lunenberg post office, for which a vote was taken in 1887, and for five years, because that constituency was represented by a gentleman in opposition to the Government, they allowed the vote to lapse and took no steps whatever to give effect to it. Now, it is due simply to such gross abuses of their power as this that these several items have been discussed as pertinaciously as they have been last night and to-night. It is because the Government are not bringing forward arguments to justify these votes. If the Government, either in the shape of the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Finance, will give us now any reasonable argument why the village of Laprairie, with 1,200 population, a village which has not increased one single soul in twenty years, but which is rather smaller to-day than it was twenty years ago, should have a public building, and why $16,000 of the public money should be wasted and squandered in this way, then there would be no disposition whatever to dispute this vote. But it is simply as a protest against this most improper and unjust expenditure, deliberately made, not for the public good, but for party purposes of a most improper sort, not because there is any just ground for erecting a post office building in Laprairie, but because it is necessary to bribe the electors of that town, that we insist on calling public attention to the matter.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It was not my intention to say anything with regard to the matter under discussion at the present time; but the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Finance appeared to me very peculiar and astonishing under the circumstances, especially his challenge that we would stay here a long time until he would say that the spirit of the resolution which he himself supported and voted for only two sessions ago, should be carried out in the interests of the country. That appeared to me to be a remarkable statement.

Mr. FOSTER. You had better first see whether you have the statement right or not. I made no such statement.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman said that we would stay here a long time until the principle of the resolution should be carried out. These were the words he used.

Mr. FOSTER. I said no such thing.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I took down his words, and that is the reason I rose to make the remarks I am making. Will the hon. gentleman say whether or not he is in favour of the principle of the resolution he voted for, whether the people of this country are to understand that it is the intention of the Government to keep faith with them in carrying out the spirit of that resolution, or whether it is their intention, as I understood the hon. gentleman to say, not to do so? It is a very simple and I think a very reasonable question to answer.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the hon. gentleman the answer. When there is an appropriation for a public work in the estimates which we are trying to pass, the appropriation will show whether I believe in that resolution or not. I voted for that resolution, and I want the hon. gentlemen calmly to take this into consideration: we are discussing a vote that originated before that resolution passed, and what I consider as a pledge which we are bound to carry out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I find no expenditure for Laprairie post office in the year ending 30th, June 1891.

Mr. FOSTER. No expenditure, but we decided on the expenditure, and a vote was taken.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the contract let?

Mr. FOSTER. The contract is let and the building one-third finished.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I may say for myself that I have made no particular objection to the erection of public buildings in Laprairie or in any other place; but I think that it is in the interest of the people of this country that some principle should govern the expenditure of public money, and I did think when the resolution of 1890 was passed by the House that it was a very reasonable one. I also think that it is desirable that the people of this country should know what is the policy of the Government, and if it takes a long discussion to inform them, I think we should be perfectly justified in continuing it. For my part I happen to represent a constituency in which there is a large town, one of the most prosperous in the Dominion of Canada, and I do not think it would make any difference in the political views of the people of that town whether the Government expended there the public money they are entitled to or not. I believe that I represent a class of people who have a higher view, who hold their political opinions from principle; and if they support any political principle, they are firm

in it, and would not be guilty of professing certain views of public affairs which they would not stand by, whether the Government granted them their rights or not. Now, I would like to read to the House the resolution that was passed, I think in the session of 1890.

Mr. OUIMET. It was read four or five times last night.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It will not do harm to read it again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. FOSTER. It will take up more time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think I am an older member of the House than the hon. Minister, and I have not taken up one minute where he has taken up hours, and I am surprised that a gentleman holding his position should say that I am killing time by making the few remarks I propose to make. I would say to the hon. Minister of Public Works that I was not present when the resolution was read, or I would not trouble him with it at the present time. I am not in the habit of taking up much of the time of the House, and when I do rise to my feet I do not think the hon. Minister of Finance will by bull-dozing succeed in making me sit down any sooner than I wish. The resolution is as follows :—

" Be it resolved that in the expenditure of public money the public interest and not party favouritism should control, and that in the choice of places for the erection of public buildings for post office, custom house, and inland revenue purposes, regard should be had to the amount of revenue collected and of public business done."

In my opinion that is a fair principle for the country to adopt. I think it is a matter of small importance, perhaps, in what places public buildings are erected, so long as some principle is observed in expending public money, and if the Government are prepared to say that the principle adopted in that resolution is not a good principle, and that they do not intend to pay any attention to it, then the country will know what the policy of the Government is. It is not fair to the people, even those supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, to give them to understand that is the policy and then pay no attention to it whatever. The town of Woodstock, in the County of Oxford, has a postal revenue of over $15,000 a year and a total revenue from customs, inland revenue and post office of nearly $145,000 per year ; the population is nearly 10,000 souls and it is a manufacturing and commercial town of considerable importance. Yet this town is refused a public building while a small place of but 1,200 souls and a revenue of $433 is to be given one. Does the hon. gentleman consider that carrying out the spirit of the resolution which this House adopted ? Are the people to understand that this Parliament is so degenerate that after passing a resolution, supported by the Government itself, we will then say that resolution is not to be carried out ? I say it is deceiving the members of this House to adopt a certain principle, and then say we intend completely to disregard it. There are over fifty places in this Dominion in which, according to the return brought down, public buildings have been erected although their revenue is hardly perceptible. How are we to expect that the people will be patriotic and honest and straightforward in their transactions, when we find Parliament setting the example of adopting a certain principle and then deliberately disregarding it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I had the pleasure of voting for the resolution which my hon. friend has just read and which was read here last evening three or four times. I sat patiently here until three o'clock this morning listening to hon. gentlemen on both sides discussing these appropriations for post offices, but I failed to hear an hon. gentleman on that side point to a single instance where the spirit of the resolution has been violated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is one before you now.

Mr. TAYLOR. The first appropriation was made in 1889 for that post office.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When was the contract let ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Government gave the pledge in 1889 by appropriating a certain sum in the Estimates to erect a post office at Laprairie, and they did the same in every case brought up in this debate, and I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to point to any instance in which the spirit of the resolution has been violated by the introduction of new estimates, contrary to that spirit. Until they do that, all the wind they wasted last night and are wasting to-night, is thrown away.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would like to call the attention of the House to this fact, that the application for public buildings for Woodstock has been before the Government for the last ten years. The Board of Trade and the municipal council and the citizens of the town have petitioned the Government for a public building and shown the great need there is for one ; and if there were any desire to do justice to that place, the Government had all the knowledge necessary to do it.

Mr. FAUVEL. I heard the Minister of Finance a few moments ago say that this vote was asked because of an appropriation made in 1889. Well, a sum of $5,000 was voted some years ago to build a wharf at Little Bonaventure. But in 1891 the County of Bonaventure returned a Liberal, and in the Estimates of that year this vote was taken off. Was there any fair-play in that ? Is it fair that because a county turns Liberal, it must be deprived of its fair share of public money ? I say that all counties should be served on the same basis. Why should Laprairie be served better than any other county ? Why should $16,000 be expended in a small country town, to the prejudice of other and larger places ? In Bonaventure we have been paying revenue to the country for one hundred and twenty-five years, and never received any return for that expenditure. What have we received in return ? We have received apparently nothing and the county has been returning a Tory member for the last thirty years, but we dared in 1891 to elect another man. If this appropriation for Laprairie was pledged in 1889, why should the money that was promised to Bonaventure at the same time be taken away ? Where is the pledge ? Is it because Bonaventure turned Liberal that we should be deprived of our rights ? Where can the Government of Canada show that any public money has been expended on that shore, though there is probably not a county in the province from which so much revenue is obtained as from Gaspé and Bonaventure, because

we import everything, we grow nothing, and we have large resources in our fisheries. If this resolution for the appropriation which was promised to Laprairie were passed, it would not be fair-play on the part of the Government to rescind the promise they made to Bonaventure in 1889.

Mr. PERRY. I cannot reconcile myself to voting for an expenditure of $16,000 for a public building in this small village. If I were to give a vote in this House for this *gaspillage*, this foolish expenditure of money, I could not justify my vote to my constituents. Looking over the report of the Postmaster General I find that, if the Government were to erect a post office in every locality in Quebec in which there was a post office revenue of over $400, it would require over two millions and a quarter for that purpose. Are the Government prepared to carry out such a policy? There are many post offices in the province I come from that have a revenue of more than $400. I am sorry the Postmaster General is not in his place, because, when an item of this kind is before the committee, he ought to be here to give any explanation required, but he is not here and the fact is he is very seldom here when he is wanted. I want to know whether he is going to give $40 or $50 or $100 to the postmaster of Tignish for rent, where the post office revenue is about $700 a year, and about 300 or 400 money orders are issued in the course of the year. Is that postmaster obliged to supply a house, and stoves, and coal and light, and to be there once every day for the daily mail, and also to look after five semi-weekly mails? I believe he gets some few dollars allowed him for the semi-weekly mails, and that is all. I suppose the Minister of Public Works does not think that in the country buildings cost anything, but that we can get them for nothing, and can get stoves and fuel for nothing. In Prince Edward Island we have to live as well as they have in the Province of Quebec or in the settlement of Laprairie, and the Minister of Finance comes down here as a dictator, as if he was the Czar of Russia, and no member has a right to speak unless he allows him to do so. Well, in the name of common sense, if the thirteen or fourteen gentlemen who occupy or mis-occupy the Treasury benches supposed that they are going to drive the whole machinery, let the whole of the rest of us stay at home, Tories as well as Liberals. The Minister of Finance says: We are the five millions of people of Canada. Like the nineteen tailors of the city of London, they say they are the people of Canada, but they will have to change my mind a great deal before they will be able to shut my mouth when I feel inclined to speak. I would be unworthy of the beautiful constituency I have the honour to represent if I did not raise my voice against the extravagance the Government is practising, which is against my people, because they have to pay their shares of the taxes which go to build that unnecessary post office in Laprairie. I need not repeat, but I endorse, what other hon. gentlemen have said that this money is not appropriated for a lawful purpose, but is I believe to bribe the electors of the County of Laprairie.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the committee rise and report the resolutions.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12 midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 19th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I beg leave to move the adoption of the first report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library of Parliament.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must ask that that be put on the Paper by way of notice. I intend to oppose it.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Generally, I believe, it is His Honour the Speaker who takes charge of this report, as chairman on behalf of the House, and I was only performing the duty for Your Honour. I hope that under the circumstances the Government will name a day on which this report may be discussed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Put a notice on the Paper.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Will you take this as notice?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law.

(In the Committee.)

On section 104,

Mr. MULOCK. I think this clause is unnecessarily severe, and that was the sense of most of the gentlemen on the committee, although they deferred to the opinion of the Minister of Justice for the time being, and did not take a division. Under this clause, you observe, that the offence consists in having in one's possession something dutiable, and which has not paid duty, and having at the same time an offensive weapon. It is argued in favour of this clause that we must assume that the weapon is in the possession of the accused for the unlawful purpose of enabling him to defeat the revenue. But it is not stated here to be necessary to show that this unlawful weapon is in his possession for any such purpose; but if the two things happen together, that a man has in his possession, suppose it were only a cigar that was dutiable but which had not paid duty, and at the same time he had in his possession an offensive weapon, that man is liable to imprisonment for ten years. The Minister of Justice seemed to think that we were bound to come to the conclusion that any person having such a weapon in his possession had it for the purpose of enabling him to defeat the revenue. I do not think we are warranted in coming to that conclusion. Senator Lougheed in the committee stated that it was the practice in the North-West for people

to carry weapons. That is an offence under the law, for which there is an appropriate remedy. If in the North-West it should happen that a person who carried a weapon for defensive purposes, which appears there to be almost as necessary a part of a man's apparel as his hat or boots, happened to be found in possession of some article that should have paid duty, Inland or Customs, we are bound to come to the conclusion that he has the weapon for the purpose of committing violence on some person who would try to seize the contraband article in his possession. That is the inference to be drawn from the situation, and therefore I think the section should be modified, and it ought to be shown that the offensive weapon was in his possession for the purpose of enabling the accused to retain possession of the contraband article, or for the purpose of enabling him to defeat the revenue. As it stands, it is a wholly objectionable clause.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The section is the present law, excepting that we have altered the life penalty to ten years imprisonment as the maximum. It is based on the principle that a man who carries a deadly weapon carries it for some purpose, which is certainly to defend himself and the property which he has in his possession, if it be not for a worse object—aggression on some one else. The property in his possession in that case is property which he has in violation of the law, that is contraband goods, liable to seizure and forfeiture. Under these circumstances, if it be not made highly penal for a smuggler to carry arms, the officers of the law have no protection for their lives, because smugglers always will carry arms.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think there should be any objection to a clause punishing a smuggler for smuggling and carrying offensive weapons; but the objection I understand is, that an innocent party might come under its provisions and receive unjust punishment. It is not necessary under the section that the person should have a guilty knowledge that the goods in his possession are liable to seizure. They might have come into his possession in an innocent way and he might not have the slightest intention of violating the law, but still he would be liable to this very heavy punishment. We have already provided for the case of a man who merely carries a deadly weapon, to which a penalty of five years imprisonment is attached. If a person carrying a weapon at the same time has in his possession goods which he knows to have been smuggled, it is right that he should be punished severely, but the question is whether under this section a person having goods in his possession, not knowing them to be liable to seizure, might not fall into the meshes of the law.

Mr. MULOCK. At the committee it was stated that a great deal of innocent smuggling took place on the part of people entering the country. There is not a citizen of Canada, I presume, who goes abroad but brings home some articles which, if the law were pushed, would be liable to duty; but the revenue officers, believing that such articles are brought in as family presents and not for commerce, do not make the law too irksome; yet technically these people are liable to be accused of smuggling, and if, unfortunately, any such person should have in his possession an offensive weapon, he would be liable to be cast into prison for ten years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am willing to adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Queen's, that the party should know the goods are liable to seizure.

Mr. MULOCK. I am told that at Windsor every ferry at night brings people over from Detroit who have some article that is strictly dutiable. Many of these people may have weapons with them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is very dangerous to allow persons to carry them. We want to prevent the officers of the law, in performing their functions under the law, in seizing contraband goods, coming into collision with people with deadly weapons upon them. If such people knowingly bring into this country contraband goods and carry deadly weapons on their persons they should be very heavily punished.

On section 105,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That ought not to extend to a man having a pistol in his possession in his own house.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. All these sections with regard to carrying weapons are, I admit, severe, and it is the only way to prevent the carrying of weapons for offensive purposes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If a man chooses to handle weapons in his own house, for instance, lay a pistol by his bedside, it ought not to be made a criminal offence. I would suggest that the section ought not to apply to him having arms in his possession when at home.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think there is any case in which a person would carry arms in his own house, unless he had reason to fear assault or injury to his family or himself, and that case is provided for. Even though he should carry them in his own house without necessity, the law is not likely to be enforced unless there is some special reason for it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I believe that the section should only apply to persons carrying arms in public places.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This has been the law for a long time, and we have never heard any objection to it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I acknowledge that is in its favour.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There are certain classes of persons who are obliged to go out at night by reason of their profession, and I think it would not be improper to allow them to carry a pistol for personal protection.

An hon. MEMBER. What kind of a pistol; one with a cork in it?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I allude to firearms. I do not deal in the kind the hon. gentleman is alluding to.

On section 108,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether in his opinion there ought not to be a distinction made between the punishment for carrying a loaded firearm and the punishment for carrying an unloaded firearm?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of the section is to punish any one who playfully points a

weapon at another. Of course if it were pointed with the intention of doing injury, the offence would come under other sections. But when one playfully points a weapon at another, it is intended to make the punishment the same, whether the weapon is loaded or unloaded.

On section 110,

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Why should this section apply only to seaport towns or cities? I do not see why it should not be just as illegal to carry sheath knives anywhere else as in a seaport town.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is where seamen carry these knives in pursuance of their occupation. But this is to prevent other people carrying them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It has been found very dangerous in seaport towns to allow seamen to carry sheath knives at all when ashore. I thought this was to prevent seamen from carrying weapons at all.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. So it is, unless engaged in his lawful trade or calling.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This will only apply to seaport towns. This will allow sailors to go armed in seaport towns, but nobody else shall.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will forbid any one carrying a sheath knife unless in pursuit of his lawful calling as a seaman or rigger.

Mr. DICKEY. This is really an exception to the section we have just passed. Section 109 will not apply to seamen and riggers in the lawful exercise of their calling.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is nothing about a sheath knife in 109.

Mr. DICKEY. If a sheath knife is not covered by 109, I may carry a sheath knife and it might be just as dangerous as a bowie knife.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It certainly seems to me that the intention is to confine the exception to the seaport towns.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I agree with you there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the object is to apply the clause to others as well as seamen it ought to apply everywhere.

Section postponed.

On section 122,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There may have been, I will not say whether there are or not, reason in some parts of the United Kingdom for enacting provisions of this kind, aimed at secret societies formed for the purpose of undermining the Government of the country, and it may have been necessary, under exceptional circumstances, to pass legislation of this extraordinary character. But I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that in Canada it is not necessary. A seditious intention is an intention to bring into hatred or contempt or to excite disaffection against the person of Her Majesty or the Government and constitution of the United Kingdom or any part of it, or of Canada or of any province thereof.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman wait until he has heard the words of the sub-section, for he will find every lawful case covered.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am afraid all the Opposition will be in prison.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sorry to say it does not cover their case.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This section would alter the constitutional law as set out in the trial of Sacheverell, and an attempt is being put forward to make the criminal law such as it was at the close of the last century. I do not think we should legislate in this way. The Government is not like the Grand Llama, a sacred institution, which the people worship, any longer. The Government are regarded now as trustees for the whole nation, and like other trustees are subject to criticism and examination into their conduct, and condemnation of their conduct if it is not deserving of approval. Every department of the Government, every person connected with the Government, is subject to adverse criticism. And the community may go further than that, because we have Acts of Parliament proposed and carried by a majority that simply are war and not legislation; and the right that people have to resist improper measures, as being a gross breach of the public trust, as a last resort, is a right which only in extreme cases should be asserted, but it is the right of revolution which exists, and which we have no right to take away by law. What was pointed out in the Sacheverell case? Dr. Sacheverell had argued and preached the doctrine of passive obedience, just as it is practically embodied in this section. The sentiment he supported was declared to be a seditious sentiment, and he was censured by Parliament, and his views, which had been printed and circulated, were ordered to be burnt by the public hangman, and Parliament asserted and reasserted the right to resist authority in the hands of the parties who are entrusted with it wherever that authority is being grossly abused. This section goes to the full extent of asserting the doctrine of high prerogative which was entertained at one time, when it was supposed that the Sovereign possessed certain adherent powers altogether independent of any compact with the nation, and when it was assumed that the business of the people was to pay their taxes and keep quiet, and if properly protected by the law in the exercise of their private rights, that was all they had to care for. This section is not legislation by free men in the interests of free men for the purpose of maintaining popular liberties, but legislation to restrain those liberties, to prevent criticism, and to punish men for criticising the conduct of the Administration, and those who may have authority in any particular. In this country, in regard to criticism by the press of the judicial proceedings of the courts, we have exercised far greater restraint than is exercised in the mother country. There, criticism, even of the judiciary and of the decisions of the judiciary, when respectful, is regarded as proper, and it seems to me this section is an attempt to exercise restriction upon these liberties which have been long recognized as belonging to every freeman in the country. It is only so long as the yoke of Government and of law does not chafe those who are seeking to maintain their rights that they will contentedly submit to the law, and the strength of the law and the disposition of the community to observe it, depends largely upon that principle. This section could

only be free from danger to the community by remaining a dead letter upon the Statute-book.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sure the hon. gentleman has not read the section or heard it read.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did both.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is not a word in it which restricts, in the slightest degree, any comment upon the Government or upon any department of it, or on the way in which public affairs are administered. On the contrary, lest anybody should fancy that the enacting words of the section could bear that construction, it is distinctly provided that it shall not be sedition.

"(*b*.) To point out errors or defects in the Government or constitution of the United Kingdom, or of any part of it, or of Canada or any province thereof, or in either House of Parliament of the United Kingdom or of Canada, or in any Legislature, or in the administration of justice; or to excite Her Majesty's subjects to attempt to procure, by lawful means, the alteration of any matter in the state."

That covers the case of every man in the country who seeks even to change entirely the constitution or the administration of the country, or of any of its departments, by any lawful means whatever that can be devised. The one thing which is forbidden by it is the treasonable attempt, not against the person of the Sovereign, but to excite her subjects to rebellion. I agree in one sense, and disagree totally in another, with the remark of the hon. gentleman when he says that the time is past when the Sovereign is to be treated otherwise than as a trustee for the people. As regards the preservation of our institutions the Sovereign is not to be regarded as a trustee, as regards the way in which her property is to be treated she is regarded as a trustee. But, if she is to be regarded in the view of the Criminal Law simply as a trustee, then it would be no offence to attempt to dethrone her by violence even, and to appoint another trustee in her place. We propose to retain the rule which has always prevailed in the British dominions: That the Sovereign as a ruler is something more than a trustee, although as a holder of property she is nothing more. If the hon. gentleman will look again at the case he has cited, he will see that he is entirely mistaken as to this being a proposition of mine to change the common law. Lord Blackburn, Sir Charles Barry, Sir Robert Lush and Sir Fitz-James Stephens declared under their own hand that "this is as exact an application as we can make of the existing law."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says that these eminent jurists have stated that this is as correct a statement of the law as they could make. That may be, but my objection is to undertaking to make such a statement. I say to the hon. gentleman that this statement does not cover the principles of the constitution recognized in the case of Sachevereil.

Mr. MULOCK. I think every one is agreed that all proper provisions should be enacted for the preservation of the existing political relations between the people of Canada and our present constitution. But, if this language is calculated in the slightest degree to impair freedom of speech which does not disturb the constitutional relations between the people and the state, then I think to that extent the provision should be modified. It appears to me that sub-section (*b*) meets the case. There can be no objections of course to sub-sections (*a*) and (*b*), and I believe they really attain all that is aimed at. But you go on to insert clauses that raise doubts, and which if interpreted by unwise judges, or perhaps strictly interpreted, may accomplish more than even the Minister of Justice dreams of. If the disaffection referred to in sub-section (*c*) was intended to result in accomplishing the forbidden things mentioned in sub-sections (*a*) and (*b*) then I could understand the enactment, but it does not declare that the hostilities that might be promoted under sections (*c*) and (*d*) is a disaffection having such end in view. If you leave out sub-sections (*c*) and (*d*), or qualify them by referring to sub-sections (*a*) and (*b*), then we would have an interpretation of the meaning of these words without which they are vague. The Minister says that even if (*c*) and (*d*) might, by reason of vagueness, be open to an improper construction, the saving clause in sub-section 2 is sufficient. I do not think it is. Sub-section 2 does not say that any person who in good faith for the purpose named raises a "ruction" should be exempt. It only says by way of proviso that no one shall be deemed to have a seditious intent only because he intends in good faith to show that Her Majesty has been misled or mistaken. It does not say that an honest intent shall be a defence. Even the saving clause of section 2 is limited by the qualification that follows to certain enumerated cases; and therefore if the supposed hostility that might be the outcome of discussion under sub-sections (*c*) and (*d*) is not limited to some of the named grievances, all the good faith in the world would not save one. The hon. gentleman has made the mistake of enumerating the only instances in which good faith will apply, and therefore the saving clause is not at all sufficient. If I were to go on the platform, which painful duty may some day compel me to do, and point out the political crimes of an individual Minister of the Crown, for example, that is not specified in sub-section 2.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not an offence under the main section to attack a Minister.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, it is. If I address an audience and raise hostility and ill-will between the various sections of that audience, I am *primâ facie* liable to sedition unless I can show that I was proceeding in good faith to do—what?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. To point out errors or defects in the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. I have to show that the drift of my language was limited to certain things and certain things only. It must be proved that my aim was to show that Mer Majesty had been misled or mistaken in her measures, or that I was pointing out errors of defects in the Government or in the constitution of Canada or the United Kingdom. To arraign an individual is not pointing out an error in the constitution.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is pointing out defects in the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. You might say that I was only pointing out the errors of an individual member of the Government. An error of the Government is an error of the whole body; the error of an individual is not an error of the Government, because we have the Government here repudiating the acts of individual members of the Government. If the Government held itself as a whole responsible for

all the official acts of its individual members, I could understand it; but that doctrine has been repudiated here. What I object to is that the saving clause is too narrow; it is limited to specific classes of cases only. I think the proper way to deal with the section is to drop everything after sub-section (*b*). Then you would not be interfering with what ought to be the right of every man, freedom of speech in pointing out what are deemed to be existing evils or abuses. Of course I am not addressing my remarks to sub-sections 3, 4 and 5, to which I do not object.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that making a speech which people might not agree with is stirring up hostility between different classes of Her Majesty's subjects. The denunciation of a Minister which might be disapproved of by the whole audience, although it might excite hostility and ill-feelings in their minds, is not the hostility referred to in this Bill. If it were, the men who drafted the code would be maniacs, which they are not.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that is an answer. The Minister may get up and deliver judgment, but that does not bind other judges. I presume he did not intend it offensively, but I do not think that is a courteous way to deal with my criticism. I see by the papers that the Premier of England the other day suggested something of a very extraordinary character in the event of the Parliament of Great Britain adopting a certain course. Where would Lord Salisbury be if this were the law of England?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the law of England; the highest judicial authorities in the country say that it is. I fancy he was within the proviso.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Which one is he under?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If you tell me what he said, I will tell you. The only thing I saw was that the House of Lords might refuse to pass a certain measure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, he referred to what Ulster might do in the event of Home Rule being adopted.

Mr. MULOCK. I hope I am more loyal than Lord Salisbury. I believe in abiding by the constitution, and changing it constitutionally. Within those limits there ought to be absolute freedom of speech, and I trust that the section will be so modified as to put that right beyond all question of controversy. If the Minister will not yield the point now, I give him notice that when the Bill is reported I will move to cut down that clause.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Would a speech favouring annexation be seditious?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not if the person thought that the constitution should be changed by lawful means.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is very well to defer to the high authority of three judges who recommended a definition of a seditious offence. No doubt they did not hear any argument and had not a specific case before them, and did not pass judgment; they only made a report in which they expressed an opinion. Of course, their opinion is entitled to great weight, but the Parliament of England has not yet seen fit to adopt it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I admit that it is not conclusive, but it is entitled to a great deal of weight as against a haphazard opinion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is entitled to a great deal of weight, but it is possible to suggest reasons why this should not be embodied in a statute. Let the matter be left open. The hon. gentleman refers to Her Majesty and Her Majesty's person. I think we have unanimously passed upon the clause which had reference to that person, and conspiracy, and everything else of that kind affecting the Throne or the heir to the Throne, and I do not think anybody raises any question regarding that. We are here defining that which has hitherto been considered vague and uncertain, and properly so considered. The liberty of the subject is not a matter to be trifled with; and it has always been held desirable, even at the time when the Crown was attempting, a hundred years ago, to invoke absolute powers and crush out liberty on the part of the subject, that the jury should have complete control, and that the Parliament should not pass laws defining by hard and fast lines how far a man may go. The common law is elastic and justly elastic. It is made by the prudence and wisdom of the judges, from time to time, and the jurys acting under the guidance of the judges, to suit the development of the people and the constitution. That which was at one time considered a seditious libel in Great Britain would now be laughed at by a jury. There were times when a man would be hanged, drawn and quartered for writing what he may now write with perfect impunity. A thousand and one reasons can be cited to show that it is not only justifiable, but in many cases necessary, that extreme language should be used for the redress of grievances, not simply of the state, but of classes in the state. A few years ago if a man advised his fellow workmen to band themselves together in the form of a trade union for the purpose of demanding and enforcing higher wages, he would have been liable to very severe penalty. Parliament had to intervene to alter the common law and allow that to be done which at one time was considered by the judges a very heinous and grave offence. Most educated men now think that is justifiable and proper, and working men are commended by Ministers of the state, and the highest authorities, and the best thinking men, for uniting to defend their rights. It is impossible to say off-hand what might be the possible outcome of this; but I do not hesitate to say it is in the direction of hampering the liberty of the subject which hitherto the citizens of Canada have enjoyed, and which they have not so far allowed to degenerate into license. I would respectfully suggest to the committee whether we are justified in hedging around the liberties of the subject, as hitherto enjoyed, until there is some *primâ facie* case made out to show that a certain class of the community has abused this and that liberty has degenerated into license. Is there a gentleman in this committee who would suggest that in any part of Canada circumstances have occurred which would justify the limiting of the liberty of the subject heretofore enjoyed? We have our public meetings and discussions, but we manage, after British fashion, when it is all over, and party feelings and passions

have passed away, to forget the excitement and everything goes on smoothly as before. The people of all classes should have all the rights they have heretofore had to alter, or ask for the alteration and improvement of any matters of state and to inculcate disaffection even and discontent. It may be most laudable to inculcate disaffection and discontent in order that a remedy may be applied for the removal of the grievance aimed at. As my hon. friend beside me says, suppose you attack an individual member of the Government in violent terms, suppose you say his presence in the Cabinet is a menace to the country, do you think that you are protected by the proviso—"to point out errors or defects in the Government or constitution of the United Kingdom, or any part of it?" The presence of one or two or three Ministers as advisers of Her Majesty, may be pernicious, and it may be desirable that they be removed, but you would not come under this proviso if you denounced them in the severest language. You could not plead that you were pointing out error in the Government or constitution. You might inveigh against the Administration in such a way as to raise discontent, and I do not see how you could find shelter behind this exception. The ground on which I base my objection is the broad and general ground that you are attempting to define what had better be left undefined, and that no good ground exists for attempting to define a law, the definition of which has heretofore been left to the judge and jury. The great safety the public had seventy or seventy-five years ago, in prosecutions for seditious libel, when three-fourths of the judges were prepared to send men to prison, lay in the fact that the juries would not find a conviction although the judges strongly directed them to do so. Now we are attempting to make a definition; and when you have done so, the judges will instruct the jury that cases come within the definition, and a very large and important and proper discretion, vague though it may be, a discretion which has heretofore been left to the jury, will be to some extent taken away from them by this definition. I would not oppose any clause aimed at a definite object. If you want to suppress crime, incitements to crime, conspiracies of any kind, riotous or disorderly assemblies, let us do it; but do not let us by definition limit that liberty which I do not think any gentleman can say has yet degenerated into license. That should be left to every individual to enjoy as he has heretofore enjoyed it. I think we are running a risk without any necessity, and I would suggest the desirability of striking out this clause. If the common law covers any part of it, you can resort to the common law; if it does not, you are improperly legislating to the extent it does not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I wish to say a few words, and will then propose to let the clause stand, in order that my hon. friends opposite may consider what amendment should be adopted with the view of arriving at the result we are both agreed upon. I find my hon. friends opposite differ diametrically from me as to what the meaning of this section is. Two gentlemen, for instance, say that they would come within the prohibitory terms of the clause if they, addressing a public meeting, stated that the presence in the councils of the Sovereign of a certain individual was a danger to the state, because that was calculated to cause discontent and disaffection among the audience. I do not think it would imperil a hair of the head or take a dollar from the pocket of any man to say that the entire Administration is a curse to the country and should be turned out, if he thought so, because he would be attempting to procure by lawful means "the alteration of some matter in the state," and this the Bill says he shall be allowed to do without any punishment whatever. My hon. friend says we ought not to cripple the liberty of the subject and liberty of speech. I avow at once it is not the intention to change the law one iota in this respect. That which is the common law we are not making any more stringent or less elastic by putting it in the statute. If my hon. friends, on reflection, can point out where we vary one hair's breadth, let them offer an amendment, and I will accept it, and make the Bill exactly the same as the common law, as these judges think they have done already. As to this question of trial by jury and the functions of the jury, that would remain under this Bill precisely as it is now. The functions and power of the jury and the way they protect the subject in England do not lie at all in defining the law, but in having the absolute and uncontrollable right to decide whether the accused has violated the law or not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The entire question was one for the jury—libel or no libel, no matter what the judges thought about it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, entirely. The duty of the judge always was to lay down what constituted a libel, and the function of the jury was to say whether the accused had violated that or not, and whether the publication complained of, therefore, was a libel or not. The case in which an attempt was said to have been made to control the jury was one in which the judge endeavoured to lay down that the prisoner was guilty of libel if he published the article, and simply left it to the jury to find if he had published the article. The jury returned a verdict of "not guilty," and that verdict was understood to be necessary in the interests of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. It is now for the jury to say whether a prisoner is guilty of stirring up discontent, promoting feelings of ill-will, and so on, or whether he intended in good faith to bring about a change in some matter in the state. So it will be absolutely in the hands of the jury, as it is now. I think hon. gentlemen on consideration will come to that conclusion, but, if not, they should suggest an amendment.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose there was a struggle involving some religious question. The contestants may present their arguments in a way certain to provoke ill-will. They do not pretend that they desire to change any matter of state. I will not say what may take place in *quasi* private places such as churches, nor will I speak as to what may be said from the pulpit, but in public assemblies there are many matters brought up which do not reach to the point of matters requiring a change in the state.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is provided for in sub-section (c) of section 2.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that will apply. I think that this proviso, by simply enumerating

the cases by which one can in good faith disturb the good feeling of the public, is an erroneous way to deal with the case, and I very much question whether it will not prevent ordinary meetings and public discussions involving the great questions which are continually agitating the labour classes. We have the controversies between labour and capital and between organized labour and unorganized labour. Organized labour may meet and discuss unorganized labour. Do you propose to prevent such a discussion? The Minister may say he does not intend that, but he is not the final adjudicator on this matter, and I am sure the labour classes will view this section with great disapproval, because it is the first step taken to interfere with freedom of discussion. Next session there will be some further amendment to the clause, and in a little while you will have robbed the peeple of their freedom of speech. In a little time you will be clothing your officers with power to prevent public meetings, and you will in that way develop a discontent which would not be the outcome of freedom of discussion. The whole history of the institutions of the mother land warrants us in concluding that the greatest safety lies in freedom of discussion. A British mob allows its ill-will to pass off by using strong language, while in other countries, where freedom of discussion is prohibited, this ill-will takes the form of deeds of violence and causes the formation of secret societies. In this country we have the Orange Order and we have the Hibernian societies, and they are all perfectly equal before the law, and they assemble, I presume, on their festal days, and largely stand by their views and principles, and each probably arraigns the other side. I presume that neither has the slightest idea of converting the other to his own views, so that they cannot have any intention to bring about a change in matters of state, and, if that is not their intention, they are liable to be found guilty of sedition under this section. I altogether oppose this kind of legislation, and I think the Minister will be consulting public opinion if he drops the sub-sections interfering with freedom of speech except so far as they are necessary to the maintenance of our institutions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The common law provides for that.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know enough as to what the common law provides to be able to state, but I will oppose anything which will prevent a man from expressing his views in regard to any matter against the state or in the state.

Section postponed.

On section 124,

Mr. FLINT. I think this is a very peculiar clause. I do not see why we should legislate on this subject. I think the clause is very difficult to enforce. Would the Minister kindly explain it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the present law, and it simply gives the right to a foreign potentate who is at amity with Her Majesty, to prosecute for libel published against him, which is likely to have the result of exposing him to the hatred of his own people, without sufficient cause. The celebrated case of Pelletier, who was tried for libel against Napoleon, was a case of that kind. As regards the effect on the estimation of the people of the foreign state, the potentate who prosecutes, or the person who prosecutes on his behalf, has to show that, and that has to be judged by the violence of the language which may be used.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A part of the section I fail to understand. It may be necessary in England, in view of the ill-feeling which exists against potentates by certain classes who make England a place of refuge. I take it that the section has in view political refugees from Austria, Poland, Russia, France or Italy, making England a haven from which they disseminate their seditious literature against the potentate from whose realms they have escaped. But I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that it is hardly necessary in Canada to pass such a law, and, if it was, I fail to understand the meaning of these words: "Who, without lawful justification, publishes any libel tending to degrade, revile or expose to hatred and contempt, in the estimation of the people of any foreign state." The standard set up is not the opinion of the jury nor of the judge, but it is the estimation of the people of any foreign state.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is now the case in respect to a libel against an individual, if it exposes him to hatred, contempt or ridicule, not in the minds of the jury, but in the minds of the public, if it is calculated to do so. It is the same test here; we say, if it is likely to have that effect in a foreign state.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the case of a private individual, witnesses must be called who will give their opinion as to whether the publication was libellous, and the jury are then, upon this evidence, to come to a conclusion. But this says that you are liable for an indictable offence if you publish any libel tending to degrade, revile, or expose to hatred in the estimation of the people of a foreign state. I fail to grasp what I suppose was the true intention the draughtsman intended to express. Supposing a libel was published against the President of the United States, it would seem to me that what you have got to show is: Does this libel, in the estimation of the people of the United States, tend to degrade and revile the President? I do not see how the standard you set up is to be reached, who is going to tell whether the people of the United States estimate that this libel tends to degrade the President? The Secretary of State may write us so, and Congress may pass a resolution to that effect.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The question is not whether it does degrade him, but whether it tends to degrade him in the estimation of the people in the foreign state, and the duty of the judge is to say to the jury: Do you believe that that libel, containing these words published by the defendant, tended to degrade this person in the eyes of the people of the foreign state? What evidence the jury may find on is another question. In the case of a criminal libel the judge puts it to the jury without any evidence of effect at all. It is for the jury to say whether the language tends to that effect.

On section 131,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In this section we are assuming the possibility that some one holding a judicial office might corruptly accept a bribe. Would it not be well to assume a similar possi-

bility on the part of a member of Parliament or of a Provincial Legislature?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will make a note of the suggestion, and we will come back to this section, if I find the matter is not provided for.

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

After Recess.

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. When passing section 123, I was out of my seat. I intended to suggest that the following words should be added: "or receiving any benefit under any such contract."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 142,

Mr. MULOCK. By this amended Act you are extending the criminal law beyond the limits within which it has hitherto been confined. The section which is supposed to be incorporated in the amended Act is limited to customs and revenue officers, but under the proposed amendment you are making the law, which was only considered in regard to the collection of revenue, applicable to many other matters, and therefore I think the clause ought to be amended or we should discuss its conditions in regard to other branches of the service and see whether this punishment is applicable. I may refer to the interpretation of the clause, which defines the term "public officers," and from this you will see that a public officer is not simply a customs officer or an excise officer but practically any person who is engaged in the Dominion service in any capacity, however trifling this service may be. Any militia officer, any person in the Mounted Police, any person engaged at all in the public service of Canada, is by the interpretation Act a public officer, and you are making it an offence to resist him, and of the same class as the offence of resisting a custom house officer. I do not think that it is reasonable. It is a new section; it is really amending the Militia Act, the North-West Mounted Police Act, the Civil Service Act—it is amending every Act on the Statute-book of Canada which requires any public service to be performed. I thought this Bill was a codification; I understood you were not making new laws. When a new provision like this is introduced, I think it ought to be clearly pointed out to the committee that a change is involved. Up to the present time I have assumed that there has been no change whatever, that we have been simply declaring the law as it exists.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not want the hon. gentleman to assume that,—I never said it. As regards this section, I do not see why any other class of public officers should not be protected to the same extent. Under the present law protection is extended to customs and inland revenue officers by punishing persons with imprisonment for life who obstruct them in the execution of their duty. We have included certain other officers in the definition of what a public officer is; it seems to me they are officers of quite as high a class and quite as deserving of protection; such as officers of the army, navy, marine, North-West Mounted Police and other officers in the public service of Canada. We have reduced the penalty from one to ten years.

Mr. MULOCK. It is not the officer we are considering, it is the duty he is performing, and we are providing a penalty to secure the performance of the public service. Now, you have the civil servants in the lobby. If any one obstructs one of these messengers in his duty of opening or closing a door, you are putting that offence on the same category with the offence of interfering with the collection of revenue. I think that the provision should be simply limited, as at present, to the collection of revenue, and if it is desirable to impose penalties in order to secure the due enforcement of other branches of the public service, let us consider those branches and then assign punishments to any who interfere with the carrying out of the service. It is absurd to say that the punishment which is necessary in the major offence, such as interference with the collection of the revenue, is to be a fit punishment in the case of minor offences. Of course, the answer is that the judge will, in his discretion, not impose the extreme penalty, but I am opposed to giving unnecessary discretion even to the judiciary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In all these cases we have to describe the general offence, and we have to provide the maximum punishment for the gravest kind of that offence, leaving it to the discretion of the court to mitigate the punishment according to circumstances. The only thing to be considered is not the duty that the officer may be performing—that is a matter for the court to consider and to adjust the penalty—but the class of officers who are entitled to protection. I do not see why any officer in the service of the Government and in the discharge of a public duty, is not entitled to be protected to the same extent as an officer of the customs or of the inland revenue. It is true they may be performing very slight duties, so may the other class; but if they are discharging duties on which the public interest depend, there ought to be a severe penalty for the worst class of cases.

Mr. FRASER. There is a reason why the penalty should be severe in the case of the customs and inland revenue, because that is a matter of much more importance to the Government than any other service.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The punishment is light now.

Mr. FRASER. I am not quarrelling with the severity of the punishment in those cases. But take the instance of an ordinary fishery officer. It seems to me absurd that resisting a fishery officer should be made as great a crime, in the eye of the law, as resisting a customs officer. While there should be stringent punishment meted out to every man who opposes any officer of the Government, I think there should be a distinction drawn in the gravity of the punishments. For example, a man may be protecting a net. That is not of so much importance to the Government as to see that the revenue is collected. A man may be going on board a ship and confiscating it, and the Government receive large sums in that way; but to say that a man may be sent to the penitentiary for ten years for resisting an officer in the discharge of his

duties in a minor matter such as the fisheries is out of all proportion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It strikes me that in this very class of cases the section might be used very arbitrarily and with no small injustice. In the case of the customs and excise, you have, *ex necessitate*, to vest arbitrarily in the officer ample powers to prevent anybody interfering with him. But it is not so in all cases. The fishery laws enable a fishery officer to seize all the property of a fisherman engaged in catching oysters, or engaged in catching fish of any kind or description, and to confiscate all that property. It is well known to those who live in the fishery districts that at times subordinate officers attempt to act in a very arbitrary way, and for mere resistance on the part of the fisherman in a moment of excitement, when his property is about being seized, you make him guilty of an indictable offence, and render him liable to a criminal prosecution. It is carrying the law much further than Parliament heretofore ever intended to carry it. I have not heard any complaint as to the exercise of the powers vested in the excise and customs officers, and I think these powers might be justified in most or all of such cases, but I doubt very much if it is desirable to extend these powers to officers in whom you have vested the arbitrary power of seizing the property of fishermen without trial, and confiscating that property as well as the boats, nets and all kinds of fishing gear, and say that if a man resists that officer to any extent he is guilty of an indictable offence. I think it is taking a very long step in the direction of arbitrary government, and by and by these officers will be able to exercise the powers vested in them without any fear on their part, and any man who attempts to interfere with them in the slightest degree renders himself liable to imprisonment. I know of cases in my experience where time and again a subordinate fishery officer has acted with such arbitrariness as quite justified the man in resisting until he got legal advice, and in most cases where he got legal advice he succeeded in getting the property back at once. But if under this law he attempts the slightest resistance, confiscation follows, and he may be put in an awkward box.

Mr. TUPPER. These cases are dealt with as they come up. I take it that we are legislating for the important cases in connection with the fisheries. In regard to the very important work of protecting the inshore fisheries, it is of great importance that there should be no interference with the fishery officers who had to perform this delicate and important duty. I submit that it is of the utmost consequence that every co-operation and assistance should be given to fishery officers in making seizures, which, in some cases, are vessels within the three-mile limit.

Mr. FRASER. I admit that, but there will be no appeal because this will be a criminal prosecution, and the person accused will have no advantages. There should be a distinction made between the classes of officers. Collectors of Customs—and I am not saying anything against fishery officers—possess education and knowledge so as to enable them to do the work more effectively, and to give the same power to fishery officials who receive $20 a year, is not to legislate on a correct principle. A collector of customs at any seaport is a man who will not do an arbitrary act, but a fishery officer receiving $20 a year in a neighbourhood where there is generally some little feeling aroused, should not be protected by the law so as to make a party who resists him liable to imprisonment for ten years. While there should be protection given to these officers, I do not think it should be to the extent proposed, because it is out of all reason as compared to the difficulty and importance of the duties they have to perform.

Mr. MULOCK. I call the Minister's attention to the great departure between the proposed section and the existing law. The existing law requires that offences of this class shall be accompanied by violence or threats of violence. It must cover resistance to collection of revenue or some interference with the law respecting trade and navigation. It is proposed to apply these penalties to very different classes of conduct and to very different classes of officers. It is now proposed to make it a felony to simply resist, perhaps in a passive way. A man might go into his own house and lock the door and be held to be resisting, and become liable under this Act as if he had committed an offence under the old law. One cannot, after this law is in force, go through a department and offer the slightest resistance. One clerk interfering with another in the discharge of his duties will be liable to be included under the proposed amendment. This section is bureaucracy gone mad. Hon. gentlemen opposite are going to make everything criminal. When I read this Bill it appeared to me as if every law was to be enforced with some police officer and as if they were to be enforced by extreme penal punishment. The spirit in which this Bill has been put together is well enough so far as it goes, and I would not have found fault with it, but changes in this section and other sections are being made in a manner which has never received the sanction of any Legislature, and which is, in my judgment, a very unsound direction in which to turn the law. I hope the Minister will consider the clause, and if there are any other radical changes he will make them known to the committee. Otherwise we are not codifying but legislating by wholesale. I have no doubt that the penalties in the Customs, Inland Revenue, Militia, North-West Mounted Police and Civil Service Acts are different, and wisely and rightly different, because the duties are different and the offences are not the same. Whenever Parliament declared a new offence it gave due consideration to it, and yet we are asked wholesale to say that every one of these Acts should be amended without taking the trouble to turn up the Acts themselves, and obtain an intelligent idea in regard to them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think the change is so great as the hon. gentleman suggests. There is a change so far as extending the Acts to other officers, some of whom are of major and others of minor class. But the principles of the existing law are not departed from. The hon. gentleman talked about locking a door and so on, but I do not think on reflection the hon. gentleman will give an opinion that such would be resisting and obstructing an officer. In section 34, cap. 162, of the Revised Statutes the same words are used as in this section, and a penalty of two years imprisonment is provided.

Mr. MULOCK. You are now making it ten years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Officers of Customs and Inland Revenue, including preventive officers, who get "nothing a year" except half or one-quarter what they seize, are vested with powers beyond the officers of Canada. Yet any one who obstructs or injures them is liable to imprisonment for life. We struck a medium, in order to give discretion to the court to enable it to give heavy penalties in heavy cases, and light penalties in light cases. The case will be very rare which will call for punishment of ten years. I shall be glad, however, to accept any suggested amendment in regard to the term of imprisonment.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman will remember that in the sub-committee it was stated by a member that he knew a judge who held it to be his duty whenever a man was found guilty to give him the extreme penalty. I will suggest an amendment to-morrow.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where men voluntarily place themselves under military law and discipline, I dare say they might be subjected to the extreme rigour of the law, or when an officer is armed with a legal warrant to execute it under the authority of the Queen, any one who resists him should be punished, but I refer to these cases where men are armed with arbitrary power which they exercise of their own motion and without a warrant. For instance, a minor fishery officer goes to the seaside, and he thinks a man is fishing for oysters and he seizes his appliances, and that man feeling sure that he is not breaking the law tries to escape from the officer arresting him without a warrant, do you wish to make him guilty of an indictable offence for that? I say that it ought not to be an indictable offence to resist an officer unless that officer is armed with a legal warrant. Surely a citizen of this country should have some rights. He will not have many after this Act passes, I admit, because you are making it so strong that I do not know what a man can do or not do. There ought, however, to be some distinction between a man armed with a legal warrant which every one is bound to obey, and a jack-in-office executing what he supposes to be the authority vested in him by statute. The officer might turn out to be legally right, and if he is, the punishment is sufficiently heavy for the whole property value, it may be at $5,000, is confiscated. I think you ought to draw some distinction in this matter.

Mr. TUPPER. Under the existing Acts the fishery officers are justices of the peace as the hon. gentleman knows, and that has been the law since 1867. The protection included in this Bill has been given to the fishery officers ever since the Fishery Act was passed.

Mr. FRASER. There is this distinction. Fishery officers are justices of the peace, but not in the same sense as justices of the peace who receive a commission.

Mr. TUPPER. They are of a much higher class than the ordinary justices of the peace.

Mr. FRASER. They are justices of the peace for the enforcement of the law, and can sit upon cases. You must remember that they always have a motive for executing the law because they made something out of it, and that is different from the ordinary justice of the peace. Of course if a justice of the peace sees a violation of the law openly before him, he can act without warrant, but the justice who is appointed for the purpose of preserving the peace, is a different man from the officer appointed by the Government, who receives a salary and is an ex-officio justice of the peace, for the purpose of carrying out that office. I think there is a great deal in what the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says, that when any person has a legal warrant which can only be issued upon regular information, he is in a different position altogether from the officer who has no warrant. It must be remembered that very often these officials do not know the law. They think they know the law but they do not, and they put strained constructions upon it. There will be a great deal of danger that these men will exercise their little brief authority to the detriment of citizens who may honestly be protecting their property, if you leave this clause as it is now framed. An officer of this kind may think that a person is violating the law when he is not. Now, if a man resists the officer putting forth authority, would it be any defence that he was acting legally? It may be pleaded as a mitigation of punishment, but it would not be a defence under this section, and I think the provision here gives a very dangerous power to these officers. We all admit that there must be certain powers given and that resistance to these smaller officials for the protection of the fisheries must be punished, but the section here is too severe.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will make the punishment less, but I cannot adopt the distinction between an officer with a warrant and an officer without it. If I did that I would be repealing half the law which has been in existence for years. I will make the punishment four years or less, but I think there ought to be punishment for a person who resists an officer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman able to state that there has been any miscarriage of justice by reason of this Draconian code not being in force? I think that the powers vested in the fishery officers are extremely great now, so great that the citizen is placed at a disadvantage, although he is engaged in the exercise of his proper and legitimate calling. To allow him to be amenable to indictment for a felony seems to me to be carrying it out too extreme.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My hon. friend will have to answer that question himself. I think I am entitled to ask him, whether, this Draconian code having been in force almost as long as he and I have lived, he can point to any oppression having come from it. Officers of less authority and less intelligence than fishery officers are clothed with more power in this respect. Officers connected in any way with the collection of the revenue have this protection, only that instead of a punishment for ten years it is a life imprisonment. That is Draconian, and we are unanimous in thinking it too severe; but we are not to be told that this is a new provision altogether. Then again, the provision with a lesser punishment extends to any one who obstructs a person seizing trees or logs, in the due execution of his duty, without a warrant, or any person acting in aid of such officer, or any person resisting an officer in the lawful execution of

any process against any lands is liable to two years imprisonment. Officers of inland revenue and customs and receivers of wrecks and various other officers have also this protection now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We do not object at all to a person being punished for resisting an officer who is executing a process. If an officer has the Queen's writ it must go where it is directed, and any person who takes the responsibility of resisting it ought to be punished. I am limiting my objection to an extension of the existing law to cases where an officer acts on his own discretion, not in pursuance of a legal writ, and attempts to seize the property of a citizen.

Mr. MASSON. I do not understand why the hon. gentleman objects to the section extending to all public officers. There are many officers in customs who receive no salary, but only get a share of the forfeitures and penalties which their work brings into the revenue, and they have inducements to be arbitrary. But other officers, such as fishery officers, have not the same inducements that customs officers have to make arbitrary seizures. In all these cases the law has made the resister liable to imprisonment for life, and yet there has been no case of that law being executed in an arbitrary manner. As the Minister of Justice has stated, the cases in which an indictment is necessary are extremely rare, and the criminal law is very seldom enforced. This matter was discussed pretty extensively in the committee and it was unanimously agreed that the life penalty was altogether too severe, and ten years imprisonment was suggested as a limit. The Minister of Justice has now reduced that to four years, which, personally, I think much better. I suggested, in the committee, five years, but I think four years is preferable. Provision might even be made in some cases for the imposition of a fine instead of imprisonment, because many of the offences would be of a very trifling nature. We protect sheriffs, deputy sheriffs, bailiffs and constables, and in some cases fines are inflicted; and even where imprisonment is permitted, I believe the judges as a rule impose short sentences or fines.

Mr. FLINT. Where an offence reaches a high grade it ought undoubtedly to be severely punished, but there ought, I think, to be greater latitude as to the infliction of punishment. If the Minister is inclined to make two classes of offences, I would suggest that he should not only reduce the maximum term of imprisonment, but also allow the magistrate the option of a fine in trifling offences.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that the clause be confined to officers engaged in enforcing the law with reference to customs, inland revenue and trade and navigation.

Section postponed.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Laprairie Post Office..... $6,000

Mr. FLINT. When the committee rose last night we were discussing the propriety of this expenditure, and the point was raised by the Finance Minister that as the House had already agreed to build this structure and as the building was partly completed, we ought to permit this appropriation to pass, and were precluded from a full and free inquisition into the policy which led to this expenditure; and he urged that the two or three salient arguments which covered all the ground, perhaps, that could be covered in objecting to the propriety of this expenditure were unduly repeated, and that members on this side ought to be contented with stating their arguments and objections once or twice and then allow public opinion to form itself upon that question. I differ from that view. I think that the time has arrived when an expenditure of this kind ought to be denounced in the strongest language consistent with parliamentary etiquette. I think that the two or three arguments which at first suggest themselves in objecting to such an expense, ought to be repeated and illustrated in almost every possible phase, in order that public attention may be drawn to the matter and public feeling aroused, not so much for the purpose of condemning the Government for the past, as of preventing a recurrence of such an outrage upon common sense and ordinary political economy and fair political consideration as is involved in the expenditure of $16,000 to build a post office at this village. I am perfectly aware that there must be a large number of hon. gentlemen who support the Government who must find it very difficult to square with their conscientious convictions public expense of this sort; and many of the observations from this side have been made for the purpose, if possible, of drawing from hon. gentlemen on the Government benches some expression, whether of approval or disapproval, of this expenditure. The hon. Minister who has charge of the item only ventured upon one defence, and that was that Laprairie was an interesting historical place and deserving of consideration on that ground. Well, the Dominion is filled with historical places. Almost every foot of our soil, particularly in the Maritime Provinces, is teeming with historical associations, and claims could be made without number from every village in lower Quebec and the Maritime Provinces for similar expenditure for historical purposes, if this principle were admitted. Should this item be taken as a precedent, let me call attention to what we might expect from the Province of Nova Scotia alone. In that province there are 65 places having a larger postal revenue than Laprairie, where it is proposed to erect this expensive building. Take Cow Bay, a place of considerable commercial importance, it has a postal revenue of $786, and the hon. member representing that constituency, good Conservative as he is, has no doubt pressed upon the Government the claim of the people of his constituency for financial assistance in various public works, and no doubt he has been met with the answer given by the Government to the hon. member for Northumberland, that while it would be well to appropriate an amount for this purpose, it was desirable that revenue and expenditure should be equalized and that the taxes should not be increased, and that, therefore, his claim cannot be allowed at present. Cow Bay, however, is entitled just as much to a $16,000 building as Laprairie. In fact it is entitled, *pro rata*, to a $22,000 building, because it has a postal revenue of about $800. Digby has

a postal revenue of $2,049, and does a large trade and commerce, and collects considerable customs duties. Digby would have a right to complain that it, too, should have a handsome public building, when a small village like Laprairie, with a postal revenue of $433, is given one, and in Digby both post office and custom house could be combined in the one building. English Town, in Victoria County, which is represented by a strong supporter of the Government, has a postal revenue of $750; and yet, despite all the sacrifices he has made to secure his election, that hon. gentleman never dreamt of asking the Government to build a $16,000 post office in English Town, for he knew well what the answer would be. It would be absurd for the Government to gratify their supporter, because every town in that district of the same size would have an equal claim. If every town in your district has an equal claim and is equally to be gratified, there is not money enough in the treasury, and I doubt if there is enough credit in the Dominion, to put up all the public buildings that will be required in the next ten or a dozen years. Take Granville Ferry, as beautiful a place as Laprairie, and with very interesting historical associations, and no doubt the member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) would be glad to see a splendid monument in stone and brick built there and used for a post office, and yet, notwithstanding all his gall and all ability, I think he would hardly venture to ask for a building costing $16,000 for that village. Then we have Great Village, in Colchester County, and the member for that county has great influence with the Government, but he has not asked, and I do not think he would be able to get a building of this kind for that village. Of course, Guysborough need not expect anything, because it is represented by a member of the Opposition, and yet it has a revenue of $979. Then Hantsport, in the County of Hants, has a revenue of $1,122, and yet no public building is proposed to be erected there. Kentville has been referred to by my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) in suitable terms. Lawrencetown, in the County of Annapolis, exceeds Laprairie in the amount of its receipts, and so does Kingston Station largely exceed it, as well as Liverpool, Lockeport, Lower Stewiacke, and Colchester in Colchester County, Mabou, Maitland, Hants, and Middle Musquodoboit in the County of Halifax. Surely the member for Halifax might do something for Middle Musquodoboit, which has a postal revenue of $519, because, if Laprairie is entitled to a $16,000 building, Middle Musquodoboit ought to have a $20,000 building. I think these hon. gentlemen who are supporting the Government from the Province of Nova Scotia should raise their voices against this improper partiality and demand better reasons why these favours are showered upon a small village on the St. Lawrence River and are withheld from those places in their counties. Then there is Milton in Queen's County, which has a larger revenue than Laprairie, and Newport, in the County of Hants. I am only referring to villages and towns in which the revenue is under $1,000, and not to places like Oxford, New Glasgow or Pictou. Then there is Port Hastings, in Inverness County, which is represented by my energetic friend opposite (Mr. Cameron), who certainly can present a case to the Government with as much ingenuity and can enforce it with as plausible arguments as any gentleman on the other side of the House. How is it that he has not pressed the claims of Port Hastings, Port Hood and Port Hawkesbury; how is it that these interesting and historical places have no post office buildings erected at a cost of from $20,000 to $25,000? I am sure that the hon. gentleman is quite willing to receive the appropriations, and that he thinks his constituents are quite equal to the constituents of the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Pelletier), so I think it must be only his modesty which has prevented his getting appropriations for these purposes there.

Mr. CAMERON. We look for bigger game.

Mr. FLINT. That may be, but possibly the secret will come out some day as to why the hon. gentleman has not pressed the Government for these appropriations. Then take Pugwash, in the County of Cumberland. How is it that my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) has not seen that Pugwash has obtained this favour? Of course these are not rights; they are favours. There are some claims which are rights, and which any one could insist upon, but, when it comes to the erection of public buildings at a cost of $16,000 in places where the revenue is under $500 a year, it is only a favour, and I cannot understand why my hon. friend from Cumberland has not insisted upon Pugwash getting this favour granted to it. Then there is St. Peter's, in the County of Richmond. I wonder if my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Gillies), who has just come triumphantly through an exciting bye-election, if all the records in connection with that bye-election were published, would not be found to have promised the people of St. Peter's that they should have a handsome post office, because, as their receipts amount to the magnificent sum of $636 a year, if Laprairie is entitled to a $16,000 building, they should be entitled to a $18,000 or $19,000 building. I do not understand why he has not defended this expenditure in order to lay the ground for a future demand on behalf of St. Peter's. Perhaps before the debate is over he may explain his conduct in that matter. There is Shubenacadie in the County of Hants, and, if the hon. gentleman could get a building there, he might be able to make his calling and election sure in the future. I see that Sydney Mines has $40 revenue more than Laprairie, and its representative ought to see that his constituents are not passed over in this disgraceful way year after year without having a public building, when they are paying $40 more than Laprairie. Then there are Tatamagouche in the County of Colchester, Wallace in Cumberland, West Bay in Inverness, Westport in Digby County, but the last is just under the line, and I am afraid there is no chance for my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Bowers), because it pays about $11 less postal receipts than Laprairie. There is West River, Sheet Harbour in Halifax County with a revenue of $744, and Weymouth and Whycocomagh and others. I have run over the principal post offices in Nova Scotia, because that is the province with which I am best acquainted. There is one post office in my own county, the village of Hebron, near the town of Yarmouth, that pays a great deal more into the public revenue than Laprairie. Right in the heart of the village there is a number of very intelligent supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the

only fault I can find with those gentlemen is that they are Conservatives in feeling, and if they are not entitled to a $16,000 post office, then Laprairie is not.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Did my hon. friend ever apply for a post office building for Hebron?

Mr. FLINT. No, I never did, I have not got the cheek to do it; although I have a fair degree of that commodity I never attained so sublime a height as to ask for a public building in the village of Hebron. It has only paid into the revenue $500 or $600 a year. Now, I venture to say that with all the earnestness on behalf of his people that characterizes the member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), it never occurred to him to ask for public buildings in the villages of his county which pay a postal revenue of less than $1,000 a year. But now that this item has put the idea into his head, now that he has the precedent of the Government in giving Laprairie this handsome building, I will not answer for the future action of my hon. friend from Annapolis when he looks over his fair county and sees the opportunity which this precedent gives him for strengthening his popularity and increasing his political influence in that county; and I warn the Government when the next general election approaches to keep their eye upon the hon. member for Annapolis, and resist with all their power his blandishments and his pressure to secure public buildings in some nine or ten villages and towns of his county which pay a revenue of from $500 to $800. Now, seriously I would ask the Government if this policy is not, in their opinion and the opinion of their supporters, the most insane that could possibly be dreamed of in administering public affairs. I do not believe that there are half a dozen gentlemen supporting the Government who do not feel in their consciences that if it were not for a feeling of loyalty to their chief, this vote is one of the most difficult propositions which they have ever been called upon to swallow. I think the Government has not only violated the principle laid down by Parliament by a vote of this House, but they have violated the most elementary principles of business management. I think we should not allow this motion to pass without strongly emphasizing our protest. No time can be considered as wasted which is used by hon. members in protesting against such an outrageous use of public money. Already I believe the few remarks that have been made upon this subject have reached the conscience of the members of the Government and their supporters, and there is less danger to-day than there was a year ago that a similar appropriation will be asked for in the future. We have had one or two half hints from the Government that this is probably the last time when Parliament will be invited to accede to such a monstrous proposal. No doubt something may be said on behalf of this vote in the fact that the building is partly completed. I think if the foundation stones had not been laid, there might have been some feeling evoked from our hon. friends opposite against assenting to this waste of public money, but now that the work is being proceeded with, and that the villagers of Laprairie are expecting before the close of the season to behold the turrets of this building rise above the tree tops, doubtless the Government cannot find it in their hearts to disappoint them, especially after having made the promise they did, and after having secured a supporter from that county as a result of that promise. I am aware that pledges made by the Government just before election are especially sacred and ought to be kept, but I would like to impress upon the Government their duty, after having once made an appropriation, to proceed to expend it and not do as they did in the case of the town of Lunenburg. My hon. friend from that county believed that he had been successful in securing an appropriation for a public building, but afterwards he was very much mistaken when the Government found that the electorate had not chosen a supporter, and so they run their pen through the appropriation. In the course of future ages, if this party continues in power, they may rise to a true conception of their position as trustees of the public funds and appropriate them on business principles, irrespective of party promises, obligations and hopes. Until that day arrives, I very much fear that hon. gentlemen of the political complexion they bear, will not be in power, but that the Government must from the very nature of the case, and from the character of the conditions I have described, be in other hands.

Mr. LEDUC. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I think I must ask the indulgence of the committee for the few remarks I have to offer concerning the item which is before us. We were entitled to some explanations in justification of the action of the Government, but instead of giving such, the hon. Minister contented himself with a few short remarks. I think it proper to urge the hon. Minister and the hon. member for Laprairie to give some explanations, for yesterday these two gentlemen kept silent, which would go to show that in their minds nothing could be said in justification of such a course. We are asked to vote $16,000 for the building of a post office at Laprairie. Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Public Works owned yesterday in his speech that the Government had made a great mistake, when, in answer to an hon. member from this side of the House, who had said that the revenue from the Laprairie post office was $433.16, he said that this must be an error. Never could a more complete admission be expected from the hon. Minister that the policy of the Government is absolutely false and unwarrantable, for by this he admitted that it was unjustifiable to ask for the erection of a building, at a cost of $16,000, for an office the gross revenue from which did not exceed $433. If a glance is cast at the official figures which are given us, we find that after deducting the expenses of that office, there only remains a net revenue of $218. This sum is all that the Laprairie post office brings after expenses are paid. Now, the Government puts up there a building of $16,000. Let us see what will then be the expenses of that post office in the future. Let us add to the present expenses the interest of this capital of $16,000 at 4 per cent, which amounts to $640 per annum. Let us also estimate at $100—and I think this is the lowest estimation possible—the increase of expenditure which must be the result of the establishment of such a post office. Again, we must not forget that there will be additional costs of construction—for experience teaches us that this is part of a system with the present Government—and surely the contractor will find it possible to swell his contract price by some $2,500 for extras.

Therefore, may we count an additional $100 on that score. Now, if you put together all these sums, Mr. Chairman, you will see that the expenses of this post office will in the future be about $840 per annum more than they are to-day. Consequently, since the net revenue is only $218, we will have to face then a clear deficit of $622 per annum at that post office. Now, Mr. Chairman, many members on this side of the House have shown the Government that there are in their counties parishes better entitled than the village of Laprairie to the favours of the Government. But among all the counties which may be so entitled to recognition by the Government, I believe that my county takes a front rank. Indeed, there is in that county—not a village, but a town—the town of Nicolet. The town of Nicolet should have a special right to consideration by the hon. Minister of Public Works. It appears by the official returns of last year that the Nicolet post office gives a revenue of $827. Should a post office building equal in value to that which is being put up at Laprairie be erected in Nicolet, a balance of $187 of net revenue would still remain after deduction of the interest on the capital put in the building. Therefore I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Government would do an act of justice towards my county, and the town of Nicolet in particular, by placing in the next Estimates an item for the building of a post office at Nicolet, since that town is infinitely more important than the village of Laprairie. It was also shown that the population of Laprairie has decreased during the last decade. I can establish progress on the contrary on the part of the town of Nicolet during the same period. Moreover, the town of Nicolet is the episcopal seat of the diocese of that name. This is an additional consideration which should induce the Government to endow that town with a post office at least as respectable as that which they are to build at the little village of Laprairie.

Mr. PELLETIER. (Translation.) I think that the most evident fact brought out by the two speeches which I have just heard is that the two last members who spoke on the question of the post office at Laprairie, have never seen that village, and do not know it. First the revenue of the place is spoken of as if there were only one post office there, while there are two. There is a temporary office, and there is a central one. Only the revenue of the central office has been mentioned. If the two are added we find a figure about double the account mentioned until now.

An hon. MEMBER. (Translation.) What is the name of the temporary officer?

Mr. PELLETIER. (Translation.) Brosseau; now, Laprairie is a place favoured with railways. At the east end is the very important St. Lambert Junction; within is the Brosseau Junction; and in the centre is the Grand Trunk line with its station, near the village. Laprairie has also the advantage of a ferry service with Montreal. Often the traffic and number of passengers are so large that two boats are required. Laprairie is the county seat of the richest county of the province, I may say, in proportion to its area. Laprairie has, besides, owing to its being in the vicinity of the metropolis of Canada, the great city of Montreal, the further advantage of drawing the city population, and of offering the finest trip that can be taken in a boat as a means of communication with the city. Its exceptional location makes Laprairie certainly one of the most popular resorts, if not altogether the most popular resort for the citizens of Montreal. Every summer, number of citizens and families from Montreal make it their favourite abode. I might mention also the military exercises which take place there nearly every year, and which, as is easily understood, bring to the village so many visitors as well as many military gentlemen of distinction. It is the favourite ground with our military authorities, who have chosen the place for an imposing military display shortly to be held. I am not far from believing that some day Laprairie will be chosen as a military camping ground, and that permanent buildings will be put up there in view of that. The population of Laprairie is larger than what it has been represented here. The population of the whole of the village of Laprairie is about 4,000. Now, if we look at the town of Lachine, which has a post office similar to that which is being put up at Laprairie, we find that the population of that town is hardly any larger than that of Laprairie. Joliette, again, has but a little larger population than that of Laprairie. The hon. members who to-day make such violent opposition to the building of this post office, are a little late in their protest; for this question is not a new one. It was discussed before I had the honour to represent the County of Laprairie. In 1889, for instance, when the county was represented by a friend of hon. members of the Opposition, Mr. Doyon, the question was brought up, a credit of $3,000 was then voted, and not the slightest protest was then heard from the Opposition side against the vote. Therefore, from that time, the principle and the advisability of the building of a post office at Laprairie were admitted by the Opposition. In 1890, a new sum was again voted for this post office, and we find in the Debates a few questions put on the occasion, but no serious objection to the vote. Mr. Doyon, who was voting with the Opposition against the Government, is found, on the sitting of 20th March, 1890, offering thanks to the Government for the generosity and the spirit of justice which they had shown in putting in the Estimates a vote for the building of this post office. Here are his words when speaking of the volume of business of the Laprairie post office:

"It appears to me however, that business has not lessened in the Laprairie post office. On the contrary it must have increased, if I am to judge by the subsidy which the hon. the Minister of Public Works has just placed at the disposal of Laprairie village for the erection of a post office, and I beg this opportunity of congratulating the hon. Minister on his generosity towards Laprairie village. It is true some members complained that certain localities having a larger population were not so favoured: but one must have regard to the fact that the County of Laprairie has never been spoiled by ministerial favours and that it is very proper that it should have its small share. I therefore consider that the hon. Minister of Public Works, in acting as he did, has been doing a simple act of justice towards the village and parish of Laprairie."

That gentleman was not a supporter of the Government, but notwithstanding his opposition, the Ministers, as they shared the views expressed by him, did not falter in their duty, and granted what they at the time thought proper and just to the village of Laprairie. It is said that a less expensive structure might have been built. I believe that progress, as well as the course of commerce or fashion, imposes sometimes certain burdens, and the building of a post office at Laprairie is one of that class. The hon. members

who to-day oppose this work, are too late, for another reason also; for the work is now under contract, and is half done. I again notice that in the speeches of some hon. members of the left, the principle in question is not at all condemned, but they complain of not being given as much. The hon. member for Napierville (Mr. Monet), if I understood him well, approves of the vote, and expresses a wish, which is that of having as much for the village of Napierville. The hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Delisle), as well as the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay), expressed the same regret, as well as the same desire. In 1890, the hon. member for Lévis, while speaking on the same question, gave expression to the same sentiment. He regretted that the town of Lévis was not equally favoured. I say that this is far from the arguments which other members of the Opposition are urging against the building of this post office. The latter gentlemen are in contradiction with themselves, since they made no objection to this vote in 1889 and 1890. It is exceedingly strange, now that the work is under contract and half done, to see them rise one after the other and enter such strong protests against this expenditure, which they first approved by their silence in 1890. In 1889, this item was voted unanimously. Another charge has been made, that of the work being granted with the object of exercising an undue influence on the Laprairie electors. I may say that the vote at Laprairie was at last election what it was about ten years ago. Laprairie was always a strong Conservative parish, and has not changed. I may, therefore, say that the granting of the post office has not had the effect of changing two votes in that parish. At the election of 1891, so little was expected from that to affect the result, that the thing was not mentioned once, neither by myself nor by the friends who came to help me. In granting the money for this post office, the Government have only yielded to their sense of the justice and desirability of that course; and so well warranted was that course that it met from the first with the complete and unanimous concurrence of the hon. members of the left in 1889, when the first vote was asked for and granted for this object.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I very much regret, Mr. Chairman, that I failed to be convinced by the remarks of the hon. member for Laprairie, as to the propriety of the action of the Government in this matter. One word pronounced by the hon. member did more than anything else that was said to impress me that Laprairie must be a very poor village indeed. In order to show us the importance of his village the hon. member told us that several railways came to it, that it had a line of steamboat to Montreal, that it was the ground chosen for the military parades; and yet, notwithstanding all this, the fact cannot be gainsaid that the gross revenue from the post office of this important business centre reaches only $433.16. Of two things one, Mr. Chairman, either what the hon. member said is true or it is not. If it is, we have to come to the conclusion that the people of Laprairie must be a very ignorant community, seeing that the postal revenue is no larger, for if they wrote the post office revenue would not be so small. It seems clear to me that the remarks of the hon. member will convince nobody that the Government did well in deciding upon the building of a post office at Laprairie. My hon. friend has also mentioned the votes of 1889 and 1890, hoping thereby to show that since he was not in the House at the time, the Opposition should not argue that in putting this vote in the Estimates the Government did so in his interest. Well, I mean to prove that this was really done in order to facilitate the election of my hon. friend. Indeed the only reason why this vote was put in the Estimates is that Laprairie is what is called an exceedingly close county; the majorities there, either one side or the other, are always very small, within the score. Now, the Government goes on with this work with a political object. As soon as my hon. friend saw his seat in danger, and found that he could not be re-elected, he hastened to urge this work upon the Government. The Government yielded to his request, and the vote was put in the Estimates with the object of securing the re-election of my hon. friend. If the Government did not use this official corruption, if the Government did not make it a system of burdening the Estimates with such votes and for such purposes, there would not be ten Conservatives returned from the Province of Quebec. If the hon. member for Laprairie goes again before the electors, he will never come back to this House, although personally I would be sorry not to see him again among us. A proof that it is not necessary in the public interest to built a post office at Laprairie is that the hon. member for Lévis and myself have asked for much more needed public works for our counties, and that the Government have not allowed them. And why, Mr. Chairman, have not the Government done justice to our claims; why have they always refused justice to the Counties of Lévis and Montmagny? The reason is very easy to point out. They knew that our electors could not be bought. We find no fault when the money asked is for necessary works. I myself intend to ask for some very shortly, for works which not only are necessary, but have been promised. It is, therefore, evident that the vote of money for Laprairie cannot be considered otherwise than as an official bribe from the Government to secure the re-election of the member for that county. The hon. Minister of Public Works said that the Government were committed to the carrying out of this work, and that they were bound in honour to have this sum voted. Very well, I accept the statement. But if the Government consider themselves bound to the member for Laprairie, if they consider themselves obliged in honour to fulfil their engagements, it must be the same thing as to redeeming a formal promise made by a member of the Government. I now hold in my hand a letter from Mr. Smith, in which that gentleman declared that he is to ask for a vote of $3,500 for certain improvements on the South River, in the County of Montmagny, as he admits that the Government is responsible for the damages caused by the Intercolonial Railway. It is evident, then, that this sum should have been put in the Estimates in accordance with the statement of the Minister of Public Works. Now, how is it that the Government are so scrupulous in redeeming their promises when the County of Laprairie is in question and that they take no such care or concern when the County of Montmagny is interested? It is easy to say why. The County of Laprairie is a doubtful county, while Montmagny gives an aver-

age majority of 400, and that were they to make $10,000 worth of works in the county they would not change the result. This is the reason why the Government do not scruple breaking their word when Montmagny is concerned; that is the reason of their inaction in face of the most positive promises. There is no doubt that this policy of entering upon public works right and left without justification, is a deplorable one. Public money is put where it is not necessary, and when we apply to the Government for necessary works, instead of receiving satisfactory answer, we are dragged before courts of justice, and the poor farmers cannot get what is legitimately due them. It is what recently happened in Montmagny. Citizens of my county had perfectly well grounded claims against the Government, and when application was made for $2,000 or $3,000 to satisfy these claims, we were sent to the Court of Exchequer to meet there four or five lawyers royally paid out of the public treasury, and knowing not a word of French, while the witnesses knew no English. That is the treatment we get from the Government. No justice is done to us, however good may be our claims. We, the Liberals, are ill-treated. We are refused all justice in the matter of public works, and then we see such large sums, as that affected to such a useless purpose as a post office at Laprairie, expended for the purpose of securing the election of a Conservative member. Pointing out these facts is enough to show the injustice of such a policy. When I see the public money squandered in public buildings at places like Laprairie, where it is absolutely ridiculous to make such expenditures, I say that the Government act against the public interest. For, after all, it is established that the Laprairie post office gives no more than $433 a year of gross revenue. And is it not ridiculous to put up a $16,000 building for a post office where no more business is done? For ten years a post office building has been promised to the town of Montmagny. A promise is all we get. And yet the post office at this point gave last year a revenue of $1,617, although the expenses of the office were only $640, which leaves a net revenue of $1,000. During election time in 1887, this building was promised on all the hustings. The Conservative candidate used that as a platform on which to do his fighting. The town of Montmagny had even promised the necessary site. Later I urged the Government to redeem their promise. I was met with a refusal, I was told the revenue of the post office was not large enough. What do we see to-day? We see the Government contradicting themselves in the most shameless way in granting a building for a post office, and where the public treasury will have to face a deficit of at least five or six hundred dollars a year. The only excuse given, the only genuine reason given, by the hon. Minister of Public Works for the action of the Government in putting up this building, is that they are bound in honour to have the work done. If such a reason is valid for Laprairie, it is equally valid and binding as to Montmagny. Ours is not a promise such as candidates will make in the course of a campaign, but it is a promise from the hand of a Minister of the Crown. I wish to believe, notwithstanding what happens, that this promise will yet be respected, for it would be shameful otherwise. I would be ashamed to come before this House as does the hon. member for Laprairie, and ask such a large sum as $16,000 for a post office building for a locality where the postal revenue is so small. It is true that we have no military displays such as mentioned by the hon. member, but I may say that our people is better educated and more intelligent than that of Laprairie, if I may judge by postal revenues. I repeat it, I would be ashamed to claim such a costly public building for a post office which must represent a a burden on the public treasury of $500 or $600 a year. It will be in keeping with the Intercolonial Railway which is managed by the Government so as to give each year a deficit of $500,000 or $600,000. I protest with all my strength against the voting of this item, which can be supported by no serious reason. It only represents official bribery under the cover of good faith and fidelity to promises.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I have no right to offer advice to hon. gentlemen opposite, but it does seem to me that in fighting this question in the way they are doing they are taking very weak ground indeed. I trust this House and country too, have come to the conclusion that grants of this sort ought not to be made in future. I think many people have come to the conclusion that a grant such as this was originally should never have been made; and on that point I quite agree with hon. gentlemen opposite. But I understand this matter has been twice before the House. Votes have been made for this particular object on more than one occasion, and passed without any particular opposition. It is not, therefore, good tactics to continue the opposition on this item, especially when it is absolutely impossible that the Government can yield. It brings the matter down to a mere trial of strength, the Government having explained that they cannot recede from their position with respect to this particular grant. Therefore, it is a mere waste of strength, and of time which is now becoming so valuable, and it is certainly not good tactics to make this determined fight on a question which has been before the House on several occasions, and on which, I repeat, it is certainly impossible that the Government can yield. I have looked through the Estimates for this year, and I do not find for any province any new grant for an office of this kind. I trust we may understand from this fact, that it is not the intention of the Government to continue to spend money in this exceedingly unfair way, by giving grants to small places which are certainly not entitled to them, while if this system is to be pursued the claims of a great many other places, which are much better entitled to public buildings, should be recognized. The system is a very bad one in every respect. It is a bad one as a means of corrupting constituencies; it is a bad one as involving an absolute waste of public money, and it is a bad one as establishing very unfair principles between the different provinces of this country. It brings the legislation of this House into contempt, as does every species of legislation not founded on right. Therefore, as regards opposition to this grant as a matter of principle, hon. gentlemen opposite are right, and I trust this House will set its face against such grants in future; but I put it to hon. gentlemen opposite, whether it is reasonable for them to take up the time of the House with a continued contest on this item. If hon. gentlemen have some particular local object to serve, which I do not know, and which I

can only suspect, if they are fighting with some particular local object in view, I submit it is hardly fair to detain the House for such a purpose. If in the Supplementary Estimates similar grants to those are proposed, if the system is continued, if this sort of thing is to be renewed, that will be a perfectly fair and just object to contend against, and if it is proposed to continue such grants in future years, I think the country, and I trust the majority of the members of this House will come to the conclusion that they will have no more of them. But, in my opinion, and I do not like to use terms which might be considered offensive, it is not only unreasonable but bad tactics for hon. gentlemen opposite to waste their strength on a point on which the Government can make out a very strong case in their behalf. The country will not think any better of hon. gentlemen opposite for pursuing a course which I think might, without very great objection, be almost termed factious under the circumstances. I have no right to expect that hon. gentlemen opposite will adopt my opinion, but that is the view I hold with regard to the present course that is being pursued, a view which the country will be very likely to take, and hon. gentlemen opposite are not going to make much by pursuing this course, I do not say with regard to the principle involved, but with regard to this particular grant.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) In answer to the remarks just made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), I would say that we must not decide now what should be the future policy of the Government in respect to expenditure for public works. It is true that we have may in the Province of Quebec less minor towns than there are in the Province of Ontario, but we have the great city of Montreal. And although the Province of Ontario may have a larger number of minor towns, that is no reason why all the money for public buildings should be spent in that province, and that it should receive more than its share of the public moneys. As to items of this nature—I do not say so as a reproach to the Government, for Ontario being the largest and the richest province of the Confederation it has also contributed its large share to the public revenue—but I think that it has received as much as it was entitled to. It has been liberally treated by the Government and I do not see why the construction of public buildings in the Province of Ontario should be opposed, even if they are to be in places with less population than certain minor towns of Ontario. For it must be remembered that in the Province of Quebec the great city of Montreal has prevented the forming and developing of a large number of small centres such as could spring up in Ontario at great distances from large cities. As to what my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) said in concluding his speech, that he, in the position of the member for Laprairie (Mr. Pelletier), would be ashamed to make such a speech as that which the hon. member delivered in support of the grant given by the Government for the construction of a public building in his county, I am most surprised at this confession of sensitiveness to shame on his part. I believe that if the hon. member for Montmagny was in the position of my hon. friend for Laprairie, he would not be stifled by such an unusual feeling as that of which he spoke. I believe that on the contrary he would defend vigorously a grant from the Government for a public building in any place in his county.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) If I could not be elected otherwise.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) We have already heard the hon. member for Montmagny claim Government aid for some river improvements. The hon. member for Nicolet has done the same. He asked for public buildings for the town of Nicolet. Now, notwithstanding all the boasting of the hon. member for Montmagny, I can say that the hon. member for Laprairie is as sure of his county as he is of his.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Oh, no.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) And let my hon. friend be replaced by a Conservative member, if his request be granted, you would see all the hon. members of the left rise one after the other, as they are doing now on this occasion of a vote for a public building in the village of Laprairie, and condemn the expenditure. It would be the same for Nicolet. Let the request of the hon. members be granted, and all the hon. members of the left will now approve either by words or silence; but let him be replaced at the next election by a Conservative member, and we will then see hon. gentlemen show themselves again just as inconsistent, contradict themselves and condemn what they will have approved. My hon. friend for Laprairie quoted the words of the ex-member for his county, a Liberal, who strongly supported the Government on this question. Why have not the hon. friends of the ex-member for Laprairie (Mr. Doyon), when this gentleman congratulated the Government for having decided upon the building of this office at Laprairie, why, I say, have not the hon. members of the Opposition protested at the time? We fully know why. They feared that in making the least protest against a grant for Laprairie, then represented by a member whom no timidity restrained, and who was free-spoken in this House, they would have been well dressed by Mr. Doyon. They knew that his voice would have been raised against the friends of his party. That is why the austere virtue of the hon. members for South Grey, for South Oxford, for Queen's, for Wellington, the austere virtue of all the hon. members who are scandalized to-day by the building of this post office at Laprairie, had no words of protest on that occasion. The County of Laprairie was then represented by a Liberal.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Would the hon. member be good enough to say if at that time it was a sum of $16,000 that was voted?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) knows very well that for all public buildings which are put up in any part of the country, money is first asked for the expenses of expropriation, of the making of the plans, &c., the preliminary expenditure. My hon. friend knows that $3,000 were first voted for the purchase of the land, and clever as he is—he must have understood that consequently the building was to cost a pretty fair price. He knew it, and the objection which is made now is totally futile. I am told the site was given. Well, the $3,000 were then voted for the plans and the preliminary work. The Government did then as is

always done with public works. They asked at first for a certain sum for the preliminary works, and it is well known that generally a public building costs from $10,000 to $20,000. As I said before, these hon. gentlemen were afraid of Mr. Doyon's reproaches, and I think it was well they did not raise their voice against the vote, for he would have scolded them pretty thoroughly. Mr. Doyon might have ceased supporting them, for he would have regarded that as a shameful meanness, and in his energetic language would have branded them with epithets which would have brought the blush to the faces of many of them. As I established at the beginning of my remarks, the Province of Quebec has only its share, its first share of public buildings. I do not see why my hon. friends of the Opposition, especially those from the Province of Quebec, find fault with the Government's policy, since all those who took the floor to blame the Government for building this post office at Laprairie, ask for similar buildings for their own counties. A large number of these gentlemen have had the satisfaction of meeting justice at the hands of the Government, of having public buildings erected in Liberal counties, like St. Hyacinthe, Richelieu, now represented by a member who defends with vigour the principles of his party and who sits with the Opposition. I could mention other counties besides. Joliette, for instance, which is also represented by a Liberal. No, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. members of the left would do much better to show a little more consistency, and, a number of them, to show less party spirit, and to accept for the Province of Quebec what is granted by the Government. If they are serious when they ask for those public works for their counties, they must give their support to the present vote for Laprairie. For otherwise we must believe, and will necessarily believe, that if the hon. gentlemen were at any time replaced by supporters of the Government, their former friends would join their new friends to blame the Government for having granted them what they ask to-day. I say, therefore, that if hon. gentlemen want to obtain justice for their counties they must reflect that they should not themselves deny justice to the County of Laprairie. And I say particularly to the hon. members for the Province of Quebec that they must not fight the grants which are made to our province, for although I do not wish to blame the Government, we are not spoiled, and as Mr. Doyon said, neither the Government which represented the opinions of my friends of the left, nor that which to-day presides over the public affairs of the country, have spoiled the electors of the Province of Quebec by undue favours. I, therefore, hope, Mr. Chairman, that in the future we will not be stopped by the obstructive policy of hon. members of the left, and that when the principle of a grant shall have been accepted as was done for Laprairie when that county was represented by a Liberal, for fear of hurting his political interest and to injure him in election time, this principle shall not be fought thereafter. When virtue has weakened like this, it should not put on such an austere face.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Yours, then.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) You are the ones who parade a scandalized virtue.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) No; they parade what takes the place of it.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) My hon. friends of the left must not on this occasion lay claims to an unyielding virtue, when their record shows that, in many instances, when their political interests required it, they bent their knees before the ministerial policy.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) I will add a word to what has been said by those who preceded me. I understand that when the execution of this work was decided upon, there were other places which could have claimed, with better reasons, similar improvements, but the question was decided then, and there only remains now to carry out the work. I hope that my colleagues have not been unsettled by the arguments of the members of the Opposition. Those who have followed this debate know that the main argument offered by the hon. members of the Opposition during this discussion, touched in no way the matter in question, but was confined to one point, namely, that the Government should not have undertaken this work, because the revenue from the Laprairie post office is not large, or equal to that of many others, or else should give post office buildings to all other places having revenues as large as Laprairie's or larger. My hon. friends forget the fact that if the Government were to grant post office buildings to all these places, they would enter upon a course of exceedingly large expenditure.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) We say that the Government should not have begun by a locality which gives such a small revenue as Laprairie. To avoid the danger the hon. Minister speaks of, and to meet our argument, he had only to commence by the places the revenues from which are larger than that from Laprairie. If he is to follow this precedent he will build at least fifty post offices in the Province of Quebec alone. If the Government want to give post office buildings to those localities, let them do so, but let them adopt at the same time an equitable basis of allotment; let the County of Montmagny be on the same footing as that of Laprairie. We do not object at all to see the Province of Quebec have its share of these public works. On the contrary we want to have them. We want an equitable rule for all. I will say to the hon. member for Bagot that if the town of St. Hyacinthe, of which he spoke, has had public buildings, the Government took good care to deprive the member of that county of any merit in the matter.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) It has had its post office. I said nothing else.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Does the hon. member mean to say by this that it is the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe who obtained it?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Do you mean to say that the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe opposed it?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) No; but I mean to say that the hon. member for Bagot has always pretended that it was not the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe that had obtained it, but that he himself had been the one to obtain this for the town of St. Hyacinthe. I now ask the Government to say whether or not it was at the request of the member for St. Hyacinthe that the thing was done?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The Government never does anything out of consideration for a member. That is well known.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Then you do not claim any merit in the matter?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I never said that it was owing only to my intervention that the town of St. Hyacinthe was endowed with public buildings. It is true that I made efforts in that direction, but it was because I was one of the members for the district of St. Hyacinthe.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Then you claim no more merit about it than the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) It is not my habit to boast of what I do for the country. My electors understand what the Government do for their county.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) In that case it is to be supposed that the electors were not intelligent enough to understand, for the hon. member for Bagot thought himself obliged to state repeatedly in public that it was thanks to him that the town of St. Hyacinthe had had public buildings, and that it would never have had them without him. I am very happy to hear him state that he has no more merit than another about it.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I have stated in public what I have said to-night, and not what the hon. member pretends.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Very well; I accept your retraction.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) just said that the Government's ground for the granting of public buildings was the importance of the localities. Of course it must be that. It is the only plausible reason offered by the hon. member for Bagot. Apart from that he read a lecture to the members of the Opposition, but he did not give a single reason to justify such a large expenditure as the Government propose to incur for the building of that post office at Laprairie. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) condemned this expenditure. We occasionally hear the hon. gentleman express views contrary to those of the Government and to their measures. We know that his views well belong to him, but we know also that his vote belongs to his party. The hon. Minister of Public Works gave us a few words this evening, but he failed to give any reason to justify such an expenditure as that which is required for Laprairie. The hon. member for Laprairie in his turn sang the praises of his village, but he, also, failed to justify such an expenditure. He tried to make us believe that the population of Laprairie is great. He quoted figures, but those figures are not correct. He told us that the population was 4,000; now, I find in the census that the population of the village and the parish of Laprairie is 2,820 souls.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Does this include the parish?

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) The parish has a population of 1,574, and the village 1,246, which gives a total of 2,820. The hon. member also spoke of the railways which cross the locality. He spoke of educational establishments, of the great military displays which take place there in summer time. Well, with all these advantages, it is really surprising that the village of Laprairie has not progressed. On the contrary it has decreased. Here is the proof: The census of 1881 gave the parish and village of Laprairie a population of 3,181 souls. The decrease has therefore been 361 souls during the decade. Such figures are not such as to warrant the Government incurring an expenditure of $16,000 for a public building at the place. The revenue of the Laprairie post office, which amounts to $433.16, has been spoken of several times this evening. Of this sum the postmaster receives $215, and there is left a net receipt of $218 for the department. A very large number of post offices give a larger revenue than this in the Province of Quebec. It seems to me that the Government would be much more justifiable in establishing post offices where business warranted. I could mention, for instance, Louiseville, a village where I live, and where the post office revenue is $1,300. I could still mention many other places which could justify such an expenditure much better than Laprairie. An amount of $3,000 has been mentioned as voted for the plans and specification. This seems to me rather extraordinary. An attempt to justify this vote of $16,000 is made by saying that $3,000 had been voted for the preparation of the plans. It is impossible that such an item as this be allowed to pass without our raising our voices against it. It is impossible to believe that the Government on this occasion is acting in view of the general interests of the Province of Quebec. On the contrary it is evident that the Government has acted in this way towards Laprairie with the view of making secure the popularity of the present member. It is not warranted for the Government to ask the House such a large sum for the building of a post office in a small village, which notwithstanding all the advantages which the hon. member has been pleased to enumerate is decreasing in business, since it is decreasing in population. It seems to me that the Government would have acted more wisely in endowing with public buildings places where business required and warranted them. I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that Louiseville is a much more important locality than Laprairie, and if he wanted to act fairly Louiseville would get a post office before one is built at Laprairie.

Mr. ALLAN. I desire to say a few words before this item is passed. It is true, as stated by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that a great deal of time has been spent on this subject, and in my judgment, Sir, the discussion that has taken place, and which should take place on such a proposal as this, ought to be of the widest possible character. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) states that it is the intention of the Government to reform in matters of this kind.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I made no such statement. I am not responsible for the Government.

Mr. ALLAN. I was very glad to hear that the hon. gentleman expressed such confidence in the Administration. He also stated that this was an old matter and that it had been arranged some three or four years ago, but I think that the new members of this House should be informed why this scandalous proposition was ever made to

Parliament. Surely this House when asked to sanction the expenditure of money should be informed of the reasons why they were so asked, or otherwise they should withhold that sanction. I have listened to the remarks of the Minister of Public Works and the other gentlemen supporting him, but I have not heard one of them attempt to justify this expenditure in any way. The fact of the matter is, that it is simply scandalous and indefensible. Just look at the nature of this proposition. Here is the small town of Laprairie, a place which I know well as I have walked its streets and have noticed the absence of all business there; it is a small place which the report of the Postmaster General shows returns a revenue of only $433.16 a year, and yet the Government of Canada propose to erect public buildings there costing $16,000. It does not matter to me whether this vote was proposed yesterday or three or four years ago. It is sufficient for me to know that it was proposed by this Government, and that this House is now asked to sanction the expenditure. I would ask what evidence is there here that the Government is going to reform in that respect? Why, Sir, for the last few days, we have been considering item after item, in the same line of extravagance and waste of money. There was an appropriation passed here for a public building at Dartmouth, a small place with a revenue of $2,000, and yet $20,000 is to be expended on buildings there. In Lunenburg, a place which is equalled in size and importance by at least forty places in Ontario which have no public buildings, the Government propose to erect buildings costing $16,000. If we look down through the estimates which have yet to be considered, we further find that the confidence expressed by the hon. member from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) is not well founded. Let us examine upon what principle $16,000 is to be expended in the small town of Laprairie, an old town which has really no future before it, and even if it were likely to develop, this money should not be asked for until it was required. Let us take the County of Essex, the south riding of which I have the honour to represent, and we have there ten or eleven towns with four or five times the revenue of Laprairie, and yet they have no public buildings. Here are some of them:

	Postal Revenue.
Kingsville	$1,554 40
Leamington	2,612 18
Sandwich	728 65
Walkerville	2,207 20
Essex Centre	2,936 12
Cumber	1,106 46
Tilbury	1,568 42
Bell River	495 54
Amherstburg	2,001 02

Amherstburg has been supplied with a post office, but Essex Centre, with an annual postal revenue of nearly $3,000, has been left without accommodation. We in Essex County have not complained very much, and we are not disposed to clamour very much for Government favours, except upon an equitable basis, but I would like to know upon what principles these appropriations are made? What we ask is, that some general well-defined rule should be established in this matter, or rather that the rule which has been adopted by the House should be faithfully carried out. By what sort of influence was this vote obtained by the town of Laprairie? Clearly it was done for the purpose of securing a Government supporter for that county; and if we look from one end of this country to the other we see that this Government is abusing its power and its patronage in the same way to further its own ends. It is a post office here or a railway there. What were the influences against which I had to contend at the last election in the south riding of Essex? The Government had erected, as I stated, a post office at the town of Amhertsburg, and the candidate who was then opposing me claimed that as a reason for returning him, and he shouted at the top of his voice at one of the public meetings: "Vote for the party that gave you a post office." But that was not sufficient, and again before the people of Amherstburg was dangled the promise of their obtaining a dry dock at a cost of an immense sum of money. The whole town was decorated with streamers, and the fences and buildings were placarded with the motto "Vote for Wigle and a Dry Dock at Amhertsburg." What was the cry raised in the town of Essex Centre in which I live? On the very same platform with myself, for we held joint meetings, Mr. Wigle stated to the electors of Essex: "Return me to Parliament, and I will guarantee to secure an appropriation that will get you the Canadian Pacific Railway to Essex Centre." What was the case in the town of Leamington, where Mr. Wigle lives? Why, Sir, he stated on the platform that he would secure the building of a breakwater there, and he pledged himself to do it if he were returned to Parliament. It may be true that the Government is not responsible for all these promises. At the opening of the first session of this Parliament I took occasion to enquire what there was in the dry dock scheme, and I found that it was a local matter, boomed by local parties solely for political purposes; but what I want to point out is that this system of distributing patronage is debauching the public mind in this country. If we figure up the promises made by the Government, some of them fulfilled and others unfulfilled, and the promises made by their supporters throughout the different constituencies, we would find that, to carry them into effect, it would cost an enormous amount of money. In addition to all these promises of public works in the south riding of Essex we had the influences of the Red Parlour brought to bear at the last moment, and my hon. friend the Minister of Militia will recollect a little by-play in Pelee Island in which he figured so illustriously. These were the influences that were at work in my constituency, and these are the influences at work in nearly every constituency in Canada. Hon. gentlemen can rise in their places and speak about how the patronage of this country has been distributed, but, Sir, in the recent election in Welland, as well as in West Northumberland, what was the cry raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, as I can show by reading an extract from a Cobourg paper? The only hope they had of carrying the county was by appealing to the personal interests of the people in that town. After referring to the merits of the present member for West Northumberland (Mr. Guillet), the paper says:

"But in view of the present strong position of the Government we are more concerned about the future of our own locality, and the effect which the result of the present contest will have upon our town in particular. This being the county town and the largest centre of population in the riding, it is but natural to assume that what will benefit

the town will also prove beneficial to the whole riding. It is also the largest market for the farmers of this section of country where the produce of the farm may always find ready sale at fair prices. The interests of the town and country are therefore identical, and we have never witnessed a more striking example of this than in the expressed sentiment of the people with regard to our new railway project at its first inception. But we have also witnessed with much regret the efforts of our political opponents to belittle the railway question in the present contest. Of course this is done for political effect, because when the railway question was uppermost, without attendant political excitement, none were more enthusiastically anxious for the new railway than were our Grit friends.

"But when the general election came on, they threw all their anxiety about the welfare of the town to the winds, and worked to their utmost for the defeat of the Government. But the Government triumphed with a large majority, although unfortunately for the town our candidate in this riding was defeated, and with him for the time being all hope of the new railway. The opportunity is again offered to the people, however, to secure the construction of the new railway, or otherwise as they may decide at the polls on Tuesday. Let them not be deceived, for upon their decision in this contest depends the fate of Cobourg for at least the present decade. We do not propose to deceive the people, nor to hold out to them false hopes. Our success just now depends upon sending to Ottawa a representative friendly to the Government, so that the charter for the new road may be extended and the additional subsidy granted, which will in all human probability secure its construction."

In addition to this we find throughout the paper all sorts of appeals to the people in the same direction, such as these:

"Business men should vote for Guillet and improve the value of their property by having the town as a terminus to a branch line of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

"Vote for Guillet, and give plenty of work at the harbour to our labouring men."

We remember all about the harbour. A small grant was asked last year, and although human life was in all probability in danger, it was withheld. We find that in order to obtain that also it is necessary to return a supporter of the Government. The elections of this country have been carried chiefly by bribing the constituencies with offers of that kind, and where these have failed, by means of contributions from public works contractors and from the Red Parlour. That is the state of affairs in this country. Whatever effect the trade policy has had, and bad enough it has been, this system has done more to damage this country than ten trade policies could possibly do; for it is possible to recover from the bad effects of the trade policy, but if you continue to debauch the electors of this country as you have done, what will become of the country? It will have practically no future before it unless we can secure honest government. Now, it is not necessary for me to go over the list of post offices and make comparisons. I have done that in my own county. Suffice it to say that in the Province of Ontario all over you find that there are about forty post offices the returns from which return about $4,000 each, and over one hundred that return over $2,000 each, equal to the returns from Lunenburg and Dartmouth and five times the returns from Laprairie, and yet none of these have post office buildings. I hope that the prediction which has been made, that the Government in this respect intend to turn over a new leaf and adopt a new policy, will be carried out. If not, I hope that the honest gentlemen who sit behind the Government—and surely there are some honest men among them—will see that no such proposition as this will ever be carried through a Canadian Parliament again.

Mr. LOWELL. I desire to offer a few remarks upon the subject now engaging the attention of the committee; and as a new member, I will not detain you very long. This proposition to erect a post office at Laprairie seems to me to be part of a system that prevails throughout this country, particularly in election times; and to my mind it is about time that that system should be brought to an end. In the county which I have the honour to represent we have at least ten or a dozen post offices, the revenue of which is far greater than that derived from the post office at Laprairie. Chippawa yields a revenue of $622, Fonthill $493, Fort Erie $943, Humberstone $780, International Bridge $777, Niagara Falls South, my own home, $1,300, Port Colborne $1,791, Port Robinson $457, Ridgeway $763, the town of Thorold $2,692, and the town of Welland $3,405; and we have not post office buildings in any of these places. Yet here is the offer which was made by the Government organ in my county during the last election, and which I had to contend against. I will read the article as it appears in the editorial columns of the Welland *Telegraph*:

"The Reformers of the County of Welland are evincing but little hope of success in the coming contest, and their candidate is evidently nearly disgusted with the situation. All the imported Grit oratory that the Reformers can bring into the county will have no effect in changing the tide of popular opinion. The great majority of the voters who have at heart the interest and welfare of the country and county, realize the utter uselessness of voting for a man like James Lowell, who, if elected, would be of no possible use to his constituents, and whose return would be telling the Government that this county had no favours to ask or expect, as it is not to be expected the Administration would go to any extra trouble to favour a county which said it wanted none. The town of Welland does want favours; it wants a post office building and it wants a new canal bridge on a line with Main street, which it may have good hopes of securing if the county sends to Ottawa a Government representative. Niagara Falls wants improved post office accommodations, and nearly every municipality in the county is wishing for improvements within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Government. In the face of these facts it is hardly likely the people will be so foolish and short-sighted as to elect an Opposition representative. Outside of these facts they have in Mr. Lawson a man fully able to represent them, and a man whose influence and ability can and will be used for the benefit of his constituency. The people of Welland are not going to be deluded this time with promises which can never be fulfilled. In voting for Mr. Lawson they have all to gain and nothing to lose. In voting for Mr. Lowell they vote for nothing."

There are one or two other paragraphs here which I will also read:

"Don't throw away your vote by giving it to a man who can obtain nothing for his constituents. If you vote for Lowell that is precisely what you will be doing."

Another:

"The electors who vote for Lawson vote for a man who is able to represent the constituency, and obtain favours for the county when and where necessary. The elector who votes for Lowell loses his vote by giving it to a man who, if elected, can do nothing but draw his pay."

These are the offers that were thrown out as a bribe to the people of the County of Welland; but the intelligent electors spurned them and returned me by a very handsome majority. If I do not do anything more than draw my pay, I can draw the attention of the House to the fact that these offers have been thrown out, as I am afraid similar offers have been in almost every constituency where elections have been held for some time past; and I say that it is a system which should be decried.

Mr. BROWN. I would not be doing justice to my constituents if I did not raise my voice in protest against this vote. It grieves me very much to

have to say anything with regard to the action of the Government, but knowing the locality where this post office is situated, I fail to see, from the discussion which took place last session, how we can allow this item to pass. I would ask the indulgence of the House while I quote the words used by the hon. member for Montreal Centre with reference to this matter. He said:

"Laprairie is one of the progressive places in the Province of Quebec. It affords me very great pleasure to give occasion for so much hilarity to my hon. friend, but I say that in the last year or two Laprairie has taken a very decided step in advance. It is now in communication with many points that it had not been in communication with before. A new channel has been completed there which facilitates navigation, and when the new wharf is completed, which it is not yet, there is no doubt that a great deal of business will be done. In addition to that, this village has lately been supplied with a fire engine, hook and ladders. They have built a new aqueduct, which is of great service. They are now putting down the pipes in connection with it. The pressure is very powerful. They have steam and air pressure which bring the water 1,350 feet from the St. Lawrence River. I know personally that at the present moment Laprairie is a place where there is a very marked improvement, and I am satisfied that the amount now asked to be voted is an expenditure in the proper direction, and that Laprairie will give a very good account of itself in the near future as one of the most progressive places near Montreal."

Now, Sir, if I understood the Minister of Public Works last evening correctly, he stated that Laprairie was entitled to a post office because it is a historical place. If that be so, there are some counties in the Province of Quebec which are still more historical. We must not forget the County of Chateauguay which was so loyal some years ago. If all the post offices giving the same amount of revenue in the Province of Quebec are to be favoured in like manner, I think you will find there are 126, and it would require $2,016,000 to give them all similar buildings. After reading you those remarks of the hon. member for Montreal Centre, I will give you the census figures to show how this village is progressing. Laprairie in the year 1871 had a population of 1,259; in 1891 its population was 1,246. You see, therefore, what it has lost in the last twenty years. I understood the hon. member for Muskoka to say that he denounced that system, but had he denounced it two or three years ago, his words might have had more effect. The hon. member for Bagot said that the Province of Quebec had received no undue favours. I do not think that any province should ask for favours. What they should ask for is justice, and I would like to know where is the justice in erecting a post office at this expense in Laprairie where the population is decreasing and there is nothing there to cause an increase. I should like to find out from the Minister of Public Works if a deed of that site has been made over to the Government.

Mr. OUIMET. The property was donated by the council of Laprairie. We have a deed, but I have not got it here.

Mr. BROWN. Has that deed been registered?

Mr. OUIMET. The ground has been donated by the council of Laprairie. If the hon. gentleman wants to have the deed produced with the certificate of the registrar, I cannot get it to-night, but I will try to satisfy the hon. gentleman before the item goes to concurrence.

Mr. LISTER. The question was whether a deed had ever been executed by the donors.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The title has been vested in the Crown.

Mr. BROWN. In my constituency I have the village of Ormstown which has a revenue of $1,198, almost three times the revenue of Laprairie, and I think the Government should do something in regard to that.

Rivière du Loup (Fraserville) Post Office, Custom House, &c..... $1,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of that? the revenue and so forth.

Mr. OUIMET. The total cost is $23,728.51. The postal revenue was $1,922.29. The money orders issued and paid amounted to $19,429. There is a savings bank there that in 1891 received $10,346. The population in 1871 was 1,541, in 1881 it was 2,291, and in 1891 it was 4,175. This building is also to accommodate the officers of customs and excise.

Mr. LISTER. Is that the cost exclusive of the land?

Mr. OUIMET. It includes the land.

Mr. LISTER. Has the land been purchased?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What did the land cost?

Mr. OUIMET. $3,500.

Mr. LISTER. When was the land purchased?

Mr. OUIMET. On the 26th March, 1889.

Mr. LISTER. When was the building commenced?

Mr. OUIMET. As soon as the site was purchased. The date of the contract was the 27th December, 1889.

Mr. LISTER. Is the building nearly completed?

Mr. OUIMET. As there is only $1,500 more required, it must be nearly completed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the name being changed from Rivière du Loup to Fraserville?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, I believe the seigniory belongs to the Fraser family.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that the old name was much more picturesque.

St. Henri Post Office, &c.—to complete. $19,000

Mr. LISTER. When was that commenced?

Mr. OUIMET. The total expenditure up to the 30th December, 1891, including the purchase of the site, was $4,023.49. The total estimated cost of the building is $23,543.49. The contract has been given, but the contractors have failed to carry out their obligation. They have been notified that their contract has been terminated, and now tenders will have to be asked for. Of course the ordinary penalty was paid by the contractors, that is, their deposit was confiscated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What firm was it?

Mr. OUIMET. Pelletier & Frigon.

Mr. LISTER. Is the building nearly completed?

Mr. OUIMET. No, it is scarcely commenced. Only the foundations are in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What quantity of land was purchased?

Mr. OUIMET. The lot is irregular in shape. On Notre Dame street it has a frontage of 77 feet 11 inches, but in the rear it is only 39 feet wide by a depth of 72 feet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a very small plot. What price was paid for it?

Mr. OUIMET. The price paid was $4,000. It is in the centre of St. Henri, which is a place now numbering over 13,000 people. In fact it is a part of the city of Montreal, and this land, being situated on the main street, is worth a very high price.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Have you a post office there now, and if so, what rent do you pay for it?

Mr. OUIMET. There is post office accommodation there now, but I cannot say what is paid for it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As the contractors have failed and the Government are under no engagement now, I would submit whether it is wise to spend this large sum of money in a place like that. The revenue is only $2,054. It would require $920 for interest alone, and then you would have to employ a man to take care of the building and pay him at least $400 more, you have got to heat and light it, $400 more; and your total revenue from that post office is gone in keeping up that building. Now, would it not be wiser for the Government to think twice before they enter into a new contract to erect a building? I presume some other building can be rented for a small amount that will afford all the accommodation required.

Mr. OUIMET. The argument of my hon. friend would carry him very far. I suppose we could get the accommodation that we have in this Chamber for very much less in rent than the interest on the capital we have invested in building this Chamber. And so with all the public buildings. For instance, the custom house in St. John, N.B., has just been burned; it cost over $350,000, and we must suppose it was built with the greatest economy since it was built by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power. Four per cent on $350,000 would give you $14,000 a year, and no doubt we could rent offices to accommodate the officials there for $200 a year. Thus it would be a very good speculation for the country not to build any more custom houses in the city of St. John. If the Government were to rent shanties and not erect any more buildings anywhere, it would be a great saving for the country.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I point out this fact, that here is a revenue of only $3,000 a year, and you propose to expend the whole of it in erecting a building. Now, if you can get a building that will answer the purposes there just as well as the new building you are putting up——

Mr. OUIMET. We cannot.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why can you not? There are hundreds of places in this country where the revenue is more and where the postal facilities are not as good, but you do not propose to erect post offices at all these places. If you can get accommodation for $2,000 in St. John, I think you are very foolish to go and spend $300,000 in putting up a new custom house there. You want to afford the people accommodation, but you want to afford it with the least possible expense to the ratepayers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the Minister aware that there is a falling revenue in this office? In 1891 the revenue was $2,235.74.

Mr. OUIMET. Perhaps it will increase when they have a better building.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When it was thought they were going to have a building, it appears to have had a depressing influence on the trade of that flourishing town, because the next year I find that the revenue fell to $1,922.74. When Laprairie was threatened with a post office, there was a falling off of $6 the first year after the post office was begun. If this policy is going to be pursued, you are going to drive the settlers away, you are going to lose your revenue, and how is the Minister of Finance going to meet the requirements of the Government and to put up offices when the people are going away and the revenue is falling off? I would ask the Minister if he would be kind enough to lay that report on the Table, that he has in reference to public works?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes. In answer to the hon. gentleman from Kent (Mr. Campbell), I may say that Chatham, which has a smaller population than St. Henri, has a post office costing $58,904.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the customs revenue of Chatham?

Mr. OUIMET. I do not know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the customs revenue of Chatham is three, four or five times as much.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is $13,406. I can tell the Minister of Public Works that if any good business man was to put up that post office in Chatham he could do it for just about two-thirds of what it cost the Government. The "boy" had to be paid out of that.

Mr. LISTER. I think the argument of the Minister of Public Works, carried to its logical conclusion, would lead to a queer condition of affairs. Because post offices are erected in large centres of populatian where an enormous amount of business is done, where a great many employés are engaged to carry on the business, he says it is necessary to erect public buildings in these smaller places in the country. Now, if it is necessary to erect a public building in this town where the post office revenue is only $2,000 a year, it is equally necessary to put up public buildings in the very smallest places, irrespective altogether of the amount of revenue. We all know that these matters must be governed by some rule either as to the amount of income or as to the number of the population, and if the Minister of Public Works would base it upon either ground, then we could understand what he is doing. But when he puts up these buildings at the mere *ipse dixit* of the Government, or at the urgent request of supporters for the purpose of securing support for the Government candidate, he is wasting the funds of the people. He is using the funds entrusted to the Government as trustees, for the purpose of buying support. This book all through shows there has been a scandalous exercise of power by the Government.

Mr. OUIMET. Scandalous is an expression that we have heard pretty often.

Mr. LISTER. I do not think it can be repeated too often. It ought to be pounded into the Government day and night in order that the country may understand it. We do not expect to have any effect at all upon the Government. We think, to use a common expression, it is like pouring water on a duck's back to talk to the Government about economy.

Mr. OUIMET. It will have some effect on the public at large.

Mr. LISTER. We had to-day an instance of it. Notwithstanding the fact that you sent your Secretary of State up there to handle the boodle, we carried the constituency of North Perth. We know when the Secretary of State goes, what influence he carries with him, and he did not go up there this time without the necessary influence, but in spite of all that influence we have carried North Perth; we carried it by an increased majority notwithstanding all the efforts put forth, notwithstanding the little subscriptions you got from certain senators in the other Chamber to take into North Perth. I suppose it is understood that these things are all secret, that the outside public know nothing about it. But there is a little bird that whispers the secret, and notwithstanding all the efforts you put forth, an honest man has been elected there to-day.

Mr. OUIMET. And a dishonest man has been defeated, I suppose.

Mr. LISTER. I am not saying anything about the other gentleman. I do not know him; but I say that dishonest means were resorted to to elect him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Keep to the question.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. Minister says that this word scandalous is used too often. I say it is a scandalous prostitution of the power of this Government, putting up these buildings in small places where the revenue does not warrant it. He is putting them in small places where ample accommodation could be obtained at a comparatively small expense that would answer all public purposes. But it is not the object to meet the public necessities in making these public expenditures. The object is obvious, and that is to have patronage in order that support may be gathered about the Government. This building, the Minister says, has been commenced. Having been commenced I suppose it must be carried on; but let the hon. gentleman understand that if any more such undertakings as have been submitted by his predecessor and himself in the way of public buildings, are brought forward, they will be vigorously opposed, opposed as strongly as it is possible to oppose them by this side of the House. I believe that in making this statement, I echo the sentiment of every member on this side of the House, that this system of petty bribery throughout the constituencies must be stopped. If you want to buy up constituencies, put your hands down in your pockets like men and buy them, but you shall not purchase them at the expense of the country at large.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sorry the Minister of Public Works has spoken as he has of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), who I think was quite within both his rights and the amenities of the debate when he addressed the committee as he did.

I understand the Minister has now placed himself superior to Parliament, and has declared that the resolution of two years ago has no bearing on him. I was not in the Chamber at the time he gave expression to that new doctrine.

Mr. OUIMET. How can you say I did so?

Mr. MULOCK. I have been told that the Minister said he does not consider that resolution binding on him.

Mr. OUIMET. Hearsay evidence in not good.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the Minister's opinion on that resolution? We are engaged on the important work of administering as economical as possible, public money, and here we have evidence repeated, item after item, that public money is being wasted, poured into the province of the Minister for what he calls public benefit, but which he will not pledge himself before the public to say is going to attain that end. When real honest demands are made on the public exchequer for consideration, the applicants are told there is no money. A short time ago a requisition was made on the Postmaster General by the letter carriers. What was the answer? The Government have got no money. They did not say: We are spending so much money for corrupt purposes in erecting post offices and other buildings which are not wanted, that we cannot afford to pay an honest day of work with an honest day's pay. The Government are paying the letter carriers of Toronto $360 a year, a pair of boots and a suit of clothes, and they think this is enough to live on. To men whose work is most onerous, the excuse for denying their honest claim was practically that the Government required so much of the public money for boodle. We have had several illustrations. This policy is being pursued in the Maritime Provinces. We were told that it is necessary to reduce the staff on the Intercolonial Railway by a great many hundreds, because the resources of the country cannot afford the present outlay. At the same time we discover that the Government have acquired a large property in the city of St. John at a fabulous price, involving a questionable transaction. Here again, to-night, we are furnished with another reason for denying Government employés honest pay for labour rendered. Could there be anything more unfair and more discreditable? The hon. member thinks these men in the service are bound hand and foot to support the Government, are slaves, in fact, bondmen, and, therefore, must support him at any cost; it is not necessary even to do justice to them, because at a moment's notice they might be discharged. Lack of funds is given as the excuse for not paying these men properly for the services they have rendered, and at the same time money is being thrown away, money collected from these very public servants by taxation, and expended for illegal purposes in order to erect public buildings and thus secure political support. I cannot conceive of any greater abuse of power than that illustrated by these very transactions that this committee have been compelled to consider to-night. A Government treating the taxes of the people which have been collected from the people for the people's good as their own money, as a means of fortifying themselves in office, forgetting they are trustees simply of those funds for the public—if we properly framed the criminal code we would make it applicable to those guilty

of those transactions. Yet I am told the Minister of Public Works has declared that the resolution of Parliament passed on the eve of the general election was in no way binding on him.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman is mistaken when he makes that statement. I never said that.

Mr. MULOCK. What did the Minister say, and what is the Minister's opinion on this question?

Mr. OUIMET. I should like the hon. gentleman, while he is speaking against time, to explain the difference between resolutions passed by Parliament, such as was passed the year before last and to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and the resolution by which Parliament decided to build this post office. Had Parliament a right to decide that this post office should be built? I suppose Parliament had the same right to adopt this resolution as it had to adopt the resolution a few years ago.

Mr. MULOCK. Last night the Minister of Finance professed to respect the resolution of 1890, but to-night the Minister of Public Works says it has been superseded.

Mr. OUIMET. The first resolution was passed in 1890. It was before the other.

Mr. MULOCK. We are now speaking of the resolution before the House. The Minister takes this ground now, that the general resolution passed by the House, laying down a certain principle, is not binding on the Administration; but, notwithstanding that resolution, the Administration can come down to Parliament with the recommendation of His Excellency to violate that principle for the purpose of a petty job. That is the doctrine which was laid down to-night, and I understand he has gone further and has said that he was going to see that the various rat holes throughout the Province of Quebec are to be filled up, if possible, with money collected from the people of Canada, on a principle repudiated by the resolution of 1890; that expenditure in the public interest can no longer govern, but his particular friends and supporters, political influence and patronage and all corrupting circumstances, shall be the ones to determine, in the administration of public funds, how he shall expend them. What is the use of public opinion succeeding in passing a resolution through this House, if the new Minister, out-Herodding Herod, says that he will repudiate all sound doctrine and set up his own will as the only thing to govern? That is what the Minister of Public Works has said, and, therefore, I say that Canada has made a most unfortunate selection in choosing him. I venture to say that there will be grave disappointment in the public mind when it is found what a terrible mistake has been made by His Excellency in seeking this adviser to administer this large spending department. The people of Ontario contribute a good deal to my hon. friend's resources, and when he tells us now, because he happens to be locally connected with the Province of Quebec, that he first intended to consider the interests of Quebec, and set up an unfair standard in order that this province will gain an advantage, I venture to say that he is committing treason against Canada. He is giving expression to a doctrine that will in time defeat both him and his Government, for I tell him that no province will stand such a doctrine as that. He has made a huge mistake in awaking the local cry. There are other localities which ought to have their rights, and it is our duty, regardless of the localities from which we come, to sink all minor considerations for the general interest of the country. The Minister of Public Works to-night has given expression to a doctrine which if sanctioned by this Parliament would be the death-knell of this Dominion. We feel to-day in western Ontario that Ontario has no voice in the administration of our affairs. We feel that this is practically a Maritime Province Administration, but this is the first time that a member of the Cabinet has openly thrown off all semblance of disguise and declared that his administration shall be sectional in its character. I for one raise my protest.

Mr. OUIMET. It is very evident that the hon. gentleman was away from this House, or that he was asleep, when I spoke. In the first place he cannot understand a word of the French language, and when I spoke I spoke in French; but what I said I will repeat in English for the edification of the hon. gentleman. I never said that the Province of Quebec ought to be favoured more than any other province, but I did say, and I repeat it here, and I believe the whole Dominion will agree to it; I said that the Province of Quebec had a right to have its share in the expenditure of the public money just as well as any other province. I am not afraid to repeat that sentiment, and I will repeat it in Ontario when I have the pleasure of going there. I am quite sure that the people of that great province will not endorse the language of the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) to-night. I know from experience that when we talk to an intelligent Ontario audience we are fairly listened to, and our arguments are received in a proper spirit. When we talk equity to the people of Ontario, when we talk fair-play and fairness to them, and when we talk equal rights for all, if the hon. gentleman likes that expression, we are courteously heard, and our arguments are not scorned as the hon. gentleman professes to scorn our arguments in this House. What do the hon. members from the Province of Quebec on the opposite side of the House say to the remarks of the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock), which ought to be a cause of shame to the gentlemen from the Province of Quebec who hold on to his tail. It has been said here by the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) and by others of his friends, that no post office will be built in the Province of Quebec until those localities in Ontario and elsewhere which have the largest revenues are served first. That means that we will not have a post office in the Province of Quebec for twenty years perhaps, and yet the hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec on the other side of the House, are ready to swallow that, and are ready to swallow everything else when it smells of opposition to the Government. Well, let them swallow the lesson from the hon. gentleman representing one of the Yorks (Mr. Mulock), and I hope that they will be ready to place it before their electors in the Province of Quebec. Are we not entitled to have the expenditure in the Province of Quebec of some part of the public money, because, be it remembered, we pay taxes just as well as the people of Ontario? I venture to say that in the Province of Quebec per head we pay more taxes

than are paid in the Province of Ontario. The doctrine to be laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite is that all the public money will be distributed in the Province of Ontario first, and then if there is some left we will have it in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. LISTER. No one said that.

Mr. OUIMET. That is the doctrine preached by the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Mulock) with his solemn utterances; I was going to use another adjective instead of "solemn" which would qualify his remarks as they ought to be qualified. And I repeat it again, that I never said that I would favour the expenditure of public money in the Province of Quebec more than in Ontario or any other province, and so long as I have the honour to occupy the position which has been confided to my trust in this very important department, I will do what is fair to every province. I would be ashamed if I had not the necessary strength to claim justice and fair-play for my own province, and the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) may scorn if he likes after that.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman in his concluding remarks has given expression to a declaration of principle, but, unfortunately, he gave himself away before that. He as much as stated that it would be twenty years before he could justify the transaction he is putting through the House to-night, if any sound principle of expenditure was adopted.

Mr. OUIMET. I have not said anything of the kind.

Mr. MULOCK. He was compelled to ask Parliament to-night to consent to an expenditure that he could not defend, and he was unable to explain why the town of Woodstock, one of the most important in Ontario which gives a postal revenue of $15,000 a year, was left without a post office, while the village of Laprairie, that does not pay one-fortieth of this revenue into the treasury, has got one. Is that what he calls equity and fair-play to all the provinces? I would like to ask him to explain his view of that doctrine of equity which he is going to bring to bear on the administration of his department. It is well enough for him to declare in loud and vigorous language that he is animated by a generous and fair spirit to all the provinces; but by your fruits we shall know you. It will not do for the hon. gentleman to wind up with a general profession of honesty when his acts are wholly inconsistent with any such profession. I ask him again, in conclusion, if he proposes to administer his department on that principle, how does he justify what he is doing in the Province of Quebec to-night, and what he is refusing to do in the Province of Ontario?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think it is about time we got down to business and stopped these recriminations. Let us try to find out the ground on which this post office is being built at Rivière du Loup.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That item has been carried. We are on the St. Henri post office.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I presume that I shall be pardoned if I just refer to that, because I did not know that it was carried. I wish to state that in 1871 the population of that place was 1,174, in 1881 it was 1,280, and in 1891 it had fallen away to 788, a reduction of 500. This just shows that wherever the Government are erecting post offices, they are driving the people away, and it is about time this policy was stopped. I think we shall have to have a change in the head of this department. The hon. Minister has shown such fighting qualities to-night that I think we had better put him at the head of the Militia Department. I do not think he should any longer blush unseen in the Public Works Department, but we should transfer him at once and get a milder man to take his place—a gentleman like the hon. Minister of Militia with a calm and even temper, who maintains his dignity and never gets angry even under the most galling criticism. It does seem singular that the hon. Minister, in discussing these matters to-night, should strive to create provincial feeling. I am surprised at a Minister of the Crown appealing to parish politics on this vote, and I am also surprised at the Minister of Customs saying "hear, hear" to these parish politics. The hon. gentleman should rise above that ground and display a national spirit in these matters. I hope the Minister will show himself to be above provincial politics by granting all contracts and public moneys on the ground of the public interest, whether in Quebec or in any other province. The members on this side of the House are bound to give fair-play to every province in the Dominion, and to judge every question on its merits.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think it is to be regretted that a Minister of the Crown should introduce provincial politics into the discussion of the questions before us. If I understood the Minister aright, he was justifying this vote on the ground that the Province of Quebec should have some money expended in it. Who said it should not? But he has given himself away; he has confirmed the view the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) took of his conduct in this matter, when he said that if he were to give the towns in the Province of Ontario their rights to which they are entitled in equity, the resolution which we are asked to pass to-night could not be granted for twenty years. Yet he considers it consistent with his duty, just because this is for the Province of Quebec, to do that injustice. He does more than that; he does what is a most unworthy thing, in my judgment; he tries to arouse the feelings of the members from Quebec Province to justify a vote that could not be justified on its merits, by alleging that an attack was made on his province, which was utterly incorrect. The members from the Province of Quebec have condemned some of the votes which we have passed just as much as members from other provinces, and on the same grounds. If he wishes to have the expenditure of this money in his own province, what the Liberal members from that province say is that he should give it to the towns which, by their importance and the revenue they return, demand consideration at the hands of the Government. But he has not done that. It is not necessary to institute a comparison between towns in Ontario and the town of Laprairie in order to make out a case. He has a case made against him when he passes over towns, of far greater importance and far larger revenue in his own province, and what the Liberal members point out is that he is disregarding principles of right and equity in the grants which he is asking us to sanction to-

night for his province and passing by other towns which are far more entitled to grants. The line he has taken in this debate, it seems to me, is altogether beneath the dignity of a Minister of the Crown. He has assumed the strange position that a resolution which was formerly adopted by this House, which is upon the records of this House, and which has not been rescinded, is not binding upon the Ministry, because if the House adopts this resolution, it is just as important as the other. In other words, a resolution directing a certain line of action to be taken by the Government is to be set aside by another resolution in direct contravention of it; and upon that view he presumes to place before the House a resolution which he has framed, and he asks the House to sanction it, and because the House refuses to sanction it, on the ground that it is contrary to the general resolution adopted by the House, he declares that the members are talking against time; in other words, we are given to understand that any remarks made, that any comments or criticisms upon any resolution the Minister of Public Works sees fit to offer, are to be characterized as speaking against time. When a gentleman of his greatness and high offices introduces a resolution to spend $16,000 in the erection of a post office which has only $400 revenue, any one who sees fit to criticise or ask questions about it is supposed to be talking against time. Because he chooses to offer a resolution to the House, anything said against it is mere talking against time. What a compliment to the gentlemen who are supporting the Government to tell them that they are bound to support a resolution simply because the Minister of Public Works has submitted it. He assumes to have got that control over his supporters that when he introduces a resolution which not one of them has the hardihood to defend in the House, they must all the same accept it. Well, it is rather unfortunate for the Minister that he has not the same power and control over the independent members of this House which he has over his own supporters, and we will ventilate our objections, when we think such objections and criticisms are just. We neither fear the threats nor court the smiles of that high dignitary in office.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I have not yet said anything in respect of post offices, but since justice is to be done to every province and every part of the province, I have a post office in my riding, in the town of Seaforth, where the revenue was $4,990, and I think Seaforth is justly entitled to a new building. I think that, under this resolution, justice ought to be done to all sections. I am not going to be prevented making the remarks I intend to make by the interruptions and noise of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the committee had better rise if these gentlemen will not stop their noise.

Mr McMILLAN (Huron). I was very much astonished to hear the language of the Minister of Public Works. As hon. gentlemen opposite will persist with their interruptions and noise, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hope hon. gentlemen will listen and not interrupt.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I was about to say that I was very much astonished——

Mr. LISTER. I move that this committee rise. I am in earnest.

Committee divided: nays 58; yeas 33.

Motion negatived.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). This is the first time I have attempted to speak on the subject of post offices, and I think I have a right to the ear of the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite is pure obstruction.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I move the adjournment of the House. If I cannot get my rights here, I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. You cannot do that; we are in committee.

Mr. LISTER. Move that the committee rise.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Chairman, you have no right to take points of order.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I was going to remark to the Minister of Public Works——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I was astonished to hear the Minister——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would call upon members of the committee to listen to the speeches which are made, otherwise it is perfectly ridiculous for us to sit here.

Mr. CASEY. We know who are making the interruptions, and we will have to name some of them.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I was surprised to hear the Minister of Public Works say there were some members here who were holding on to the tail of their leaders. I think the Minister has a long tail and an unruly tail to-night. I was astonished to hear him say that a new resolution to build a post office in a place with a revenue of $2,000 was just as binding on the Government as to build a post office in accordance with a vote which was passed two years ago. If Ministers can set aside any resolution passed by this House they may set aside any decision we come to here. In my riding we have the town of Seaforth, which is certainly entitled to a post office, as it has a revenue of $4,955.73. which is ten times as much as the revenue derived from the post office at Laprairie for which we have passed a vote to-night. The point taken there was that the vote was taken before the resolution was passed two years ago, but that is not the case in regard to this vote. In Seaforth we have not the accommodation for a post office considering the large amount of postal matter which is handled there and distributed to the north and the south, and I hope the Minister of Public Works will take that into consideration when the next Estimates come down. But I suppose we need not expect it as long as the Government will simply spend money in localities from which they expect a supporter. When the Government gerrymandered the County of Huron they expected to get two Conservative representatives, but they have been much disappointed, because we have two Reform representatives here from that county, and

if justice had been done, Huron would still have three Reformers here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Hon. gentlemen opposite may cry "hear, hear," but they know it very well. I observe that the respectable part of the Conservatives are acting like gentlemen, and it is only the rowdy element that is making the noise, and, if the Chairman cannot control them I hope he will adjourn the House. The Province of Ontario has as much right to be considered as the Province of Quebec, but no member of the Government has any right to raise sectional or provincial feeling here. We formed this confederation in order to become a united people, and with the idea that all works which were for the general advantage should be carried out without any idea as to the locality. The people in a Reform riding have as much claim on the country for public buildings as those who live in a Conservative riding, and the town of Seaforth is entitled to have justice done to it. In the County of Huron we have four post offices with a revenue of over $4,000, and there is not a public building in any of those places. We have 13 post offices with a larger revenue than that of Laprairie, and I say this is not doing justice to the different localities. I hope the Minister of Public Works will see that next year at least a new building is given to Seaforth.

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear. In English.

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) It is impossible for me to address the House if the hon. members interrupt me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. In English.

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) What is the distance between the St. Henri post office and the city of Montreal?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) About 3 miles.

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) Could th hon. member tell me when this work will be completed?

Some hon. MEMBERS. In English.

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) English is dead; you have murdered it.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The building will be completed before the 1st July next. I mean, the 1st July, 1893.

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state the reason for which I use the French language. If one speaks English, one is not listened to, while if you speak French, at least you have hearers. For my part, I must protest against the insinuation which was made by the hon. Minister of Public Works against the members of the Province of Quebec. I am from the Province of Quebec, and I represent a very important county of that province. I would not like to have it said of me, any more than of any other member for that province, that we blame the expenditures that are made there, simply because the money is spent in the Province of Quebec. We are not the slaves of the hon. member for York, or of any other member. What we blame is this system of preference which obtains in favour of localities which return members favourable to the Government. What we blame is the injustice meted to the counties which send members hostile to the Government. I was surprised at the serious and unmerited charge brought against us by the hon. Minister of Public Works. I protest against such charges. Let me tell him—with all the respect I have for him—that I do not deserve them. Last night, when we discussed the vote for the Laprairie post office, I asked him if he did not think it would be more equitable to put in a small vote for a post office building at Buckingham, in the Province of Quebec. Was that blaming expenditures in the Province of Quebec? The only expenditures I might have blamed were those that are made for useless works with the only object of redeeming promises, not in the Province of Quebec, but in other provinces. I might, besides, call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that when the committee discussed the votes for Nova Scotia, I asked him that the same treatment be dealt to the Province of Quebec as to that of Nova Scotia. Therefore, the charge he made a minute ago was an utterly unjust and unworthy one against his fellow representatives of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. CORBY. I have sat here for the last week listening to the obstruction of the Opposition, and I stand here as a business man to say that they are pursuing a ridiculous course. When you speak your English language or your French language in this House, we are perfectly willing to listen to it, but when you speak the Gælic, or some other language that we have heard to-night, I certainly think it is time to draw the line. I think we have put up with this thing long enough, and I stand here to-night as a business man to protest against the money of this country being fooled away as it is by the obstruction of the Opposition. I think it is time that the people of this country put their foot down on this practice. The amount that we are asked to vote to-night was passed last session; if there was anything wrong about it then, why did not the Opposition vote against it? The amount has been voted, the contract has been given out, and the Government can do nothing else than appropriate this money, and I for one, if I have to stay here till the 1st of January, will remain, and the rest of the boys will remain with me, to vote that item through. We are going to stay with you if it takes six months, but we are bound to vote that item through. If the gentlemen of the Opposition want to fight it out on that line, we are ready to meet them. I tell them, further, that if they think they are going to choke us down, they are greatly mistaken. They come here and make a terrible fight and a terrible row over an item that was passed last session, and the Government are obliged to vote it again because they have let the contract.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I rise to repudiate the insults that have been thrown across the floor of the House by the hon. gentleman. I have just as good a right to rise in this House and give my sentiments with respect to the expenditure of public money, as the hon. member for West Hastings has, and I have a perfect right to do so in my own mother tongue, and I am not talking in a language that I am ashamed of. I want to tell him that since I came to this country I have wrought my way into the position I hold, notwithstanding my broad

Scotch accent, and he is the second slanderer that I have ever heard rise in this House and insult the nationality to which I belong. I think the hon. gentleman has got a little too high. I am afraid he has been drawing just a little too much from the stuff that he deals in, and that is what has called him forth to-night.

Mr. CORBY. I have heard the hon. gentleman many times speak in this House in regard to corn and a hundred other things. I tell him to-night that I do not take anything back that I have said. I have given my opinion, and I certainly think it is ridiculous that the time of this House and the money of this country should be wasted in the manner that hon. gentlemen are doing.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has charged this side of the House with obstruction. We can find no fault with him for making that charge, but we deny that it is correct. Does that hon. gentleman expect that this side of the House is here merely to allow such votes as the Government think proper to bring down, to pass without proper criticism? We are simply in the exercise of our right, and it is our duty carefully to criticise every vote that the Government offers, and if hon. gentlemen have so much business outside this House that they cannot attend to their parliamentary duties, then they should not seek a seat in this House, but should remain at home. Sir, money is not being fooled away by what the Opposition are doing. The effort of the Opposition in this matter is to prevent money being fooled away, and I venture to say there is scarcely an hon. gentleman opposite who, if he speaks his honest conviction, will not say that we have voted away these last two or three days tens of thousands of dollars that we had no right to expend at all, if the public affairs had been properly managed. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that the money of the country is not being wasted by the conduct of the Opposition. When hon. gentlemen went to the people and asked them to send them here, they agreed with the people to take as an indemnity $1,000, whether the session lasted three months or one year; and let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if this session lasts for one year, not one dollar more than $1,000 shall be paid to them. That will be the amount of money that the hon. members will get, and not a fraction more if the Opposition have to remain here three months to prevent it.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Who asked it?

Mr. LISTER. You know that your side have been asking it for the last three weeks.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). You are mistaken.

Mr. LISTER. I want to tell the hon. gentleman who charges us with wasting the money of the country by opposing the measures of the Government, that whether the session lasts one month, five months, nine months, or a year, not one dollar more will be paid them, if the efforts of this side of the House can prevent it.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think it comes with very good grace from the hon. member for Lambton to be lecturing this side of the House upon their duty. I think we have sat here very patiently day after day, and I must agree with every word regarding obstruction that was uttered by the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Corby) that the time of this House has been wasted by the Opposition in as pure an obstruction as was ever offered in Parliament, either in this or in any other country. The hon. member for Lambton says you are paid to come here and do your work. Where was the member for Lambton during the first half of this session? Was he here attending to his parliamentary duties, or was he attending to his professional business in the west? He scarcely ever graced this House with his presence for the first half of this session, yet he now comes here and pretends to take credit for doing what he has not done. I say there has been more money squandered by the useless talk of the Opposition, and more money wasted by the time taken up by the members of both Houses of Parliament, than the whole amount of items that have been passed during the last three days. We were sent here as members of Parliament, to act as business men, to do business in a business-like way, and not to talk against time, for the purpose of preventing business being done. The hon. member says we are sent here to check these things, but I should think that the check the country has given them in almost every bye-election ought to be a sufficient rebuke to them for their policy during the lastfew years. If I correctly understand the duty of an Opposition it is, when they cannot control Parliament, to criticise the measures of the Government in a fair and reasonable manner, and oppose them according to the rules of the House, but it is not to waste the time of the House by factious opposition and by useless talk to kill time. They are in a minority to-day, and they cannot presume to arrogate the right to control the majority in this House. It is a simple waste of time, and it cannot be expected that members of Parliament should sit here day and night, as we have been doing during the last few days, listening to what are not arguments but proceedings which amount to simple obstruction, and thus wasting the money of the country and time of 215 members of Parliament.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman waxed wrathy at the time of this House being wasted. I am sure if the House was to act upon the ideas of the hon. gentleman there would be no time wasted, because he would pass every vote and every measure of the Government without any discussion, holus-bolus, and take it just as it is. It is nonsense for the hon. gentleman to talk about time being wasted. If we are paid for a session, be that long or short——

Mr. SPROULE. To sit here and do nothing.

Mr. LISTER—we are doing a great deal.

Mr. SPROULE. What did we do last night?

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman is perfectly ridiculous in the statements he makes. He was bold enough to say that during the first half of the session I was not in the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I said "very little in the House."

Mr. LISTER. I was here from the beginning to the present time, with the exception of three or four days.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman was absent time after time, and his motions were allowed to stand.

Mr. LISTER. During Sir John Macdonald's funeral my court was sitting——

Mr. SPROULE. You are a year out.

Mr. LISTER—and the only time I was absent was a few days at the time of the funeral.

Mr. SPROULE. You are far out.

Mr. LISTER. I mean Mr. Mackenzie's funeral. If I were not in the Chamber, I would use stronger words. If the hon. gentleman said that outside in the lobby, I would say he was a deliberate vilifier.

Mr. SPROULE. I neither care for you outside in the lobby, nor in the Chamber; neither for your wrath nor your impertinence.

Mr. LISTER. Neither his threats nor his tongue do I care anything about—I care nothing about him at all.

Mr. SPROULE. You cannot have more supreme contempt for me than I have for you.

Mr. LISTER. He is a man utterly despised by his own friends in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. You have the brass but not the brains of your party.

Mr. LISTER. So far as the bye-elections are concerned, to which reference has been made by the hon. gentleman, and I am bound by the rules of the House to call him honourable—it is not necessary to recall them. When history comes to be written we shall find how they were carried. I will remind the hon. gentleman that in a Conservative constituency with a large majority, which was gerrymandered so that a Liberal majority of 350 was taken out of it, we have to-day returned a Liberal, in spite of all efforts to the contrary. If the electors were allowed to express their true feelings, uninfluenced by the influences which we know have been used on the part of the Government party, if we could prevent the abuse of the power that the Government used for the purpose of gathering to themselves support—if we could suppress that influence and allow the electors to express their true opinion, hon. gentlemen opposite could not carry one bye-election in Canada.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to drop the discussion and come down to the item. Hon. gentlemen must never have any personal discussion among themselves across the floor of the House. It is forbidden in the House, and the same rule applies to the committee. If there is anything to settle, hon. members can do it in the lobby and not on the floor of the House.

Mr. GIBSON. I regret the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Corby) and the member for Crey (Mr. Sproule) should have made remarks derogatory to the Scotch. I am a Scotchman born. I was elected as a member to this House as a Canadian, but I have endeavoured to do justice to my own nationality. I am not ashamed of being a Scotchman and of addressing this House as such. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier need not laugh, for when he speaks English he does not speak it better than I do. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) may sometimes stumble and be not very well understood in all parts of the House, but when you read his speeches, so well reported in *Hansard*, they can be easily read by every man in the Dominion. In simple justice to my nationality, I ask the hon. gentleman to retract the remarks he made derogatory to my countrymen.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I care not whether we are Englishmen, Scotchmen or Irishmen, but first and foremost we should all be Canadians. I care not whether the member for Huron (Mr. Mc Millan) talks good English or not. It is his misfortune if he cannot do so. I do not care whether the member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) talks as good English as some other Scotchmen in the House can talk. That is his misfortune. They have not had the education that is required of Canadians. Let us leave nationalities alone, and confine ourselves to the Estimates. Let us consider what is for the good of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite are following a course of obstruction. Let us, however, come down to the item and discuss it as sensible business men. Let us consider the purpose for which we are here. Are we here for business or for fun? Let the electors consider who are making the fun and wasting the money of the country. I suppose we will have to give gentlemen on the other side credit for a certain amount of intelligence, and it appears to me ridiculous that men of any intelligence should waste the time of the country discussing matters which have already been settled in this House. I can tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that we are going to carry this item. You may stay there as long as you choose, gentlemen, but we are greater stayers than you are and my advice to you is to set down to business principles.

Mr. GIBSON. I had hopes that my distinguished and learned friend from Algoma (Mr. Macdonell), was about to second the request I made to the member for Hastings to withdraw the remark he made against my countrymen.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not so much blame the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Corby), but I think a great deal of responsibility attaches to the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and especially to the Minister of Finance, because, while I am sure the apology would have been made at once by the gentleman from Hastings, the hon. Minister of Finance called upon the committee to proceed with the question.

Mr. BOWELL. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not care what the Minister of Militia says, I am sure of it, and the Minister of Finance will not deny it. I say that the whole party opposite are endorsing this insult to an important portion of the community of this Dominion. Although not a Scotchman myself, I protest against the insult that has been hurled against one of the most important portions of the community. The Government assume this attitude with a large majority behind them here, but this matter will be heard of outside the walls of Parliament.

Mr. CASEY. I did not intend to prolong this debate were it not for the conduct of members on the other side of the House to-night. I am sure it is only the most utter "greenhorns" on that side of the House who can imagine that there is any value in that style of procedure, because those members who are a few years here know that the argument of scratching their desks with the toes of their boots only prolongs the debate indefinitely, and obstructs the business of the House.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman says

it is only "greenhorns" who are scratching their desks. Is that parliamentary language?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think it it parliamentary.

Mr. CASEY. I would define "greenhorn" for the hon. member for Algoma to mean a very new, raw, fresh and inexperienced member. If the hon. gentleman thinks that is offensive to him I will withdraw it, but I am sure nobody but a "greenhorn" would feel offended at my application of the word.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I rise to another point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not think the hon. member has satisfied this House as to his interpretation of the word "greenhorn." If he applies it to hon. gentlemen sitting on the back benches of this House, in my opinion it cannot be parliamentary language, and his duty is to withdraw the offensive expression.

Mr. CASEY. I declared my willingness to withdraw the expression if the hon. gentleman felt offended at it. I tried to do it in a way that would not hurt the hon. gentleman's susceptibilities, but his susceptibilities are so very tender that he feels like a piece of proud flesh, and you cannot refer to him without hurting him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He called you a piece of proud flesh.

Mr. CASEY. I withdraw the word "greenhorn," if he thinks it an offensive name to call him, and I trust hon. gentlemen opposite will allow me to come to the question now before the House. I think the hon. gentleman was rather too severe upon the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby) who was the first to introduce these national recriminations. I am sure that the hon. member, knowing him as I do to be a thoroughly good-natured and good-humoured man, did not mean to be so offensive to the people of Scotch nationality as his words would seem to imply, and I think that the hon. member for Algoma read him too severe a lecture.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I did not say anything about it.

Mr. CASEY. Representing a riding chiefly composed of Scotchmen, I must on their behalf protest against such references being made in future. Now, I understand from the hon. Minister of Public Works that this post office was within three miles of the Montreal post office. It seems to me that is rather too near a great metropolitan post office to justify the erection of another public building costing as much as this is expected to cost. I would like to ask the Minister on what grounds he justifies this?

Mr. OUIMET. Because the necessity of the postal service demands that there should be another post office there.

Mr. CORBY. I have listened to the remarks made by the hon. member for West Elgin and the hon. member for Lincoln, and I must say that no better evidence of obstruction can be given than the attempt to convert my language into an insult to the Scotch nationality. That is only got up as a piece of clap trap for political purposes. As my best friends in West Hastings are Scotchmen, they know better than to suppose that I would insult their nationality. They supported me at the last election and they will support me again, and they will not listen to such clap trap statements as have been made by the hon. member for West Elgin and the hon. member for Lincoln. I had no intention to insult the Scotch nationality, and if I did so, I withdraw what I said. Hon. gentlemen opposite are only talking to-night for political purposes; but let them go on and do their best.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for West Hastings does me an injustice, because I distinctly stated that I did not suppose that he intended to be insulting to the Scotch nationality. The hon. Minister, in reply to my question, says that the erection of this post office so near to the Montreal post office can be justified on the ground that the public service requires it. That is a very large and comprehensive answer. It is as much as to say that this post office is needed because it is needed. I am aware that that is a natural justification to put forward, but what I wanted to obtain from the Minister was some details as to why it is needed. The reasons do not appear on the face of the Postmaster General's Report, in the census returns, or in any of the public documents laid before the House. It is clear from these documents that St. Henri has a smaller population and yields a smaller postal revenue than a great many places that have not obtained post offices. It has been alleged by some hon. gentlemen on the other side that we are attacking these appropriations because they are made in the Province of Quebec. We are doing nothing of the kind. We are pointing out that if such places as St. Henri and Laprairie are justified on the basis of population or of revenue in receiving post office buildings, there are many other places in the Province of Quebec much more entitled to receive them on the same grounds. I took the trouble last night to give a list of about 130 places in Quebec which returned a greater revenue than Laprairie, and it would be quite easy to form a list of Quebec towns yielding a larger revenue than the one now under discussion. We have had from the Minister the same justification that we have had all along, that in the first place the money has been already voted for this purpose, and in the second place that the public needs require it; but he has not undertaken to show us what means he has used to ascertain that. The conclusion we are obliged to come to in this case is the same as that which we came to in the Laprairie case, that this building is being erected wholly for political reasons. The County of Hochelaga, in which it is situated, returns at present a supporter of the Government. He has not invariably been a solid Conservative, but such little grants as this will no doubt contribute to brace up his allegiance to the party, and secure the support of his constituents at the polls. These are the only objects that can be achieved by this grant, and we have no doubt that this is the object of the Government. It is because we feel this that we have determined to give such votes as this the fullest and most exhaustive discussion, and to do so at such a length as will draw the attention of the country forcibly to the system pursued of the unlimited bribery of constituencies by means of grants for public works.

An hon. MEMBER. Tell us something new.

Mr. CASEY. I am very sorry that the statement is not new; I am very sorry that this practice is as old as the Government. I deeply regret

that the bribery of constituencies by means of public buildings is not something new, but has become so habitual that I have no doubt some members supporting the Government have utterly ceased to see the corruption involved in the system, and even ceased to see its impropriety. We have heard them defend openly the principle that the Government should stick by their friends and spend money only in those places which return Government supporters. We had this very evening the statement from the newest member in the House (Mr. Lowell) that in his constituency a post office was promised by the Government organ in return for the election of a member supporting the Government. I have tried to confine my remarks as much as possible to the policy of the Government on the item before the House. I am glad that the hon. member for West Hastings has withdrawn words of his which probably he did not mean to use in their full significance. I merely ask the hon. member for East Grey to follow his example, since he declared, in the first place, that he endorsed every word which fell from the hon. member for West Hastings, who said he had listened to English and French but drew the line at what he called the Gaelic spoken by the hon. member for Huron.

Mr. TAYLOR. If I remember correctly, about three years ago the item was placed in the Estimates, now under discussion, to build a post office near Montreal. The Minister of Public Works then made the statement to the House, showing the estimated cost and revenue and everything connected with the item. The hon. members for West Elgin and Lambton were then in the House and heard the statement and approved of the item, which was carried unanimously. Next session the item was repeated and approved of, and now they come forward and say they are not obstructing when they are preventing the passage of an item which they have already twice or thrice approved.

Mr. CASEY. We did not approve it.

Mr. TAYLOR. They never disapproved it, and now they come forward and say they are not obstructing, although the last two or three nights have been spent in discussing this item. The time thus lost has cost the country more than enough to build half a dozen post offices.

Mr. CASEY. Give the figures. How much a day does it cost?

Mr. TAYLOR. The sessional clerks, pages, messengers and all the staff in connection with the House of Commons, who are paid by the day, entail a heavy expense on the country for every day they are employed, so that every day's obstruction costs the country thousands of dollars.

Mr. LISTER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that I was in the House when this item was passed before?

Mr. TAYLOR. I say that the hon. gentleman was a member of the House then, and it was his duty to be in his place; and I say that the Minister of that day gave all the details required, and that the hon. member for West Lambton and every member of the House then gave their assent to the item by not voting against it or disapproving it. In the face of this, they try to make the House believe that their course now is not obstruction. It is obstruction, and the country will know how to appreciate it; and we are prepared to remain here just as long as they are. The hon. gentleman said that an extra indemnity would not be accepted by hon. gentlemen on that side, should the session be prolonged through their obstruction; but we know how the extra indemnity passed before when they delayed prorogation by the same course as they are following out now. They then were glad to accept the additional indemnity just as they will take it this session, notwithstanding the professions of the hon. member for Lambton, if they keep us here a month or two longer.

Mr. LISTER. My hon. friend has thought proper to drag a good many things into this discussion, and no doubt he feels perfectly justified in supporting the motion before this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Because I did it before. I will be consistent.

Mr. LISTER. Is that any reason why you should do it now?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman would vote for it any way.

Mr. TAYLOR. The country is committed to it.

Mr. LISTER. When the hon. gentleman talks about saving money, let me remind him that if the Minister of War had not made that little purchase in St. John the other day, he would have saved the country $200,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Draw a herring across the track, if you like. I made a plain statement.

Mr. LISTER. My hon. friend says it was my duty to be here. I do not think he knows whether I was in the House or not. He first made the statement that I was, and then he substituted for it that it was my duty to have been here. Does my hon. friend think that because this was perhaps not opposed—and I cannot say from recollection whether it was or not, but I have no doubt that it was; I have no doubt that if you turn up *Hansard*, you will find that this matter was opposed when first introduced—does he say that because it was not opposed—then it should not be now? Does he think that we should not criticise generally this expenditure of the Government? Does he not think it is the duty of the Opposition to criticise the general principle, apart altogether from the particular item? Then my hon. friend talks about the $500 last session. I think he ought to say very little about that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not say a word about that. I said we were kept here five months on the Franchise Bill. I did not refer to last session at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I believe we are entirely out of order, the whole House, and I think hon. gentlemen on both sides, when they read this in the *Hansard* to-morrow, will regret that they have spoken as they have. They are not talking to the question, and we had better proceed to business.

Mr. LISTER. I will, if you will allow me first to say that what I said about claiming no extra indemnity was not intended in the way of a threat at all. I said we had a duty to perform and we would perform it if it took us six months or a year. The Government have delayed to the last moment the bringing down of their most important

measures, and now they say we must hurry them through. They have kept us here for two months doing nothing, and in the last week of the last month they say we must hurry through. Such conduct is not fair to the House or to the country.

Mr. CASEY. It is the duty of the House to discuss these matters. The work of the House is not simply to pass estimates but to criticise them as well. On the first occasion when this vote came up, the question was asked and some information was given, but no one on this side of the House seemed to be posted on the obnoxious character of the vote; but last year, as the *Hansard* will show, there was considerable opposition to it. We do not necessarily approve of everything that is passed because we do not vote against it, and especially in committee, where the names are not taken down in division.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to say that I spoke before the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Corby), and did not say that I endorsed all his remarks. I had no referrence to them whatever, but to what he said in regard to the construction.

Mr. LANDERKIN. According to the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman, we have no right to discuss this matter now, because the late Minister of Public Works placed this item in the Estimates. Many things have happened since then. The hon. gentleman has been degraded and placed in the ranks, which apparently casts a stigma upon him and a suspicion upon this item. It is no reason from their standpoint for our voting this money, now that explanations were given by that Minister whom they have crowded out or frozen out of his position and reduced to the position of a private member of the House. Why should we not ask if these statements are correct or not? I am not responsible for contracts the Government has entered into even though I may not have moved any resolution against them. We are told, if we move resolutions, that we are obstructing business. I repudiated that at the beginning and I will continue faithfully to repudiate it, and I will not have any one say that I am responsible for a vote because I did not move an amendment. I now record my emphatic protest against the multiplication of post offices where there is no necessity for them, no matter in what province they may be.

St. Hyacinthe Post Office, Custom House, &c.—to complete..... $10,800

Mr. FLINT. What is the total amount to be expended on that building?

Mr. OUIMET. When completed the total cost will be $35,000.

Mr. MULOCK. In what stage is the work now?

Mr. OUIMET. $10,800 will complete the whole thing, including furniture, fittings, &c.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary..... $22,800

Mr. OUIMET. This vote is to be applied for the purchase of materials and tools to be used for building purposes by the convicts at the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary during the fiscal year 1892-93; also for engines and supplies required for use. Of this amount $17,500 is for making a boundary wall, and for materials used in the different shops.

Richmond Post Office..... $4,600

Mr. FLINT. I think this item is subject to much the same criticism that was made with regard to Laprairie post office or the St. Henri post office. This place only gives a revenue of $1,900, the population of the village is only 2,000, and the returns of the office about $1,000 a year, yet the Government is erecting a building that will cost $12,000 or more. By and by the Liberal party will be attacked for not having objected to these expenditures. I believe that in objecting to expenditures of this kind we are echoing the sentiments of a large number of hon. gentlemen opposite who have claims for public buildings in their own constituencies far superior to this. There are places in many Conservative constituencies that return five times the receipts of Richmond and that have a larger population, and, therefore, have superior claims for grants of this kind. But the ground the Opposition take is that there should be a rule laid down by the Government that no place under a certain population and returning revenue below a certain amount should have a public building at the expense of the country. I think the discussions we have had for the last few days will, perhaps, lead the Government to adopt some such rule as this, which will place the politics of the country upon a more healthy basis. In what condition is the work at Richmond?

Mr. OUIMET. The contract has not been given yet.

Mr. FLINT. If the hon. Minister is not too tightly bound by pledges, I should hope he might see his way to cancel this vote and give a larger amount to some of those large towns in the west, which have stronger claims from a business standpoint.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the Minister state that the land has yet been bought?

Mr. OUIMET. Not yet, it is being purchased. Not a cent has been spent yet.

Mr. MULOCK. So there will be no loss by abandoning the scheme at this stage. Perhaps the Minister would consider the suggestion made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). It is quite clear that this enterprise is an infringement of the resolution of 1890. I would like to know how the Minister justifies asking the House for this money in view of that resolution?

Mr. OUIMET. The first appropriation was made in 1890, and it was renewed last year. I think it is time we should keep faith with that locality.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the population of Richmond?

Mr. OUIMET. A little over 2,000. The revenue is $1,909. The cost of the buildings will be between $16,000 and $18,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On what principles does the hon. gentleman justify, from a business point of view, an expenditure which will involve to us a charge of at least $1,500 a year for the collection of a revenue of $1,900. It is not sufficient to tell us that a promise was made. The hon. gentleman ought to be prepared to show some reason in justification of a vote of this kind. When we are told that the population is 2,000, that the revenue collected is $1,900, and he is

going to spend $20,000 or thereabouts, involving a charge of fully $1,600 a year for the collection of a revenue of $1,909, is it possible for the hon. gentleman to disguise to himself, or to attempt to disguise from the House, that this is utterly and outrageously in violation of the agreement that was come to by that resolution passed in 1890? The hon. gentleman says that nothing has been spent as yet, no contract signed, no land bought. It appears to be the most outrageous possible defiance of what was really and virtually an agreement entered into by both sides of the House without any dissent.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There are many precedents for dropping this item if the public interest does not require it. When we consider the small population and small revenue collected it is an unbusiness-like transaction to spend $16,000 or $20,000 on a post office. I remember in regard to Goderich harbour last year, an item was dropped by the Government. An item appeared in the Estimates for a public work in Bonaventure, but the Government afterwards thought it was wholly unnecessary and dropped the item. It is the duty of the Government to reconsider this item, and decide whether it should not be dropped. The fact that a promise was made during the previous Parliament, that this work would be proceeded with, is no reason why it should be constructed. There was some force in the contention of the Government in regard to previous items, that the work had been commenced and should be completed, but in this case no land has been purchased, nothing has been done on the work, and therefore the Government could drop the item without detriment to the public service. I hope this will be done, or at all events that the amount will be expended at some other place in the province where the postal revenue is much larger and where a post office is more required. For example, Hochelaga has a revenue of $2,506, and other places run up to $3,000 or $4,000, and yet they have no public buildings. What accommodation is there at Richmond at present; where is the post office kept, and what rent is paid?

Mr. OUIMET. I differ with the hon. member for South Oxford. The Government have undertaken certain obligations for this locality as well as other localities, and they feel bound to fulfil those obligations. It is intended to have the post office, custom house and inland revenue office in the building.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is put down in the Estimates as post office alone.

Mr. OUIMET. That is a mistake, and we will amend the item. Richmond is a port, it is a very important place, a railway centre, and it is bound to improve.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a reason, and I am not unwilling to consider it. In the Estimates we are asked to vote for a post office alone, and to that I extremely object. If the hon. gentleman says that the building will include custom house and the inland revenue office, and there is a large amount of business done at that place, that would furnish a fair reason for a vote.

Mr. FOSTER. We will amend the item to post office and public building.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. BOWELL. Richmond was formerly a port, but it was reduced to an outport and attached to Sherbrooke, not because business was falling off, but because of the policy adopted in the department when I was in charge of it, by which we effected a reduction in the expenditure in carrying on the Customs Department by making as many outports as possible. The port alone reports to the department here.

Mr. DEVLIN. Have tenders been invited for the work?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Mr. DEVLIN. When will tenders be invited?

Mr. OUIMET. When plans have been prepared.

Mr. DEVLIN. Have you any idea where the site will be; will it be placed in the centre of the town?

Mr. OUIMET. I have no idea. We will try to get the best site for the least price.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount of customs revenue?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman at present, because the report of the outport is made to the port of Sherbrooke, and the amount collected is not detailed in the Public Accounts. When it was reduced to an outport the collections I think were from $12,000 to $15,000, but I am not positive about it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What accommodation is there at present, and what rent is paid?

Mr. OUIMET. The rent for the post office is $100 a year; I do not know the rent for the custom house office, as it is not in my department.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is desirable that this state of things should be continued. It is evident that the new building will cost $1,600 a year, while the service is now done for $200. Is the accommodation now sufficient?

Mr. OUIMET. It is not. The intention is not to have a special caretaker for these buildings, but either the postmaster or the customs officer can live in the building and take charge of it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You will have to pay them for taking care of the building.

Mr. OUIMET. I suppose $50 or $100 a year extra, and the lodging will do for that, whereas we would have to pay $400 for a caretaker.

Mr. DEVLIN. The object in going on with the work is to carry out an engagement made with the town?

Mr. OUIMET. Certainly.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a certain matter, and I think it is the first time I have drawn his attention to it this session. Last session, when I did invite attention to it, he was not Minister of Public Works, and really all the efforts I made in the direction indicated were unavailing. It was that an engagement was made a few years ago with the city of Hull to build a post office there, and it was built. It is certainly a very fine post office, but it is not completed. There is a tower attached to the building, but the place where the clock was to have been has still a black board across it.

Mr. FOSTER. That policy has gone out.

Mr. DEVLIN. The policy of putting a clock in public buildings!

Mr. FOSTER. We erect buildings, but we won't put a clock in them.

Mr. DEVLIN. I did not know that the policy had run down. However, I am glad to know that economy will be effected even in that way. This want of a clock to which I call attention destroys the whole appearance of what otherwise is a handsome building. Last year I was told that my application in this respect would receive consideration, but it did not, and I suppose that is because the policy has run down.

Mr. LISTER. As I understand this vote the Government has not purchased the land upon which the post office at Richmond is to be erected, and this is therefore a new vote. The objection raised to all the other votes has been that the receipts in the office did not justify the expenditure, and we find here that the office in Richmond yields a gross postal revenue of only $1,909, and yet the Government are to expend between $16,000 and $18,000 on the erection of buildings, although the land has not yet been purchased.

Mr. FOSTER. The land will be purchased out of that sum.

Mr. LISTER. I do not suppose that the Minister of Public Works will pretend to say that the land will be purchased and the building fully completed for the sum of $18,000?

Mr. OUIMET. Certainly, or not exceeding $18,000.

Mr. LISTER. The Minister has stated that it shall not exceed $18,000 for the whole building and the land?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. RIDER. I would like to enquire of the Minister if the building of new post offices will entail increased salaries to postmasters?

Mr. FOSTER. It does not.

Mr. RIDER. It would seem that instead of the Government building new post offices in places where the population and the gross revenue is such as not to justify it, it would be much better for them to cut down the rate of postage. That policy would be a great advantage to the public and would be appreciated by the country generally, whereas the building of post offices involving the expenditure of large sums of money, and the permanent cost of maintaining them, is a very heavy burden on the country. I hope that the Government will carefully consider the reduction of the rate of postage before they sanction the outlay of any money for such buildings as these in the future. With regard to the building of a post office at Richmond I would like to call the Minister's attention to a town in the county which I have the honour to represent, the town of Magog, which is now yielding a gross postal revenue of $1,949, and which has a population of 2,100. It is also a port of entry, a large manufacturing and railway centre, and a growing place; and if other places are to be favoured, it seems to me that this place surely ought not to be passed over.

Mr. OUIMET. I think the hon. gentleman's county has already a public building at Coaticook.

Mr. RIDER. Yes.

Mr. OUIMET. Then the hon. gentleman ought to be liberal enough to give another place its turn, and when the turn of his county comes again, it will certainly get a building.

West Farnham post office..... $4,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will explain on what gound West Farnham is entitled to a post office.

Mr. OUIMET. The amount required for the ground was given last year, when $4,000 was voted for the purpose, and this is an additional vote. It is for a public building. West Farnham is a great railway centre. Though its population is only 1,520, its postal revenue amounts to $1,998.58 and it issues money orders to the value of $17,895, indicating that there must be a pretty large trade done here. The place has three saw mills, a grist mill, a woollen factory, a beet sugar factory, brick fields, and manufactories of various kinds. I understand also that it is an outport of customs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it is a village of about 300 families, and the postal revenue is about $1,900. What is the cost of the proposed erection?

Mr. OUIMET. $10,500.

Mr. LISTER. There can be no possible justification for this expenditure. Amongst all the cases we have discussed, this is, I think, the worst except Laprairie. Previous to 1891, Missisquoi was represented by a Liberal, and shortly before the elections of 1891 it was circulated in that county that the Government proposed to construct public buildings in the town of Farnham, and the present member (Mr. Baker) represented that his influence would be used with the Government to get public buildings for the town—about the same procedure as was followed in the town of Welland. The Government organs there represented that Farnham was in want of public buildings, and that if it expected to get public buildings it must send a member to support the Government; in other words, although the town claimed to be justly entitled to them, still it would not get what it was entitled to unless it sent to Parliament a supporter of the Government. We have a small town of 300 families or 1,520 souls altogether, and with a postal revenue of something like $1,900, getting public buildings, while they are denied to larger places, simply because the people of Missisquoi returned Mr. Baker a supporter of the Government, instead of the gentleman who opposed him, and who was a member up to 1891. Now, Sir, it has been charged over and over again on this side, and but faintly contradicted on the other side, that these public buildings are being used for the purpose of bribing the constituencies; and I appeal to hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House if it is not in itself a suspicious circumstance that this small town on the eve of an election should be promised by one of the candidates running there that public buildings would be procured for that town if he were elected, and that immediately after his election the construction of these public buildings has commenced.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you know that such a promise was made?

Mr. LISTER. I know it was made in the county. I know that in West Farnham, before the election

took place, it was said all over the county that if Mr. Baker was elected they would get public buildings.

Mr. FOSTER. Did Mr. Baker say so?

Mr. LISTER. He allowed his friends to say so, the press of the county said so, and subsequent events showed that his friends had good reason for making that promise. If the Government were governed by the necessities of the case, are there not a dozen of towns more entitled to public buildings than West Farnham? There is but a small revenue from the post office there, and I will venture to say very little indeed from customs and none at all from excise. What necessity was there for this building except to influence the vote. Session after session the Government have been asked by the people of Wookstock, which has a postal revenue of $15,000 a year and a large customs and inland revenue income, for a public building. The town of Sarnia yields a revenue of $9,600 from the post office alone besides a very large revenue from customs and excise. There is a large number of people employed and the offices are at considerable distances, but the Government, notwithstanding it is a place of 7,000 inhabitants and situated on the frontier, and notwithstanding the matter has been brought before them from session to session, have never seen the necessity for constructing a public building there. Yet they can see necessity for putting one at the small town of Farnham. The Government ought to come forward boldly and admit at once that they are using public moneys for the purpose of entrenching themselves in power, and not come with the shallow excuse that they are moved by public interest. No language can be too strong to condemn these expenditures. The Government are not only wasting the money of the country, but are corrupting and debauching the electors. Is there under the broad canopy of heaven any other country governed like this? I believe that if we were not a law-abiding people the Government would be expelled by force. In Central America I believe the Government is pure compared with the administration of public affairs in this country. What do we find? We find a Government exacting from the contractors——

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. It is now half-past two o'clock, and about time the hon. gentleman should restrict himself to the question, and not waste our time discussing general charges.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We are discussing as distinct and clear a bribe as was ever offered any constituency.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has no right to say so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have. The very statement made by the Minister of Public Works proves it.

Mr. FOSTER. It proves nothing of the kind.

Mr. LISTER. I think we have a perfect right to draw the inference which reasonable men draw from the admitted condition of affairs. The Government never found that this small town of Farnham was in want of a public building until immediately before the election, and then they discovered that this little town of 1,520 inhabitants, yielding a postal revenue of $1,900 and nothing from inland revenue or excise, required an expensive building for its public business. We find that in doubtful constituencies the Government, in order to secure the election of their friend, at once propose to help their friends by a public building. We find that in West Middlesex, in the Counties of Bruce and Haldimand and in a dozen other counties of Ontario, the Government never could see that the towns were entitled to public buildings until they returned supporters of the Government. And we find that in all these elections in the press and on the platform, the people are told repeatedly that unless they elect Government supporters they need not expect these favours. Could such a thing happen in Great Britain? Would there be found a man there who would so demean himself as to say to a constituency, if you return a supporter of the Government we will give you something; if you do not, you will be refused? Could you find it in any other country? In the United States the revenue must justify the expenditure before any public building is erected. There is no tampering with contracts there as here, but a different policy is pursued over in that country at which hon. gentlemen never lose an opportunity of sneering. In that country what has appeared in the daily *Globe* for the last few days would have driven any member of the Opposition out of office, but here, instead of being driven out of office, he appoints his own judges and draws his own indictment.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister o Public Works if the land for the post office has yet been bought?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Mr. MULOCK. When was it decided to put a post office there?

Mr. OUIMET. Last year.

Mr. MULOCK. What cost?

Mr. OUIMET. $11,000.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the estimated cost of maintenance?

Mr. OUIMET. About $250.

Mr. MULOCK. How is that made up?

Mr. OUIMET. The postmaster will be given his lodging in the post office. There will be $100 for fuel, $40 for lighting, and the balance will no doubt go as an indemnity to the postmaster for taking care of the building.

Mr. MULOCK. What does the post office cost at present?

Mr. OUIMET. I understand $80 a year.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the allowance made, and the postmaster supplies the accommodation?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. What will it cost under the new arrangement for the interest on construction, and the maintenance, wear and tear, and so on.

Mr. OUIMET. The interest on $10,000 at 4 per cent would be $400 a year.

Mr. MULOCK. I presume that before making the change, the Minister has made an estimate so as to draw a comparison between the present cost and the cost under the new arrangement?

Mr. OUIMET. This information was given last year when the House was invited to make an appropriation.

Mr. MULOCK. It is the duty of the hon. gentleman, as the successor of the former incumbent of his office, to give us the information.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was furnished last year.

Mr. MULOCK. If the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) knows more about it than the Minister, he had better get up and give us the information.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was here last year and heard it, and you voted for it as well as I did.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman states what is untrue when he states I voted for it.

Mr. TAYLOR. You did not vote against it.

Mr. MULOCK. I disapprove of many things which I do not vote against. The member for Leeds may as well try to be truthful and honest. I will address myself to the Chair. You, Mr. Chairman, represent an intelligent constituency———

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DENISON). I do not think you have any right to refer to the person who may be occupying the Chair.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I will refer to you as if you were not in the Chair. I will refer to what I think would be the duty of the member for West Toronto, and I think he would agree with me, if he were doing his duty in his place, that this transaction was not one which could be approved of in our part of the country. I would ask the Minister of Public Works whether, in determining upon this grant, he took into consideration the requirements of other sections of the Dominion?

Mr. OUIMET. We have given the information several times before, and the hon. gentleman has put the same question on every vote.

Mr. MULOCK. I have never asked that question before, but I ask now if the Government considered the requirements of other portions of the Dominion when they decided upon making this grant.

Mr. OUIMET. We have.

Mr. MULOCK. Then you have decided adversely to all places which are not named in the Estimates, and I desire to know on what grounds you have decided adversely to populous cities and towns in Ontario and favourably to the insignificant village of West Farnham?

Mr. OUIMET. I object to that mode of discussing the matter. If the hon. gentleman has anything to say against this vote he may say it, and may repeat it once or twice or ten times or twelve times or a hundred times, and, if we choose to answer him a hundred times, we will do so, but, if the House does not think it necessary, I shall not feel that we should be asked to answer him every time.

Mr. MULOCK. Of course the hon. gentleman must have weighed the information before him before he came to the judicial conclusion to propose this vote, and we are entitled to the evidence he had. I do not wonder at his becoming impatient when he finds that he cannot in decency confess the reasons which impelled him to arrive at this conclusion, or at his endeavouring by a sort of bravado to escape from the dilemma in which he has placed himself. We are considering how we can best apply the public resources, and it is our duty to consider how best to supply the needs of all parts of the Dominion. Before I can agree, for one, to sanction the expenditure of this money in this spot, I would like to know if it would not be better expended, say in Woodstock with ten times the population and ten times the return to the treasury, of this little village? The Minister can, of course, call upon all those gentlemen behind him to support him, and they may ultimately prevail, but they should do it with a knowledge of what their duty is, and not simply as machines. The Minister evidently considers those gentlemen behind him as nothing but machines.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. OUIMET. State your point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that the Minister thinks the gentlemen behind him are machines. It is an insult both to the Minister and to the House.

Mr. MULOCK. State your point of order. You have no right to make a speech.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DENISON). I do not think it is proper——

Mr. MULOCK. Let me say something on this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Finance is not the only member who has a right to address remarks to you. I draw my inference from the action of the Minister of Public Works. He will not give his reasons for the action he has taken, and he is calling upon his supporters to vote this money without giving any reasons, and I reassert that any Minister who does that, without giving reasons, is not treating his supporters as reasonable beings, but as puppets.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DENISON). I cannot quite agree with the hon. member. He stated that the gentlemen behind the Government benches were machines.

Mr. MULOCK. You had better know your facts first. I said the Minister thought they were machines.

The CHAIRMAN (MR. DENISON). Of course, if you say you did not state that, it is different.

Mr. MULOCK. I said the Minister seemed to think they were machines.

Mr. BOWELL. You said they were machines.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not.

Mr. BOWELL. They are not as much machines as you are. You have been driven to-night like a pack of dogs.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is only right that the Minister should tell us why he decided in favour of a grant for this small spot and against larger and more populous towns. It is his bounden duty to give us that information, and if he refuses to do so, it is the bounden duty of the committee to refuse him the grant.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. I have been thirty years in public life, and I must say that to-night I have seen hon. gentlemen making the greatest public exhibition of themselves that I ever saw public men make. When hon. gentlemen look across this House and call us voting machines, and look into the faces of these Ministers and say that we should be compelled by force to vote against this item, I wonder what conclusion we can come to

as men of honour, and men of dignity. Now, I think it is fair and right to discuss these questions, every question in an honourable and fair manner, but I do abhor slinging dirt across the House. I respect every man, let every man think as he wishes, but I think that every man in this House should be a gentleman no matter on which side he sits. I am surprised to hear these remarks uttered on the floor of this House. I am a humble farmer, but thank God I have common understanding, and the common honesty to treat my opponents in a fair and honourable way. I am sorry to sit here and listen to what I have heard. We have had religion, creed and everything else. Now, I want to know what all these side issues have to do with this question. I am willing to sit here day after day, and night after night, and discuss and criticise every item that comes before you, but when hon. gentlemen look across the floor of this House and look over the heads of these Ministers and in their faces, and say we are voting machines, I draw the line there. When hon. gentlemen look across the floor of this House and in the face of these Ministers and say that they will compel us by force, I draw the line. It cannot be done. I am willing to discuss these things squarely and above board, but do not throw challenges across this House, because if you do you will find men to take them up.

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) I would like to ask the hon. Minister ——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there are rules which govern the debates in this House. I ask for your protection. I wish to know whether you are able to see the dignity of the House respected. It is impossible to discuss this item as long as the members of the right will continue to make such a noise. Well, since there is no stopping it, I will try to put in English the remarks I was about to offer.

(In English.) I thought I had a perfect right to speak to the Minister of Public Works in his own language. I was about asking the Minister several questions when an hon. gentleman behind him stood up and spoke upon every concievable and inconceivable question, except the question before the Chair. He spoke of a great many matters which have no connection whatever with the Farnham post office. He told us, for instance, that he was thirty years in public life. Nobody disputed that. That matter is not before the Chair now. We are delighted to know that the hon. gentleman is thirty years in public life, and if our wishes were carried out he would be thirty years more in public life.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The item is West Farnham. You had better not follow his example.

Mr. DEVLIN. Well, I have so seldom reason to follow the example of a Conservative, that I was availing myself of this opportunity now, and you pick a quarrel with me.

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) I wanted to answer the arguments of the gentleman who preceded me, but interruptions are constantly disturbing the thread of my speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) I am speaking to the question. The post office at Farnham gave last year a revenue of $1,998.58. That is the figure which we find in the report of the Postmaster General. It appears that the hon. Postmaster General told us to-night that the reason for which the Government undertook this work was that it had been promised some time ago.

(In English.) There is an interesting little bit of history in connection with this post office. The Minister of Public Works said that certain engagements were made, and as the result these buildings are being carried out. We all know that the member for Missisquoi was elected to this House at the general election in 1891. A protest was entered against his return, and it was expected that another election would take place. Engagements were entered into about that time for the construction of this public building in Farnham, not before the general election but after it, and immediately preceding the anticipated bye-election. The question is, had this promise anything to do with this proposed expenditure?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. DEVLIN. The Minister of Public Works was not Minister at that time, and perhaps he has inaugurated a new way of doing things. No doubt the hon. member for Algoma will find no fault with this expenditure.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). No.

Mr. DEVLIN. That hon. gentleman found no fault with the Bancroft affair or with the Harris expenditure, or with any other expenditure made by the Government. He is satisfied to whiten whatever they ask him to whiten. I brought up the night before last, last night and again to-night, the question of the Buckingham post office, because the necessity for the construction of public buildings is stated by the Minister to be the cause of this expenditure. I have pointed out that Buckingham is ahead of Farnham. We have recently had the verdict of the people, and we are satisfied with the verdict rendered.

Mr. BOWELL. Once in a while you are satisfied.

Mr. DEVLIN. We had a verdict in Welland and were satisfied; in Lincoln and were satisfied; in Prescott and were satisfied, and we will have no doubt a satisfactory verdict in Pontiac.

Mr. BOWELL. We do not begrudge 4 out of 20.

Mr. DEVLIN. It is he and other gentlemen like him who charge us with obstruction when we are actively engaged trying to find out how public money is expended. The population of Farnham is 1,520 and the revenue from the post office last year was only $1,998. As I take from the blue-book, the Postmaster General's Report——

An hon. MEMBER. It is the Dairy Report you have got.

Mr. DEVLIN. It is not. I believe the hon. gentleman likes cream, and probably that is the reason he called it the Dairy Report. Of course the explanation given for the erection of this building is that the present Minister of Public Works was not in office when these public building were promised, and that he is merely carrying out promises made anterior to his reign. It is very satisfactory to know from this statement that he will in all probability drop this kind of policy, and it is in the interest of the country that it should be

dropped. The hon. gentleman said this afternoon that we, the members of the Province of Quebec, complained bitterly that money was expended in that province. I, for one, represent a county in which money has been expended by the Dominion Government, and I am quite satisfied with the expenditure that has been made. I do not complain bitterly of that expenditure, but we do complain, not that money has been expended in the Province of Quebec, but that money has been expended in localities where it might not have been expended, and that it has not been expended in places where it could have been expended with advantage to the country. It would be much better to keep this money and expend it in the town of Buckingham.

Mr. CAMERON. Would not that be unlimited bribery?

Mr. DEVLIN. No; because the Government does not expect my support.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said all these votes were unlimited bribery.

Mr. DEVLIN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He said nothing about placing this $8,000 in Buckingham.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Would not Woodstock be a good place?

Mr. DEVLIN. Yes, and I have no doubt that Sudbury would be a better place than West Farnham. Will the hon. gentleman dispute that statement?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I might.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman say that the money is better expended in Farnham than in the most important town in his district?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). There are twenty places in Algoma that will readily take it.

Mr. CAMERON. What about Buckingham?

Mr. DEVLIN. I am afraid we shall have to wait for a change before we get a building there. Let me point out that it is very wrong to turn this very serious matter of the claim of the town of Buckingham into a joke. It is no joke.

Mr. CAMERON. What is the population of Buckingham?

Mr. DEVLIN. The population of Buckingham is something over 2,000.

Mr. CAMERON. By sexes, please.

Mr. DEVLIN. We do not take the population by sexes up there, and I could not give it by sexes. We have not the hon. gentleman's sex in our county, I do not know to what sex he belongs. I never saw anything like it until I came to this House. I was about to say that there are many places in the Province of Quebec where this money could be expended with more advantage and propriety than in West Farnham, and inasmuch as it is probable that this expenditure is the result of an engagement made in view of a bye-election, now that the bye-election is over, and the Government has that support, will it not be as well to try and save the country this money, and not incur the beginning of an expenditure of which the Government does not know the end?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the hue and cry which greeted the remarks of my hon. friend from Ottawa when he spoke in French, I intend to use the French language, and I hope that the hon. members on the Government side will be good enough to listen to what I have to say. I understand that the question now to be decided is that of voting to the town of Farnham the sum of $4,000 for the putting up of a post office building. I was not present at the whole debate which took place this evening, but I understand that the hon. Minister of Public Works admitted that the site for this building has not yet been bought.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) How do you know, since you were not here?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) That is why I was careful not to assert that the hon. gentleman had said so. Although the site has not been bought, we are asked to vote an additional sum to that which was put last year at the Government's disposal. I understand why we are asked to vote this item. In the famous gerrymandering Bill, it was intended to ask the House to put this town of Farnham in the County of Rouville, where the Liberal majority would thereby be increased, while thereby also the chances of Conservative candidates would be bettered in Missisquoi.

Mr. OUIMET. Si non e vero e bene trovato.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The hon. Minister is quoting an Italian saying which could be better applied. However, I think I may state that what I say is true; and if the idea has been abandoned, it was not owing to any spirit of justice towards the Liberal party. It seems that the hon. member for Missisquoi is quite seriously attached to this little town, and he applied to the Government for a few cents more for Farnham in order to secure a majority in that town. It is then that the Government resolved to get this sum voted in order to make Farnham a Conservative town. When it was thought of annexing Farnham to Rouville, the intention was to get rid in Missisquoi of a somewhat Liberal locality, but it was thought since that this annexation could be avoided with the help of a vote of $4,000. However, I believe that the electors of Farnham are intelligent enough not to allow themselves to be caught by this trick, and that at election time the Government will find that they will not have succeeded in buying them with this sum. Can it be claimed that there be any proper reason for voting a sum of $4,000 for a building the site of which is not yet bought? I find, Mr. Chairman, that the intention is to do with the town of Farnham what is being done with the village of Laprairie. It is evident that the Government do business like children. If we take the case of Laprairie, we see that the Government is building a post office on ground that does not belong to it but which belongs to the municipal corporation? Now, what will happen when the building is done. When the expenditure is done, when some $20,000, perhaps, are spent, for it is probable that the total cost will reach that figure, the corporation will then claim the price for the site, and the Government will have to pay the price asked. Is that a course to be followed by a serious Government? Would a Government mindful of public interests put up such an expensive building on a site which does not belong to it, running the

risk of having the owners come and claim the price for their property? This, I believe, would be enough to show that these are reckless expenses, the object of which is only to tempt the electors and induce them to vote for the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question. question.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I hear hon. gentlemen telling me to speak to the question. If these gentlemen understood French, they would know that I am at the very heart of the question. The Government want to do at Farnham what they did at Laprairie. They want to spend money without even owning the site for the proposed building, without even taking the minor precautions which a Government mindful of its duty should take. Now, it will be said, why should one oppose the building of a post office in a town like Farnham? I understand all the importance of Farnham. I know that this town would be very prosperous if its progress was not checked by the Government's policy. It is known that the main industry in Farnham is the manufacture of sugar. There is to be found there a manufactory of beet-root sugar, and I believe it is the only one in the Dominion of Canada. According to the census, this town had in 1891 a population of 1,520 souls. There is no doubt that, if the Government wanted to protect this sugar industry as they protect the combines which we have in the city of Montreal, Farnham would soon have a considerable importance, and that there would then be some justification for the construction of a post office such as is proposed now. But what do the Government do? While they propose to build a post office in this town, which is nothing but an electoral scheme by which they want to reward the electors for the support they have given to the Conservative candidate in the last election, they undermine and destroy entirely the only industry which gave Farnham the importance it has to-day, the beet-root sugar industry. Why do not the Government give Farnham the protection it has a right to expect for this infant industry? They prefer to secure some more public money for the reptile fund which will be used to corrupt the electors when election time shall have come. The town of Farnham is entitled to get from the Government a certain protection, but it is not a post office building that it wants. Efforts should be made to maintain in Farnham the industry which made its prosperity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question. question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member should speak on the question.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I am altogether in order, Mr. Chairman, and it is my right to discuss the question from whatever standpoint I may choose. I understand why the Government refuse to grant this industry the protection to which it is entitled. It is because the effect of this would be to remove the agricultural class from the false position in which it is found now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question. question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I am in order. I do not know whether Mr. Chairman understands French or not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Not very much.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Well, I think it is a very singular thing for me to be called to order by the Chairman of the committee, when he admits himself that he does not understand French. Had he followed the thread of my argument from the beginning, I believe he would not do what he does now. I say that it is not by giving a post office building to Farnham, or by voting $4,000 as a bait for votes, that they will encourage the industry which alone will cause this place to progress. It is not because a post office shall have been given to Farnham that the electors will be pleased and will vote for the member for Missisquoi. This expenditure of public money, under the circumstances, is not serious, for the two reasons which I mentioned. I see by the report of the Auditor General that there is in the Province of Quebec a large number of towns and villages which are much more important than Farnham, and which nevertheless get no grant for post office buildings. The reason of it is that those towns and villages are represented in this House by Liberal members. The town of Coaticook has a population of 3,086 souls. Its post office gave last year a revenue of $3,466.85; however, nothing is done to endow that town with a post office building, because it is represented by a Liberal member. What difference is there between Coaticook and Farnham? Farnham has only a population of 1,520 souls, while the population of the other is 3,086. Coaticook has progressed at a great rate during the last twenty years, while Farnham, in consequence of the policy of the Minister of Finance, has not progressed as much as it should have done. The village of Buckingham gave last year a revenue of $2,627.66. In 1871 this village had only a population of 1,301 inhabitants; in 1881 its population was 1,479, and in 1891 it was 2,239. That is a progressive town, which, owing to the development of mines in the neighbourhood, will before many years attain a considerable degree of importance. Why not give it a post office building? I notice that French speaking is bringing harmony among us. It was not so the other day, when we had to deal with the question of the abolition of the French language in the North-West, for there was a division. I believe that the member for Missisquoi has too much tenderness for Farnham, which causes him to forget certain other parts of his county. I will mention Cowansville, the post office of which gave last year a revenue of $2,117.75, while that of Farnham did not reach $2,000. But I see by the report on last elections that this member had a considerable majority at Cowansville, while he was in a minority at Farnham. If he had wanted to reward his friends, and not use this money for electoral purposes, he would have given his influence in favour of Cowansville, which gave him a majority of 60, while in Farnham he had a minority of 100. Cowansville has a larger population and more importance than Farnham and it should have had the preference. As another example, I will speak of Danville, which is represented by the hon. member for Richmond. I am surprised to see this member taking so much interest in Farnham, while neglecting Danville, although that locality gave last year a revenue of $2,228.39. Why does he not use his influence with the Government to have a post office given to Danville? Surely he is not sent here to work for

the County of Missisquoi? If he does not do so, it is because he is led by partisan spirit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is just possible that many of my hon. friends would like to hear in English what we have just heard in French. But I would just suggest to the Minister of Finance that possibly it might be deferred until concurrence if he is disposed to take this item and rise now.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite well disposed to take this item, but I do not think, after the many hours that have been occupied in what I think a majority of the House will consider has not been a very profitable discussion, and one meant for a purpose, that it is possible to separate from this festive gathering without getting a few more items.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In that case we will proceed with the discussion of West Farnham; we have no objection if the hon. gentleman has none. But I may remind him that up to the present time no reasonable ground has been given for this vote at all; and, although we are willing to give him until concurrence to find reasons for it, we are prepared to go on now quite as long as he is, and I hope that my hon. friend who has just spoken will do us the favour of repeating to us in English before we separate what he has said in French, as to what the hon. Minister says he has no right to complain. Here his Government have come down with all sorts of propositions, which are utterly indefensible; and they have not given one solitary excuse for asking for this vote for West Farnham, a little village smaller than two or three hundred other places which do not possess similar accommodation. They have shown no justification for it, and my hon. friends here are most undoubtedly justified in calling the attention of the country to the gross immorality of these transactions. There can be no doubt whatever that this vote for West Farnham was not in the public interest, is not in the public interest, is in no way demanded by any pledge the Government have given. The Government tell us now that they are bound to expend this money, because, forsooth, it appeared in the Estimates of 1891. Well, as I have pointed out to the House again and again, when it does not suit the Government's purposes to allow a vote of this kind to be expended—if, for instance, the County of Missisquoi had returned a supporter of the Opposition in place of a supporter of the Government, judging by their previous conduct and all our past experience of them, we have a perfect right to say that these hon. gentlemen would not have taken the smallest step to implement their so-called promise or pledge; but because they have got a supporter there, because they succeeded in displacing a supporter of the Opposition, for that reason and for no other they are prepared to give to this little village of three hundred families an expenditure which they deny to towns of very important character, having very large revenues, not merely in the Province of Ontario, but in the Province of Quebec itself, and in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Therefore, they have no sort of right to complain if every possible opposition is shown by us to giving them a vote which they are deliberately using, I repeat again, for the purpose of bribing the electors of West Farnham and Missisquoi.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has been quite as strong in his assertions as in his best and palmiest days—more strong, I should think, than one would have expected after this long strain of endurance for so many hours. However, he has done justice to his habits of extravagance and of using strong language. Now, without meeting my hon. friend in that respect, suppose we take a calm view of the situation. These items which we have been discussing for three days constitute about three items of unimportant public buildings.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are not unimportant.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will please allow me my opinion about these things as I allow him his. They are comparatively unimportant public buildings. All but one of them, as has been pointed out time and again, is the continuation of an old vote which began two or three years ago and has been passed upon by the House two or three times. They are all of such a nature that they constitute an obligation, and on two or three occasions hon. gentlemen opposite have acknowledged that they looked upon them in that light. The buildings have been commenced.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is not—

Mr. FOSTER. In so far as a vote has been taken, and to that extent the House is pledged to the people of Farnham to carry on this building. The hon. gentleman says it is for the purpose of bribery. A younger member of this Parliament, but one almost as audacious as my hon. friend, and who, in the course of time, no doubt will constitute a fair rival, commenced by stating that this was promised by the Government. When challenged to prove this, he left that position and went on to state it was promised by the candidate. When asked to prove that, he acknowledged he had no proof, but said it was promised by the friends of the candidate. Now, hon. gentlemen will admit, if they take a calm view, that it is impossible to hold the Government or a party to statements made by canvassers in a county during the course of a general election. If they do, they will find they will have quite as many sins in that respect to answer for themselves. There is a direct connection between hon. gentlemen opposite and a great party in the Province of Quebec, which has unfortunately been under a cloud, and is now decimated and shorn of its leadership. They were part of that party and that party was part of them. They worked hand-in-glove together. The policy of the one was the policy of the other. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very free with their assertions regarding this side of the House. Let them look at home. Let my hon. friend go to the Province of Ontario and take his brother politician and partner, although of a different stamp from himself, Mr. Mowat, and look at his elections, and if he applies that rule, he has only to go down to the election in Kington, three months ago, when Mr. Mowat's representative, Mr. Harty, was a candidate, and he will find that in that canvass the most audacious and open bribery pledges were made in order to elect Mr. Harty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What were they?

Mr. FOSTER. They were made in that constituency, in the press, and upon the public platform.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What were they ?

Mr. FOSTER. I would not insult the intelligence of hon. gentlemen by endeavouring to explain to them what they know well enough. My hon. friend has no proof at all that this is bribery. It is not. West Farnham is not a large town, I admit, but it is larger than many which have had public buildings during the last ten or twelve years, in pursuance of the plan upon which these buildings were granted to various places. This is not the smallest town by any means. It is a growing town, a railway centre ; it has a comparatively large revenue, about $2,000 postal revenue ; and in response to the representations of the inhabitants and of their representative, it was decided two years ago that a public building should be placed there for a post office—not an expensive one, but one which would only cost $10,000. Now, we may have different opinions as to whether or not a place of that size should have a public building ; but what I state is that during the last ten or fourteen years, places as small and smaller have had public buildings, and this is one of that class. It does not come under any new policy, and the Government will show by the appropriations hereafter to be brought before the House its policy with reference to this matter, and that policy will be found to commend itself to all reasonable men. These, then, being old votes, the principle has been affirmed. They have been discussed for three whole days, but still my hon. friend and those who vote with him have undertaken to say that they shall not pass except when they are willing to allow them to pass. The minority, which has come from the country defeated and discredited, is in the face of a Government fresh from the country with a large majority and the approval of the country behind them. It is our duty to carry on public business. It is our duty to see that the public service is provided for, even if necessary to oppose endurance to endurance and physical vigour to physical vigour, in order that the public service may be provided for and the ends of government carried out. We are not unreasonable. Hon. gentlemen have for three days had their own way in this matter. There is not a charge that ever originated in even their fertile brains which they have not flung across the Chamber during the last three days. They have been allowed to do that unimpeded and unobstructed while discussing items which, on ordinary occasions, with fair work, would be passed in the course of an hour. The time has come when the majority must assert itself in this House, and show that they are able to fulfil their duty of carrying the Estimates and going on with the service of the country. We ask nothing unreasonable. Hon. gentlemen may discuss the questions as long as they see fit, provided they discuss them reasonably. They say their arguments have not been met. They have made none. Any information asked for was given by the Minister over and over again. One of the items discussed to-night was one which had been introduced in 1889 by the then Minister of Public Works, who gave the cost of the building, the revenue and every detail in answer to questions put to him by hon. gentlemen opposite. There was not an hon. gentleman on that side who had a word to say against it, and that item was the Laprairie post office. Mr. Doyon himself got up and congratulated the Minister of Public Works upon doing justice to his county by putting in that vote for the post office. He called attention to it the second time, and hon. gentlemen opposite who knew the whole cost and the revenue, and whose party was just as strong, though not so excited, at that time as it is now, sat dumb because the county was represented by one of themselves. They permitted what they now call an outrage, and they permitted it for party interests. Then when another gentleman was returned and the Government carried out the policy they began, these hon. gentlemen have taken upon themselves, because, forsooth, the Government did not drop the item, to air their ferocious virtue, as it was described by the hon. member for Bagot, and they have been now for the last twenty-four hours howling about the same post office which they never said a word against when a representative of their own stripe happened to be in the House from the county. I do not intend to be unreasonable, but I do intend to try and make progress. And if hon. gentlemen opposite are not reasonable in the matter, let the country judge between us. We are here after a long period of the session. We have not had extraordinary heavy business to carry on. It was stated yesterday afternoon that the Government business was not early before the House. Why, Sir, the time has not been for the last two months when these estimates have not been brought before the House on every possible occasion, but there has not been an ordinary session, in my experience at all events, where such floods of useless talk, not connected with any pertinent subject, have flowed from hon. members as during this session, though it has not been a very important session. I think my hon. friend opposite is unreasonable in the first place in asking that these long speeches shall be repeated on concurrence, and then in the second place in dictating to the majority and to the Government that we shall pass this one item and then adjourn. I am willing to put a reasonable proposition before my hon. friend. Let us go to work as business men and pass the items in No. 144 and 145, and go home sensibly and get our breakfast.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly not. No. 145 contains a great number of items which will require discussion when the various members of the House who are not here now will be present. I entirely object to taking up new business after 4 o'clock in the morning. There is a great deal to be said on this matter of West Farnham. We are quite within our right in comparing it with other towns and villages with a larger revenue which are not provided for, and we shall have the right to discuss it on concurrence whenever we are disposed. If the hon. gentleman proposes to go on with 145, we may as well have the discussion on West Farnham now as at any other time. In regard to what he has stated, he entirely misconceives his position here and the position of the Government. The business of the Government is to come down here, and, whether the matter has been voted on by a previous Parliament or not, to give intelligent reasons, in answer to questions put to them from this side, for the expenditure which they propose to make, and it is our right and our privilege to criticise that expenditure and those answers, whether they were given last year or the year before or the year before that,

and no one should know better than the Minister of Finance that we are here to obtain information from the Government, that we are not here to be referred, as the Minister of Public Works would refer us, to the *Hansard* of last year. We are here to hear what the Minister of Public Works has to say in regard to any item which is submitted to us. Half the questions which have been put to him from this side of the House were not answered at all, either last night or the night before. He did not appear to have studied his brief, or to have made himself acquainted with these numerous details with which a Minister of Public Works is expected to be acquainted. The Minister of Public Works and the Ministers generally have only themselves to thank for the prolongation of the discussion, which might have been over hours ago if they had kept their followers in order. When my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan), who does not use words needlessly, who does not address the House very often, and who always has something to say worth listening to, was speaking, it is within your recollection, Sir, for you were in the Chair at the time, that he was subjected to a period of continuous interruption lasting over twenty minutes, by actual count, before he could say what he desired to say. The hon. gentleman has no right to state that it is from this side of the House that the delay has come. We are perfectly within our right in discussing these items. I do not care whether Laprairie was smuggled through the House two or three sessions ago or not. We all know very well that a great many of these items have been smuggled through the House, that they have been taken up at hours when those who would take part in them otherwise were absent, where no attention was paid to them, so that votes of that kind were allowed to slip through. I do not recollect—and I am generally here when the Estimates are under discussion—any discussion taking place in regard to Laprairie before. I do not think any did take place, but at all events the thing was allowed to pass with very little discussion. No doubt, if the facts which were disclosed the other night had been previously disclosed, there would have been discussion. But it does not matter. The question is whether the particular vote at present before you should be passed, whether it is a wise and proper expenditure of public money or not. Hon. gentlemen cannot say that with reference to Farnham, which was not discussed at all. Moreover, I deny the correctness of the hon. gentleman's statement that he and the Government of which he is a member have felt themselves bound in the slightest degree, when it did not suit their convenience, by any vote for a purpose of this kind. When it suits their convenience, they felt bound by the vote, but when it did not, as in the case of Lunenburg and others, they did not feel at all bound. They have played fast and loose with these votes. They have used the money which Parliament has voted for base and unworthy practices, and it is time that this should be made unpleasant to them. We are not staying here and debating this for any purpose except to call public attention to the base use these hon. gentlemen have been making of the public money, that for years back this whole Public Works Department has been nothing more or less than a means to exact contributions to the reptile fund, as has been abundantly shown by our committees last year, and as is being shown from day to day by the records which are being published in the *Globe* newspaper, which show that the member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) alone, obtained $15,000 of stolen money, money stolen from the public treasury, with the aid and assistance of some at any rate of his colleagues for the purpose of debauching the constituencies. These items in the Estimates have been one of the most fertile means of corrupting the constituencies. This case of Laprairie is one instance, that of Farnham is another, and Richmond is another. I do not know whether St. Henri comes into that category, but it is an expenditure for which no justification has been shown by the Minister of Public Works or any of the howling dervishes behind him or the Minister of Militia or any one else.

Mr. FOSTER. Just a word or two as to what the hon. gentleman has said, because I do not propose to aid him in his purpose of obstruction by taking up much time. First, as to his facts. He implied that the vote for Laprairie was smuggled through. It was not smugled through. It was discussed, some of the most brilliant financial talkers opposite took part in it, and they handled it very mildly because Mr. Doyon was sitting with them. With reference to West Farnham, the hon. gentleman says it was not discussed in this House. It was discussed in this House, if my memory serves me, for two or three evenings, and after it was discussed it was passed and was so affirmed. Now, I am not asking anything unreasonable, I ask that No. 145 be taken, as well as the remaining items of 140. These are nearly all unimportant and old items.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They cover several hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be. You voted the other day for canals in Quebec and Ontario nearly two million dollars in one sitting. Now, all these are items which are in the main simple. The post office business has been pretty well exhausted, and Heaven knows you have made sufficient protest, and you have had your chance to bring it before the country. The other items are matters almost of course, works which have been started and for which appropriations are needed to complete, or for repairs. I ask nothing unreasonable, and I put my case before the House and before the country on that simple proposition. I ought to have asked more, but I do not. Now, as to the reptile fund. My hon. friend is very fond of bringing up the reptile fund. Some of these days he will get enough of that reptile fund in this House, and if no one else does it, I propose to take the matter in hand myself. I say to him, and I would say to his leader if he were there, that gentlemen are sitting on those benches to-day, and the number that you have is made up of men who are in their seats and voting on that side, because they were bought or kept in their places with money stolen from the funds of the Province of Quebec. The great Reform party, that paragon of virtue, that stands up here night after night thanking Heaven they are not as other men, that great Reform party have not the common honesty to pay back into the depleted funds of Quebec the sums of money which members of that party on sworn evidence know to have been stolen from the public funds, and which they

acknowledge was used for the purposes of the party contests and protests.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that there are several strangers upon the floor of this House. In the first place, there is one gentleman masquerading as the member for North Ontario (Mr. Madill), and another masquerading as the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), it seems to me, who are acting as no member of the House should act. These strangers ought to be expelled.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not see any strangers in the House.

Mr. CASEY. I say that there are individuals here acting as no member of the House certainly should act, and assumed that they must be strangers. In regard to the speech of the Minister of Finance, no course of conduct could be more cowardly, could be more indecent, could be more in contravention of ordinary parliamentary rules, than for a member to get up and make bald assertions across the floor of the House that members on this side were elected by means of stolen money, when he dare not make his statement on his responsibility as a member and demand an enquiry into the facts. When we have charges to make against that side of the House, we make them on our responsibilities as members. We demand an enquiry before proper tribunals, and they vote it down. They will have no enquiry at all unless they draw the indictments themselves and appoint their own judges. It is very easy for the Finance Minister, knowing that he has a majority at his back, knowing that he is sheltered from all enquiry, to make accusations which he knows to be unfounded against members on this side of the House. He dare not make those accusations in the way in which they have been made from this side. He adopts the cowardly plan of getting behind a stone wall or a stone fence, and throws mud across the floor.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the item?

Mr. CASEY. The item is the Finance Minister, and a very small item he is, an item that never occupied a smaller space in the eyes of the people of this country than he has done to-night. He has taken refuge behind a stone wall, and all the whistles and cat-calls of his followers will not relieve him from the contempt he has earned by his short speech to-night. He says that the Government insist upon making progress with the items under discussion, that the majority have a right to rule. Well, I would ask him in the immortal words of a gentleman whom he ought to know historically, and with whom his Government have had indirect relations—I mean the late lamented Boss Tweed—what is he going to do about it? If he thinks he is going to pass it when he chooses, he is very much mistaken; he is going to pass it when we choose. By making these absurd threats to prevent discussion, he is simply postponing the period when that item will be passed. Those on his side who passed through the fire in 1885 know that nothing is gained by this policy of howling and making noises. If hon. gentlemen have not had enough of it in the past, they will have another lesson now. The Minister of Finance knows himself that the speeches he has made to-night will have the effect of prolonging this discussion

The gentleman must have some object in prolonging this debate, something must yet remain to be brought down which has not been submitted, or he would not have made the speech he delivered to-night. Such a speech could have only one result, namely, to act as a challenge and direct threat to this side of the House. The object of this discussion has been properly stated by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), namely, to draw the attention of the people to these grants under discussion. It is not one grant alone to which we object, but it is to the policy of public bribery with public funds. I challenge the Finance Minister, who did so much mud-throwing to-night, to have an enquiry into the policy of the Government on these matters, to have a detailed examination into all these items, and I challenge him to prove his offensive and indecent insinuations, for they are such unless they are backed up with the motion which should follow. Let us have a full and free enquiry as to the standing of members on both sides, and see who sit here as representatives of stolen money, whether himself and his colleagues or members on this side of the House. Let the hon. gentleman show himself to be a man or a mouse, and let him back up his assertions in the constitutional manner.

Mr. INGRAM. As a young and inexperienced member I have listened to the manner in which the items have been discussed. I have always found that questions bearing on items under consideration are asked the Minister in charge of the department and have been reasonably and courteously answered. I am sure there is a reasonable excuse for the older members making noises, because they have sufficient reason to make them get out of patience with the manner in which these items have been discussed. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) spoke of several matters foreign to the debate and found great fault with the Minister of Finance because he made certain statements. I have listened during the discussion to several charges made by hon. gentlemen opposite, with the Finance Minister. When the Finance Minister had answered different questions put to him by members of the Opposition, and had answered them reasonably and fairly, some other hon. gentlemen opposite would enter the chamber and ask the same questions over again, so that the same answers had to be given two or three times. Does he not think the Minister has good reason to get out of patience with hon. gentlemen opposite? The discussions to-night, last night and the previous night, prove conclusively that they have been obstructing. There can be no reasonable objection to any question being answered by the Minister, but after he has answered the question fairly and squarely, that should be sufficient. Hon. gentlemen opposite have declared their opposition to the policy of the Government as regards constructing public works in different constituencies. That has been repeated not once but a hundred times. After the House understands that the policy of the Opposition is different from that of the Government, hon. gentlemen opposite should go to the country and explain their position. It is high time to drop these discussions of outside matters and proceed with the Estimates in a business-like manner, and such is the opinion of a young and inexperienced member of this House.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat need scarcely have gone to the trouble of informing us that he is a young and inexperienced member. But this hon. gentleman has tried to lecture this side of the House.

Mr. INGRAM. I was defending myself as a young and inexperienced member from the charge that I was misconducting myself.

Mr. LISTER. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman was included in those who were disturbing the quietness of the Chamber. The Minister of Finance spoke very warmly as to the manner in which these items were being criticised. I entered the House the same session the Finance Minister appeared, and I will remind that hon. gentleman that previous to 1878 the Government was carried on by the late Mr. Mackenzie, and the late Sir John Macdonald was then leader of the Opposition. I would remind the House that the present Minister of Militia was one of the greatest obstructionists of those days in Supply, and he kept the House on more than one occasion many hours on what were really unobjectionable items. It is true that within the last two sessions the hon. gentleman has introduced the Estimates at the beginning of the session and proceeded with them when there was nothing else to do, instead of the Estimates being brought down in the middle or latter part of the session. We are now at the end of a three months' session and the important legislation has been brought down only within the last few days.

Mr. FOSTER. We want to clear the decks and be ready for legislation.

Mr. LISTER. Ah, that is what you want. You want to get us through the Estimates and then we are gone. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that when the Supply Bill is passed the Opposition is in the power of the Government. The Minister of Finance has thought proper to throw across the floor of this House charges that hon. members on this side were elected by money stolen from the bankrupt Province of Quebec. If the hon. gentleman believes what he says, it is his duty to at once formulate these charges and to have a committee appointed to try them. If he does not believe them or is not prepared to formulate them in the usual way, then the hon. gentleman should not make them at all. We have formulated our charges and asked for an enquiry, and we have conclusive evidence in the handwriting of certain members of the Government, and of a member who has retired from the Government, that at least 24 gentlemen on the opposite side owe their elections to money received from the reptile fund in the Province of Quebec. They will probably know more about it before the election courts get through with them. They cannot deny that large sums of money were paid by Thomas McGreevy, because we have the written orders. The Government have been afraid to investigate the matter properly, but they have appointed their own judges and changed the form of the indictment. *Grip* has it exactly, where the Postmaster General and the Minister of Justice are judges. The Postmaster General is in the criminal dock, and the Minister of Justice is prosecuting him and the scales of justice are not balanced.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, that is an old cartoon.

Mr. FRASER. Is there any other public building than this in Missisquoi County?

Mr. OUIMET. Not that I know of.

Mr. FRASER. Last session I called the attention of the Government to two places in my own county, Canso and Guysborough, which are larger than Farnham, and I thought from the kindly way in which the present Minister of War spoke that there was going to be something done.

An hon. MEMBER. It may be in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. FRASER. Then I understand the Minister is going to fulfil his promise?

Mr. BOWELL. What promise did I make?

Mr. FRASER. I did not say there was a promise made, but the Minister stated it would be looked into.

Mr. BOWELL. Surely the hon. gentleman does not pretend to say that I would promise that I would look into the question of public buildings at Canso and Guysborough. I did promise the hon. gentleman to look into some smuggling matters, and about the payment of some portions of moieties.

Mr. FRASER. And the Minister has done so. But this was in connection with petitions I presented in respect to a harbour of refuge. I brought up the question of some public buildings for my county last session, and I understood from the kindly way in which it was received that there would be some attention paid to it. I discover now that being unfortunate enough to differ, very mildly perhaps, from the Government, the matter has evidently not been considered. This method of appropriating money is not in the interests of the country, and I am glad to know that a hint has been given that a new method will be followed, but I am afraid that all the bad that can be done will be done before the new method is introduced. Suppose, for example, the Government decide hereafter that only towns of a certain size will receive appropriations, both Canso and Guysborough may be excluded, while in the meantime West Farnham and other small places have got their public buildings. That will be very unfair. It will be unfair that Guysborough should be compelled to do without public buildings when counties supporting the Government are given them. This arises from inaccurate methods of administering the public money. I think it will be found that public buildings have been built in this Dominion on no system at all. For one thing, they have been much too expensive. Unless there are indications that this town is going to grow, the proposed building is altogether too expensive. I think there should be a graduated scale. Half the money might be expended in the meantime, and an opportunity left to enlarge the building in the future, if the growth of the town would justify it. I think, therefore, the Government should announce what the policy will be hereafter in regard to the construction of public buildings, and when that policy will come into operation.

Mr. BOWELL. What better evidence do you want for the future than this, that there is not in these Estimates a single new appropriation?

Mr. LISTER. You said others were to come down in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. BOWELL. I said nothing of the kind. I said you would see when the Supplementary Estimates came down.

Mr. FRASER. If there were to be no appropriations in the Supplementary Estimates, that remark was meaningless.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before the motion is put, I would say that I think the time has arrived when we should adjourn. We have made a good deal of progress during the night, and I think the result of our efforts will be of lasting benefit to the people of Canada. I have no doubt that the little discussion which we have had to-night will save to the people of this country thousands and tens of thousands of dollars. There were never more scandalous estimates submitted to any House than these estimates.

Mr. BOWELL. Use a milder word.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No milder word would express the truth of the matter. Not a single hon. gentleman has ventured to rise in the House and defend these votes, except only so far as to say in some instances that the Government have to go on with the work because they have been pledged to it, but no man has got up to defend them because no defence is possible. It is perfectly ridiculous that public money should be voted for the purposes for which these votes are taken, and I have no doubt that our criticisms of them will have a wholesome effect on the Government and will prevent similar estimates being brought down in future. Therefore I think those who have to defend these votes in the country, and who are in their hearts as much opposed to them as we are, should give us their thanks for the assistance we have given them on this occasion. There are many matters in connection with this question which have not yet been touched upon and I think will require several hours more to discuss, and it would therefore be well that the committee should rise, report progress and ask to sit again.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that, after this debate, it is plain that there was much to be said on the question which is before us. I am going to try to explain as briefly as possible the position I intend to take in this matter. I could sum up my argument with the simple statement of the figures which I find in the last report of the Postmaster General, and which shows that there are in the Province of Quebec 113 post offices yielding more than does that for which we are now asked to give a vote. I will take this opportunity to say a word or two in answer to what has been said by the hon. Minister of Finance, about the alleged corruption practised in the Province of Quebec during the last elections. In a moment of ill-humour, which he must doubtless now regret, the hon. Minister said that at the last elections certain Liberal members had been elected through corruption, and by means of money stolen from the public treasury. It is very curious to see this hon. gentleman with such a paternal solicitude for the Province of Quebec. It is very curious to see this paragon of virtue so mindful of the Province of Quebec, when he and all his Conservative friends protected men that are certainly more guilty and who practised corruption on a much larger scale than Pacaud. The Liberal party has repudiated Pacaud, and I do not see how the Minister of Finance can have the face to say that in the Province of Quebec certain members were elected through corruption, when he and his friends have not the courage to grant an investigation into the more serious charges recently formulated against one of his colleagues. They intend to maintain him here, and they use all means to prevent the truth from being known.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. member ought to speak to the question of the committee rising and reporting progress.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I am, no doubt, an inexperienced member, but I have always understood that on a motion of adjournment one could speak on any subject; besides, my remarks go to answer what was said by the hon. Minister of Finance. But to come back to the question before the House, I will say that the Government has in no way justified the vote which he wants given in favour of the post office at Farnham. I wish to explain in English what I have said in French about Farnham and the beet-root sugar industry.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we should draw the line at beet-root sugar.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are supposed to understand both languages here and the hon. gentleman has no right to repeat in English what he said in French.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have a right to explain in English so that my friends here will know what I said.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a fine constitutional question, Sir, and you must not interfere with the rights of us four Englishmen here who wish to know what was contained in the admirable speech of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Brodeur).

Mr. BRODEUR. The principal industry of Farnham is the beet-root sugar industry, and if the Government refuse to give that industry the bonus which was granted last year the population of that place is sure to decrease. If on the other hand the bonus is given the population will increase, and we must not pass this item until we know that. I understand that the Government is willing to protect all the big monopolies in Montreal who contribute to the reptile fund for election purposes, but they will not give that industry in the town of Farnham justice which it is right it should have.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I regret exceedingly that the Minister of Justice is not here. I would like also to have the senior members of the Cabinet here. I don't care so much to talk to the junior members. I am glad, however, that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is here. I understand that he has been in Stratford and that he delivered an address there on the Farnham post office.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That has nothing to do with the question before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Most undoubtedly it has. This Farnham post office is a matter of great importance. However, the speech was not in Stratford on Monday night, but it was in the *Citizen* on Tuesday morning.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I wish the hon. gentleman would talk to the question before the Chair.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The editor of the *Citizen* has a grand conception of the Farnham post office, and it appears he performed craniotomy on the head of the hon. member for Assiniboia and saw his speech before it was delivered and reported fully in the *Citizen*.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was a serious question. Happily for the country, Farnham has grown a little. It is a most unfortunate thing that the member for Assiniboia did not speak there, because the revenue would have increased and the population would have increased if he had been there.

Motion that Committee rise negatived: Yeas, 8; nays, 37.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved that the item for West Farnham post office be reduced from $4,000 to $10.

[The debate was continued by Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LANDERKIN, Mr. DEVLIN, Mr. DAWSON, Mr. MILLS (Bothwell), Mr. CHARLTON, Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. CHOQUETTE.]

Motion of Sir Richard Cartwright negatived.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 20th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further papers respecting the enforcement by the Newfoundland authorities against Canadian fishing vessels of the Newfoundland Act respecting the sale of bait to foreign vessels.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 20th May, 1892.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, the report of the Royal Commission appointed to investigate the working of the Civil Service Act, and other matters connected with the Civil Service generally.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 20th May, 1892.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of William Findlay Maclean, Esq., for the electoral district of the east riding of the County of York, Ont.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

WILLIAM F. MACLEAN, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of East York; introduced by Mr. Dickey and Mr. Macdonald (Winnipeg).

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Orillia Public Building..... $5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister of Public Works please state the details of this case?

Mr. OUIMET. This vote of $5,000 is required to carry out works during the fiscal year 1892-93, on the projected public building in Orillia, for post office, customs and inland revenue purposes. The total cost is estimated at $19,600, exclusive of the site which has been presented to the Government by the corporation of Orillia. Orillia is a very important town, and the headquarters of the weights and measures inspection district, the inspector residing there. The exports are quite large. The population in 1871 was 1,322; in 1881, 2,911; in 1891, 4,752. The postal revenue was $7,907. The amount of money orders issued and paid last year was $55,000, and the amount of savings bank deposits $26,362.

Mr. MULOCK. Has this work been commenced?

Mr. OUIMET. The work is now under contract, and the name of the contractor is J. R. Legion. The amount of the contract is $10,000; that is, for the foundation, the walls, the flooring and the roof, in fact, the complete building with the exception of the furniture and fittings.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman will see that he is getting in the town of Orillia a public building which is going to serve the several branches of the post office, customs, inland revenue and weights and measures services at a cost of $19,000. Consider what the country is getting for this against the sum spent for a building at Laprairie where the receipts are only $400. No greater condemnation of the acts which the Minister is recommending to this House could be offered than the resolution now before us.

Mr. OUIMET. I rise to a question of order. I think I have borne heavily enough the punishment of all the misdeeds with which I have been reproached during the whole of last night and this morning until ten o'clock, and I think it will be only fair not to return to the same style of discussion or to discuss the items which have been passed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman misunderstands. My hon. friend was pointing out just now that there were really fair reasons for this vote, and although it is not often that we are able to commend the expenditures of the hon. gentleman, we really propose to help him to pass this one with all the good-will in the world.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister quite misapprehended the drift of my argument. I would like to point out, inasmuch as he announced himself as so highly in favour of equal rights, that if he had applied that principle to the Estimates, he would have had a vote of $272,000 for the

building in Orillia if it were to be built on the same scale as that of Laprairie.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What description of building is the hon. gentleman going to erect at Orillia? I have noticed of late that the Public Works Department have adopted a sort of uniform plan for these public buildings, and I am bound to say that it is a considerable improvement on the old style of building that used to be put up. Is this building at Orillia to be on the same lines as others in Ontario, for instance, the Napanee Post Office?

Mr. OUIMET. It is a brick building of two full stories, with stone foundation and stone facings.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does he expect that this $19,000 will complete it?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes. But it does not include the site, which has been donated, and which is worth $5,000 or $6,000.

Petrolea Public Building..... $14,000

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman give particulars of this item?

Mr. OUIMET. This sum, together with the sum of $14,000, which is already voted for the present year, will complete the building which is now under contract. The total cost is estimated at $28,379, including the site. It is on the south-west corner of Victoria Street and Winfield Street, and the lot is 60 feet frontage by 150 feet deep. It was purchased on the 9th of January, 1891, from W. R. Gibson and G. Sampson for $4,000. The building is to accommodate the post office, the custom house and the Inland Revenue Department. The population of the town is 4,357. The postal revenue last year was $6,648.11; the money orders issued and paid amounted to $42,481. The population in the last twenty years has been increasing very rapidly.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the customs and inland revenue?

Mr. OUIMET. The amount is about $25,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About what are we paying for accommodation there?

Mr. OUIMET. $600 altogether.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the estimate of the cost of the maintenance of this building after erection?

Mr. OUIMET. About $600 a year at the outside.

Mr. MULOCK. I hope the hon. gentleman will not be disappointed in that, but I am afraid he will. Why is the Minister expending $28,000 on this building in Petrolea when he is getting a building in Orillia for $19,000?

Mr. OUIMET. We are getting the site free in Orillia. The architect tells me now that the figures for this item of the Petrolea post office have been reduced to $24,000.

Mr. MULOCK. I observe that the selection of the site took place immediately after the elections of 1891. How was the value of the land arrived at?

Mr. OUIMET. The selection of the site was made by the chief architect, as usual, after examination of the different lots offered.

Mr. MULOCK. That will hardly explain how the figures were arrived at.

Mr. OUIMET. The chief architect is doing the same work about a dozen times a year, and he ought to have some experience. The hon. gentleman will agree with me, I think, when I say that it is better to pay even a few dollars more than the market price, in order to avoid the expenditure of expropriating.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the size of the lot?

Mr. OUIMET. It is 60 x 150 feet, right in the centre of the city.

Mr. MULOCK. The Government must have fortified themselves with some figures of a reliable expert before fixing the price.

Mr. OUIMET. The officer of the Government is supposed to be an honest man and an expert in this business.

Mr. MULOCK. That won't do.

Mr. OUIMET. That won't do for the Opposition, I suppose, and we want to be very particular to fortify ourselves against all the attacks and insinuations made against us here. However, I think it will do in the opinion of the people of this country. We have followed the rule of ordinary business intelligence in this matter and our action will, I have no doubt, commend itself to the people of this country.

Mr. MULOCK. It is the duty of the Government to have on record the basis at which these valuations are arrived at. The officer in question may be a very honest man, and I do not doubt it, but he might be incapable of buying land to the best advantage. What steps were taken to see that a fair value was paid?

Mr. OUIMET. I cannot exactly say what was done in this special case, but in a similar case lately a plan of the town was submitted to me and several lots indicated with the prices asked for them. An officer of the department, who is not known in the locality, was sent there to take all information as to the value of the land, and to verify the figures by the records in the registry office. He did make a report to the department, and then the chief architect and his assistant gave their opinion as to which lot was the best and what price ought to be offered. I think it is better that we should exercise our judgment in this way rather than to go to the expense of expropriating.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not assuming that the Minister had anything but the public interest in view, but I say that we ought to have a record of the evidence on which he arrived at the value. When it becomes known that the Government contemplate purchasing land, all the land owners in the locality put up the price and ask more than they would if trying to sell to a private individual, so that what the various owners ask is a wholly unreliable basis on which to form an opinion. For that reason the Government ought to fortify itself with every information apart from that furnished by the land owner. The hon. gentleman says that the Government officer who was travelling incog, went to the registry office. That is a very proper step to take. You might do more. He should inform himself as to the assessed value.

Mr. OUIMET. So he does.

Mr. MULOCK. They are not wholly to be depended upon, but they are some evidence, and all this evidence ought to be on record. Further than that the position of the Government ought to be fortified by the opinions of reliable local men who can be depended upon, and unless we adopt some such precaution, it is better to go through the process of expropriation and have the evidence under oath.

Mr. OUIMET. I have had a good deal of experience in the valuation of land, having been president of a large loan company, and I may tell the hon. gentleman, from the information I have been able to gather and the examination I made myself of the proceedings of our officers, that I have just as much confidence in their ability as I would have in the expert valuation of the loan company to which I belonged.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I would like to know upon what principle the Government proceed in erecting post offices? Is there any basis as to population or as to gross revenue on which they act? I would like to know, as probably I may get a post office myself for the town in which I am living, should it possess the necessary requirements. I would like to know why, when the Government gave a post office at Petrolea, they did not deal similarly with Ingersoll? The gross postal revenue in Ingersoll is some $9,000, $2,400 more than at Petrolea, so that if postal revenue has anything to do with the matter, this expenditure should rather be made in Ingersoll. The county in which Petrolea is situated, however, is represented here by a very strong supporter of the Government who wrested that district from a Reformer, and, no doubt, the Government are trying to strengthen the position of their supporter by spending public moneys in that particular centre. Ingersoll is a prominent place in another district, a district which sends here the hon. member for South Oxford. Is it because Petrolea is represented by a Conservative that we have this, or are there other reasons? The Postmaster General must bear in mind that the revenue from his department does not come within $1,500,000 of the expenditure, so that he has not the excuse of an overflowing treasury for this extravagance. The policy of the United States is not to spend money in the erection of small post offices, but we are erecting them here in order to bribe the people in the different constituencies. See what was done in the town of Goderich. Up to four years ago, it had no post office building, but on the eve of the election of 1887, when Mr. Porter was opposing Mr. Cameron, an agitation was set on foot to support Mr. Porter on the ground that $15,000 or $20,000 were to be spent there for a post office and customs house. Mr. Cameron was the representative of that riding for nearly twenty years, but it was not until the election of 1887 that the necessity for a post office was found to exist. Any one with one eye, and that partly closed, can see the intention of the Government. Petrolea, with a total revenue of only $6,648, is to get a post office building costing probably $25,000, while Woodstock, whose postal revenue is $15,400, gets none. Sarnia with a postal revenue of $9,350 is in the same position, but it is in a riding which is represented by a strong Liberal who gives splendid dressings-down to the Government, and therefore it cannot get a post office. I would ask if the present Government, since they have taken office, have built any public building in any town represented in this House by a Liberal? The whole thing is so thin that a child of five years can see through it. It is a dishonest act, because they are taking the money of Reformers and spending it in Conservative counties. The system is injurious to private individuals, because the Government has no right to put up public buildings where the interest is not one per cent on the investment, and take money away from private parties who can supply large and commodious buildings for the purpose. I believe that, with the exception of two or three hangers-on, the hon. gentlemen behind the Minister do not approve of the system, because they do not attempt to defend it though they have not the manliness to condemn it. The member for West York (Mr. Wallace) sometimes takes an independent position, but he seems to have lost the independence he had last year when he brought up the Combines Bill. I hope he will state whether or not he is in favour of this. I have prepared a statement showing the enormous cost which would be entailed if these buildings were put up in all the places which are as much entitled to them as Farnham, Petrolea, Orillia, Picton, Port Arthur, Smith's Falls, where the Government propose to build post offices. Ontario would require 409 post offices, at a cost of $8,180,000; Nova Scotia, 76 post offices, costing $1,520,000; Quebec, 134 post offices, costing $2,630,000; New Brunswick, 148 post offices, costing $960,000; British Columbia, 22, costing $440,000; Manitoba, 56, costing $720,000; and the North-West Territories, 17, costing $540,000. The cost of lighting and fuel of all these buildings would be $1,113,000, and the interest on the amount to be expended would be $560,000 a year. Now, I think it is bad policy for the Government to expend the people's money on little places like Farnham and Laprairie, and to neglect other places that are much more entitled to have public buildings. Now, I understand a post office is about to be built at Port Arthur, and I am sure the hon. member from that section of the country will strongly advocate it, although I believe he is honest enough to say that he does not believe in the principle adopted by the Government. Perhaps Port Arthur is entitled to a building, but at the same time I believe he will see that the Government is not justifiable in spending such large sums of money in small places for the purpose of catching votes at election times. Now the Government has been too fond of making promises during elections. There was a bye-election in West Huron not very long ago, and the Tory newspapers of that county——

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. SPROULE). I would ask the hon. gentleman to keep a little closer to the question, which is the post office at Petrolea.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I think I am coming pretty close to it now, so close that hon. gentlemen opposite are uneasy. I think I am perfectly in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. According to my judgment, as Chairman, you are out of order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am perfectly in order. I am not responsible for the Chairman's

judgment, I am responsible for my own. I must be at liberty to exercise my own judgment in discussing questions of this kind. I was going on to use an illustration to point my argument; he is not supposed to see through my argument, because he is a Tory of the Tories.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Chairman must exercise his judgment as to what he believes is to the point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to a point of order. I think we would make a very serious mistake, and would very seriously interfere with a proper discussion of the Estimates, if we were to hold that when an hon. gentleman is endeavouring to show the House that, with respect to this particular item, the policy of the Government has been founded on wrong data, he was not allowed to point out various instances that have occurred in which the Government have, for reasons best known to themselves, erected post offices at points which do not appear to him to have deserved the special favours that have been shown to them. That is a perfectly reasonable and proper thing for him to do.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I submit to your judgment, Mr. Chairman, that that is perfectly unfair, and makes a discussion without limit. If, when a vote is proposed, a member has the same right to discuss every other vote that he has to discuss this one, it is a mere farce to pretend that any rule of order whatever applies to this House. But the primary point is whether a gentleman occupying the Chair of the committee of the whole House, is to be wantonly and grossly insulted in the way the member for Huron has just referred to the Chairman of the committee.

Mr. MULOCK. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is using unparliamentary language, and I ask that it be taken down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member is now speaking to a point of order.

Mr. MULOCK. He has got out of order, he must keep in order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am raising the point of order that the expression the hon. member for Huron used to you was insulting, and such as ought not to be used. I submit it was an expression that we ought not to pass by, and I am sure the member for Huron himself will realize it. It is impossible for us to go on with debate if the Chair is spoken of in such terms.

Mr. MULOCK. When a point of order is taken by a member, he must keep within order in presenting his point.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not the question.

Mr. MULOCK. I am within the question. I submit that the Minister of Justice puts himself out of order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not the point.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the point. The Minister of Justice is not the dictator of this House; he is amenable to rules the same as any other man. I submit that when a point of order is taken, whoever is discussing it must discuss it within the rules of debate; he must keep himself in order. I submit that the Minister of Justice was not justified in pronouncing judgment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I raised a question of order with regard to the member for Huron, and that is the question before the Chair.

Mr. MULOCK. You have put yourself within contempt.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for North York cannot shunt the committee off to some other question.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice knows full well that it is not his privilege, in taking a point of order, to put himself out of order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not the question.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the Minister allow me to state my question?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I call the hon. member for North York to order. I have raised a question of order as to the language of the hon. member for Huron, and I ask for the decision of the Chair.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to speak to a point of order, and I will speak to a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. My ruling is simply this: I rose to give a ruling on the first point of order that was raised by the Minister of Justice. If the member for North York afterwards thinks my ruling is wrong, all right. I first rule that the language used by the hon. member for Huron, in my opinion, was wrong when he said either that he practically disregarded the ruling of the Chair, or that he paid no attention to it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I refer to what the hon. member said when he said that my ruling was out of order.

Mr. MULOCK. Now come to my point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. member has a right to say that he did not intend to use the words he did, and to withdraw them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The question which I raised was as to the language which the hon. member for Huron used with reference to the Chair, and I think the hon. member will see that he ought to withdraw that language.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. member for Huron when referring to this item adverted to the general policy of the Government. I understand the Chair has intimated that the hon. gentleman should not refer to any other matter but the item under discussion. We question that ruling.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I submit that that question is not before the Chair. The hon. member when called to order used language in regard to the Chair which was improper, and it was in regard to that matter that the point of order has been raised.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That was the question to which I referred.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I used no language towards you, Mr. Chairman, but what was respectful. You said that was your judgment. I said I

was not responsible for your judgment. I further said you were a Tory of the Tories. I never heard of a Liberal-Conservative, so-called, who was ashamed of being called a Tory, and if I was to say that a man was a man of men I would only increase his manhood.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is wandering off on the same line.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am explaining the matter. If Tories on the other side of the House say that a "Tory of the Tories" is a disrespectful phrase I will withdraw it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have had it applied to myself.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I contend that the expression used to the Chairman of the committee was offensive and out of order, and especially when coupled with the assertion that the Chairman could not be expected to see that the statement was in order because he was a Tory of the Tories.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman had better withdraw the expression. In my opinion at least it was clearly intended to be offensive—that because the Chairman was a Tory he could not rule fairly.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). You mistake my motive.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order. Withdraw.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I have said nothing contrary to the rules of the House. Supposing one of you said that I was a Liberal of the Liberals, do you think I would be offended? I would be proud of it. If you are not proud of the phrase "a Tory of the Tories," you should abandon Toryism. If you consider the expression a reflection, I withdraw it. You can call me a Liberal of the Liberals a hundred times, and I shall be glad of it, because I believe in principles of which I need not be ashamed; but I suppose you are going back to the original meaning of Tory in Ireland, where it had a meaning which you do not now apply, nor do I.

Mr. MULOCK. I presume the hon. gentleman has purged himself of his contempt. I wish now to proceed with my point of order. The Minister of Justice in calling the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) to order characterized his language as grossly insulting. I submit that this is not the privilege of any member of the House. If the hon. gentleman takes exception to the language of a member, it is his duty to state to the Chair what his opinion is, but it is not his privilege to deliver judgment and to pronounce upon the language. I submit, therefore, that the Minister of Justice exceeded the parliamentary rules of debate in characterizing the language of my hon. friend as grossly insulting. I trust the hon. gentleman will withdraw the expression.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will not withdraw it. Hon. gentlemen opposite may shout "withdraw" until they are black in the face, but I will not withdraw it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have a personal interest in this matter. I understand the Minister of Justice has laid down the proposition that to address a man as a Tory of the Tories is grossly to insult him.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said nothing of the kind. That point has been decided. What I said was that it was grossly insulting to speak of the Chairman of the House or the committee as a person who was incapable of appreciating the point because either that he was a Tory of the Tories or a Liberal of the Liberals. That implies partisanship.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice stated that the language of my hon. friend was grossly insulting.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That point has been decided. I decided that point of order. In my opinion the Minister of Justice was quite within his rights, and within the amenities of the debate, in what he said.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So it is within the amenities of debate to say that an hon. gentleman has grossly insulted you. We want to know, because these decisions are very useful.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I want to know whether the point has not been decided. I did not say that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) had grossly insulted the Chair, but what I said was that the expression was grossly insulting.

Mr. LAURIER. If the Chairman rules that the language of the Minister of Justice was in order we have only to submit, but we take exception to the statement that it is within the amenities of debate.

Mr. FLINT. In the collateral discussions which have arisen on the remarks of the hon. member for Huron——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is the hon. gentleman going to speak to the item under consideration?

Mr. FLINT. I am going to raise a question of order. On the question that has arisen in regard to the observations of the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), the most important point is this, as to what extent hon. gentlemen addressing this committee can draw illustrations from foreign sources to give point to their arguments. An hon. gentleman may, I contend, illustrate his argument by reference to the postal laws or regulations of any country in the world, and by reference to the customs, habits and laws of any country or people in the world.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must remind the hon. gentleman that I ruled on that point some time ago.

Mr. FLINT. I am going to appeal from your ruling on that point. If your ruling is sustained, then free speech in this House is ended.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). If the hon. gentleman wants to take exception to the Chairman's ruling, he must appeal to the House.

Mr. FLINT. I will appeal to the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No one will contest the right of a member to use an illustration from anything that has taken place in this or any other country. The Chairman, however, must always be the judge as to whether a member is making an illustration, or availing himself of the opportunity to discuss other items. If such references are

merely used for the purpose of illustration, no one will object : but the Chairman must be the judge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is all we have been contending for. All the point I raise is this: If you are discussing the question of an appropriation of public money for a building at Petrolea, for example, it is perfectly germane and legitimate to show that in other cases the rule which appears to be applied to Petrolea has not been observed ; and, by way of illustration, we have the right to call attention to the fact that in other places adjacent perhaps to this point, or other portions of this Dominion, sums of money have been voted for similar purposes on different lines.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am sorry the Minister of Justice has characterized my statement as grossly insulting. I think I have more right to be annoyed and insulted at that hon. gentleman than he has at me. Surely it is worse to say to a man that——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am in order. I have a right to refer to it, and if the Minister of Justice does not wish to give me an opportunity of answering the remarks he made about me, it shows cowardice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question. Order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The Minister of Justice said that I used grossly insulting language.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order. Sit down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman must be too old a parliamentarian not to know that he should sit down when the Chairman rises. I have already ruled on these two points, and I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order. I think the hon. gentleman should confine himself to the item.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Have I no opportunity of saying a word in my own defence. Hon. gentlemen around me have condemned the language of the Minister of Justice, but I am not permitted to say a solitary word. What kind of a country is this? Do you want to take the freedom from the individual? I thought the Tories had more justice in their hearts.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Well, Sir, I will pass on. It is a good sign of these hon. gentlemen opposite who wish to discard the word Tory. They used to be Tories, but now they call themselves Liberal-Conservatives, and next year they will call themselves Liberals.

An hon. MEMBER. We are not crazy.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). To come back to the point, I asked the Minister of Public Works on what principle it was decided where to build post offices. He refused to tell me, and therefore I must draw my own conclusions. I can only illustrate the principle by showing what promises were made by other places that got post offices. In the County of Huron in 1887, promises were made to the people, that if they elected Mr. Porter, a custom house and post office would be built in Goderich. Mr. Porter was elected and they got the public building. That is the principle which has been carried out in every constituency in the Dominion, and that is the way the public money has been spent by the Government for the purpose of gaining political power for themselves in the various places. I asked the Minister of Public Works awhile ago if he could point to one solitary Reform constituency in which public buildings have been erected, unless they had some special advantages.

Mr. OUIMET. You had better change the first part of your question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). You were going to answer me before I finished my question. Unless the Reform constituency had special and peculiar claims, it got no public building ; and in other cases nine times out of ten, moneys were spent in Conservative constituencies for political purposes. In order to further the ends of partyism the Government has spent millions of money in subsidizing railways and erecting public buildings.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am driven to give those explanations because the Government give no reason for the erection of those post offices other than can be given for many other places. I have a very high respect for your judgment, Mr. Chairman, although not responsible for it, and I know you can see, as well as any one else, the difference between an honest expenditure of public money, and an expenditure for the purpose of bribing the electors. The whole country has been placed in the hands of the Tories,—I will not use that word because it would be an insult— in the hands of the Liberal-Conservatives, by the expenditure of public money. There are many gentlemen opposite who know that nearly every one of the bye-elections has been carried by money, either directly or indirectly taken from the coffers of the country. I know whereof I speak because I know men who got it. The entire government of this country is known to be corruptly conducted either by public buildings, subsidies to railways or boodling in every part, and the sooner the Government comes to the end of that the better for themselves. In two years I believe that they will be swept from the field of politics, and that wiser, better and abler men will govern this country, and men who will not be ashamed of being called Liberals of the Liberals.

Mr. MULOCK. I want to ask the Minister of Public Works how it comes that he has decided to place this building in Petrolea, in the County of Lambton, which is a smaller place and from which there is less revenue from postal service than Sarnia in the same county ?

Mr. OUIMET. The reason is that Petrolea will grow more rapidly than Sarnia in a very short time, and that it was more in the public interest to have that building there than in Sarnia. But this is only my personal opinion. This item is in consequence of a resolution passed by this House two years ago, and we are now committed to that expenditure. The contract has been let, and it is not for me to answer questions which the hon. gentleman ought to have put at the time ; and he must remember that I have no choice in the matter.

Mr. MULOCK, Yes, the hon. Minister was a member of this House.

Mr. OUIMET. I was a member of the House ; I was Speaker of the House. If there is anything

to be said the hon. gentleman has not done his duty, for he has not put his question at the right time. He ought at that time to have tried to prevent the proposition being accepted by Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. Unfortunately, Parliament was committed to this transaction in January, just before the elections of 1891. The Government committed themselves to the Petrolea transaction without the approval of Parliament.

Mr. OUIMET. How do you know?

Mr. MULOCK. I think the property was bought before Parliament was consulted.

Mr. OUIMET. How do you know?

Mr. MULOCK. Because you told us so, and I believed you.

Mr. OUIMET. I said that the site had been purchased in January, 1891, and the first vote taken in this House was taken in 1890.

Smith's Falls Post Office, Custom House, &c $10,000

Mr. MULOCK. We had better have some explanation of this.

Mr. OUIMET. This vote is to make provision for the erection of this building. The total cost is estimated at between $25,000 and $26,000, the cost of the site included. The town of Smith's Falls was incorporated in 1882. Since that date there has been a steady increase in its growth. Its population in 1885 was 2,824, and it has increased to about 4,500 at present. The assessment has increased from $467,350 in 1885, to $837,117 in 1889, and, to-day, it is over $900,000. The revenue of the post office in 1885 was $3,858, and in 1889, $6,145. Smith's Falls is a railroad centre, and is certainly one of the localities that ought to have a public building of this kind.

Mr. MULOCK. Has the land been bought and the work begun?

Mr. OUIMET. There has not been one cent spent yet. The selection of the site was submitted to me the other day, but I have not been able to come to any decision yet. Several sites are offered, varying in price from $2,000 to $6,000, and it will be some time before I can come to a decision.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Minister say, inasmuch as this is a transaction which originated with him, and for which he does not repudiate responsibility——

Mr. OUIMET. It did not originate with me. The first vote was taken in 1890, and I have to carry it out.

Mr. MULOCK. However, the vote produced nothing; everything lapsed.

Mr. OUIMET. $4,000 was voted in 1890, and in 1891 that amount was revoted, and an additional vote of $3,500 taken, making $7,500 which are now available, so that with this vote of $10,000 there will be $17,500 at the disposal of the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What sort of customs business is done there? I do not quite understand how at Smith's Falls, which is a small inland town, there can be any necessity for special accommodation for customs, any more than exists in a hundred other places.

Mr. OUIMET. The town has been made a port of entry of late, and the receipts for the past six months amount to $6,000 or thereabouts, which is at the rate of $1,000 per month. I am told that the merchants there are very enterprising and are now importing their goods; and being a railroad centre, and being besides the centre of a very good farming country, it is pretty safe to say that before long it will be a place of considerable importance.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is a matter of prospect.

Mr. OUIMET. Just now the postal revenue justifies the expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I admit that as compared with a great many other votes which the hon. gentleman proposes, there is a good deal to be said for this vote. But after all said and done, Smith's Falls is a thriving, pleasantly situated, prosperous inland town, nothing more, nothing less. It is not going to be a very important railway centre. There may be one or two branches of the Canadian Pacific Railway that may go there, but they will not create any considerable customs business, as the hon. gentleman knows well. It is in the nature of things that no considerable customs revenue should be collected there. If he will compare the state of things which he describes as existing at Smith's Falls and justifying the expenditure of considerable public money there with the state of things which exists at a score of other towns in Ontario, he will see that there is a great deal of reason in the complaints made on this side that the Government are acting on no principle and are disregarding the claims of very important localities, which are far more entitled to the expenditure of public money than Smith's Falls. Take Ingersoll, in the county I represent. It is very much larger than Smith's Falls, it has fifty per cent more postal revenue, it has a great deal more customs revenue, and it also is a railway centre for the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Woodstock is a vastly stronger case. The hon. gentleman can do nothing for these places, but he tells us that Smith's Falls is a kind of place that ought to have a public building. Take the case of Sarnia. It is on the frontier, and is a very important point where a customs building would be of considerable public utility. It has a vast deal larger postal revenue and population than Smith's Falls, but the hon. gentleman does not see the slightest necessity for erecting a post office or custom house there. There can be no doubt whatever that on every principle the hon. gentleman has attempted to lay down, or, more correctly speaking, in view of the evidence the hon. gentleman has brought forward to justify the appropriations in the case of Smith's Falls, the towns of Picton, Orillia and Petrolea are more entitled to appropriations; and, until some distinct rule be laid down and reasonably well adhered to, the hon. gentleman has no right to complain that very severe reflections are cast upon the mode in which these buildings are being carried out. There is no use in the hon. gentleman trying to disguise the fact that all these votes have been given to reward faithful representatives. They have not been given on public grounds on the hon. gentleman's own evidence. All that he alleges shows clearly and distinctly that the hon. gentleman and his predecessors have wilfully and deliberately shut

their eyes to far superior claims of other places which are represented by opponents of the Government.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman is rather too severe on myself and the Government. There is no doubt that when this policy was inaugurated it was the intention of the Government to push it to its ultimate consequences, that is to give to every important locality in the different provinces a public building which would not only be useful but also an ornament. There is no doubt that it was the intention of the Government that every one should be served in turn. The complaint hon. gentlemen can have is that this Government has leaned a little towards its own friends and has seen in some cases fit to serve its own friends first. I should say that the public at large will find nothing very strange in that, nothing indeed very objectionable; and if hon. gentlemen were to come back on these benches, they would do as they did in the past, and which far exceeded that which has been done by us. I maintain there has been no real injustice done. As I have said, there has only been delay in serving our friends, our enemies; but every one will be served in turn, and I hope we shall live long enough and the revenue of this country will maintain itself high enough to enable us to serve our good friends opposite just as well, if not better, than we have served our own. I have been challenged by the hon. member for Huron to cite any case of localities represented by Liberals which have received such buildings. I may say that we have been very unfortunate with regard to some of our favours in that direction, because those have been the places for which we are most blamed. I might mention Laprairie, St. Hyacinthe and Orillia. Orillia was represented by a very good Grit and received a public building long before it had the advantage of being represented by a Conservative. At all events, the Government has been this year very careful only to take up those places towards which obligation has been undertaken, and we are only fulfilling those obligations.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It seems to me from what the Minister has said that he is rather bolder in his avowal than any one I have heard before. He thinks it is not objectionable. Perhaps it is well he should take that ground, because it is useless to attempt to deny that the Government have used the public moneys of this country to favour their friends and help their success. Now, that judgment might seem harsh if pronounced by their opponents and might he thought unfair, but I ask hon. gentlemen who were present last night and heard extracts read from the press of hon. gentlemen opposite whether the Government are not guilty of using the public funds of this country for years past for the purpose of demoralizing the electorate. It is not the gravest charge against them that they have given to smaller places public buildings at the public expense while larger places have been neglected in defiance of a solemn resolution of this House; the gravest charge is that they have done this in such a way as to produce a state of things in Canada which should make any Canadian blush for shame. Their action has so far succeeded in lowering the moral tone of this country that it has so demoralized a portion of the public press, though not all, even, of the Conservative press, that hon. gentlemen were able last night to read extracts from what are supposed to be respectable newspapers plainly stating that it was a well-known fact, and the electors might govern themselves accordingly, that, if they returned a Liberal to this House, they would receive nothing at the hands of the Government, but that, if they returned supporters of the Government, they would receive, not justice, but favours at the hands of the Government. It is one of the things most to be deplored that the public press, the guardian of free institutions and of all that tends to the preservation of the state, should have been led by these hon. gentlemen to openly and unblushingly declare it to be the fixed policy of the party in power that the public funds shall be used to reward political supporters and, by withholding these funds, to punish those municipalities that do not accord them their confidence. The gross injustice of passing over towns like Woodstock, with a revenue of $15,000, and erecting buildings in places with about a fortieth of that revenue, being before the eyes of the people, no doubt their press speak the truth in declaring that to be their policy. Here are men who are only the servants of the people, having taken control of the Treasury benches for a time by virtue of a majority, so manipulating and handling the public funds as to seek to make the people their bond-slaves instead of their masters, and endeavouring to sap the spirit of freedom by declaring that if the people want what is just, they should approach those who should be their servants hat in hand and do their bidding, or they would not receive even what was in the public interest. When a portion of the public press supporting them will state this to be their policy, it is not their opponents who judge them, but they are judged and pronounced upon by their own friends, and, if there is any sense of what is right and proper in the gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches——

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant)—it would not be an appeal made to them in vain to ask, looking at the state of public feeling and of their responsibility——

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant)—that they should change their course——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant)—and say, we will go on in the future in a different way, and will only expend public money in view of what is right and just.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. You ought to know that you should take your seat when a point of order is raised.

Mr. FOSTER. My point of order was that the gentleman was not discussing the question before the House. He seemed to think he was in North Perth.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The remarks of the hon. member were perfectly legitimate and in order. They were simply and distinctly a reply to the statements made by the Minister.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I was not referring to North Perth at all. I am not aware of what was done in North Perth, but, if the hon. gentleman sent promises up there by the hands of the

Secretary of State or any other, it would simply be one more instance of this kind of thing than we are aware of. I would like to have your ruling on this question of order. Did I in any remark of mine transcend the proper limits of the debate?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. My opinion was that it was rather irrelevant to the question, but, in view of the explanation the Minister of Public Works gave, I thought you were entitled to a little more latitude because you were making a reply to him.

Mr. LISTER. The Minister of Public Works asserted that no real injustice had been done to any section of the country by the proposition to vote this amount for Smith's Falls. I do not think the hon. gentleman could have given the subject proper consideration before making that statement. The town of Smith's Falls has a population of 3,864, the post office revenue is $6,206, so that I take issue with him and flatly contradict the statement he made that no injustice is done to other parts of Ontario. I will compare that town with two others in the province, one of which has been neglected while the other has received the attention of the Government for obvious reasons. The hon. gentleman has told us that the town of Petrolea is so progressive that it is overtaking Sarnia, the capital town of the County of Lambton, and that Petrolea should therefore be preferred to Sarnia in the expenditure of public money for public buildings. If the hon. gentleman had ever been west, he would not have dared to make such a statement. The population of Petrolea is 4,357. If he will look at the census returns he will find that in 1881, the town had a population of 3,465; in 1891, the population had risen to 4,357. The total receipts from the post office amount to $6,648. Now, let me compare the position of affairs in Petrolea with the position of the town of Sarnia.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to keep to the item under discussion.

Mr. LISTER. But the hon. gentleman has said that he has done no injustice in the expenditure of the public moneys, and I want to show that he has not made an accurate statement. According to the last census, the town of Sarnia contained a population of 6,993, and it has a postal revenue of $9,351, or $2,000 more than the town of Petrolea. According to the census of 1881, the town of Sarnia had a population of 3,874, so that it increased during the decade by 2,719. The town of Sarnia is one of the few towns in the whole Dominion that shows a substantial increase of population during the past ten years, and let me say to the hon. gentleman that it is one of the most progressive and enterprising towns in the Dominion of Canada, a town growing as fast, if not faster, than any other town in western Ontario; and yet the hon. gentleman has the boldness to stand up here and say that the town of Petrolea on account of its progressiveness, is overtaking the town I have the honour to belong to, and for that reason he says Petrolea should have a public building, when he ignores and overlooks the principal town of the County of Lambton, a town that is a railway terminus, and has enormous shipping interests. The town of Sarnia returns from customs duties thousands of dollars more than the town which he has favoured with a public building. I venture to assert, without binding myself to be strictly accurate, that the town of Sarnia returns to the treasury of this country over $40,000 a year of revenue from post office, customs and inland revenue. Small towns like Walkerton, Cayuga and Trenton are attended to, while the real commercial centres of western Ontario are utterly ignored. And why? They are neglected because the people of West Lambton have refused to return a supporter of the Government; but favours have been given to East Lambton because that county turned from its allegiance to the Liberal party, and sent to this House a supporter of the Government. Never, from 1882 to 1887, was it suggested that Petrolea should have a public building. But after 1887 it suddenly dawned upon the Government that this town was so progressive it should have a public building, and so a public building was erected there. I throw back with indignation the statement made by the Minister of Public Works that he has been doing no real injustice to any section of the country. The town of Sarnia is the third largest town in western Ontario; the city of Woodstock has ten or twelve thousand inhabitants, yielding an enormous income to the Government from post office, customs and inland revenue; yet these two towns are utterly neglected, their rights are utterly ignored, not the slightest measure of justice is attempted to be done to them for the reason that these people thought proper to return gentlemen to this House who are opposed to the present Administration. This is the way the Government take the public moneys and use them for the purpose of entrenching themselves in power. I say it is degrading to the electorate of the country, I say it is disgraceful to the Government who dangles these things before the electors, and who pretend to be the masters of the people, when in truth and in fact it is the people who are their masters. This thing cannot be allowed to go on. In no other country in the world would such a condition of affairs be permitted to exist. When a constituency is represented by a Liberal, and there is a chance of getting in a Conservative, then the promise of a railway subsidy or a public building is held before the people to bribe them to support the Government candidate. It is high time that these things should be stopped. It is time that the people should realize that they are themselves the masters of the men who govern this country to-day, that the money belongs to them, and they have the right to come here and ask, not as a favour, but as a right, that justice be done them in the distribution of public money in erecting public works. I say the treatment West Lambton has received, particularly as respects the town of Sarnia, is indefensible; no man can pretend to defend it, no man does defend it, and when the Minister gets up here and says that he is doing justice to all parts of this country, he is stating what is manifestly not the case.

Picton Post Office.....$10,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I desire to draw the attention of the committee to a resolution which I think it is important we should keep in view, after the speech of the Minister of Public Works. This resolution was passed by this House two years ago, and is as follows:—

"It be resolved that in the expenditure of public money the public interest and not party favouritism should control; and in the choice of places for the erection of public buildings for post office, custom house and inland revenue purposes, regard should be had to the

amount of revenue collected and of public business done."

That was the declaration, and yet the Minister of Public Works has risen in his place and declared that he was going to disregard that rule, that it was the proper thing for the Government to disregard it; that the Government ought to make expenditures first in places represented by their friends, and it was not a question as to which places in the public interest required expenditure to be made. Can any one doubt that in the items under discussion there are a score of places where, in the public interest, buildings should be erected rather than in the localities selected? I have had placed in my hands the report of the Royal Commission to investigate into the Civil Service of Canada, and it contains some remarks which so exactly conform to my views that I will read them to the committee. They are as follows:—

"In connection with sums spent on construction of public buildings, your commissioners, in calling attention to the system pursued of erecting buildings for post offices in comparatively small places, would point out that in such cases the cost of the building is not the only expense involved. The ordinary country postmaster, under the present system, is paid a comparatively small salary, which is generally augmented by the profits of store-keeping or similar means, and the Deputy Postmaster General stated in his evidence, in answer to a question, that the department was beginning to suffer inconvenience arising out of the fact that the postmasters, in a number of places where public buildings are situated, have no means of adding to their salaries, as they cannot be allowed to carry on another business in a Government building, and accordingly pressure is brought to bear for increased allowance to enable them to live. In addition to the interest on the cost of the buildings and the increased rate of remuneration to the postmasters, must also be mentioned the cost of a caretaker and the expense of fuel and light, and, at the same time, it must be remembered that these additional charges bring no corresponding increases in the revenue collected. Your commissioners would submit this matter for the consideration of the Government, so that some system may be adopted limiting the erection of such structures to places only where the revenues collected warranted the outlay."

I hope hon. gentlemen opposite who have been assured that this policy is to be abandoned and that future expenditures is to take place only in those localities where the public interest demands them, rather than the claims of party proclivities, will pay particular attention to, and remember well the words that have been addressed to this committee this afternoon by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. OUIMET. I find I made an error in regard to this matter. This amount is not to complete the work.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We assumed that this was for the completion of the work.

Mr. OUIMET. The whole building is expected to cost about $24,000, including site. The population of Picton is 3,287. The postal revenue is $5,593, customs duty collected $9,343, amount of money orders issued and paid $38,785, value of exports $73,024, imports $57,303, goods entered for consumption to the value of $57,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cost of the site?

Mr. OUIMET. The site has not been purchased.

Toronto Drill Hall..... $97,800

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is expected to be the total cost of the Toronto drill hall, and what is the value of the land given by the city?

Mr. OUIMET. The cost of the building will be $300,000, exclusive of the site which was donated by the city. The value of the site has been estimated at $150,000, but it is certainly worth $100,000.

Mr. MULOCK. Have any representations been made by any of the labour organizations of Toronto, touching the cutting of stone for the Toronto drill hall?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. What consideration has been given to these representations?

Mr. OUIMET. The answer was given that the department could not interfere after the contract had been let. It was for the contractor to make his arrangements, and the Government had nothing to do with them.

Manitoba Public Buildings..... $2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. Minister explain this item?

Mr. OUIMET. This amount is to cover improvements and repairs to public buildings. At Brandon an expenditure of $2,187 was recommended, but this was reduced to $2,000.

North-West Territories — Edmonton Registry Office and Crown Lands and Timber Agents' Offices..... $10,000

Mr. OUIMET. This is a revote from last year. It is for the purpose of erecting a building to contain the registry office and Crown lands and timber agents' offices. The building will be of brick, one story and a half, 69 by 32 feet, on a stone foundation, containing two brick vaults. The land has been given by the Hudson Bay Company, and the cost of the building will be $10,000.

Mr. MULOCK. Have you got any policy in regard to this class of buildings in the North-West Territories?

Mr. OUIMET. The policy is that this building is required and we have to build it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know what the cost of maintaining these buildings will be? In the North-West I have observed on several occasions that the cost of maintenance became a very formidable item, presumably on account of the expense of fuel.

Mr. OUIMET. Between $200 and $300 a year. Fuel is not very costly at Edmonton.

Mr. MULOCK. Have you any model building for registry offices in the North-West Territories? In Ontario I understand that there is a regular model building that the inspector requires to be put up. If you can adopt a standard building, you will see how much easier and less expensive it will be to prepare plans from time to time. Has the Minister considered that question?

Mr. OUIMET. The suggestion of my hon. friend is certainly worth considering. I will ask the architects to take a note of it and see if they can follow the plan adopted by the Ontario Government.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not wish the Government to follow the plans of the Ontario Government unless they approve of them. I believe it would be in the public interest to have a model building, because I hope the population will so increase in the North-West Territories, that it will be necessary to erect a number of these buildings. There should

be a general scheme and plan laid down at the initiation of these works. If you have a model building, you escape to a certain extent local importunities, not to speak of the economy of such a plan. The Government, if they had the same kind of vaults all through, would be able to contract in a wholesale way for repairs less expensively than under the present system. I am surprised to think that this has not already received the consideration of the Minister. In reply to an observation made by the hon. Minister, I may say that I do not think he should be unduly held responsible, personally, for matters that he did not originate. But at the same time I think that the Government as a whole ought to be able to give reasonable explanations, and to justify if they can, the conduct of the previous incumbents of the respective offices. I am not inclined to accept as a sufficient reply that the work was begun under some former Minister, and that the present Minister was not responsible. Under our system of government there are changes of portfolios all the time. For example, if I were to attack, if it were possible to attack, the previous administration of the Department of Militia—of course I know I should have a most difficult task. It would hardly satisfy the country if the present Minister was to say that all these villainies were perpetrated under the administration of his predecessor. Somebody must be responsible so long as the same Government is in office even though there may be individual changes. The Minister of Public Works when repudiating responsibility personally, perhaps does justice to himself, but at the same time he is doing an injustice to his predecessor and is suggesting what I think a representative Parliament like this cannot accept as a sufficient explanation.

Regina Court House, Land Office and Registry Office..... $10,000

Mr. FLINT. Is this a new building or repairs to an old one?

Mr. OUIMET. It is a new building.

Mr. FLINT. Has not the Government had a court house at Regina?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a building there, which has been occupied for Government offices and for court house accommodation. It does not belong to the Government, but to the town site trustees, who are also trustees for the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. The rent we pay amounts to a good deal more than the interest on the sum for which we shall get a new court house constructed. It is expected that it can be constructed in a very convenient part of the town for $20,000, and we get the site gratuitously from the town trustees, because we are entitled under the trust to get sites for any public buildings without cost. The immediate reason for the work is that more accommodation is required for the land offices, and it is a question whether we shall have a new court house or a new land office. All things considered, it was deemed best that the old building should be used for the purpose of the Interior Department, and that we should have a new court house.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What material is used, stone or brick?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Brick.

Mr. FLINT. Has the construction begun, or has it been offered to tender yet?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Lethbridge Custom House and Court House, site being furnished..... $7,000

Mr. FLINT. Is this a new building?

Mr. OUIMET. It is an entirely new building. It is to cost about $20,000.

Mr. FLINT. Is there a post office there?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes. It is yet to be considered whether the post office will go into the same building; but perhaps there will be some opposition on the part of the town, which gives the site.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the population and the revenue of Lethbridge?

Mr. OUIMET. The population is 2,400. I am not able to give the revenues.

Mr. FLINT. I hope the Government will insist on including the post office in this building, even if it costs a little more to do so. We know that otherwise the citizens will attempt to induce the Government in a year or two, when the next general election is approaching, to erect another building for the post office; and the country will be put to the expense of perhaps $20,000 more, whereas an addition of $5,000 now might give them all the accommodation they require. Therefore, I trust that the Government will have this building made sufficiently large to accommodate the post office as well as the custom house and the court house.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think we are bound to consider whether the postmaster is getting a living from his salary alone. If it is adequate to support him, then it might be that the proposition made would be the cheapest for the Government, but if he is a man who has to supplement his salary by engaging in other pursuits, then the case would be different.

Calgary Post Office, Custom House and Inland Revenue, Dominion Lands and Crown Timber Office..... $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has any expenditure been made as yet for these?

Mr. OUIMET. This is not a new building. The estimated cost is $51,000 including the site, which cost us $2,500, and the town of Calgary has paid the balance. We bought three lots on the main street, each of which cost $2,500, and the Calgary people have paid for two of these.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not disposed to cavil at reasonable expenditure, but it must be recollected that a huge sum of money of the older provinces goes to the North-West, and I doubt extremely whether an expenditure of $20,000 in a small town like Calgary for a public building is not extravagant, when we find that $20,000 or $25,000 is quite enough in other parts of the country. The hon. gentleman ought to give much more detailed information why he requires this sum for the purpose of a town whose population is about 3,000. There is another item for the same town which will involve many thousands of dollars more.

Mr. OUIMET. I may tell the hon. gentleman that this town is rapidly increasing. Its population is now over 4,000 and its postal revenue over $9,000, and I am told that the customs revenue is also very large, about $25,000. There are very

expensive buildings in the town of Calgary. The banks are very expensive buildings on the main street, and it is expected by business men that this is going to be the town of the west.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of what material is this to be constructed?

Mr. OUIMET. Of stone.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What are the dimensions of the building?

Mr. OUIMET. 60 by 54; the plans are not yet finished.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is a tremendous price.

Mr. OUIMET. That figure will not be exceeded, and we will endeavour to limit the expenditure as much as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not disposed, nor are my hon. friends, to quarrel with legitimate expenditure for the purpose of buildings of this kind in the North-West, but there ought to be a limit. I must say that for the legitimate requirements of a town of that size $50,000 appears to be an excessive sum. Hon. gentlemen ought to remember that in all these places there is very considerable danger in dealings on account of the progressive ideas of these worthy people in the west. Every town expects to be a great city in no time at all, and many of us know that these expectations are very far from being fulfilled. Most of us are aware that the ideas in the wide west are much more proportionate to the area of the country than the population we have been able to put into it, and the Government are liable to be deceived by these representations.

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

After Recess.

OTTAWA CITY PASSENGER RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 16) respecting the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company.—(Mr. Robillard.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 6,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Bill as printed contains two amendments in reference to the new powers granted to the company by the report of the sub-committee on the Bill, and these amendments were added in the general committee, making the new powers subject to the municipal regulations. The object of the committee was to make the operation of the railway subject in all respects to the statutes of Ontario and Quebec respectively, and it was supposed that the purpose was carried out, but the counsel for the city have called our attention to the fact that the words "municipal regulations" very much restrict the meaning of the provision, and that in fact there are no municipal regulations in the statutes of Ontario. I, therefore, propose to strike out those two amendments which are inserted on the margin, and this afternoon the counsel for the railway agreed that these provisions should be struck out.

Mr. DEVLIN. I should like to ask a question in regard to the crossing of the bridge to the city of Hull. It is very narrow for a railway to cross, and I should like to know, if a new bridge is to be built there, who is to build it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Bill gives permission to the company to pass over the bridge on such terms as the Governor in Council may consider to be right. If it is considered that the bridge is safe to bear the traffic, it is the intention of the Minister of Public Works himself to have the tracks laid on the bridge, so that they may be available for any other company that may desire to pass over it. At the same time, the Minister is advised by his experts that the bridge will require strengthening before the tracks can be laid there, and it is altogether problematical whether the company can use it or not. It was admitted that, at the narrow part of the road in Hull, the railway could not be accommodated properly, and the counsel for Mr. Eddy wanted to have him protected in that matter. It was stated by the railway company that it would be essential for them to construct a new bridge, but the Railway Committee declined to interfere for the protection of Mr. Eddy, or of any one in Hull or in Ottawa, leaving the matter to be entirely dealt with by the city councils in each place, in regard to Sparks Street in Ottawa and the roadway in Hull. It was, therefore, agreed that the exercise of the powers conferred by this Bill should be dependent on the city councils.

Bill reported, as amended, and read the third time and passed.

THE DOMINION MILLERS' ASSOCIATION.

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Dominion Millers' Association was considered in Committee and reported.

Mr. STEVENSON moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Before this Bill passes I would like to ask if there is not danger of the Millers' Association controlling the grain markets of the Province of Ontario? I have seen it stated in a couple of newspapers that they proposed to have a central buyer to buy grain. Now, I understand that through a central buyer they send a circular every week to the grain buyers in that province, and I fear that this is the commencement of a combine in order to keep down the price of grain. I think there should be some clause inserted in this Bill to forbid them to have a central buyer. It is easier for them to have one buyer, but he can only attend at one market place at a time, and he purchases for the Millers' Association through other buyers in that province. It seems to me that there is a great danger of the Millers' Association controlling the wheat market, and I think they have already begun to do so to a certain extent.

Mr. FLINT. This matter was discussed fully in the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and a clause was inserted which distinctly provided that this association should have no trading privileges or powers whatsoever. That seemed to satisfy all the members of the committee that the fear expressed by the hon. member for Huron is unfounded. I think the secretary of the committee of the association was present, and he utterly repudiated any intention on the part of this association to act as a trading concern. The object of this associa-

tion was said to be simply to gather information and place it at the disposal of members of the association, and also to act as arbitrators in disputes between members of the association.

Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Calgary Post Office, Custom House and Inland Revenue, Dominion Lands and Crown Timber Offices.....$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman any further information as to the amount of this vote?

Mr. OUIMET. The plans are not yet prepared, but they will be prepared with an eye to cheapness. That place is progressing rapidly and is certain to become in the near future a very important centre. On one of the main streets of Calgary lots of 35 feet front are selling for $2,500, and I understand that a lot two blocks away from the Imperial Bank has been sold for $5,000. These facts show that the place is growing rapidly, and I do not think this expenditure is out of proportion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman will put up a very handsome building, and that it will be very acceptable to the inhabitants of Calgary. I have no doubt whatever that Calgary is a thriving and prosperous little town, but it seems to me that no case has been made to justify us in voting $51,000 for a small town of three or four thousand people. We have a great deal to do in the North-West. It is a tremendous drain on the resources of the older portions of the country, and the hon. gentleman ought to be very careful indeed about incurring any unnecessary expenditure there, because such expenditure is taken away practically from more important objects to which this money should be devoted. Now, all through we find that the expenditure in the North-West has been carried on in an extremely lavish fashion. There is no doubt that the expenditure for the Mounted Police, which I believe to be a very good force, has been on an extravagant scale, and a great deal of it has been unnecessary, in my opinion. There is no doubt that the expenditure on the score of Indians is larger than it ought to have been, and larger than our treaty obligations call for; and there is no doubt that the annual sum we are called upon to pay for the North-West general purposes has become a very serious matter to us. I see we are charged, entirely apart from this sum, with $220,000 for what is called government in the North-West Territories, and the hon. gentleman knows that we have an enormous expenditure besides that. I would not grudge a reasonable expenditure, but I see here, over and above this $51,000, that there is another heavy item, to which we will presently come, for a court house and lock-up.

Mr. OUIMET. That is not in Calgary; it is to be at Maple Creek and another point west of Qu'Appelle.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to hear that. Have we provided a court house in Calgary besides?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did the Calgary court house cost?

Mr. OUIMET. About $25,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And we also have erected expensive police barracks there.

Mr. DEWDNEY. One barrack building which cost probably $7,000 or $8,000. It has been erected many years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So, altogether, the expenditure in Calgary will be about $100,000. Looking at the position of old Canada, and looking at the cost of the North-West to the people of Canada, although we entertain every desire to make reasonable provision for the Territories, we must feel that we are spending money there with altogether too free a hand. Looking at what is given to the other province, that is altogether more than we should be asked to vote for mere purposes of ornamentation, because the hon. Minister has practically admitted that it is not really required, but he wants to keep up in character with the handsome buildings already erected in the town. I am very glad Calgary is prospering and the people are able to erect imposing structures, but that is hardly sufficient justification for this expenditure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). To what extent are the people of the North-West Territories now taxed? Court houses and buildings of that kind are erected in other portions of the Dominion by municipal taxation. That rule does not apply to customs houses and post offices. If we were to adopt the practice in the American territories of granting a certain sum for these purposes, it would be a most satisfactory way of dealing with this question. The people would then erect such buildings as they thought proper, and if their subsidy was not adequate, they would impose a tax on themselves. The amount proposed to be expended on this building is out of proportion to its dimensions, and $30,000 would be an ample provision.

Mr. OUIMET. Post offices of the same character are estimated at $25,000 in the old provinces, and the extra cost of building in Calgary may be placed at 30 per cent. Besides, there must be accommodation provided for several officers, and if a small building were erected, other buildings would have to be put up within a few years. The registry office will also be in the building.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no provision for a registry office in this item.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is the intention to move the registry office into this building, and to provide fire-proof vaults. The Government have received from the sale of property there over $250,000. Calgary has become quite a railway centre, and is the most improving town west of Winnipeg in the North-West. Property is increasing in value yearly, and there is an increase in population. The buildings erected are of a first-class description, even better than any other place, including Winnipeg.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman had better provide separate buildings for

registry offices, as is the practice in Ontario. Unless the structure is a very expensive one, there is danger in having the registry office in a building used for other purposes.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in regard to the isolation of registry offices. No doubt all these matters will be attended to when the North-West has representative government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I cannot find that the North-West people are obliged to tax themselves for any purpose. I do not know anything provided by ordinary Provincial Governments and municipalities which is not provided in the North-West by the Dominion Government. That is an impression which is very widespread, and I have gathered it myself from the public records.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They tax themselves for schools and other matters to the extent of about $40,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Very partially for schools, because a very large sum is voted for school purposes by this Dominion, and that sum is altogether out of proportion to what is spent elsewhere and is increasing in a ratio that, in some districts, is positively alarming.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It will not increase in future.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, I had a conversation some time ago with a gentleman occupying a position of some responsibility in the North-West, and he gave me to understand that it was likely to increase very considerably. However, I do not want to wander from the subject. I would like to ask the Minister if he has purchased the site, what its size is, what he has paid for it, and from whom he has purchased it.

Mr. OUIMET. It is 75 feet frontage on the main street by 150 feet deep. It consists of three lots of 25 feet each. One of these lots we bought from a man named Hull, paying $2,500 for it, and the two others were given to us by the town of Calgary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. Minister advised that the lots are worth $2,500 each?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, and it was considered very cheap.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What did the city pay for the other two?

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). The city paid $6,200 for them.

Court House and Lock-up accommodation.... ..... $8,000

Mr. OUIMET. This is to provide for the building of two court houses and lock-ups for the use of the Mounted Police—one at Maple Creek and one at some point between Moosomin and Qu'Appelle, either at Grenfell or Wolseley. Both will be wooden buildings with stone foundations.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why are not these buildings left to be erected by the Legislature of the Territories?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We do not give them the funds.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that we should pay them a certain sum in proportion to their numbers, as we do to the provinces, leaving them to make such provisions as they saw proper; and if they wished to put up a better building than could be obtained with the moneys we furnished them, they could tax themselves for it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They have no funds available and none that they could raise by taxation for this purpose, and all the responsibility of the administration of justice rests upon us. The reason the Minister of Public Works cannot state definitely where the court houses are to be located is that there are so many places where court houses are desirable in the Territories. In some places the courts have to be held in hotels; but in the more important places it is desirable to have a suitable building in which to hold court.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In the Province of Ontario the court houses and gaols are not built out of funds furnished by the Provincial Treasury, but out of funds raised by taxation on the municipality, although the municipality has no control over the administration of justice except to bear the expense of supplying the accommodation.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are no municipalities in the neighbourhood of Maple Creek. In fact, there are not over half-a-dozen in all the Territories.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That only goes to show that there is no great necessity for a building of this sort.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The reason there are not more municipalities in the Territories is that a great many of the people there went from Manitoba where they were taxed out of their boots by municipal and school taxation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The taxation for these buildings must come out of somebody, and it comes out of the people of the older provinces. To say that after providing for what is necessary for their own wants, they have to provide for those of the North-West Territories, seems to me to be a peculiar argument to address to the House, especially to representatives of the older provinces. I think we ought to aid the North-West Territories on precisely the same lines on which we provide for ourselves. They ought to have reasonable funds placed at their disposal, and they ought to be made responsible for the disposal of those funds for local purposes; and if they wish to erect fine buildings, they ought to bear the additional expense themselves, and in this respect they will be placed on an equality with the other portions of the Dominion. The North-West country is not a charitable institution to be maintained at the expense of the rest of the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The importance of this subject does not lie in the small amount of money we are voting, but in the precedent we are laying down, and the point is, where is it going to end? If we have to provide all these necessary appurtenances of civilization for the whole North-West Territories, it opens up a vista of expenditure which is simply delicious in the eye of a contractor and appalling in the eye of the tax-payer. It seems to me that it would be very difficult to retrace our steps, because it would be contended that as you did this for Calgary and Maple Creek, you must do the same thing for other places, and the argument would be unanswerable. We ought to be very careful about taking this initial step where the

ulterior consequences that are unavoidable and in sight are so serious; and I very largely share the feeling of my hon. friend, that while it is important and right under the peculiar circumstances in which the people there are placed, that we should supply them with those institutions which are supplied by the Provincial Governments of the various provinces, I question very much on what principle we can be asked to supply them with those things which are supplied elsewhere by municipal taxation. The Minister of Interior says that many people who were taxed out of their boots in Manitoba, left that province to go to the North-West, and that they objected to being taxed there again. Every one shares their dislike for taxation, but then there is the other side to the question. The tax-payers from whom the money is taken ought to have some consideration. They are taxed for their own municipal institutions, and now it seems they are also to be taxed for the municipal institutions of the North-West. From what the hon. gentleman states, I am inclined to think that his ideas as to the character of the buildings that ought to be erected are far in advance of what the ideas of the people would be if they had to put their hands in their own pockets and pay for them. We are putting up these buildings on what is called a Dominion scale for Dominion purposes, and I am bound to say, if they had to be erected at the cost of the North-West settler, his requirement would be very different, and they would be on a much more modest scale. It is a matter for congratulation, and ought to be published everywhere, that if there is an inhabitant of this Dominion favoured beyond all others it is the settler in the North-West. To some extent that is justifiable, as we are trying to get people in there and ought to give them every inducement, and we are giving them inducements which were never given any other settlers in the world. I do not think, though I say this with diffidence and subject to correction, that the United States Government provided institutions for the settlers of the Territories before they became states or at any rate acquired territorial government. I think we are treating these North-West settlers more generously than any other settlers in the world have been treated, and I think the hon. gentleman ought to be excessively cautious how he sets a precedent for vast expenditure, because although the item under discussion may not itself amount to much, it may be used in the future to extract from the treasury very large sums for buildings in other places. I thought that last session when we extended the powers and the jurisdiction of the North-West Legislature, they were to have full control of their local affairs, and this sort of thing was to cease. I have not at hand the Act passed last session, but I am certainly under the impression that their local powers were largely increased, and I think it was intimated from the other side that such votes as this would not be required in the future, and that the Legislature of the North-West Territories would be placed in a position to legislate upon these matters. In any case, I do think the time is approaching when they should be provided with means of setting up house-keeping on their own account, as it is almost impossible for members of this House to legislate with sufficient knowledge upon matters of this kind, as we are far too distant to give them proper consideration. I hope that very soon the Government will be in a position to extend to these Territories full provincial powers and provide the Territories, from whatever source seems most appropriate after a careful study of the situation, with the means of conducting their own affairs. They will no doubt then exercise economy much more effectively than we can possibly do at this distance from the scene of operations.

Mr. FRASER. How many other buildings of this kind does the hon. gentleman think necessary to put up in the North-West?

Mr. OUIMET. I could not tell. It would depend a good deal on the rapid settlement of the Territories.

Mr. FRASER. The answer makes the question more serious than it was before. If the number of buildings which will have to be built is indefinite and will depend on the growth of that rich country, then we have a cause of expenditure on our hands worse even than building the Canadian Pacific Railway. It must not be forgotten that the North-West is a very rich country, one of the richest in the world, and the people there get their lands cheaper than they do in the older provinces, particularly in the Maritime Provinces. Are the settlers to get all these municipal buildings built for them by this Government, besides getting land and every other opportunity for railway construction? I know counties that are not wealthy, counties where the people have a great deal of difficulty in making ends meet, and they have to put up their own public buildings. The Government ought at once to inaugurate a system by which these people in the North-West would be compelled to do so. I believe, with the hon. member for Queen's, that we ought to give advantages to that new country, but only in so far as it is necessary to put them in the same position as people in the older provinces. It is not fair to the older provinces that they should have to put up their own public buildings and be taxed besides to put up those in the North-West where the people are better off than we are. What will be the effect of this? When the farmers of the North-West Territories are more wealthy than others in the Dominion, they will find themselves not only wealthy as regards land but also as regards public buildings, court houses, gaols and other buildings built for them by the older provinces, while these provinces have to put up such buildings for themselves.

Mr. BOWELL. And get subsidies.

Mr. FRASER. Yes; and the new territories will be getting subsidies just the same, without taking into account these expenditures, because they will not be a charge on the Territories as the debts of the old provinces were a charge on them when they entered Confederation. These court houses and other buildings which we are erecting are matters of municipal government. Court houses are matters of municipal government, and I feel certain that when the time comes that these Territories shall enter the Dominion as provinces, there will be no account taken of this. It is unfair that they should start out with all these advantages, and I think the Government ought to be able to give us some idea of the extent of the expenditures in this

direction. If, as the Minister says, he has no idea, and if, as the country grows, we will have to erect these buildings which are required, then I say that the outlook is not hopeful. I believe it will be found that the expenditures made by this Government in the Territories are not made as judiciously as they would be under municipal government. When the people are taxed directly themselves they will see that these moneys are carefully expended and that exactly the kind of buildings required are erected. You build a very fine building out of a vote of this House, in a certain locality. The next place that wants a building will require one just as fine, and how can the Government say nay? I do not think there is an hon. gentleman on either side of the House who will object to granting what is fair to the North-West, and who would not be willing to do everything possible to lighten the difficulties that the earlier settlers have to contend with. It is at least fair, however, that we should know how far the Government are going in this respect, and that the Government should state now how these buildings are going to be charged against these sections of the country when they enter as provinces into Confederation. Of course these provinces will have to get a subsidy just as the older provinces from the Dominion treasury, and I think the cost of these buildings should be taken into account when they enter. If that is not done, a great advantage will be given to these rich settlements, richer by far than any older part of the Dominion. The Government should have some idea of what they intend to do in this matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no difficulty in stating how far we are going, because the matter is in the hands of the House from year to year. There are four judicial districts there, and three or four places in each district where it would be desirable to have court house accommodation, and the plan on which we originally started out was to ask Parliament for about $4,000 each year to provide that accommodation by cheap and temporary buildings. We have not quite kept up with that. We have turned two immigrant sheds, which were not required, into court houses, and we have built one court house. That is as far as we have gone except in the case of Calgary, which is in a different position altogether, and in Lethbridge where we have been given a site. The idea is not at all to build expensive or even permanent buildings, because we look forward to the development of the Territories in such a way that they will be able to provide for themselves. As far as I know we do not stand committed, and we have no intention of being committed, to any plan of putting up municipal or public buildings for the people of the Territories. We have no idea whatever of putting up that class of buildings which would be taken into computation as part of the public works, if provinces should be established there in the early future. Our object is simply this: The judges have to administer justice in places where there is not the slightest accommodation for the judge to preside, or the jury and witnesses to sit, or even for the prisoners to be kept. When the judge arrives at one of these country places, his first look-out is to see if there is a school-house that he can get to adjourn for a day or for a week, in order to hold his court there. If he is fortunate, he takes the teacher's desk and sets up Her Majesty's court there. If not, he has to hold the court in a hotel, in the dining room, if he is fortunate enough to get the dining room. We do not think that kind of thing is conducive to the respect or efficiency which should attend the administration of justice, and we think that this country can afford to put up buildings which will provide court house accommodation for the next few years; not at all buildings of an expensive character, but cheap wooden buildings where two or three prisoners can be kept below, and where the judge and the court can sit above. If Parliament at any time is tired of pursuing that scheme, or if the Territories have sufficiently developed to form municipalities to tax themselves, Parliament can stop any year, and we have no desire to go forward beyond the actual wants of the country. Certainly the state of progress of settlement in the Territories has not yet been such as to warrant us to expect that the people will tax themselves for buildings of that character, and no comparison can be instituted with counties in the older provinces which have erected court houses. There are no counties in the Territories; there is no population of a density that would make it possible to put up a structure such as a court house. But, when these settlements grow, and when the towns are formed they can build their court houses for themselves just as they can build town halls; and when the municipal institutions are established they will be able to provide better buildings than we are now erecting. When the time comes to extend the provincial system they will, of course, have to look after all these buildings themselves. In the older provinces—I am speaking from my recollection of the earlier history of the provinces by the sea—grants were made of this character for the building of court houses in many parts of the provinces, in the earlier times when the state of settlement was about what it is in the North-West now. Of course as the counties became organized they were able and willing to look after their own municipal buildings. There is the other side of the question, that we could of course give the money to the Territorial Government to erect and look after these buildings. That would be a convenient system for us, and we would have no care in future for works of this character; but I think we will find there is no economy in it, because for every dollar that you now give for small temporary buildings of this character, we should have to give $10, if we give it in the shape of a subsidy to the Territorial Government. We will find in all probability that the money will be devoted to the services which specially interest the members of the Territorial Legislature, and that the services over which we have a particular care, such as the administration of justice, will be left uncared for. I believe there is real economy in our keeping control of the funds for these purposes, though I am quite willing to be guided by the views of the House if it is considered that a change would be in the interest of the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Any one who has read the early history of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick will know that the judges had to administer justice under similar difficulties, but I think justice was as well administered then as when the judges are met by the sheriff with a four-horse carriage, accompanied by an outrider blowing a horn.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have never seen that here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have often seen it in the old country. I want to arrive at the principle upon which we appropriate the money which we vote to the North-West every year. Do I understand that it is given on any *per capita* basis, or is it just as the Local Assembly submits a demand or a schedule of its wants, and is that endorsed by the Government and proposed to Parliament?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Every year since the formation of the Territories, an estimate has been prepared by the Lieutenant Governor and sent down here, and it is criticised here and submitted to Parliament after consideration.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What was done by the Lieutenant Governor formerly is, I suppose, now done by the Lieutenant Governor in Council?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is advised to a certain extent by the Assembly. In former times there was a vote for the Administration of the Government in the North-West Territories, with so much for education, so much for roads and bridges, and so much for salaries. The plan now is to vote the amount to the Territorial Government for these services.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Last year we vested in the Legislative Assembly of the North-West larger powers than they ever had before. In point of fact, we conferred upon them substantial power very closely akin to those which are exercisable by the Provincial Assemblies. Amongst those is the power to make ordinances for the establishment, maintenance and management of prisons in and for the Territories. Having given them exclusive control, as I suppose, over the establishment and maintenance of prisons, it would appear to me to be logical and proper to allow them to construct these works out of the moneys we vote to them. I differ with the Minister of Justice in his opinion that they will spend $10 where we would spend $1. I suppose they would do that if they could come here and get all the money they ask for, but Parliament determined that this was a proper power to delegate to them, and I think we ought to leave that entirely in their hands. We are practically repealing that power and showing that we have no faith in them, if we are to continue to build these prisons for them. It might be necessary to increase the grant by a few thousand dollars, but I do not know and I do not commit myself to that. Those who are responsible for submitting expenditures to the House should consider whether or not they should leave this matter to the North-West Assembly. At present you give them $235,000, and you supplement that by paying for the public buildings which you declare it is solely within their province to establish and maintain.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are not building any prisons at all. These lock-ups are only places of detention for prisoners awaiting trial. Generally, the prisoners are held in the Mounted Police barracks. When the judge goes to the place of trial the Mounted Police bring the prisoners with them, and these lock-ups are in the basement of the court house to keep the prisoners in until their cases are disposed of and they are sent to the penitentiary or to the guard-room. We are not providing for prisons. We have no gaolers and do not intend to appoint any. It may be a question whether this system should be continued, and next year we may consider whether we shall stop or go on with the same policy.

Mr. LAURIER. What will be the difference between next year and this year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have two or three votes outstanding—buildings that are not finished—and we may desire to go on and finish those without undertaking new works. We have not committed ourselves by any promise or undertaking for the future.

Mr. LAURIER. The only reason the hon. gentleman has given for this is the reason of economy. He says that, if we left this to the Territorial Assembly, we would have to pay $10 for $1, but that would apply to the province as well as to the North-West Territories. I am not sure whether that might not be a subject for consideration at some time or another, but, while that principle is not applied to the provinces, I do not see why it is to be applied to the Territories.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What I meant to convey was that there was no argument on the score of economy in applying this system to the Territories.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But if you give them a certain amount, they must cut their coat according to their cloth.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. But you might have to give them more money.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We need not give them more than we do now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It would have to be a *per capita* arrangement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Supposing we do, there is no reason why we should give them more money in proportion than we give to an equal number of people in the older provinces, save and except this, that we have taken possession of all the lands in that country which, in my opinion, is the only thing that constitutes a legitimate excuse for a great deal of what we are doing here. It may be an open question as to whether they would not make a better use of the money than is made of it from Ottawa.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have discussed the subsidy question very closely with the representatives, and we were satisfied that if we embarked on that plan we would have to give very much larger sums of money than we vote now for the Territories, or else we might begin an agitation which would lead the people to think they were not as well treated as the people of the older provinces, in view of our having the lands, and in view of the great extent of territory which they have to provide for.

Mr. LAURIER. That may be, but since the hon. gentleman has alluded to it, is it not a fact that the representatives of the Territories have insisted on having control of these moneys?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, and if these services are to be provided for by the local authorities, we must add a good many tens of thousands a year to what is granted now.

Public Buildings in British Columbia—General repairs and improvements . $3,000

Mr. OUIMET. This item is to provide for various improvements and repairs to the Dominion buildings in British Columbia—post office at Nanaimo, a fishery office at New Westminster, penitentiary and post office at New Westminster, custom house and immigrant building at Vancouver, custom house, post office, quarantine station and immigrant buildings at Victoria.

Vancouver Post Office and Custom House. $30,800

Mr. OUIMET. This vote is to make provision towards the erection of a post office at Vancouver. The total estimate of the building is $79,839. Of that, $24,733 have been already spent. The amount of the present contract is $54,500. A. E. Carter was the first contractor but he became insane, and his contract was cancelled. New tenders were asked for, and Thomas Tompkins, of Brockville, got the contract, at $54,500. The site of the building cost $4,000.

Mr. CORBOULD. It is worth $40,000 to-day.

Mr. BOWELL. It was set apart by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for a public building when they first laid out their property, and it was reserved.

Mr. LAURIER. They made no donation of it to the Government?

Mr. BOWELL. If you compare the prices of the adjacent lots, you may almost say it was a present. The hon. gentleman laughs, but I assure him that the corner lot immediately opposite sold, when I was at Vancouver, for between $40,000 and $50,000, the very same sized lot.

Mr. LAURIER. But that had been set apart for a post office.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, when the town site was originally laid out they said: You can have that at the price we are now selling the property; and the Government took it.

Mr. OUIMET. The population of the city is 13,709; in 1881 there was not a soul there. The postal revenue is $21,585.99; customs duties, $261,377.82; savings bank deposits, $41,570; money orders, $269,900; value of exports, $511,599; imports, $1,155,951; goods entered for consumption, $965,316; excise, $48,306.

Mr. CASEY. It seems to me this is a very large amount to pay for a post office there—about $80,000 in round numbers. I think this should build a post office for a city the size of Toronto.

Mr. OUIMET. The Toronto building cost over $300,000, not including the examining warehouse, and it was built by the Mackenzie Government.

Mr. CASEY. I think in this case, as in many others where public buildings are erected, more is spent than is necessary to give the required accommodation, merely for the sake of having a handsome building. A public building should be substantial, but I do not think we are called upon to build an extremely handsome and attractive building merely to advertise the city of Vancouver.

Victoria Drill Hall..... $14,000

Mr. OUIMET. This is for the purpose of proceeding with the work of erecting a drill hall in Victoria. A contract has been let for $33,000, but incidental expenses and fittings will bring it up to $35,000.

Mr. CASEY. The number of volunteers that will use this drill shed will not equal the strength of an ordinary country battalion. Formerly wooden drill sheds were built, costing from $6,000 to $8,000. A wooden structure would answer all purposes in Victoria. It is perfectly absurd that such an expenditure as $35,000 should be made for this purpose in Victoria, in view of its population and the number of men who would use the drill hall.

Mr. BOWELL. The drill shed in Belleville for one battalion cost $25,000, and the accommodation is not beyond the requirements.

Mr. CASEY. There is a difference, at all events, of $6,000 or $8,000, and the number of volunteers in Victoria will not equal that in Belleville.

Mr. BOWELL. There is in Victoria a battery in command of Col. Prior, and also "C" Battery. Victoria is the capital of British Columbia, and a wooden drill shed would not suit either the people or the character of the buildings in that city. When you consider the importance of the place, and the value of the property, and the nature of the buildings in the city, $20,000 or $30,000 is as little as could be expected in order to secure the necessary accommodation.

Mr. CASEY. Timber of the very finest quality, which is not to be obtained in this part of the country, is cheap in British Columbia, and a practically permanent drill shed could be built of wood at far less than the item before the House. I would point out that batteries do not need a drill shed of the same extent as infantry do, because except for mounting and dismounting the guns, batteries require to be drilled out of doors.

Mr. BOWELL. I will make a note of the information required by the hon. gentleman and provide it on concurrence.

Victoria Military Buildings..... $5,000

Mr. OUIMET. These buildings are for "C" Battery and Gunnery School. It is intended to provide a building for the new magazine on the barrack property, new quartermaster's office, quarters for the staff sergeants, stables, a hospital which alone will cost $4,000, and a drill shed of 50 x 100 for the men, costing $2,550. This $5,000 is to pay part of that expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know generally what arrangements have been made between the Government and the Imperial authorities touching the fortifications of Victoria? If I remember aright in a discussion which took place some time ago in the Imperial House on the subject, there was an intimation thrown out, either that an agreement had been come to, or that a proposition had been made to the Government here involving a very considerable expenditure for the purpose of fortifying Victoria. I should like to know what arrangements have been come to, or what negotiations are going on with the Imperial authorities?

Mr. BOWELL. There have been negotiations or correspondence between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government on the subject of the fortifications of Esquimalt, but they are not

yet concluded. I do not think public interests would be served by complying with my hon. friend's request to state what these propositions are at the present time. As soon as time will permit during the summer, it is the intention to consider that whole correspondence and report to Council. This $5,000 has nothing whatever to do with the fortifications at Esquimalt, but is for the accommodation of "C" Battery.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can quite understand that the hon. gentleman may not feel at liberty to discuss what is going on with the Imperial authorities, but I suppose that whenever any agreement is come to, the papers will be communicated to us at a reasonably early date. If Esquimalt is going to be fortified in such a fashion as to resist possible attacks from hostile ironclads, undoubtedly the expenditure would be no trifle, and we ought to be informed at an early date what agreement you propose to undertake.

Mr. BOWELL. I quite concur in the remark of the hon. gentleman that when an expenditure which probably may be of a large character is needed, the information which he has asked should be laid before the House, unless there are good reasons against it. I may just as well frankly state that I have not had time to consider this matter sufficiently to give an intelligent opinion to the House, as to how far the Government is prepared to agree to the recommendations which have been made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there are no English soldiers in Vancouver at present?

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any naval force maintained there?

Mr. BOWELL. There are four ships of war there at present, among them the Admiral's flag ship at Esquimalt.

Mr. CASEY. I would point out to the Minister that there is no report of the inspection of the British Columbia volunteers in the annual report of the department.

Mr. BOWELL. The General has informed me that the report was not published with the others because, when it was sent to him, it was of such a character that he could not accept it, and he had to send it back, and it did not arrive in time for publication.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister will have that report in his department?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, I suppose so.

Mr. CASEY. Is this to complete the buildings?

Mr. OUIMET. No; the total estimate is about $12,000, and it will be to accommodate over one hundred men of "C" Battery.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Would it be asking the hon. gentleman too much to tell us what he intends to take up on Wednesday?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If a good many members attend, I would like to move the second reading of the Redistribution Bill. If there is a very thin House, I would not think that reasonable. In that case I would take the Criminal Law and Supply, and leave the Redistribution Bill till Friday.

Mr. LAURIER. The Government notices of motion, then, will not come up on Wednesday?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would take these on the day most convenient to the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Say Friday, then.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Very well.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10 o'clock, p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 25th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CANVAS COAL BAGS.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Whether the Government asked for tenders for the making of canvas coal bags, at St. John, N.B., during the winter or spring of 1891? If so, what was the number of bags tendered for? What were the names of the different contractors, and what was the price of each tender? Was the contract given to the lowest tender?

Mr. TUPPER. No public tenders were invited by the department for coal bags at St. John. The agent reports that in June he asked for a price of 150 bags from Brundage & Jackson, and accepted an offer from them at the rate of $2.25 each, as in his opinion they made the best, strongest and most suitable bags for the purpose.

MAILS FOR STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. CARROLL) asked, Whether the Government asked for tenders for the carrying of the mails between Ste. Anne de la Pocatière station and the village of that name? What were the names of the parties who tendered, and the amount of each tender? Has the contract been awarded to the lowest tenderer?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Tenders were asked for this service, but they were not considered, as application having been made for the renewal of the existing contract, the renewal was authorized.

PRINTING BUREAU—SALE OF TYPE.

Mr. FRASER (for Mr. FORBES) asked, Whether the Government has disposed of any type, during the last two years, from the Printing Bureau or elsewhere? If so, how much of each kind? To whom sold and for what prices, and why was the sale made?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The Government has disposed of no type from the Printing Bureau during the last two years.

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL—CONTRACT.

Mr. MULOCK asked, 1. To whom was the contract let for deepening and forming the upper entrance to the Sault Ste. Marie Canal? 2. Has

the work been completed? If not, what proportion thereof yet remains to be done? 3. Has the work been carried on by the original contractors, or has any one been associated with them? If so, who? 4. What was the estimated amount of the lowest tender for the deepening and forming the lower entrance to said canal? 5. Was any tender received for performing said works on both sections? If so, what was the estimated amount of such tender? 6. To whom was let the contract for performing such works? 7. What was the estimated cost of the performance of the last-mentioned works? 8. What amount has been paid on each contract? 9. What amount, if any, in respect of each contract has been earned and is unpaid?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. The contract for the upper entrance was let to Allan & Fleming. 2. The work is not completed. Between a quarter and a third of the work has yet to be done. 3. The department only deals with the original contractors and is not aware of any one being associated with them. 4. The estimated amount of lowest tender for lower entrance, that of Hugh Ryan & Co., was $299,313. 5. Tenders were called for both sections together, and each contractor tendered on the whole work; the division into two contracts was made after the tenders were received. The estimated amount of lowest tender for the whole work, that of John Nicholson, was $608,249; the next lowest, that of Hugh Ryan & Co., was $648,134. 6. The contract for lower entrance was let to Hugh Ryan & Co., and for upper entrance to Allan & Fleming. 7. The estimated cost of lower entrance at contractors' prices was, for lower entrance, $299,313. 8. The amount paid Hugh Ryan & Co. on lower entrance is $163,224.34. The amount paid Allan & Fleming on upper entrance is $237,401.88. 9. The only amount due contractors for these works is the drawback, which is, for Hugh Ryan & Co. $18,136.04, and for Allan & Fleming $2,439.09.

FISHING PRIVILEGES ON LAKE ST. PETER.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL asked, Whether the Government have decided to cancel that part of the instructions issued to the fishery overseers of the counties surrounding Lake St. Peter, in a circular issued to them on the 11th April last (1892), which reads as follows:—

"5. The privilege of taking soft fish during the close season for other fish is, by the Minister's directions, withdrawn; it being held that the judicious laws enacted for the protection of fish at spawning time should be stringently enforced."

Have the Government legal authority to prevent fishermen from taking fish which is not protected by any law and the catch of which is open at all seasons of the year? Have the Government been informed that the fishery overseer for the district of Montreal has confiscated a large quantity of fish which had been brought to market, without any notice having been given to fishermen that the catching of soft fish had been prohibited, thus inflicting on them, not only the loss of the fruit of their toil, but also the expenses of their journey and for carriage? Is it the intention of the Government to indemnify these poor fishermen for the loss so inflicted on them by taking away, without notice, a right they have always enjoyed under the law and under the regulations of the Department of Fisheries, and for the loss of their fish and their expenses? At what date will the prohibition mentioned in article 5 of the said instructions to fishery overseers terminate?

Mr. TUPPER. While the question recites correctly the 5th clause of the directions issued by the Department of Fisheries touching the privilege of taking soft fish during the close season, it is misleading to some extent. The privilege was not, strictly speaking, withdrawn. For some years back it had been the custom to issue permits, notwithstanding the close season, for the catching of coarse fish in the districts affected by this question. That was not continued this season, and the notice of its non-continuance was as stated in clause 5. I may say that the Government have not decided to cancel these instructions; but the subject has been brought to the attention of the Government and is now engaging their consideration, whether the permission hitherto granted, and granted only for a certain number of years back, shall be continued or not. The Government have legal authority to prevent the taking of fish which are not protected by any law and the catch of which is open at all seasons of the year. I am correcting the hon. gentleman's question a little, but answering it. Under the general regulations all fishing without license is prohibited in the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario, so that in that manner the Government are able to protect the fisheries and to refuse to allow fishing though the season for the particular fish for which a license is desired is open. The other portion of the question I may answer as follows:—The local fishery overseer having reported that he had seized at Montreal some thirteen boxes of soft fish which were claimed to have been caught in the Berthier district, it was ascertained that the permit was only a receipt for money paid for a license. The fish were subsequently released. The Government have no intention of indemnifying the fishermen for fish caught contrary to the regulations. In reference to the last part of the question, at what date will the prohibition terminate, I cannot state, until the conclusion of the present consideration of the subject, anything as to the continuance of those permits.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. I was not referring to the thirteen boxes of fish which have been released, but to the seizure of a very large quantity of fish in the harbour of Montreal, which were either thrown into the water or given away by Mr. Morris, the Government officer, without the fishermen having any chance of disposing of them at any price.

Mr. TUPPER. That subject has not come to my attention; but I may tell the hon. gentleman that even were the facts which he has stated officially brought to my notice, the fishermen would have no right to indemnity under the circumstances I have mentioned. The decision of the Government may be right or wrong, but all fish caught without authority and during the close season without license under the present regulations found in the consolidated Orders in Council, section 15, would be illegally caught.

CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before passing to the Orders of the Day, I would invite the Government,

if they are in a position to do so, to state to the House whether any negotiations are at present pending between Canada and Newfoundland with reference to the fiscal relations existing between that province and this Dominion. The newspaper press has reported that the Bond-Blaine Treaty will not positively receive the sanction of the Home Government, and also that negotiations are pending between the Dominion and Newfoundland, and that they have arrived at a satisfactory stage. I have no information personally in reference to the matter, but I think the House has a right to be informed if such negotiations are pending, and what the negotiations are.

Mr. FOSTER. In reply to my hon. friend, I may say that negotiations have been going on and are now approaching what seems to be a successful termination. We have had an intimation from the Newfoundland Government that the *status quo* of 1889 will be returned to on their part, if we are willing to return to it, which we are, for the remainder of this year, and pending further negotiations.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I assume that the Government intend in that view to introduce legislation which will render that *status quo ante* legal.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That may not be necessary, in view of the powers given in the Act to issue a proclamation relieving certain products of certain duties; but that is a matter of detail about which we cannot be informed definitely, until we know more definitely the details of the proposition made by the Newfoundland Government. We are in communication with them on that subject now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is any delegation coming here from Newfoundland, or any going from here to Newfoundland?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know; but the proposal, as the House will remember, was that the *status quo* could be reverted to pending negotiations, and the acceptance of that in general terms, is all that we are able to state. I presume there will be communications from that Government received here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is rumoured also that certain initiatory steps have been taken on the part of one Government or the other with a view of bringing about a union of that province with the Dominion. Is the Minister in a position to make any statement in that regard?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That subject has not been discussed of late.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman in a position to make any statement to me to-day in reference to the Bill reserved by the Lieutenant Governor of Prince Edward Island regarding the Legislative Council of that province?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not, just for this reason: that on the day on which the hon. gentleman last spoke to me in the House, I was in receipt of a communication from the Lieutenant Governor, stating that he would, if desired, transmit the reasons which induced him to refrain from assenting to the Bill. I immediately replied that it was desirable that he should communicate those reasons. To-day a communication has been received from him, and, if the hon. gentleman desires it, I shall be ready to state in the first part of the week what policy will be adopted.

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law.—(Sir John Thompson.)

On section 143,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perjury is by the common law an assertion on oath as to a matter of fact material to the issue being tried, and assertions on immaterial matters do not come within the meaning of that offence. A statute, I understand, was passed some years ago in Canada, which may or may not have the effect of extending perjury beyond statements made under oath on matters material to the issue. The language is rather curious, and some lawyers hold that the definition extended under that statute, to every statement made on oath, whether material or not. I am sorry that some attention was not called particularly to the sections in our Bill which alter those of the English Bill of 1880 in matters of definition. At first sight, one would suppose that this section was exactly that of the Bill of 1880, but the very material words are added: "Whether such evidence is material or not." These words are not in the English Bill. It is well that the committee should understand that a witness nowadays is subject to examination of a most severe character, extending to matters which have no relation to the subject before the court, and which is allowed for the purpose of testing his credibility. It may be right or it may not that we should attach to every statement made by a witness, whether it has reference to a material part of the examination or not, the qualification of perjury, if wilfully incorrect, but we should understand that we are doing so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In that respect it was intended to make the law perfectly clear. The effect is exactly the same as that of our section in the Revised Statutes. The question always arose, under indictment at common law, as to whether testimony alleged to have been false was material to the issue, and efforts were made to show it to be irrelevant and inadmissible. To prevent confusion, by allowing exceptions of that kind, it was thought desirable to settle that the reception of evidence establishes its materiality, as otherwise tribunals trying for perjury would have to re-try the other case practically, for the purpose of seeing whether the evidence was or not. Section 5 of the Perjury Act in the Revised Statutes got over the difficulty in a roundabout way, by providing that every statement under oath shall be "deemed material." The present section is shorter and plainer: "Whether such evidence be material or not." I think the effect of the English Bill would have been the same, as it provides that it shall be perjury whether the evidence was admissible or not. A great many causes of confusion are eliminated from the enquiry into perjury by this definition, and the guilt of the accused is exactly the same, whether the evidence is material or not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman will find that the English section did not go so far as to say that the evidence, whether admissible or not, would be perjury.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The English Bill provide that every person is a witness who actually gives evidence, whether he is competent to be a witness or not, or whether the evidence be admissible or not. It provides that he shall be deemed to be a witness though everything he said was inadmissible.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seems to me that the English Bill merely removed from the category of doubtful points the question whether a man was a competent witness or not, but it did not purport to extend the crime of perjury in any sense. The latitude now allowed in cross-examination is enormous. A witness may be called upon to prove an account in court, and I am happy to know that most counsel recognize the responsibilities of their position and do not put witnesses on the rack unnecessarily, but there are counsel who for various reasons are not actuated by the highest considerations, and the witness may be examined in reference to his private life or the moral character of others and in regard to matters without any relevancy to the question at issue. Many witnesses consider that these are questions they are not sworn to answer, and very often they do not treat them as they do questions affecting the matter before the court. It is worthy of consideration whether, if a man is asked totally immaterial questions as to his private life or his conduct many years before, not connected with any matter before the court, questions which may not be put from motives of the most creditable character, he should be put on the same status in regard to his answers, if he makes untrue answers, as if he were replying to questions affecting the issue before the court.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I know there are some text writers, and there are some judgments among the elder decisions of the courts that do not permit a cross-examiner to go as far as my hon. friend has stated, but the weight of authority at the present time is, I think, that the right of a cross-examiner in testing the credibility of a witness is practically unrestrained except by his own consideration of what is proper. Whether that ought to be so or not, it is not for us now to consider. The Minister has referred to the case of a party who ought not to have been examined on the trial, but how is it with regard to a person who ought to have been examined? It is perfectly clear, as far as he is concerned, that, under the English Bill, if it had become law, he could not have been prosecuted for perjury with regard to his answer on an immaterial subject. I think the intention was to make the responsibility of the person who ought not to have been examined, who was not a proper witness, just as much as that of a proper witness and no more. According to the common law ruling one who had not been a proper witness would not have been responsible for perjury on account of anything he testified, his evidence not having been properly received. That Bill proposed that he should be made responsible for his testimony just as if he had been a proper and pertinent witness. It did not pretend to put him on any different footing from any other witness, and I therefore think that all you can properly infer is that, as far as his testimony was testimony important in the issue, he would be held responsible though even he was not a proper party to call in the matter, so that it leaves the law in regard to proper and pertinent witnesses as it was before.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was not undertaking to discuss critically the wording of the English Bill, which has not become law, but my impression is that it goes further than my hon. friends think. As to the latitude of cross-examination, it comes to this, that the right of cross-examination has practically no limit so far as it tests the credibility of the witness who is testifying, and, if a witness is examined in reference to matters which are immaterial to the issue but which are material to his own credibility, it should be left to the court to punish him for perjury if he makes a false statement. The decision depends, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, upon the credibility of the witnesses, and very often the court is misled by the evidence given, and it has been very difficult to arrive at what was the distinction at common law between what testimony was relevant or material and what was not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If counsel undertakes to examine a witness on matters which are not material to the issue, he is bound by the answer whether it is right or wrong. You cannot call other witnesses to prove that the witness made a false statement. The courts have found it necessary to put some limit to this irrelevant cross-examination, and the only limit they could put to it was that, if counsel asked an irrelevant question, he was bound by the issue, and then the common law came in and said, if you asked a witness a question as to his own moral character or that of some third person, you did so at your own peril, the witness could not be prosecuted for perjury, and you could not contradict his testimony. Now, we are removing one of these guarantees, and I think the extreme latitude of cross-examination will have one of the most important restrictions removed. I think educated popular opinion for many years has been running in the other direction. I think most people are of the opinion that this cross-examination is carried to an absurd and extreme latitude, which is wholly unjustifiable in many cases, and calculated to do untold wrong, besides wringing the heart of a sensitive witness very often, as I have seen it done. But if the committee are satisfied to introduce this serious change in the law, I cannot help it.

Mr. WELDON. It has been here 23 years.

Mr. MASSON. I agree with the hon. gentleman as to this being new, according to the interpretation that has been given by several of our judges in Ontario. Under our late statute, which is consolidated in the present Consolidated Statutes, it only bore this interpretation, that it was no longer necessary to prove that the statement alleged to be false, was material. That, I think, is just as far as the words of the statute can reasonably be interpreted. I agree with the Minister of Justice that if a statement is made on cross-examination that affects the credibility of the witness, it is just as important that what he says affecting his own credibility, and that gives weight to his evidence, should be true, as that the material facts referring to the issue should be true. The

point made by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island adds all the greater weight to this view, in that if the question is material, the examiner and the court are bound by the answer. The examiner cannot call witnesses to rebut or to explain it; he is bound by the answer as a whole, and he cannot call a witness to change its effect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I agree with the hon. gentleman as to the meaning of the existing law. The 5th section of the Act 32 and 33 Victoria says: "All evidence and proof whatsoever, whether given or made orally or by or in any affidavit, declaration or examination, shall be deemed or taken to be material," with respect to any liability of any person to be proceeded against. It is a *primâ facie* material. I think where you alter the criminal law and make a man liable to 14 years in the penitentiary, the courts will require very clear language to show that you intended to make the alteration. The hon. gentleman says that every statement a man makes upon oath should be subject to the same penalties, whether the statement has reference to the material issue before the court or not. Now, supposing a man is called to give evidence on a question of fact, and the lawyer cross-examining him, goes into his private life, and asks questions that no man should be asked, that no witness should be liable to be asked—and that has occurred; some notable cases have occurred in England where questions affecting not only the character of the witness but of third parties, have been asked, cruel and brutal questions, I am not so sure in my own mind that this Parliament is legislating correctly when we put an answer to an impertinent question of that kind on the same footing as an answer which a man ought to make in justice and in law, truly on his oath.

Mr. MASSON. I agree with the hon. member in that respect, that they should not be dealt with in the same manner.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They are by this Bill.

Mr. MASSON. They are put in the same category, it is called by the same name, but the heinousness of the offence is greatly different. I do not know any other way to reach the end except by putting it in the same class of crimes. A man is subpœnaed for the purpose of giving evidence upon a certain issue, and he goes into the witness box. He has had plenty of time since he was subpœnaed to consider what his evidence is to be upon that issue. He has had notice of that subject. While the witness is under cross-examination, and excited, it may be, he is asked questions that are entirely immaterial, and, in the hurry of the moment, he may give answers that are entirely incorrect. What impressed me in view of this subject was, that a witness, speaking inadvertently, under surprise, might make misstatements that would subject him to a prosecution for perjury, when, in fact, the man may never have intended to make a false statement. Of course, the intent would be a matter for the jury to consider, it might be a very difficult matter for them to consider, because there is a statement proved afterwards to be untrue, although he ought to have had time to collect his thoughts on that subject, and to know what he wanted to say. That is the greatest objection I see to introducing the immaterial questions. As to the example cited by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island, where a person is asked as to his own character, I do not consider that a serious objection, because, if his own character is open to suspicion, it is right that the court should know it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I contend with the greatest confidence that the meaning of the section is exactly the meaning of the clause in the Revised Statutes. It cannot be that "deemed" is to be *primâ facie*, because it is not a question of evidence. It is always a question of law as to whether a statement is material or not, presuming, of course, that the facts are not disputed. There is no change made in that respect. But when the statute says that a man who does so shall be deemed to have committed a certain offence it is a question, primarily, of proof. When Parliament says that evidence shall be deemed to be material, no witness, no judge, no court can deem it otherwise, no matter what evidence comes up. I think that is clear, and it has been so decided over and over again. I never heard a doubt expressed before. But as regards the latitude of cross-examination I think what the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., has said is correct. We can doubtless recall, in our experience, many cases of witnesses who have been subjected to injurious and cruel cross-examination, but we have to consider, not the feelings of witnesses nor their interests—because these must always be left to the guardianship of the tribunal—but we have to consider the necessity of arriving at the ends of justice. If a witness, even in a moment of temper or anger, under provocation, under irritation—and it is a ground of reproach for any counsel thus to irritate a witness—if, even under these circumstances, he states what is false, with a deliberate intention of misleading the tribunal and deceiving the court, it seems to me he ought to be amenable to the penalties for perjury.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose a man is put on trial for perjury, and the falsehood is deemed to be relevant, it can be contradicted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think so, because the statute says that whatever he said then shall be deemed to be material, not presumed. The materiality is a question of law, assuming the evidence to be undisputed; and if the evidence is disputed, still it is open as much as it was then. It does not affect the question of materiality. The fact being apparent, that he swore to such and such a transaction, and that the statement was not true, it is for the court and not for the jury to decide whether it was material to the issue. The phrase is common in criminal law that if a man does so and so he shall be "deemed" to have committed larceny, and so forth. It is not made a matter of presumption, but it is a declaration by the Legislature that the act which he commits constitutes that offence, and no one can gainsay it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I submit whether, when it is declared by statute that the falsehood must be material, it could not be met by evidence. It has been claimed that this is not material to the party, although he may be seriously injured by it, and counsel may ruin the reputation and cast suspicion on a party who is not before the court by the very questions he may ask. If this House proposes to extend the liability of the party in this way, we must also alter the present law as regards the rights of counsel.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Taschereau, in the chapter on perjury in his work, referring to the report of the Criminal Law Commissioners, says:

"There is no doubt, however, that, according to all the definitions of this offence, by the common law, the party must be lawfully sworn, the proceeding in which the oath is taken must relate to the administration of justice, the assertion sworn to must be false, the intention to swear falsely must be wilful, and the falsehood material to the matter in question."

In their code, as he understands it, they do not alter the essential ingredients of the materiality of the answer. According to English law, it is still necessary that the answer should be material, before it is possible to sustain any indictment for perjury.

On section 146,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Taking these sections together I must say they are inartistically drawn and will require to be redrafted. In section 143 the attempt is made to define in so many words of what perjury shall consist, and, rightly or wrongly, the draftsman has omitted the words "knowingly, wilfully and corruptly." They were left out presumably for a purpose, and the section thus defines perjury to be something other than it was technically defined at common law, thus leaving it open to the interpretation that every one making, under oath, an assertion knowing it to be false, was guilty of perjury. The subsequent sections define perjury *quoad* any oath, affirmation, solemn declaration or affidavit, as different from perjury as defined when made during an examination in court. In section 146 these words "knowingly, wilfully and corruptly" are inserted. It is not desirable to have two distinct definitions of perjury, and section 146 might be omitted and a few apt words added to section 143.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. Let the section stand.

Section postponed.

On section 149,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is a new offence altogether, and I certainly do not understand at present exactly what it is.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is an analogous offence to making a false statement. It is fabricating circumstances which coincide with the statement made by a witness. There is an illustration given in the report, in which a person was charged with firing a pistol with intent to kill. The defence was that the pistol was not loaded and the discharge was only intended to frighten. Evidence was given that a pistol ball had been found in a tree, in the line from the spot where the accused fired. It was afterwards discovered that the ball had been placed in the tree by those interested in the prosecution, in order to supply a missing link in the evidence. In the cases of evidence regarding firearms having been recently discharged and such matters, the fabrication of evidence is not very uncommon, although grave cases, like the one mentioned in the report, are somewhat rare.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I fail to grasp the distinction between this new offence and subornation of perjury.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There would be no subornation of perjury in a case such as quoted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

On section 150,

Mr. MULOCK. I think with all these new penalties you will have to get increased prison accommodation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is merely showing what the law is.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If you are attempting to codify you ought to do so with the whole law and not with a part. To single out from the general law of conspiracy one particular point, and not to cover the vast range of offences which the law of conspiracy does cover, seems to me a peculiar proceeding.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The offence mentioned in this section is one which we ought to mark with a special punishment. This kind of conspiracy which tends to the misleading of justice is closely analogous to perjury.

Mr. LAURIER. What are the new reasons for it? You propose to take it out of the category in which it is now, and to put it in a special category. Could the hon. gentleman say what are the reasons for that?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It ought to be a special offence to enter into conspiracy, not to rob a man of his property, but of his life and liberty. That tends to the misleading of justice, and it ought to be made punishable just as perjury is.

Mr. LAURIER. That reason is not sufficient. The true reason would be that the punishment for the existing offence is not adequate, and that you want to repress a species of crime which is becoming common. Unless there is some special object it seems to me that it is not desirable to make this new offence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no punishment assigned to it otherwise than at the discretion of the court. Where it relates to a conspiracy to prove a crime against an innocent person, it seems to me that it is analogous to perjury, and ought to be marked by a heavy and special punishment.

Mr. DICKEY. I would ask the Minister of Justice if he does not think the punishment severe? The punishment for conspiracy to murder is only ten years. If you conspire to make a false charge against a man that would cause him to be sentenced to death or imprisonment for life, the punishment would be imprisonment for life. In section 231 it will be found that imprisonment for conspiracy to murder as the Bill was drafted, was 10 years, and that was made 14 years in committee. It seems to me that is quite as serious an offence as the conspiracies mentioned here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A sentence of 14 years is almost equivalent to life, and I move that it be reduced to 14 years.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 151,

Mr. MULOCK. This provision, imposing a penalty on magistrates for taking affidavits which they have no jurisdiction to take, has been the law, I think, for many years, and has been very much disregarded. I think it is a law that ought not to be on the Statute-book, so far as punishment by imprisonment is concerned. Justices of the peace are not learned in the law, and it has always been

their practice to take affidavits in good faith. I suppose there is not a magistrate in Canada to-day who would not be liable under this clause for having administered an affidavit when not authorized to do so. I think the only punishment imposed should be a pecuniary fine. After all, the affidavit would be a nullity. I think we ought not to pass legislation which is certain to be disregarded. You may impose any penalties you like with the view of restricting the action of magistrates; but magistrates will always be drawn from about the same class they are to-day, and they will probably continue to administer affidavits just as they are doing now. I am not in favour of exposing them to very great risks. They have very few rewards, and they accept their offices in the public interest. As in some instances we have made the law more severe, we can, I think, with equal propriety, modify it where it is now too severe. I would also say that if you want to have uniformity of language, there is no reason why you should continue the word "affidavit" in the first section, and strike it out of sub-section 2.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is struck out of the main section. The policy of this section is apparent on its face, namely, to prevent the taking of oaths on trifling occasions. This was greatly on the increase. Every time a man was injured or thought he was or had any complaint, he rushed off and made an affidavit; and although the Act does not prevent by any means all extra-judicial oaths, it has suppressed a vast number of them. The frequency with which statutory declarations have come into use shows that the Act has had good effect. Of course, the penalty of imprisonment will not be imposed on a magistrate who acted in good faith, or even in ignorance of the law.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the ignorance of the law excuse him?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will save him from imprisonment. We leave that to the discretion of the court, as we do every penalty. When we remember that the Act has been in force fifteen or sixteen years and nobody has been imprisoned improperly, we have reason to feel confidence in the exercise of discretion by the judges.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we may assume that there are many cases in which magistrates have violated the law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. And this extra penalty has never been enforced. Why? Because it was against the conscience of the courts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the fact that imprisonment may be inflicted has prevented many violations of the law by magistrates.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is willing to trust every judge with full discretion. I do not wish to trust judges with more discretion than is necessary. Their powers should not be greater than reasonably necessary. The hon. gentleman will remember that at one time nearly half the town of Calgary was in prison through the unwise discretion of a judge there.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That was an act of indiscretion.

Mr. MULOCK. He was your own appointee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I beg your pardon.

Mr. MULOCK. I never knew the hon. gentleman to repudiate that before.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I should feel very sorry for that myself.

Mr. MULOCK. At all events he was appointed by the Government only a few years ago, and the town had to transact most of its business in the gaol at the time, as most of the leading citizens were in gaol. Has the hon. gentleman any evidence that there are not more such persons in the service to-day? Why give more power than is necessary? That is the weak point of the whole of this Bill. The Minister is clothing the magistrates and judges with more power than is required for the public interests. I move that the words, "imprisonment not exceeding three months" be struck out.

Amendment negatived.

On section 152,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think that creates an undefinable offence which might be construed in a very harsh, unreasonable way. Every man defeated in a suit has often the impression that the witnesses who swore against him conspired to defeat the ends of justice.

Section dropped.

On section 154,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why make this a criminal matter?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the public interest a private individual ought not to be allowed to discontinue a penal action, and for his own advantage enable an offender to escape. The reasoning is the same as against compounding a felony.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Many actions are brought under the election law in the heat of excitement, shortly after an election, for penalties, which the parties afterwards do not want to go on with and which is not desirable, in the public interests, should be gone on with. It is often very desirable in actions for small penalties of $200 or $300, that they should be settled, the parties paying costs and no penalty exacted, and all ill-feeling at an end. Often these actions are brought for penalties right after an election, when no public end is served by bringing them, and which the parties drop after cool reflection.

Mr. MASSON. I think the provision that they may be settled with the consent of the court is quite sufficient to meet that case. The penalty is imprisonment only. I should think it ought to be imprisonment or fine.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The clause is taken from the law of the Province of Quebec, and I should like to hear from the gentlemen from that province what their views are about it.

Mr. LAURIER. I share altogether the views expressed by my hon friend beside me (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.), and I might call attention to a class of penalties in our province, which are always very odious. For instance, there is a provision that if partnerships are not registered within a certain time, a penalty of $200 is thereby incurred. The courts have taken every means to set aside and dismiss such actions. Very often these actions are taken in a fit of anger. A partnership may

sue a debtor, and the debtor out of revenge may take action for the penalty of non-registration.

Mr. MASSON. I move that all the words after "liable" be struck out, and the following inserted:—"To a fine not exceeding the penalty compounded for."

On section 160,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If there is no further crime committed than the escape, it seems to me to be a natural thing, and not a moral offence, for a man to endeavour to regain his liberty.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have a great many places of detention in Canada which are very insufficiently guarded and secured, and it is a great assistance to the officers that the prisoners can be informed that the mere fact of escaping is an offence in itself. It may be more effective as a prevention than a cure, because we are never able to get a conviction in the case of the man who does escape.

On section 163,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In connection with the enormous powers we have given constables to arrest men without warrants, I doubt whether in this clause we are not legislating in an extreme direction. Now, if this law passes a man can be arrested, in many cases, without a warrant at all, and you make him guilty of an indictable offence if he escapes from lawful custody. Supposing a man is arrested without a warrant, and he believes that the person detaining him has no power to hold him, and believes himself justified in going—I think it is going too far to make him guilty of an indictable offence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think we must have some penalty to escape from lawful custody. Under our present Act every one who escapes or who rescues, or aids in rescuing, any person from lawful custody, is liable to imprisonment for any term less than two years.

Mr. FLINT. It might be well to give the court the option of imposing a fine. The offences are not very serious.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The difficulty about the fine is that it includes the graver kind of offences. A fine might be resorted to in some very serious cases. I think, considering it is the maximum, we had better leave it. An hour's imprisonment will satisfy the law.

On section 171,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We have got along very well without importing this old and crude and misunderstood law on blasphemy. There is nothing to justify us in specifying these new offences, as there has been no instance to justify Parliament in adopting this new offence. I am sure you will create a good deal of ill-feeling by this legislation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is an old offence, and when we are specifying offences and describing punishment for them, we must define this offence within the limits of experience, or we must treat it as no offence at all, which we would hardly be disposed to do.

Mr. LAURIER. Leave it as a question of fact to be disposed of by the jury.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We live in an age of religious liberty, and a man should be allowed a deal of latitude in expressing his opinions on this subject.

Mr. CURRAN. Does the hon. gentleman think that any more liberal language could be used than is used in this section?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would leave it as it is.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are not any more stringent in this section than the common law, and we are putting in a fair qualification about blasphemous libels, and one consistent with modern experience and modern liberty of speech. This protects from punishment any one who expresses in good faith and in decent language his arguments upon any religious subject whatever.

On section 177,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any definition of what constitutes an indecent act?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This section leaves a very large discretion in the hands of two justices of the peace. They might put a very curious construction upon the words "indecent act."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It must be in the presence of one or more persons.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the case were tried before a judge of a Superior Court, who is trained in such cases, one would not have any objection; but many justices of the peace are not trained men, and are not capable of appreciating the niceties of the English language, nor would they have any standard to guide them. One justice might hold that to be indecent which another would perhaps laugh at.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What would you suggest?

Mr. LAURIER. What makes the objection stronger is that in the next section you make a gross act of indecency an indictable offence. It is difficult to know what is a gross act of indecency, and what is not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You get the higher judge for the indictable offence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). All these offences against morality have crept into the common law from the earlier ecclesiastical law, and they were rather sins than crimes, not being attacks upon property or life, or upon any other members of the community. The offences are wholly subjective, and altogether different in that respect from the other crimes embraced in the Statute-book; and it is a question whether crimes of this sort should be punished by long terms of service in the penitentiary. I do not think they should. I think that flogging, or something of that sort, and the discharge of the prisoner is preferable, and a far better deterrent than anything else.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a distinction, I think. We only punish them as crimes where they are offensive to the people, or set a bad example. As to section 178, relating to acts of gross indecency, I have no objection to reducing the term of imprisonment, considering that whipping accompanies it. It is impossible to define these cases by any form of words.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why not retain the word "grossly" which is in the present law?

Section postponed.

On section 179,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We should take care not to err on the side of prudishness. The other day in London some one brought an action against an exhibitor for exhibiting an indecent picture. The picture was in reality a work of art, and it was only after the exhibitor brought artists to prove this, and after the public press had brought its engine of ridicule to bear upon the action, that the case was dismissed. A man may have in his possession a picture which some people would object to as being indecent, which is not necessarily indecent, and there are many pictures imported by exhibitors which, in the eyes of the inexperienced might be supposed to be indecent, and it would be well for us to see that we do not go too far in this matter. Artists and others engaged in the study of human anatomy often have pictures in their studios which some people might think indecent.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman has said, but it is difficult to be very definite in legislation of the vague character which legislation dealing with indecent offences must have. There have been many petitions laid on the Table for legislation in this direction, and there can be no doubt it is needed for the purpose of preventing indecent shows and pictures and photographs. There are photographs for sale now such as would not at all come within the category of works of art, as they have no attraction at all to the customer except their indecency, and the object is to put a stop to that kind of business.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think that is covered by sub-sections (*a*) and (*b*.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You would not punish the person who has them in stock?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The language in the Bill, as originally drawn, taken from the Bill of 1880, is carefully framed and is all right. It must be a picture exposed to public view and tending to corrupt morals, but you have amended that by saying that any photographer who keeps a picture which others may choose to call an indecent picture is liable to prosecution. We know how differently different minds view these things. An artist will look at it from the standpoint of art almost entirely; another man, prudishly inclined, may think it comes within this section.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the same with regard to almost all these matters. In some cities the restrictions in regard to pictures and books have been carried almost to a ridiculous extreme, but still the public would rather have a protection of this kind and run the risk of its being carried to excess than be without the protection. There are cases which are well known of photographers' establishments where immoral pictures are kept in order to satisfy curiosity and are not offered for sale, and the knowledge of the existence of these led the committee to propose this addition. I have heard of books being seized in Montreal most unjustifiably under a provision of this kind in the city by-law, and of pictures of sculpture being seized. This of course shows a great want of competency on the part of those who administer the law, but the law is aimed against gross indecency in matters of this kind, and it is impossible to narrow the definition down by any language that we can use.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The section originally was artistic, and provided that to constitute the offence the party must publicly sell or expose for public sale or to public view the picture or other alleged obscene article or book, and that must be of a character which would tend to corrupt morals, and in the latter part of the section it said that the motives and objects of the publisher or exhibitor should be altogether irrelevant. Now you have interpolated the statement that if any man takes a photograph of any picture of this kind, he is liable to the penalty and his motives are irrelevant, leaving out the provision as to this tending to corrupt morals. A photographer necessarily takes copies of pictures which in the minds of the vulgar would be considered indecent, but he may have the highest motives in doing so, they may be required for art students and may not have been at all intended to corrupt morals. I think the amendments are calculated to do more harm than good.

Mr. MASSON. In the committee statements were made as to what was aimed at in reference to the photographs. It was alleged that it was becoming a very common practice by many photographers to import the obscene pictures and sell photographs of those pictures, and the intention was to stop that practice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It will stop a good deal more than that.

Mr. MASSON. It may be that the language is too sweeping, but the object was to stop photographers from reproducing obscene and indecent pictures, the photographs being distributed to the corruption of the morals of the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would not this cover the case of photographers who are called into a surgical school where operations are being performed and photographs are taken for the use of students, to give them some idea of the character of a disease? I think the clause is quite broad enough for that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think sub-section 3 covers that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it goes so far that no nude picture could be photographed, no matter how high a work of art it may be. These pictures are in private houses everywhere, and many a man would have to remove from his library or his drawing room pictures which are perfectly innocent and calculated to do no harm. I approve of the section as it was originally drafted because there were the two limitations. It must tend to corrupt morals. That is all right, but that is not extended to this new section. On the contrary, this new section stands by itself, and no matter how pure, how high, or how noble the motives of the man may be, the mere fact of his having in his possession the photograph of a nude picture which might be considered indecent by some men, would subject him to a penalty.

Mr. MASSON. If the picture was not indecent, the photograph would not be indecent.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. How is the offence to be punished of persons who take obscene and indecent photographs of pictures which persons of ordinary artistic taste would consider grossly indecent, but do not publicly sell them but bring

persons to their studios and sell them privately? That amounts to a public sale.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think we are overdoing this kind of legislation, and that the section as originally drafted is sufficient.

On section 180,

Mr. LAURIER. In sub-section (*a*) the hon. gentleman is mixing up disloyalty with immorality.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is in the Post Office Act, chap. 35.

Mr. LAURIER. That may be, but I thought we were improving that Act. This chapter deals with offences against morality, and here you are joining with those offences the transmission of seditious, disloyal and libellous publications.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose it would be regarded as seditious to advocate independence or to advocate annexation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Those are offences below the others mentioned here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There was a member, I think, of the Local Legislature, representing one of the divisions of Essex, who went to Woodstock sometime ago and delivered a speech in favour of annexation, and for that speech he was not interfered with, he was not prosecuted. It was allowed to be within the limitation of the exercise of his judgment. I suppose he proposed to bring about these revolutions by the sanction of public opinion; but suppose that speech were printed and copies of it were sent through the post office, the hon. gentleman would make it a criminal offence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not unless it were disloyal. The agitation of the question, or speaking in advocacy of a change in the relations of this country with other countries, to which change Her Majesty would be a party, could in no sense be considered disloyalty.

Mr. LAURIER. It may be quite proper to make the sending of seditious matter an offence, but the hon. gentleman will see that a provision of this sort ought not to be made in this chapter dealing with offences against morality. Sedition is an offence of an entirely different character.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object was to gather into this Act the penal enactments of the statute, but I have no objection to amend this section by striking out the words "seditious" and "disloyal."

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 184,

Mr. FLINT. I think the words "under promise of marriage, or by threat, or by the exercise of his authority, or by solicitation or the making of gift or present" might be omitted, as these would be matters of evidence.

Mr. LAURIER. This section is very wide. It makes it an offence for the master or other officer to seduce a female passenger, but it applies also to seamen. A common seaman will be liable to the same penalty as the captain or any officer who committed a like offence. Is it right to apply the same rigidity of law to a seaman as well as a captain?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the object of the section is to protect these passengers against the interference of such persons.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not intimately acquainted with maritime matters, but it seems to me that the punishment of an officer on board ship is a proper one: although a common seaman ought not to be treated in the same way. An officer cannot be too severely punished for such an offence, but a common seaman cannot exercise authority in the same sense.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The intention of the draftsman of the original section was an excellent one. It was supposed to be confined to ships bringing immigrants to this country, and to apply to a class of passengers more or less in a helpless condition, many of them not being able to speak English. These immigrants are very largely under the control of officers of the ship, and it was deemed necessary that stringent regulations should be passed. If we are determined that the mere act of seduction is to be a crime, there is no reason in the world why it should be confined to offences committed by seamen on board an ordinary ship. I can well understand the motives which prompted those who drafted the Immigration Act to throw very stringent restrictions around the protection of female immigrants. I think, however, it is a mistake to incorporate that provision in a general Act and to make it a crime on board an ordinary ship, when it is not a crime when the same people are on shore. I can understand that possibly the captain of a ship might occupy a position which gave him an undue advantage over his passengers, but I cannot understand that an ordinary seaman should be supposed to hold that position.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will allow the section to stand.

On section 187,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suggest that sub-section 2 be struck out. A girl at the age of sixteen is a mere child, and I do think the brothel keeper ought to be given the chance of saying that she had reasonable cause to believe that the girl was over sixteen. In dealing with serious offences against children, I do not think we should throw around the brothel keeper any such defence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to striking out sub-section 2.

Section amended.

On section 189,

Mr. FLINT. I do not think the punishment in this case is severe enough.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Make it four years, then.

Section amended.

On section 190,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This section is, I suppose, taken from the Indian Act?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So that if an Indian woman went into prostitution in one of the large cities, she would be liable under this section when

a white woman would not. In the Indian Act it is intended only to apply to the Indian reservations.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is this intended to apply only to unenfranchised Indians? As drawn it would apply to Indians who are enfranchised, and they are legislated for by the provinces, as regards their civil rights, the same as any other class, and are not distinguished from the rest of the population on account of their being Indians. They cease to be under the protection of the Government once they are enfranchised.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to say "unenfranchised."

Section amended.

On section 191,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that the definition given in England?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A nuisance which only affects the comfort if not a criminal act, how far should you define a nuisance which you do not make a criminal offence?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is worthy of consideration.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This section defines a common nuisance to be an unlawful act or omission to discharge a legal duty, which act or omission endangers the lives, safety, health, property or comfort of the public. There are many acts which are lawful, but which are none the less a common nuisance. For instance, a man may plant a saw mill or an electric plant with engines in the vicinity of my house, the noise of which renders it a nuisance, but which is perfectly legal in itself. He may build a large saw-mill in the middle of a lot of houses and may put in an electric plant with engines, the noise of which may prevent the neighbours from sleeping. It is not an illegal act, but it is a nuisance all the same, and this definition says a nuisance is an unlawful act or the omission to discharge a legal duty. It may be a lawful act and yet may be a nuisance. If this provision is exhaustive, and if this is to be a code, I should oppose this section.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is a definition for criminal purposes only. It must be an unlawful act, and it may be one which endangers health and property, and it is intended that in that case it shall be an indictable offence, or it may be an act which affects the comfort of the neighbours, and then the proceeding must be by indictment. The English report points this out very clearly, and the object is to preserve for the criminal law that class of cases the remedy for which is by indictment, but which partake, in all other respects, of a civil proceeding, and to provide that it shall be within the purview of the criminal procedure for carrying out the abatement of the mischief done to the public right. There are cases which are to be punished criminally, there are those which can be met by a civil action between private individuals, and there are those where the offence is against the public and which require to be proceeded with by way of indictment, which is a criminal procedure, though the remedy itself would more partake of a civil character.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It occurs to me that that class of nuisance strictly comes within civil rights. Although the form of procedure is criminal, still, if it is a regulated right and therefore a civil right, it does not belong to the criminal law, but is a right of one citizen against another.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. But there are these cases where the offence is against the public, and the proceeding is by indictment, and the object is to keep that class of cases within the purview of the criminal law.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not understand why the words "property or comfort" are used in section 191, which is the defining clause, and not in section 192, which provides for the punishment of the offence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is to reach the class referred to in section 193 where the comfort of the public is affected, and which can only be reached through the criminal law procedure, and we do not want a man sent to prison for that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It appears to me that the procedure should give way to the fact and that this, being a matter of civil right, should be dropped out of the criminal law altogether, and should be left to the Provincial Legislatures to provide for. Under section 92 of the British North America Act, by which they can provide for the punishment of offences under a local statute, I think they can provide the system of procedure. If they were to provide punishment for persons stealing the ballot box in a local election, I think they could provide the procedure. The criminal procedure as well as the criminal law generally is, of course, under the control of this Parliament, but certain forms of offences—provincial crimes, as they are called in the case of Russell *vs.* the Queen in the judgment of the Judicial Committee—may be dealt with by the Local Legislatures, and surely they may provide the procedure in such cases. Once you admit that the subject-matter is not in itself criminal, then the subject drops out of the control of this Legislature and you can properly omit it from the criminal code altogether.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Does not the hon. gentleman think there is some difficulty in the Local Legislature taking what is now a common law offence and providing procedure to give redress in regard to it?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Take the case of something which interfered with the comfort of a particular family or individual, and not the public at large. Anciently it was doubtless a criminal offence. Now you propose to leave that to be redressed by a civil remedy. It simply amounts to this, that it is no longer a crime. It is what the jurisprudence of the United States calls a police offence, and you can leave it to the proper police remedy. I would suggest to strike out the words "or comfort."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The nuisance might affect property.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is another state of facts which this clause affects. The construction of a wharf is in one sense an unlawful act in so far as it may interfere with navigation. Now, supposing under these two sections an individual were personally injured and he brought an indictment against the owner of the wharf, the owner would be in an awkward position. I was going to suggest whether that last line is necessary. You are

providing here for public injuries which affect the public generally, or a section of the public, which endanger the safety of their lives. So far so good. But when you go on to provide for indicting a man who commits a technical nuisance which occasions injury to an individual, are you not going a little further than necessary? Now, everybody knows how difficult it is to define whether a wharf is a nuisance or not. You have no right to build a wharf, it is only justified by the peculiar circumstances, by the greater benefit to be conferred on the public. The building of that wharf, although for the public benefit, and although it interferes with navigation in a very minor degree, still it may occasion injury to an individual. It seems to me under that definition he would have a right to an action.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Would he not in common law?

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I do not think so. I think if it could be shown that the wharf was necessary to carry on the commerce of the country, even if it did interfere with navigation, the individual could not abate it as a nuisance.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has been decided in the Supreme Court that he could abate it.

Mr. MASSON. Would not the effect of striking out "comfort" be to do away with the very example cited by the commissioners, say in the case of a highway? It is only the public comfort that is interfered with by the non-repair of a highway. What remedy would you propose for that?

Mr. LAURIER. The municipal law would provide for that.

Mr. MASSON. It does not at present.

Mr. LAURIER. It does in my province.

Mr. MASSON. If you take it out of the calendar of criminal offences entirely, then an individual especially aggrieved, instead of having to resort to proceeding by indictment, would have to take upon himself the responsibility of a personal action in which he would have to assume all the costs of such proceeding.

Mr. LAURIER. A penal action.

Mr. MASSON. That might be. It is only a question of remedies, and how to enforce it. I think you would strike a great blow at the public remedy if you took out the word "comfort."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does a public indictment now lie against a corporation or person who injures the comfort of an individual, unless there is a pecuniary damage?

Mr. MASSON. Not the comfort of an individual, but the comfort of the public.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The question of comfort is a question of injury.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I cannot understand how you could maintain any action under this section. Under the first section you define a common nuisance to be so and so. Under the second section you say *quoad* a certain character of this nuisance, you can proceed by indictment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You can proceed by indictment, but it is not a criminal offence. I will let 191 and 193 stand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

On section 194,

Mr. LAURIER. This class of offences, selling for human food articles which the seller knows to be unfit for human food, is a matter of police regulation, and should be left to the provincial authorities. What is fit for human food in one country may not be so considered in another.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Is it quite safe to leave it with the provincial authorities?

Mr. LAURIER. There are by-laws in force in all our cities providing punishment for these very offences.

Mr. CURRAN. Certain parts of the country may not be sufficiently advanced to have by-laws such as we have in Montreal, Quebec and elsewhere.

On section 200,

Mr. FRASER. Why is there a distinction made between the three classes of houses? I think it would be just as much a violation of the law to prevent an entrance into the first.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will look into that.

On section 203,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How long is that upon our Statute-books? I have never seen that notice posted in any railway; not even the Government railway.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is about 14 years.

Mr. FLINT. We might consider whether it is worth while keeping a law on our Statute-book which is never observed. I would not favour personally the compelling of railway companies to place this notice, as it disfigures the cars and nobody would read it. It would not strengthen the law in any way, but it is much worse to have a law which is not observed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seems to me this is unnecessary legislation. People can take care of themselves just as well in a railway carriage as they can in a club or private house. I do not think the section is a good one. If a man chooses to play for a dollar or two in a railway car, and loses it, let him lose it and have done with it. I object to having laws on our Statute-book which are not observed. Constant legislation against social habits which is not enforced is calculated to bring the law into contempt. We have had this law for ten or twelve years, and I have never heard of a man being prosecuted under it for playing a game of cards on a train. It seems to me a very curious kind of legislation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have frequently seen conductors stop playing.

On section 204,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suppose it is my duty to call the attention of the committee to the addition of sub-section 2, which proposes a relaxation in regard to betting on the race-course of an incorporated association while a race is going on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is just as well that the committee should understand that we are legalizing betting on a race-course. I do not know that the committee is prepared to do that.

Mr. CURRAN. The law has always allowed betting on horse races.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think you can recover a bet on a horse race.

Mr. CURRAN. You cannot recover a bet in a court, but if the money is deposited you can recover from the person who holds it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think so.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This does not make the bet a legal debt, but it prevents it being a criminal act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, it is the most extraordinary kind of legislation I ever knew. In the one case you make it criminal for a man to play a game of whist, a game of skill, for ten cents, in a railroad car, and in the other case you relieve him from a criminal action if he bets a thousand dollars on a horse race.

Mr. MASSON. I never have approved of the stringent provisions in reference to playing cards on a railway car, but that has been law for some time. The distinction is this: In a railway car many people travel who do not play games at cards, and it is an offence to them for these games to go on in their presence, while people who go on a race-course go there knowing that betting will be going on there.

Mr. FRASER. I think that is a very good argument against it, because people may be innocently drawn into a game in a car, but if they go to a race-course from malice aforethought, surely they ought to be punished the more.

Mr. MASSON. I do not think my hon. friend has understood my remarks. I did not say that the objection was to a person innocently playing a game, but there are many who go there, who not only have no intention of playing but to whom it is offensive to have a game played by others in their presence; and for the protection of the feelings of these people this Act was introduced by Mr. Blake, to prevent such games being played in a public convenience such as a railway car.

On section 206,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have not thought it expedient to make any reference to any other mode, except burial, of disposing of dead bodies, which may hereafter be sanctioned, such as cremation.

Mr. LAURIER. Does this section apply to an undertaker?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is a common law offence, the leaving unburied a body by persons responsible, either through relationship or because they were employed to bury it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Should not some provision be made, under sub-section (*b*), to protect medical men who dissect bodies for the purposes of science?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They will only come under this law when they treat a dead body improperly or indecently.

Mr. BERGIN. There are anatomy Acts in Ontario and Quebec which cover these points.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are in all the provinces.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A Provincial Legislature could not interfere in so far as this is a criminal offence.

On section 207,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seems to me there are parts of this unnecessary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think we need that section.

Section dropped.

On section 210*a*,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As to the criminal offence which you are here creating, I am afraid you are likely to give rise to considerable litigation and to cause a considerable amount of annoyance to the husband. There are two sides to every question. This is not in the English code and is a new thing. The wife has her remedy already, if the husband does not provide for her, she can get supplies and necessaries from any one who will give them to her, and the husband is civilly liable to make that good.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is on his credit.

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

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. But these blackguards generally have no credit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is assuming the man is a blackguard, but that is not always the case.

On section 216,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I find some difficulty in regard to the declaration that a child becomes a human being when it has completely proceeded in a living state from the body of its mother, whether it has breathed or not. I know of no means of judging whether it has lived or not except by the fact that it has breathed, and the information which the condition of the lungs affords. If we depart from this test, we involve ourselves in very great difficulty. If the child has breathed, the condition of the lungs will show it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is only one of the tests.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). By what other test are you going to ascertain this fact? Suppose a child was said to have been born alive, and it had not breathed, how would you proceed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The fact of the lungs floating in water is the usual test.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If you eliminate the three tests, that the child breathed, that it had an independent circulation, and that the navel string was severed, what other tests will be applied?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Any other medical tests that are known. This section simply provides that the killing of such a child is homicide. These tests mentioned may be the only ones known to medical science, but the common law is flexible so as to admit the application of any other test that may be discovered from time to time?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why not omit the words defining the different tests, for there is apparently no necessity for mentioning them?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The test of the floating of the lungs is principally used in connection with civil cases, where it is necessary to prove that the child breathed, but it is not absolutely relied on as a test in criminal proceedings.

On section 236,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In the second clause the punishment is out of all proportion to the offence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Every one understands the effect of concealment of birth, which, although in itself not a *malum in se*, is prohibited under the severest penalties, with the view of preservation of life.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The words "or permanent injury" should follow the word "death"—"unless she proves that such death or permanent injury"—in first part of section.

Amendment agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the hon. gentleman state what he proposes to take up on Friday?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We propose to take the Government notice of motion about the appointment of judges on the commission, and after that the Redistribution Bill; and when that is finished, we may take up the Criminal Law Bill.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 27th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, a certificate of the fact that the appeal in the Chicoutimi and Saguenay election case has been dismissed, and the decision of the trial judges in the court below, voiding the said election, remains unaffected. The trial judges having reported that corrupt practices extensively prevailed at the said election, I have, in conformity with section 48, chapter 9 of the Revised Statutes, withheld the issue of my warrant for a new election, pending the decision to be taken by the House in the matter.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 89) respecting Dominion lands. He said: In explaining the Bill, I may state that section 1 simply repeals the clause in the old Act which provided for the laying out of lands in blocks of four townships each before any further division took place. This has been found to be inconvenient, and, in many cases, impossible. By section 2, an addition is made to clause 21 in the old Act in order to enable us to avail ourselves of the triangulation surveys being made in the Rocky Mountains, where survey in the ordinary way is absolutely impracticable. In section 3 we strike out the words, "or hereafter obtains," where they relate to the pre-emption privilege, which has been abolished: and we add a proviso so that the settler may, at his option, reside on his first homestead while earning a patent for a second homestead, provided such second homestead adjoins the first; but he is obliged to cultivate a substantial area of the second homestead. Section 4 extends the time for second homesteading from the 2nd of June, 1887, to 2nd of June, 1889. As the law now stands those who have not complied with the conditions of their entry before the 2nd June, 1887, are not entitled to another entry; and it has been contended that this is unfair to those who had homestead entries in 1886, when the second homesteading was abolished, and who, although they completed their homestead duties after the date mentioned, were induced to settle in the country on the strength of the second homestead provision. Section 5 provides facilities for the closing up of roads, where the statutory road allowance is not suitable for the purposes of a highway. The intention is to give the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West the power, with the consent of the Governor in Council, to close up such a road allowance, take other land for a road, and authorize such disposition of the original road allowance as may be found expedient in the public interest. Section 6 gives the Governor in Council the power to grant the right to construct irrigation ditches, &c., through public lands. Section 7 provides for the proper disposal of mineral lands in the Rocky Mountains Park. Licenses of occupation are now authorized, but this title is of so limited and precarious a character that it is found that capitalists will not risk upon such security the investment of money necessary for proper development. It is proposed to authorize the granting of leases in the Rocky Mountains Park or in respect of other public lands for a term not exceeding twenty years.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WRIT FOR PONTIAC.

Mr. LAURIER. On this day week I enquired about the electoral writ for the County of Pontiac. I understand that it has not yet been issued.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That the Order of business under Rule 19, for Wednesdays, be made the Order of business for Mondays for the remainder of the session.

Motion agreed to.

CHARGES AGAINST SIR A. P. CARON.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That this House do approve of the appointment of the Honourable Mr. Justice Routhier, of the Superior Court in the District of Quebec, and of the Honourable Mr. Justice Tait, of the Superior Court in the District of Montreal, as members of a commission to be appointed under chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, to take evidence as to the truth or falsity of certain allegations and charges against the Honourable Sir A. P. Caron, one of the Queen's Privy Councillors for Canada, and a member of the House of Commons of Canada, as set forth

in a resolution adopted by this House on the fourth day of May instant.

He said: I will forbear presenting any remarks to the House upon the names submitted as commissioners, because anything I would say upon that subject might be altogether by way of anticipation of criticisms which may not be offered. I will, therefore, merely say that as regards the number proposed to be appointed, it has seemed that two would be sufficient, inasmuch as no judgment is to be arrived at, but merely evidence taken by these judges. It is intended that the instructions to be issued to the commissioners will guard against any possible disagreement in the discharge of their duties, by providing that if they should differ at any time as to the admissibility of any evidence, the evidence shall nevertheless be taken, and they shall report the points on which they have differed in opinion.

Mr. LAURIER. Upon every other occasion and every other question, I would very willingly accept the invitation just extended to this side of the House by the hon. gentleman, and review the qualifications of the high judicial functionaries whom he offers to the approval of this House as members of the commission to investigate charges brought against the Postmaster General; or rather not the charges brought against the Postmaster General, but those framed by the Government out of the charges brought against him by the hon. member for West Ontario. Not so, however, upon this occasion or upon this question. Not a word shall pass my lips as to the qualifications of the gentlemen who are offered to the House as members of this commission. Not one word shall I utter either in approbation or disapprobation of the choice made. I have nothing to say as to the qualifications of these gentlemen. Everything which may be said of them might be of the highest character, and I would not say one word of dissent. We refuse on this side altogether to discuss the qualifications of the gentlemen appointed members of this commission, because we object to the commission *in toto*. We do not recognize it, and will have nothing to do with it. The only tribunal we recognize as competent to try and judge the Postmaster General, arraigned before this House for high political offences, is the House itself and no other. I venture to assert, and I make the assertion with the greatest assurance, that the course taken by the Government is one altogether unprecedented in British parliamentary history. This is the first time, either in this country or in the mother land, when a member of the House of Commons being accused, as is the Postmaster General, of high political offences, the House declined to enquire into them itself, but referred the matter to a body appointed by the accused.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, appointed by the accused himself, because the Postmaster General is still a member of the Government, and there is solidarity among all the members of the Cabinet, so that what is done by one is done by all. This is the first time, I say, that in parliamentary history, either on this side or the other side of the water, on an accusation being brought against a member of the Cabinet by a member of the House, such accusation was referred to a tribunal selected by the accused himself. Upon every other occasion, the practice has been invariably to have the House deal with it by referring it to a select committee of the House itself, which acted under the supervision of the House, the House reserving to itself powers which always can be brought into motion, if thought necessary, to take any action it deems proper in order that speedy and substantial justice may be rendered. I might quote examples from the mother country, but without referring to the history of the mother land, I can cite examples from our own history. In 1873, a charge was made, well known to the minds of all, which involved the greatest accusations against the Administration of the day, and the Government rejected a motion for an investigation which was made in the House. But only a day or two afterwards, Sir John Macdonald, then leader of the House, having received a better spirit, probably from a higher quarter, came before the House, and asked that these charges should be tried—by Royal Commission? No, by a sub-committee struck by this House. It is true, at a later period, the committee was superseded and a Royal Commission issued; but this action was taken for reasons which existed then and which exist no longer. Up to the session of 1873, a committee of this House was not clothed with the power of examining witnesses under oath; and a Bill was passed in that session giving such power to committees of this House, and it was only after this Bill had been disallowed in England, that a committee of the House was superseded and a Royal Commission issued in order that an enquiry might be carried on before a tribunal competent to swear witnesses. Again, in 1890, when the hon. member for South Oxford called the attention of the House to the charges which appeared in the newspapers against Mr. Rykert, then a member of this House, the Minister of Justice himself proposed a reference, not to a Royal Commission, but to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. And again last year when Mr. Tarte, then a member of this House, brought grave charges against a member of the Administration, the accusations were referred, not to a Royal Commission, but to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. No one at the time even suggested that the enquiry should take place before any other body than that which has always dealt with such cases. Now it is proposed to take a new departure. We are not to deal with these charges as they have been dealt with formerly, but the House is asked to deprive itself of its undoubted powers in that respect and delegate them to a Royal Commission. What are the reasons advanced for this step? They are certainly very singular, in view of the position of a committee of this House. The reasons which were advanced by the Minister of Militia, when making this proposition, was that it was desirable the evidence should be taken by gentlemen who would not be influenced by political consideration or any other consideration except a desire to arrive at the truth. This is certainly a very strange inference the hon. gentleman drew with regard to the morality of the majority of this House. If those charges were investigated by a committee of this House, this committee would be composed as are all committees of this House; that is to say, there would be a majority on it of supporters of the Government and friends of the Postmaster General. Now, the inference is drawn by the Minister of Militia that

such a committee, so composed, would be influenced by political considerations and not by a desire of arriving at the truth. I would like to know, if such be the case, in what way the Postmaster General would suffer? If that committee were to be swerved from the path of rectitude by political considerations, certainly the Postmaster General ought to be the last man to object. But however that may be, we have no such fear on this side. We would be in the minority on that committee, and it is only fair and right that we should. It is only fair and right that on such a committee the Opposition should be represented by a minority; but we want to have the investigation held before the eyes of the public; we want to have it held by a committee of the House, because if the committee should not render justice we can appeal to this House; and if we cannot obtain justice before this House we can appeal to the public at large, who must be the supreme judges in all such matters. This is the reason why we insist on parliamentary rules being followed on this as well as on every other occasion. These rules have come to us from a long experience in the mother land, and never yet has it been suggested that they should be departed from; and so long as we value a parliamentary government, it should be the duty of us all to adhere to these rules with the greatest tenacity and respect. It may be true that the Committee on Privileges and Elections would be rather unwieldy, composed as it is of something like forty members; but if we do not refer those charges to that committee, we should refer them to a special committee of five or seven members—I would suggest five—who would deal with them according to the customs and traditions of parliamentary government. But that is not all. The charges which it is proposed to refer to a commission are not those which have been made by the hon. member for West Ontario. The accusations to which the Postmaster General would have to answer before the Royal Commission, and which these judges would have to investigate, are not the identical accusations which have been brought by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), but have been garbled in such a manner as to make the enquiry almost futile in its object and in its results. They have been defaced in such a way that the hon. gentleman has stated he can no longer attempt to prove the allegations he made against the Postmaster General. There are several particulars in which these charges have been garbled, but I will call attention only to one. Section 10 of the charges brought by the member for West Ontario directly charged the Postmaster General with having, during the election of 1887, in twenty-two different counties, expended money which he had received, to the amount of $100,000, and had expended in order to assist his political friends. This charge is omitted altogether and entirely from the reference to the Royal Commission. It has not been only omitted from the charge itself but from the recital. Is it to be supposed that such a charge as this ought to be omitted? Are we to be told that in such conduct charged against the Postmaster General there is no guilt in regard to which Parliament ought to make an enquiry? It has been stated that the investigation of these charges would practically be to try twenty-two elections. Nothing of the kind. Although those sums of money have been spent in twenty-two counties, sums varying from $4,000 to $5,000 each, though the Postmaster General is charged with having given to twenty-two of his candidates these sums for use in their elections, it is well known that all these seats were not carried by the Government, and there might be controverted elections in those cases; but the charge is much broader than that. It is that the Postmaster General has been guilty of a conspiracy, as it were, not perhaps a conspiracy in law, but has been guilty of having organized a system of bribery in order to carry on elections; and I do not hesitate to say that it is so serious a charge that Parliament ought to spare no effort to obtain an investigation into that matter. If that statement of fact is true, this is an end of parliamentary government. What independence are you to expect from members who have received from a member of the Government sums varying from $4,000 to $5,000 in order to carry on their own elections? What independence can you have from such men when any question comes before the House in which the Government is interested? The man who receives that is no longer a free agent, but is the tool and instrument of the man who has furnished him with the money to carry on his election. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance to have these charges investigated. It is not simply a matter of party controversy. I say there are far greater and deeper interests than party interests involved in this matter. The very question whether we shall be ruled by parliamentary government, or by personal government under the name of parliamentary government, is involved in this. Yet those charges have been eliminated. I ask the House to pause before coming to the conclusion here proposed, and to look well before taking the final step. It is not yet too late. The charges brought by my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) have been brought before this House, and, instead of having a garbled investigation before a tribunal which is not the proper one, I propose that we should have a proper investigation into all the charges brought by that hon. gentleman before the House. I, therefore, move in amendment that all the words after "That" in the resolution be omitted and the following inserted instead thereof:—

The charges preferred against Sir A. P. Caron, P.M.G., by Mr. J. D. Edgar, a member of this House, from his place in the House, on the sixth day of April last, be referred to a special committee of five members, to be so struck by the House, to enquire fully into such charges, and for that purpose to examine witnesses on oath and to send for persons, papers and records.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This matter is of the very gravest importance, and it seems to me rather an extraordinary thing that the members of the Administration propose that this motion shall be allowed to go without even a discussion. The hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches may think that this is a matter of no consequence, a matter in which the public take little or no interest, and that therefore it may be disposed of in this summary or cavalier manner. I do not think that is the view which will be taken by the public at large. Since this subject was first brought to the attention of Parliament, many documents, or the facsimiles of many documents which are, no doubt, referred to in these charges, have already been laid before the public, and I apprehend that hon. gentlemen will find that the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario will

be regarded as charges seriously affecting the character of the Government and of Parliament, not only by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and those who sympathize with them politically, but by a very large number, and I am inclined to think a majority, of the Conservative party in this country who support the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches and who, up to the present time, have accorded to these hon. gentlemen their confidence. The charges are of such a character as to require investigation, and that investigation should be had by a committee of this House appointed by the House itself, and by no other body whatever. Sir, I have been taunted with saying that the rule which we asked to have observed in the trial of these charges is a rule which dates from the days of Edward III, and I think that is so. I have taken the trouble to copy that rule, and it is part of the law of Parliament from that day down to the present. The rule is as follows :—

"That it is the undoubted right of the Commons to enquire into public abuses, and to impeach the councillors of the Crown for acts of corruption."

That is the law as to the authority of Parliament. Are the charges which have been made by the hon. member for West Ontario, charges which involve public abuses? Remember, Mr. Speaker, that charges of this sort do not relate simply to members of Parliament ; they relate to Ministers of the Crown in their official capacity, and they relate also to any other officers of the state having important functions to discharge. Sir, Parliament has never delegated to any other body this inquisitorial power ; it has never delegated to any other body the right to enquire into existing abuses, or into acts of corruption charged against members of the Administration. It was stated at an earlier period than this that the House had nothing to do with enquiring into charges against members unless those charges related to acts performed by them in their capacity as members of the House. I do not understand that to be the law. It is the business of Parliament to enquire into the conduct of Ministers. Ministers are entrusted with great power ; they have devolving upon them important public duties, and in the discharge of those duties they are responsible to this House. If it be a question simply of public policy, that question may be dealt with by the House by the expression of its want of confidence in the particular Minister, or in the Ministry as a whole. But when there are charges made affecting the character of a Minister in his official capacity, it is the business of the House to investigate those charges and to see whether they are well founded. Now, there are duties devolving upon the House with regard to investigations relating to various matters, and in order that there may be no confusion in the minds of hon. gentlemen with regard to these matters, it is well that they should be distinguished. Parliament has again and again enquired into charges made affecting the character of members of the House by outside parties, and although these charges are of such a character that they may be dealt with by the courts, nevertheless if they are of such a character that they affect a member's standing with his fellow-members in the House, and he chooses to bring them under the attention of the House, it is the usual practice of the House to deal with them ; and I know of but two instances in the whole history of the House of Commons in the mother country where that rule has been departed from, and where he has been left solely to the redress which the courts of law may give him. But that does not apply to what may be said against a member in the discharge of his duties as a member ; it does not apply to the case of a Minister of the Crown who is charged with any misconduct in office. It is the business of Parliament to investigate the conduct of such a Minister, and enquire into the facts and ascertain what foundation there may be for the charges, and if they are found to be well founded, of a serious character, then those charges are made the subject of enquiry by the House of Commons and formerly with a view to impeachment before the House of Lords. That has long been the practice, and it is has been recognized in the Imperial Parliament down to the present day. It is true that the practice of impeachment is one which, it is said, has, in a large degree, become obsolete. It has not been used for seventy years, but that is not because there has been any change in the law, but because there has been a change in the practice of those who have been entrusted with the important functions of Ministers of state. They have carefully avoided doing any of those acts which had hitherto led to impeachment, and what they have been charged with has usually been mistakes of public policy, errors of judgment, which are sufficiently dealt with by the political proceeding known as a vote of want of confidence. Now, I have said that there is a distinction between charges made relating to what a member may do as a member, or as an officer of state, and to what he may do or may have done in his private or individual capacity ; and if the charges are of the second character, and relate to something that is said by a member from his place in the House, or by some newspaper, or by some member upon a platform, then the House may either deal with the subject itself, or he may be left to the redress which he may find in a court of law. But this rule has never been applied, and I say is one that is never had recourse to when a charge has been made in Parliament against a great officer of state with reference to his conduct in the discharge of the duties of that office. There was a case in the early part of this century which showed to what extent Parliament has sometimes been governed by the decision of judicial tribunals with regard to the conduct of its members. Lord Cochrane was indicted and put upon his trial in the early part of this century before Lord Ellenborough, on the charge of having fraudulently engaged in speculation of the funds, of having put in circulation false reports to affect their value, and having been tried along with other parties he was convicted. He complained that he was improperly convicted, but the House of Commons refused him a committee on the ground that his case had already been disposed of, and that the House was bound by the decision of the court. It was questioned as to whether that was a proper proceeding ; and in modern times it has been regarded as rather a harsh proceeding, because it was established long years afterwards that Lord Cochrane was wholly innocent of the crime of which he had been convicted. Now, Sir, there are cases in which the House has expelled members who have been convicted because they were considered unworthy of being candidates for election to the House, as in the case of O'Donovan Rossa, and in the case of

John Mitchell. Those persons were, on account of judicial proceedings that had been had against them, held to be disqualified and unfit to sit in the House of Commons. The House has always maintained its right to carry on investigations either protectively with a view of defending the character of its members, or punitively for the purpose of purging the House of those who were no longer fit to associate with those that had been elected. Let me mention one case that was referred to in a discussion some seven or eight years ago in the House of Commons, a case that occurred in 1834. Mr. Whittle Harvey was a candidate for admission to the bar in England, though one of the Inns of Court, and the benchers of that Inn had refused him admission, they had rejected him on the ground that he had, some twenty years before, been convicted of an offence which rendered him unfit to be a member of the bar. Mr. Whittle Harvey was at the time a member of the House of Commons. Mr. O'Connell proposed that an enquiry should be had into the proceedings of the Inns of Court for the purpose of ascertaining why Mr. Whittle Harvey had been rejected. Sir James Scarlett, a distinguished lawyer and prominent member of the House at the time, looked upon this rather as an investigation into the conduct of the Inn than an enquiry into the character of Mr. Whittle Harvey. Upon what ground was the committee granted—for a committee in that case was granted—for the purpose of enquiring into this matter? For two reasons: The first was in order to exclude Mr. Whittle Harvey from the House, if he were not fit even to be a member of the bar; and the other was to protect him in his rights as a member of Parliament in case the proceedings against him had been unwarrantable proceedings. And so you have in that case an enquiry into the private character of a member of Parliament by a committee of the House for the purpose of vindicating him, of showing that he was a proper associate for those about him; or, if he were shown to be unworthy, to enable the House to remove him from his place and to give the opportunity for the election of one who was fit to occupy that position. Another case was that of Mr. Ferrand. In 1844, Mr. Ferrand had accused Sir James Graham, then a prominent member of the Government, with having used his influence with other members of the House to obtain from an election committee a false and fraudulent report. That was a charge against a member of the Administration, a charge precisely as this is. What was done in that case? Mr. Ferrand was called on to make good his statement, and he would neither withdraw his charge nor would he undertake to substantiate it by evidence. It is true there was no committee appointed. There was no committee appointed because Mr. Ferrand would do nothing in the matter; but Parliament did this: It at once passed a resolution declaring the charge made by Mr. Ferrand was wholly unworthy of credence. Parliament relieved Sir James Graham of the accusation made against him by a fellow-member, not because it refused to investigate the subject, but because the mover, refusing to proceed in the matter, was held to have made a statement which he felt he could not uphold. There are many other cases I might mention, which equally establish the fact that whenever an accusation is made affecting the character of a member, whether that accusation is made in Parliament or, when the accused desires it, out of Parliament—with two exceptions in the cases of accusations made out of Parliament—the practice has been to grant special committees to investigate those charges and to report to Parliament with respect to them, because there are no more important functions devolving upon the House of Commons that represents the nation than those inquisitorial powers which the House possesses to enquire into all abuses that exist in the administration of the Government, to ascertain what foundation there may be for them and to secure a proper remedy for them, if they exist. Sir, I might refer to the case of Mr. Butt. Serious imputations were made against that member and other members of the House. They They were charged with corruption, and on that occasion they were charged by the *Times* newspaper, they were not charged in Parliament, and when a motion was made for the investigation of those charges a committee was at once granted. Lord John Russell declared that the charges having been made, it was the right of the member to have a committee to investigate those charges in order that he might vindicate himself and purge himself from those accusations. If that be so with respect to charges made outside of Parliament, it is *a fortiori*, the right of every hon. member who chooses to make such charges, or the member against whom they are made, to have them investigated by a committee of the House. It is the most expeditious manner of conducting these enquiries. It is the method which the law of Parliament has provided, and it has been well said by one of the highest authorities in England, Hallam, that it is the most appropriate tribunal, considering the serious character of the accusations and the importance of the proceedings, for investigating into the facts and for vindicating the law. In this matter the hon. gentleman proposes two things that are, in my opinion, a very wide departure from anything that has existed hitherto in the history of parliamentary government. The hon. gentleman proposes to enquire into charges that were framed by a member of the Administration, by a colleague of the Postmaster General. He proposes to refer to a commission, not the allegations of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), but allegations that were formally presented to the House by the Minister of Militia. But the Minister of Militia has not assumed here to formally accuse his colleague of wrong-doing; he has not assumed to declare on his responsibility as a member of this House that those charges are true. Why, then, does the hon. gentleman propose a commission to investigate them? If the Minister of Militia is not prepared to allege that what he has set forth in his resolution is true, he has no right to call on anybody to investigate what is there asserted. But the Minister of Militia intended that his resolution should be substituted for charges which, I believe, are of quite a different character, charges that were made, after a careful consideration of the facts, by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and that hon. member asked that those accusations should be investigated by the tribunal known to the law of Parliament, that is by a committee of this House. Sir, the Minister of Militia in submitting these charges which he has framed, and which he will not assume the responsibility of declaring he believes to be true, which he will not

assume the responsibility of declaring that if a commission is granted he will be prepared to establish, asks this House to refer them to a body that is wholly unknown to the law of Parliament. He proposes to refer them to a commission appointed by His Excellency, upon the advice of his Ministers, among whom is included the accused party. That is the position in which the hon. gentleman stands before the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite at first told us there was nothing in the charges. They told us, which is contradicted by every period in English history, that unless the charges were pointed against a member of Parliament in his capacity as a member, there was no right to investigate. Why, Sir, I remember the investigation that was carried on affecting Lord Melville before a committee that investigated into his conduct in regard to the distribution of the funds of the navy. Were the charges based on the disclosures before that committee made against him in his capacity as a member? Not at all; they were made against him in his capacity as a Minister of the Crown. If you go back to the period of the impeachment, or enquiry which preceded impeachment in the case of every Minister of state, the enquiry which preceded and the impeachment which followed had reference to his conduct not as a member of the House but as an adviser of the Crown, as a trustee for the nation in that capacity. This House, as the great inquisitorial tribunal of the country, is the proper party to enquire, through the agency of a committee of its members, appointed by itself, into the conduct of every great officer of state. That is part of its duty. The hon. gentleman has proposed to appoint a commission. One of the important advantages of a committee is its expedition. The matter could have been disposed of long ago before a committee. I think, if I remember rightly, that less than a fortnight elapsed between the time the charges were made against the late member for Lincoln and the report being made to Parliament. There is no reason to suppose that this matter would have occupied a longer time. Few committees of investigation appointed by the Imperial House of Commons have ever occupied more than a few weeks at the farthest, and in the great majority of cases, but a few days. There could be no doubt that that would have been the case here. But, Sir, who is there to undertake to substantiate these charges before a commission? Mr. Speaker, what a mockery is it to propose to investigate into allegations which have never been made; what a mockery is it to undertake to investigate, by a commission outside of this House, charges that have been made by a member in this House. Every member of this House is privileged; he is not answerable elsewhere for what he says here, and he is responsible only to the members of this House. This House cannot change the law of Parliament. You would completely change the whole system of the constitution, if you were to call upon members to answer before tribunals elsewhere for what was said on the floor of Parliament. That was done in the time of Charles I, but it has never been done since the fall of the Stuart dynasty. The hon. gentleman will look in vain for a precedent in which he will find that a member of the House of Commons was ever called upon to answer before another tribunal for what he said from his place in the House. He speaks here as a freeman, and as a representative of a free people. He speaks here as a member of the great inquisitorial body appointed by the nation to redress its wrongs. He makes an accusation here against an officer of state and he states what his accusation is. He asks this House to appoint a committee to investigate his charges, and he declares that he is prepared to establish them. He takes the responsibility of stating that money which was appropriated by the public for certain purposes was in effect diverted from those purposes and applied to other and corrupt purposes, and that corrupt arrangements were made by the Minister. I am not saying whether these charges are well or ill founded, but I say this: that a member of this House has made them, and that a member of this House says that if a committee is given him he will be prepared to establish them. That member is here in the interests of the public, and it is his right and duty to be here. It is not his duty to be anywhere else for this purpose, and you have no right to call upon him to be or to go anywhere else. Are the Government going to burke an enquiry in this matter? I do not charge them with attempting to do so, but I say that that will be the effect of what they propose. An hon. member came to this House and said: I make certain charges against a Minister of the Crown, and I am prepared to establish these charges, and I ask for a committee for that purpose. The Government altered these charges, they made them altogether different from what he made them, and they say: We will not give you a committee as the law requires, but we will send you before a commission appointed by the members of the Government of which the accused person is one. That is the position in which this question stands at the present moment, and it is impossible to explain it away by a proposed commission, and by naming the gentlemen whom we are asked this day to approve of. Sir, we cannot approve of it. We disapprove of the mode of procedure altogether. We stand by the ancient landmarks; we stand by the rules and principles laid down by the constitution, and we do not propose to agree to any deviation. Long experience has proved that the constitutional rule laid down in the mother country by the Imperial Parliament, is the rule which best serves the public interest, and yet that rule is the one which you now propose to disregard. You set it aside and you propose to take into the hands of the one who is accused the appointment of the tribunal by which the charges are to be investigated. That I say is an improper proceeding. As I have said, there are two cases only in which there was any departure from the rule of appointing a committee wherever it has been asked by a member seriously charged outside of Parliament with an offence. The one was the case of Mr. Dillon, where the *Times* charged him with being a notorious liar and with dealing in falsehood. He asked for a committee to vindicate his conduct, and the Government, who were opposed to him and who had no sympathy with him or his party, told him to go before the courts and to bring his action and seek redress there. If he had been a private person that would have been the only course open to him, but with regard to a member of Parliament asking for such a committee that was the first instance in which it was denied.

Then a year later when the *Times* made serious charges against Mr. Parnell, and he asked for a committee. the Government said to him: We will not grant a committee, but we will pass a Bill appointing a commission, which was not such a commission as he had agreed to. They said: We will carry through Parliament a Bill creating a commission by which your case shall be heard. And so all Ireland was put on trial before that commission in order that Parnell might be besmirched in his political capacity by some crime being fastened on some members of the league. I refer to these two cases, not as affording any justification or precedent for the proceeding here; but refer to them because they are not precedents. I refer to them because they dealt with charges not made by a member from his place in the House against another member or against a Minister of the Crown, but with charges made outside of the House by other parties, and redress was refused, because it was said that the courts of law furnished adequate redress if the parties chose to have recourse to them. That cannot be said of charges made in Parliament. Now, I will not pursue this subject further. I will merely say that there is no instance of a committee being refused where charges were alleged against a fellow-member and where the party making them declared that he was ready to substantiate them. There are cases where a member who had made charges refused to undertake to substantiate them, where Parliament declined to appoint a committee, regarding it as unnecessary to do so, and vindicated the character of the member accused by resolution of the House without any enquiry at all, because it was assumed that charges made by a man who would not undertake to establish them were altogether unfounded. Now, Mr. Speaker, I trust that the leader of this House will reconsider his proposition, and that he will agree to the resolution proposed by my hon. friend beside me. Let us have a prompt investigation, which can occupy but a few days: let the matter be disposed of in the light of day, in the presence of the representatives of the nation, who are responsible for the purity of Parliament and for the honest conduct of public affairs; and, Sir, if that is done, and the Postmaster General is vindicated, if the charges are found to be unfounded. the whole country will acquiesce in the decision that is reached. But, Sir, if the hon. gentleman proposes to frame a series of charges which no person has made, nobody will take the responsibility of making, and appoint a commission, an unusual and improper body, to take evidence and investigate these charges, the hon. gentleman will accomplish what everybody will believe was intended to be accomplished—a defeat of all investigation, a refusal of all proper enquiry; and the public will be far from satisfied with the course the Government have taken on this subject.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, as well as the hon. leader of the Opposition, have told us that the course adopted by the House on this question is unprecedented, and they challenge the Government to quote a precedent where a committee of the House had been refused, when asked for, to investigate charges made against a member. My hon. friends have certainly short memories. They have forgotten a precedent which is before their eyes as well as ours; it is a precedent of the House of Commons of Canada, which we find recorded in the Votes and Proceedings of the 4th of May instant. On that day the House of Commons of Canada decided that the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which is the tribunal to which such charges are usually referred, should not be granted for the investigation of these charges, but that, instead of their being investigated by a committee of the House, they should be taken before one or more commissioners to be appointed in the manner described by the Revised Statutes of Canada, and having all the powers mentioned therein, with the condition that the names of the said commissioner or commissioners should be submitted for the approval of the House before his or their appointment, and this precedent was agreed to "on division." That is to say, the House has already decided: first, that the Committee on Privileges and Elections should not be the body to which such allegations and charges should be referred; secondly, that they should be referred to commissioners, not to decide them, but to take evidence upon them; and thirdly, by unanimous vote, that the names of these commissioners should be submitted to the House for its approval. In conformity with that decision, the submission of the names is made to-day, and in adopting the motion now presented to us, we shall not be violating the constitution or depriving the members of this House of any of their privileges, but, on the contrary, I question whether, if we were to adopt the amendment, we would not be violating the rules of the House. The point of order has not been raised, and I am not going to raise it; I do not take such a leading part in the debates of this House as to feel prompted to do so; but it strikes me that the amendment is out of order, being contrary to the rules of the House. It is a rule of Parliament, as a deliberative body, not to go back and vote again upon questions upon which it has already recorded its decision; and, Parliament having a few days ago voted upon this question, I do not think our hon. friends opposite have a right to make another motion in the same sense as that previously voted down. My hon. friends may say that the wording of their motion is different from the previous one, and perhaps, by an ingenious interpretation of the rules of procedure in Parliament, it is not strictly out of order, because they would say: We propose a committee of the House composed of five members instead of a committee composed of forty-three or forty-four members. I say that their motion is an absolute contradiction to the decision of this House. But, Mr. Speaker, I go a little further. The short discussion which has taken place has elicited nothing new, except—and even that is not new—an exhibition of the knowledge and erudition of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). It is true, his precedents in this case, as in other cases, are not altogether applicable to the question; but it is always pleasant to hear his lectures; it is never unpleasant to listen to a studious reader. Then, the hon. leader of the Opposition has told us that the course adopted by the Government implied a variation and an alteration of the charges made against the Postmaster General. He has also said that the judges were appointed by the Government itself, that is to say, that those who are responsible for the acts of the accused were appointing the judges themselves. This is not new. That protest has been proposed to the House and voted down. The other

was that this course is opposed to constitutional practice, and is a violation of the privileges of this House. But neither is this objection new, as it was embodied in the proposition made to this House by the hon. member for South Oxford, and voted down. The hon. member for South Oxford moved the following resolution on the 5th of May:—

"That the House views with repugnance the proposition to permit the person accused to vary and alter the charges preferred against him, and instead thereof to substitute a new set of charges drawn up by himself or his colleagues; and that such a demand, no less than the proposal that the said charges should likewise be investigated by persons to be appointed by himself and his colleagues, is entirely unprecedented, and is opposed to parliamentary law and usage as settled by the practice of the mother country; is a violation of the privileges of members of this House."

Everything, therefore, that has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite has already been urged before this House and disposed of. The discussion to-day, I am afraid, if not intended to mislead public opinion, is calculated to do so; and I say that hon. members would not have made the remarks they have made in this debate, any more than they would those they made in the former debate, if they were disposed to look at the matter calmly and judicially as would judges sitting in judgment. Any one would suppose, judging by their remarks, that there was really no charge embodied in the resolution proposed by the Minister of Militia. Any one would conclude that whatever charges had been made by the hon. member for West Ontario had been mutilated or rejected. But such is not the case, as will be seen at once on reading the indictment contained in that resolution. Will it be said that there is nothing in the charges, as now laid against the Postmaster General, of a kind that could be proved before a judicial tribunal? Not at all. That bill of indictment, for I may well call it such, is a fearful bill of indictment, taken not only from the charges, the vague charges, brought by the hon. member for West Ontario—charges not very courageous but full of innuendoes—but taken also from the allegations made by hon. members on the other side against the Postmaster General and the Government generally. Those allegations were not embodied in the form of charges preferred by the hon. member for West Ontario. The hon. gentlemen who made them did so under the shelter of their irresponsibility, knowing, as the hon. member for Bothwell said a moment ago, that they were not answerable elsewhere for what they said here. They thought they would not be answerable for charges which they preferred, not in a bill of indictment, not by putting their seats in jeopardy—if their seats can be jeopardized by making unfounded charges—at any rate, not by putting in danger their name and honour by making, in a substantial form calling for investigation, charges without foundation; and now they are irritated at such allegations being embodied by the Minister of Militia in the indictment he wants submitted to the commission. The leader of the Opposition, and I compliment him on his conduct to-day, has declared that he has not a word to say against the honour and integrity of the gentlemen to be appointed commissioners. I congratulate him upon having at heart the dignity of the bench and of not giving sanction to a rumour sent to the public, and a rumour which received support from the statements of other hon. gentlemen in the Opposition ranks. Have we not heard two members on the other side, when the name of one of the judges was made known, saying that in an investigation held by him in the Province of Quebec he showed he had neither foresight nor integrity by the course he took? That honourable judge, whose high character, intelligence and learning are above suspicion, is well avenged of those unmanly aspersions by the courageous declaration of the leader of the Opposition. It is true that the hon. gentleman who ventured to make that false accusation and slander against Judge Routhier did not know a word of what he was speaking about, when he said that Judge Routhier had, when acting as commissioner in the Province of Quebec, called none of the accusers before him, when, as a matter of fact, they did appear before him, and the most prominent of them, Mr. Mercier, gave evidence in the investigation which covers no less than forty pages. Pardon me this digression, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the character of the judges, since the insinuations against Judge Routhier must be taken as not having been said, the leader of the Opposition having declared that he had not a word to say against the character of either of the judges. I say that the charges proposed by the Minister of Militia cover the ground of those preferred by the hon. member for West Ontario. They cover wider ground, and under them there is nothing to preclude proof being brought against him if the Minister conspired to defraud the public treasury by obtaining subsidies voted to railways and spending them in bribing and corrupting the electorate for personal and electoral purposes. The only thing which does not appear in the indictment, as drawn by the Minister of Militia, is the names of the counties, and because of this omission, will it be said that the course adopted by the Government is unprecedented? It is not. It precludes the election trial of members whose seats have not been contested. The debate of the 4th May, like the proceedings which have taken place in last session before certain committees of this House, has shown that the mode adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite to deal with charges against members of this House is both unjust and unprecedented. All their efforts went to bring evidence which was entirely irrelevant to the question at issue. The discussion in this House, instead of being limited to the questions raised by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), went over the whole range, and what was the answer of the Government, and of the House? It was that the evidence should be taken by another tribunal; that, if party prejudices, if too great zeal in political matters might lead people to prejudge the facts, and to bring into the trial facts which ought not to be included——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Unfit to take evidence, but qualified to judge.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It has been considered that, on the whole it was better that evidence should be taken by members of the higher magistracy of the country impartially, and that the judgment upon that evidence should be left after all to members of Parliament, so as not to deprive them of their privilege. If the whole question could be decided with that quietness, with that coolness, wisdom and impartiality that a legal tribunal possesses, it

might be preferable to leave it all to this House; but is it to be expected, or is it known of late years that such an impartial hearing and judgment could be obtained in Parliament and that party allegiance or party ties will not influence the proceedings? Still, this is an inherent institution of Parliament. We must have Parliament with its advantages and its disadvantages, and one of the latter is that these cases have to be decided by judges who are perhaps not entirely impartial, but should be sufficiently impartial to judge of a grave and serious accusation laid against one of their members. I only desire to emphasize what I said in the beginning, that we are discussing a matter which has already been decided by the House, and are considering a motion which has already been voted down and which is not an amendment to the main motion, because the motion made by the Minister of Justice is only the execution of the order given by the House to the Government to put before the House the names of the commissioners that Parliament itself had directed to be appointed.

Mr. FLINT. I am sure every hon. gentleman will be disposed to welcome back to the discussions of the House the hon. gentleman (Mr. Chapleau) who has just taken his seat. At any rate, they are disposed to be gratified to find that he is in such excellent physical condition, after the illnesses which his friends had reason to regret and which caused his absence from among us for so long; but I am sure that those who are most appreciative of the hon. gentleman's talents will regret that the earliest exercise of them since his return has been to assist in a depreciation of the powers and wisdom and ability of Parliament to protect itself and the public treasury against those attacks upon the public treasury which are complained of both in the charges of the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) and in the charges of the Government. The point he makes, if I appreciate it, is that this question has already been settled. Now, in the first place, the vote of the House on the last occasion when a vote was taken on this subject did not decide that a committee of two judges was preferable to a committee of five members of this House. It decided that, as a means of taking evidence, it was preferable to refer the question to judges of the Superior Court than to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and upon the ground of convenience there might be something to be said in favour of that. The Committee on Privileges and Elections, according to the contention of the Minister of Justice, is somewhat large and unwieldy, it is often difficult to get a quorum, and it might perhaps be better to have a smaller number forming a committee to take the evidence from day to day; but the proposition to have the matter referred to a small special committee of this House has not been decided, and, consequently, it is quite competent for my hon. leader to move to substitute a small committee of this House for the gentlemen who have been proposed in this resolution of the Government, no matter what may be their position or their talents. The able speech of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) covered completely the question as to the position this House occupies in regard to questions of this kind, and as to the new policy which seems to have been adopted that we should give up our duties and our functions to the judiciary. While no one in this House more admires the judicial branch of the Government than I do, I entirely dissent from the slavish and flattering manner which hon. gentlemen on that side of the House and too many on this side of the House, are ready to beslabber the judges of the country. They are only men. Many of them are eminent lawyers, many of them have occupied political positions, and, though they are now removed from the turmoil of political life, perhaps only temporarily, still many of them are not without political feelings and prejudices. I could not admit that there are no men outside of the judicial bench in this country who would be competent to preside over tribunals such as this. The Government could find a large number of men of leading standing and reputation who could take evidence in as full and judicial a manner as any of the judges of the land. That is not showing any disrespect to these eminent judges at all, but I think that this sort of appeal has a tendency to degrade rather than to elevate the judiciary. I think that unless the question was one of almost overwhelming importance, of such importance that it could be shown that outside the judiciary, there was no tribunal in the country likely to give it impartial and intelligent attention, the judiciary should not be called in to decide these questions. The tendency is to lower the position of the judiciary in the public mind when they are called upon to enter, even to this extent, into the political arena, and to have their actions, their statements and their opinions discussed within the walls of the House, and upon various political platforms throughout the country. I think, then, that as a mere matter of convenience, and out of regard for the usefulness of the judiciary, it is unwise to place upon them the burden and responsibility of investigations of this character. Regarding the hon. gentlemen who are suggested to the House, I have no possible objection to them, because apart from their names I am entirely unfamiliar with their standing in the province to the bench of which they belong; but I think, as a matter of prudence, it would have looked better, to say the least, so long as the Government insist that the judiciary shall decide the questions of evidence to be taken in this case, had one or more judges been chosen from some of the other provinces of the Dominion than from the province which is the seat of the alleged corruption. It is almost impossible for these gentlemen to free themselves from the passions and feelings and prejudices which must influence any man who has taken part in the political life of that province. Had one of the judges been selected from the bench of Ontario, or from some other province, I think it would have been wiser as a matter of political statecraft. I was considerably struck by the reply of the Minister of Customs to the assertion of the hon. member for Bothwell that this was an unprecedented course. I did not catch the first portion of his remarks, but I understood him to reply that he had a precedent, and after listening quite a while to his very impassioned observations upon that subject, I was surprised to learn that the precedent the hon. gentleman was quoting was the very case

in question. I doubt whether a more amusing quotation of a precedent has ever lighted up discussions in this House. The precedent the hon. gentleman was quoting was the very subject under discussion. I was led by him to the reflection that if there is a precedent I am surprised that hon. gentlemen upon the other side of the House, with their experience and knowledge, and with the study which they have no doubt given to this question since it was first introduced into the House, have not been able to produce something looking like a precedent for the action of the Government on this occasion. They required, in the first place, to find a precedent where the charges have been altered by the Government, or by the party who objects to the charges. There was certainly substantial ground for argument at the outset when the Minister of Justice took the ground that Parliament was not a body judicially constituted to weigh and carefully decide the intricate and delicate questions connected with an investigation of this kind. That certainly was a debatable ground, and although he came to a conclusion adverse to that reached by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House as to that particular point, at any rate it was a question which might have been settled in any one's mind, one way or the other. But as to the propriety of calling upon the individual who produced the charges, to defend other charges which he has not produced, and for which he does not hold himself responsible, I think there can scarcely be two opinions. That the charges have been altered, I understand the Minister of Customs to deny, and this being the case, we have to refer to the original charges of the member for West Ontario, and the charges as amended by the Minister of Militia, to see if there are any charges, to see if the latter are a modification of the original charges preferred by the hon. member for West Ontario. Now, what did the member for West Ontario charge? In ten clauses he substantially asserted that the Postmaster General was a member of the Government and a member of the House of Commons; that while he was so occupying these positions, Parliament, at the request of the Government, appropriated large sums of money for the construction of certain railways; that he was, during a portion of this period, a member of a construction company which was engaged in building these works under contract with the Government, and that out of subsidies paid to this company, he received corruptly large sums of money which were expended in corrupting certain defined constituencies. The Minister of Justice, in opposing the reference of these charges to a committee, referred to the indefiniteness of the charges, he stated that here could be found no allegation of any public money having been misappropriated or maladministered. He laid down the sound constitutional principle that if there was an allegation that public money had been misappropriated or maladministered—which he could not find in the original charges of the member for West Ontario—then it was within the functions, and it was the duty, of this House to investigate these charges. Having insisted upon that position, in order to bring the charges within the functions and the duty of this House to investigate, the Government inserted a clause in their charges which did not exist in the original charges of the member for West Ontario. In clause 7 they assert:

"That the said Sir A. P. Caron misappropriated public money for the purpose of corrupting the electors of Canada, to wit, a portion of the money voted as subsidies as hereinbefore stated."

Consequently, I say that the very argument by which the Minister of Justice undertook to induce this House to place the trial of these charges in the hands of the judiciary, has been taken from under their feet by the Minister of Militia. He has now made boldly a charge which the Minister of Justice insisted could only properly be tried by a committee of the House. At any rate it is an altered charge, which is not found in the charges of the member for West Ontario; and the member for West Ontario finds himself called upon to vindicate, at the expense of his own time, and of his own means, and upon his own responsibility, before a tribunal to which he is opposed, a tribunal selected, to a large degree, by the very person whom he has charged with these offences; he is called upon to prosecute charges which he never made upon his own responsibility. Another ground taken by the Government in their charges is one which I think members of this House ought to insist should be investigated, if investigated at all, within the jurisdiction of this House, and under the protection of this House, and that is the assertions made by hon. members in the course of the debate upon this subject. It is all very well for the Government to select abstract propositions and a series of observations from the speeches of those which favoured the proposition of the member for West Ontario, and to make them a portion of the recital leading up to their own charges made by the Minister of Militia. Among others we find they quote the language of the hon. member for Bothwell to this effect:

"So when the leader of the Government and his colleague undertake to seriously argue that this House is denuded of all its power to enquire into the misappropriation of public money for the purpose of corrupting the electors of this country, because the trial of election petitions has been referred to the courts, I take issue with those hon. gentlemen on that ground. The trial of election petitions is one thing. The use of public money for deliberate corruption of the electors by a member of the Administration is a proper matter for enquiry by this House, and is not in the smallest degree restricted in any way by reason of the trial of election petitions having been referred to the courts."

Is this proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to be placed before a committee of this House, or before a committee of judges to be investigated and tried out on the evidence? Is this House afterwards to be called on to express an opinion as to the wisdom or unwisdom, the logical or illogical character of these observations of the hon. member for Bothwell; or are they mere misleading and illusive recitals brought in to cover up the real and true issue before the public mind of the country as to the innocence or guilt of the Postmaster General in respect to the charges brought against him by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar)? And so on with all of the recitals which lead up to the new formulation of charges made by the Minister of Militia, and by which it is endeavoured to place upon the shoulders of the hon. member for West Ontario the responsibility for the truth of the charges, or otherwise he will stand before the country, as was stated by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, with having made charges which he is unable to prove. If the original charges were open to the allegations of indefiniteness, which ought to prevent the House from

undertaking any effort whatever to enquire into them, the charges are now formulated are doubly open to the same accusation. While the constituencies in which the moneys were alleged to have been expended, the moneys improperly received from the construction company, improperly received out of the subsidies which the Postmaster General is charged with having made use of for election purposes, were confined to certain definite constituencies in the Province of Quebec, these are struck out of the charges, and the charges are still more indefinite by inserting the words "certain portions of Canada." Assuming, for the sake of argument, there was in the possession of the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) documentary and other evidence for the expenditure of money in those and other constituencies mentioned, or assuming that the Government who have taken up these charges, and with additions and alterations of their own, made them their own charges, had in their own possession proofs that moneys so corruptly obtained by the aid of the machinery referred to in the charges were expended in other constituencies of Canada, certainly they were bound, by all rules of law and equity, to have stated and named the constituencies in which those moneys were expended. If it was unfair, improper and inequitable to name those 22 constituencies as seats of corruption, as the locus in which these moneys were expended, certainly it was unfair, improper and inequitable that a commission should be appointed with power to go through the whole Dominion to trace funds which now are alleged to have been improperly and corruptly expended. We have, then, these features to which the motion indirectly refers and to which we desire to call the attention of the country, because I understand the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) utterly declines to accept and indeed repudiates the commission or tribunal now selected to try these charges. It is true that after the evidence is taken this House will be called upon, or may be called upon, to pronounce a verdict as to what may be discovered or revealed by the evidence so taken, and, in this manner, it is argued that the matter is still held within the jurisdiction and dealing of the House. If that is the case—and it may be so to a limited extent—what becomes of all the long arguments we have had as to the propriety of submitting charges of this kind to the judgment of Parliament? At one breath Parliament is denied the power, duty and privilege of appointing one of its committees to take this evidence, another body is selected, and the evidence is then to be submitted to this passionate and partisan tribunal for settlement and for a verdict. I think the most serious complaint, after all, that was made against the action taken by hon. members on the other side of the House is that they have so altered the charges, by adding to them and taking away from them, that the hon. gentleman who possesses the evidence on which he has declared, on his responsibility, that he can convict the Postmaster General of the improprieties indicated in the original resolution, now utterly repudiates the jurisdiction of the new tribunal and declares he will not come forward and attempt to prove those charges, the proof of which he has in his possession, and thus Parliament is actually deprived of the opportunity of passing a sound verdict on the issues which were thus presented. Laying aside the important question as to the dignity and power of Parliament being overruled and overridden by the proposal before the House, brought in by the Government, and considering the case upon the mere ground of convenience, it would be far preferable that this matter should be adjudicated upon the charges made by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and that the evidence should be taken by a committee of this House. We avoid bringing the judiciary, which our hon. friends opposite are not tired of praising, into the arena of party conflict; we avoid the delay and expense to members of Parliament who are interested in this investigation and who may perhaps have evidence to present before the tribunal, in bringing evidence forward when Parliament is not in session, and we will have the benefit of the continued presence of Parliament to assist in enforcing the claims and demands of the committee and in protecting its own members in all cases which may arise before that committee. Consequently, on any of these grounds I think the proposition by way of an amendment to the resolution approving the appointment of judges is preferable to the course now proposed. Another point, which will probably not arise in this discussion but which might arise, is worthy of consideration. Suppose the Government had brought in the names of judges who were very distasteful to the House. Suppose, for instance, the Government proposed as commissioner the name of a judge whom certain members of the House had asked to be investigated, would not the very proposition of the name of a judge who was distasteful to the House, who might be attacked personally on the ground of his strong political partiality or on the ground of his having acted on former occasions injudicially, would it not have a dangerous tendency to lower the position and to diminish the reverence which we ought to have for the bench? I cannot understand why, if the names of judges are proposed for the approval of the House, it would not be perfectly open to members of the House to attack any of the judges whose names were suggested on the ground of former connection with a certain political party, or on the ground of being personally connected with leading politicians in this country, or on the ground of their temperament, or of any previous judicial decisions they have rendered. We do not propose to make these attacks, but I say that they might be made, and as a matter of principle, and as a matter tending to protect the judiciary from attacks of this character, it is unwise to bring before the House for approval or disapproval the names of judges who shall be appointed on commissions. It is in imitation of the methods of our American friends with whom one branch of the Legislature is also a portion of the Executive, and we are asked here to occupy the position of the Executive Council in deciding upon governmental appointments, and thus to assume responsibility for the executive acts of certain gentlemen, which the House ought not to be called upon to assume. Upon this ground, as well as upon the others I have mentioned, the appointment of a commission and the asking of the approval of this House to the names of the gentlemen who shall compose that commission is a great error of judgment and of statesmanship. I trust that the Government may yet see its way clear to recede from what I cannot but believe to be an untenable and unconstitutional position, and I hope

that they will leave entirely and completely in the hands of this House the settlement of the unfortunate proposition for which they are responsible, and for which no member on this side of the House is responsible. Let it be understood that the charges as now formulated against the Postmaster General are not the charges of any member on this side of the House, but they are the charges of the Government, and to the Government the people of this country will look to see that they are thoroughly and impartially investigated. If there is any proof to support them, the responsibility is upon the Government to see that those who are guilty, if guilty they are, of the serious crimes charged by the Government shall be properly punished by means of all the powers placed at the disposal of the Government by the constitution of this country.

Mr. DAVIN. I was very much surprised, Mr. Speaker, to hear the speech of my hon. friend the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), because, as the member for Terrebonne (Mr. Chapleau) has said, he is, on subjects of the nature we are now dealing with, a great and erudite authority, and he is full of facts and precedents. On this occasion he referred to the celebrated case of Lord Melville. We heard the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) make from his place in Parliament to-day, the statement that the charges against Lord Melville were referred to a select committee of Parliament, and the hon. gentleman has communicated to the public press a statement to this effect:

"There was a select committee to whom the report of the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry respecting the office of King's Treasurer was referred, and that committee enquired into the application for naval purposes of surveys that were not naval, and it was information so collected that formed the basis of impeachment. If you were to turn to the volume of parliamentary reports you will find from the evidence taken by this committee (that is to say the committee of the House of Commons) that more than a score of parties were examined."

He further said that any one who undertakes to champion a different view will find themselves very grossly mistaken. Now, Sir, I will have to ask the attention and forbearance of the House, because I will have to lay an argument before hon. gentlemen which is somewhat dull and dry, but which I think is conclusive. On the 18th June, 1782, the House of Commons in Committee of the Whole came to the following resolution, amongst others:—

"That it is the opinion of this committee that some regulations ought to be adopted for the purpose of lessening and keeping down the balances of public moneys, and so on."

On the 18th June, the same day, the House again resolved itself into committee and passed certain resolutions, and the upshot of these resolutions was an enquiry by the Naval Commissioners into the management of the navy; and a number of reports were made by these Naval Commissioners, amongst them what was known as the tenth report. On the 13th February, 1805, the reports of the Naval Commissioners were laid on the Table and they were ordered to be printed, and on the 8th April, 1805, the House was moved:

"That the tenth report of the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry respecting the office of the Treasurer of His Majesty's navy, which was presented to the House on the 13th February last, might be read, and the same was read.

"The House was later moved that a copy of the letter from Lord Viscount Melville should be read. And the House was moved that the Act made in 25 George III for better regulating the office of the Treasurer of His Majesty's navy might be read, and so on. The House was moved that the Act of the 43 George III be read. The House was moved that the report which upon the 10th day of June, 1782, was made from the Committee of the Whole to whom it was referred to consider, the several reports presented to the House from the Commissioners appointed to examine state and take the Public Accounts, might be read.

"The previous question being put and the numbers being equal, Mr. Speaker said that in proceedings to take his vote, he should beg leave very briefly to state his reasons by which it would be governed. Three charges had been advanced. The noble lord: violation of the Act of Parliament; connivance at the private profits illegally made by Mr. Trotter out of the public money. Upon the other hand, it had been urged, that before the House could come to a satisfactory vote upon these charges, a further enquiry should be instituted by a select committee of the House, from whence material information might be derived, which ought to influence the decision of the House upon the charges. But that upon the whole debate, it appeared to him, that material as such further information might be with reference to the latter charge, it could not apply to the former charges, which were confessed by the noble person himself, and being so established, the original question was now fit to be submitted to the judgment of the House. And, therefore, he declared himself with the yeas.

"So it was resolved in the affirmative.

"A motion was made, and the question being proposed, that Henry Lord Viscount Melville be impeached of high crimes and misdemeanours;

"The House was moved, that the tenth report of the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry respecting the office of the Treasurer of His Majesty's navy, which was presented to the House upon the 13th day of February last, might be read; and the same was read.

"The House was also moved, that the report which, upon the 27th day of May last, was made from the select committee to whom the said tenth report of the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry was referred, to enquire into the application of any moneys issued to the treasurer of the navy for naval services to purposes not naval, and whether any and what representations were made to the Lord Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury or the Chancellor of the Exchequer respecting the withdrawal from the bank any sums of money so issued since the passing of the Act of 25 Geo. III, c. 31, and also into the proceedings had for the recovery of the debt due to the Crown by the late Adam Jellicoe, might be read; and the same was read.

"The House was also moved, that the resolutions of the House of the 8th day of April last, respecting the matters contained in the said tenth report of the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry, might be again read; and the same were read."

Then the ten resolutions are given. We have an account here of the trial of Lord Melville, and we have also an account of the debate that took place in the House of Commons when Mr. Whitebread moved for the impeachment of Lord Melville:

"Mr. Whitebread rose to make his promised motion, founded on the tenth report of the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry, and spoke as follows:—'When first, Sir, I gave notice that I should call the attention of the House to the subject on which I am now to address you, it was my intention to follow the precedents by which the House has been generally guided, and to move that the tenth report of the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry be taken into consideration in a committee. I have, however, since, on mature reflection, seen reason to alter this original resolution, and, confining myself to the most important part of that report, to make that the foundation of certain propositions with which I shall have the honour to conclude.'"

And he goes on to argue that there is ample ground in the report of the Naval Commissioners for making the enquiry. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Pitt, rose to oppose the motion of Mr. Whitebread. He said that the accused had not had a fair trial, that he had not had the opportunities that he ought to have had of answering. He goes on to say that for this purpose he thought the best course to pursue would be to refer the report to a select committee, inasmuch as there were many

points contained in it which would require further explanation; and he concludes by moving:

"That the tenth report of the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry be referred to a select committee of this House to examine the matter thereof and to report the same to the House."

Mr. Fox, and other great Liberals of that day, opposed the motion of Mr. Pitt; and when it came to be voted on after a considerable debate, what happened? The motion of the leader of the House, Mr. Pitt, for a select committee was voted down, and from time to time a number of resolutions were put before the House: but the result was that when the motion for the impeachment came to be dealt with, it was dealt with on the report made by the Naval Commissioners, and not by any select committee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that that case all through proceeded on the assumption that the House was already possessed of sufficient information, and that on that ground a select committee was unnecessary. It had incidentally obtained the information by other proceedings, just as we had by the Public Accounts Committee last year, instead of its being obtained on formal charges made.

Mr. DAVIN. If I admitted that, the hon. gentleman must still stand convicted of inaccuracy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh, no.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not suppose for one minute that he would mislead the House. I will not trouble the House further on this matter; but what I say is that the hon. gentleman's statement that in the case of Lord Melville there was a reference of the serious charges made to a select committee, cannot be sustained, and I have shown it. Now, that being so, I say it is a pretty serious thing—and I will only deal with it in passing—to have the proposition which I make here to-day, and which I made once before, characterized as inaccurate, and sent forth to the world in this Hamilton *Times* interview. Now, I will deal with the question very briefly as it has been dealt with here to-day. I say the reference has been misrepresented: the nature of the charges which have been placed before the reference has been misrepresented; the manner of the reference is misrepresented; and the effect of the reference is misrepresented; and this is done for no other purpose than to cast dust in the eyes of the public, and give newspaper writers, who do not trouble themselves to enquire into these things, an opportunity for talking loudly about the dreadful outrage that has been perpetrated by the Government in not bringing the Postmaster General to justice. Why, Sir, do any of these anonymous writers suppose for one minute that they are more concerned in the purity of Parliament and the purity of the Conservative party and the Conservative Government than the mass of the Conservative members of this House? I have heard most extraordinary statements made by the hon. leader of the Opposition to-day. He stated, very properly, that if members were brought into this House by a Cabinet Minister their liberty would not be worth speaking of. It is all very well to make that statement upon a mere allegation, an allegation made without any particulars whatever, and made in such a way that it could not possibly be regarded as a fit matter of enquiry by any assembly careful of its dignity and its self-respect. Now, I challenge any man either in this House or anywhere else, to meet me and controvert the proposition I lay down, that the charges as alleged by the Government, in every material point not only cover the whole ground of the Edgar charges, but enlarge the scope of the enquiry. A learned friend of mine, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), who certainly has not the reputation of being mealy-mouthed in expressing his opinions where he thinks any wrong is likely to be done, and myself went over those charges together. I also read them with another hon. and learned friend of mine. I wanted to find a single charge which could be pronounced a definite charge: and though I do not know what conclusion my hon. friend from Albert came to, I know this, that when two persons, one of whom is a thorough lawyer, and both of whom had received originally a legal education, go over these charges and are unable to find a definite charge made of corruptly receiving money, there must be something wrong. The fact is, Sir, those charges were skilfully framed. I compliment the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), although the compliment has not that element of praise that would make him fit to sit on a bench of bishops. I compliment him on the skill with which he made these charges, because they were well calculated to fill the public mind with the idea that a serious charge was made: and if the hon. gentlemen could only have held their tongues, they would positively have embarrassed the Government. If they had only remained quiet, this assembly, in accordance with common fairness, in accordance with the sense of its own dignity and its duty to the country, and out of respect for the very genius of the English language, would have had to vote down that motion: and then hon. gentlemen could have gone from platform to platform and cried out: There is the spirit of the Government, there is the Government that shrinks from enquiry, there is the Government that harbours within its bosom a man against whom we make these serious charges, there is the Government that was afraid to go before a committee, and unblushingly voted our resolution down. But they insisted on speaking and lost their opportunity. They explained what they meant by their charges: and these indefinite charges, being made plain by the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, the Government had a clear duty before it and that duty it has accomplished. Had hon. gentlemen opposite remained quiet, even if they had no evidence to prove any of those charges, much less to prove them up to the hilt, the making of that motion, vague and indefinite as it was, was calculated to have drawn the Government into the trap of voting it down; but I say the bringing of those vague charges made in the way they were, is probably the greatest act of parliamentary cowardice that the annals of mistakes in Parliament can show. Now, I say that the tribunal is misrepresented. The leader of the Opposition talks well; and he talked indignantly about the taking of this thing out of hands of Parliament? What is the difference practically between the two judges in this commission and the naval commissioners who enquire into the conduct of naval affairs? What is the difference between a commission taking evidence such as these judges will do, and a naval commission? Why, one of the very charges made about these naval commissioners was that they could

not go so thoroughly into matters as a different tribunal would. But they went so thoroughly into them that statements made by them were made the foundation of an impeachment, without any reference to a parliamentary committee. Suppose now that this tribunal sits, and the member for West Ontario does what the hon. member for Yarmouth says he will do, utterly ignore it. Well, if he has no evidence, he will do wisely. If he is really without evidence to prove his charges against the Postmaster General, and he ignores this commission, he will do wisely: but if he will not go before that commission, let me tell him that he will stand confessed before the people of Canada,—

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, as a man ready to make cowardly charges, who, when given an opportunity of proving them, slunk away like a dog with his tail between his legs. But if he has proofs, what is to prevent him coming before these two eminent judges and proving his case? What is to prevent him going before these judges and presenting any evidence in his possession? Is it to be supposed for one moment that these judges, if the request is a reasonable one, would not allow him to go into the evidence? I venture to say if he will go before these judges, these gentlemen, acting in accordance with their practice in criminal matters, will allow him to bring his evidence under the indictment as laid. Then, again, I say that the thing is not taken out of the hands of Parliament, as the leader of the Opposition declares it is. The tribunal is one that can take all the evidence which gentlemen making accusations have to give, if they have any: and I say that they never made so great a mistake as in bringing these charges, if they are now going to ignore the commission, and the public will come to its own conclusions. I may say that my hon. friend the member for Bothwell, in the speech we have just listened to, became rather confused in his language about the powers of Parliament, when he spoke throughout of these charges being brought before the high court of Parliament, which he must know this House of Commons is not. Now, my hon. friend from Bothwell spoke of the case of Mr. Parnell and of the case of Mr. Dillon. In the Parnell case, he said the whole of Ireland was arraigned before the commission. What harm was done to the whole of Ireland or to Parnell? The point is this, that Mr. Parnell wanted a committee, his friends wanted a committee, and the Government refused it. The Government said: A committee is an awkward tribunal to deal with a charge of this sort, but we will give you a commission; and they gave a commission composed of three judges. Did any harm come to Mr. Parnell in consequence of that? Did not that tribunal fulfil all the functions of a tribunal for taking evidence and trial, sifting the matter to the bottom, and did not Mr. Russell, the great counsel for Mr. Parnell, have full scope in pressing the case of his client? What is there to prevent one of the most eminent men at the bar of Ontario and a great friend of the hon. member for West Ontario, Mr. Blake, going before this committee? It will be easy enough for the great Reform party to give him a fee, or his patriotic sentiments may urge him to take up the case without any such consideration. Let him go before the committee, and in his weighty manner arraign the Postmaster General and bring up his evidence under these charges. Then if the leader of the Opposition finds that that tribunal was not equal to fully investigating the charges, or that the charges as framed left something not dealt with, what is there to prevent him, when the report of the commission is made and before us, rising in his seat and saying: This report is good enough as far as it goes, we have proved such and such, but there are other matters to be proved which these judges would not allow us to enquire into? Will any one assert that you cannot, if you have a case at all, make such a case as would make it impossible for any Government to refuse a further and larger enquiry, should you show that these two judges failed to cover the ground you desired in the public interest should be covered? Hon. gentlemen opposite are on a weak scent altogether in trying to arraign the character of the tribunal or to show that, under the charges as laid, they will not be able to go fully into the question. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) used an argument I hardly care to deal with. He said that he does not like to place such work upon the judiciary, to place upon the judiciary investigations of this kind. Surely there is no force in an argument like that, and my hon. friend must have been hardly driven—and I admit that, if I had to take up the cudgels on behalf of the position taken by that hon. gentleman's party, I should be hardly driven myself—when one of the arguments he uses is that he does not like to place the weight of a judicial investigation on judicial shoulders, to place in the hands of men whose duty and training it has been all their lives, the duty of taking evidence. That is one of the most extraordinary arguments I have ever heard of. What kind of men would he place the duty upon? Would he place it upon men not accustomed to take evidence, merchants or lumbermen or ranchmen? He does not like to place a judicial investigation upon judicial shoulders. That is a very curious argument.

Mr. FLINT. The point I made was against bringing the judges into the arena of politics. It was the political bearing of that investigation rather than the judicial that I referred to.

Mr. DAVIN. I will take it any way my hon. friend wants. He objects to a judicial investigation into a political matter by judges. Then he would like a non-judicial investigation into a political matter by persons who are not judges. I rather think that this is a *reductio ad absurdum*. Then he said the way in which these charges as now to be sent before the commission were made, was to take a number of abstract propositions from speeches made by hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House. Why, propositions more concrete, if I may use such language, one can hardly imagine than those which have been made. The statements in the original Edgar charges might be called abstract propositions, if you like, but the charges laid down by the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and by the hon. gentleman who represents Bothwell so well (Mr. Mills), and in the speech of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), were not abstract propositions but concrete propositions, laying a number of specified villainies at the door of the Postmaster General. I think my hon. friend is again

astray in that statement. Even the leader of the Opposition condescended, in speaking of these charges, to say that they had been changed and garbled, but he did not attempt to show where a single charge was garbled. He claimed that the lugging in of 22 constituencies and making a vague charge of spending $100,000 in these constituencies had been omitted, but he did not attempt to show that any of these charges had been garbled. I will say to the hon. and learned gentleman who leads the Opposition with so much ability and efficiency, that to garble charges you have to distort their meaning. You cannot garble a charge by adding words to it which explain its meaning; and, above all, who garbles a charge? Is it the friend of the man who makes the charge? Is it the maker of the charge himself? No, it is generally the enemy, the opponent who garbles a charge; but here he says the charge is garbled because there are added to it the words of the leader of the Opposition, the words of the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and the words of the member for South Oxford, so that we have the monstrous statement made by the leader of the Opposition himself that the member for South Oxford and the member for West Ontario and the gentleman from Bothwell have garbled the charges they laid before this House. Again, the leader of the Opposition stated that, if this course could be taken, there was an end of parliamentary government. Now, surely that is again a proposition that must have seemed to him more fit for the platform than for this House. How can there be an end of parliamentary government if this course is taken? I did not expect that we should be troubled again with this subject. I will only say, in conclusion, that I cannot see how the House can be asked, looking at it from the point of view of parliamentary procedure, to undo to-day what a short time ago it deliberately, and after debate and after full consideration, did. If we are to take a course like that, I think myself there would be an end to all parliamentary progress, and although amongst some people outside this House there may still be the opinion that in some way or other the Government and the Conservative party in this House have shrunk from enquiry, yet, as this question gets to be more and more discussed and understood, it will be seen that those who have shrunk or are about to shrink from full enquiry in this matter are the very persons who tabled the charges in this House.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has not been up to his usual mark, and I think there is some good reason. There was an absence of a cartoon from *Grip* to hold up before the House, or there was some other reason for his not being up to the usual force. There were no interruptions to give him an opportunity of answering his opponents. The necessary appendages for the oration were lacking. This speech, like the other speeches which were not delivered by the hon. gentleman, was apparently not revised. He neglected the scenery, the contingencies and all the circumstances which have at different times drawn from him those witty repartees which have made him celebrated throughout the Dominion, and consequently there was lacking not only the argument but the usual force of the hon. gentleman. Certainly he did not bring much to his argument from the large number of ancient tomes and modern books which he had before him, and did not throw as much light on the subject as I expected. There was this about it, he was evidently discussing the question, because he felt that either in his own interest or in the interest of some friends, he must make some defence of the action of the Government. I have also to join with my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) in congratulating the House upon the reappearance of the Minister of Customs among us. It is certainly pleasant to know that he is no longer a hostage: it is pleasant to know that in place of being on strike, he now strikes, and that he has determined, after finding, perhaps, that his previous method was not successful with the Government, now to come forward boldly as a knight should, and to show in this House that he is entitled to the distinction and preferment that he claimed under different circumstances. These things make the House understand that after all this is the place where distinction is won; and I congratulate the Government that at last, by their not yielding, perhaps, to the pressure, they brought this hon. gentleman to the position of doing in Parliament what they have to do, that is, to stand by their measures and stand for the measures, and so to discuss them here as to gain not only the respect of his colleague but also of Parliament. But there is something else in the remark made by the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to which I wish to call attention. I think he was very unfortunate in dealing with the anonymous writers who are writing about this question. I think, perhaps, that hon. gentleman himself is not without some little experience in the *rôle* of anonymous writers; I think, perhaps, that not always does he follow the methods followed in France of signing his name whenever he writes for a public newspaper; and at least he did not follow that method always, for charges have been made from time to time, and there were interviews from time to time published, that did not receive his signature. But really when he referred to the interview of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I think he struck a weak point in the whole argument. I have never been interviewed. I suppose simply because my views are not worth putting in a newspaper; but when I shall have advanced so far as to be asked what my opinions are, I suppose I shall give them in the usual method. But be that as it may, it is a very useful way of finding out what are the opinions of men who are able to judge of this question. The public wish to know; for after all, much as the general public know already, they do look to those who understand more about the question to get some new light upon it. Now, I take it that the defence made by my hon. friend of the proposition of the Government is not just the defence the Ministry would like to have made. I think, perhaps, he made certain statements that will not be sanctioned by the Government. For example, he says that when the judges sit, if the member for West Ontario comes and says: "I have charges," of course they will be enquired into. If he says: "I am here bringing my charges"—these are his words—"I want to enlarge them," and does anybody, he asks with considerable gusto, think that these judges will not enlarge them. I did not see the usual smile sitting so pleasantly upon the face of the Minister of Justice when the member for Assiniboia made that statement. When the mem-

ber for Assiniboia was broadening the case and promising that the Government would give such a fine opportunity to the member for West Ontario, I saw that the member for Assiniboia was not instructed, that he had forgotten, as he did upon the occasion of enquiring into the legality of the charges, to consult with the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and other lawyers; that he had forgotten to consult with them also as to the method of defence on this question. Why, any gentleman can see at once, if the action of the Government is what he says it will be, it would mean that any one of the charges preferred by the member for West Ontario could be submitted to these judges; and if he makes any other charges that he likes before the judges, they will be enquired into.

Mr. DAVIN. Certainly, if I made any such statement as that, it was not what I meant; but I do not think it will be found in *Hansard* that I made any such statement as that the judges would so enlarge the case as to allow new charges to be put in. The point I tried to make was this, that if the member for West Ontario were to go before this commission he would be able to prove all the facts which he could have proved under his own charges, leaving the omnibus and absurd charge respecting twenty-two elections on one side. That was the point I tried to make.

Mr. FRASER. The statement does not help the hon. gentleman at all. But I accept it even as made. He means that if, for example, the member for West Ontario were to say: "I have a number of witnesses here who will prove so and so; the charges are not broad enough; if you put certain words in I can get that evidence in."

Mr. DAVIN. No, that is not what I mean.

Mr. FRASER. He sees that he has made a mistake. He understands very well that he was arguing this question upon an assumption that is not in the statement at all, and if any person was trying to throw dust in the eyes of the public, it was the hon. member for Assiniboia; if any person was trying to give a piece of specious argument in favour of the Government's proposition, it was the member for Assiniboia himself. Why, Sir, that statement is as definite as can be. He seems to forget that it is something similar to issuing a commission to take evidence, and supposing that the commissioner will allow the solicitors appearing for either party to say: "I want such and such questions to be put," after the questions agreed upon had been put. If the hon. gentleman had given the question a moment's study, he would understand that these charges laid by the Government are as specific as can be, and that these judges would be bound as judges, the moment a tittle of evidence was to be given different from the charges laid, to say that that evidence cannot be given, just as a commissioner that takes evidence gets authority from a court to take the evidence, and he has no power to go beyond that. So the judges appointed by Parliament have their commission from Parliament, and they cannot go beyond that. The Minister of Justice, if I understood him, says that if the parties had any evidence to give that could not be taken in under the charge as laid, they might report to Parliament that they were going to have the power to report that there was evidence offered that could not be taken in—I so understood him. But if that is the case, why have the Government not enlarged the charges so that the judges may be able to enquire into all the evidence without making such report? The hon. gentleman will see at once that he has been arguing upon an assumption that does not exist at all. He has been assuming that these judges are simply in the position of being able when they sit to do as they please. There is no sense in the statement of the hon. gentleman when he says that if the member for West Ontario has any charges to make let him bring them before the judges. The hon. gentleman thinks that the evidence he is going to bring is a charge. That is a nice state of things. The hon. gentleman distinctly stated that the member for West Ontario can come before the judges and say: I want to enlarge the charges. Now, what is the meaning of enlargement? Is it not adding to them? Is it not making the scope wider? It does if language means anything—and I take it that no man understands the effect of language, after he coolly looks into it, better than the hon. member himself. When he was making this statement he playfully refers to the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) and says that if he had been in as difficult a position as the hon. member for Yarmouth, he would be ill at ease. Well, I submit that if the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) had not a difficult position, then I don't know what position can be difficult, because the statement he made about bringing these charges certainly did not seem to carry the conviction to those who heard it, and that the hon. member himself had read the charges very carefully. I take it that no such thing can be done, that the words are as definite as words can be, and that the judges who are appointed simply to take evidence, will take evidence under those charges only, and should a witness, after having given some evidence that was considered admissible under the charges, endeavour to go behind them and enlarge his testimony in a manner such as would point to the guilt of the accused party, he would undoubtedly be stopped at once. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Chapleau) has referred to the fact with pride that nothing has been said so far in regard to the judges themselves. I take it for granted that the hon. gentleman is surprised. Did not the very fact that he was surprised show consciousness within himself that something might be said against the judges? Of course, nothing was said against the judges. Why? No man is going to attack a judge, until he has done some act that he ought not to have committed. No man in Parliament or outside of this House is going to attack a judge until he has committed some improper act. The leader of the Opposition intimated that for the purpose of this discussion he would not say anything against the two judges who have been appointed. They might be the best men in the world; but with such charges submitted to them, nothing could be said against the judges. I therefore take it that unless these men had actually done wrong, there was no necessity to say anything about their character in regard to this discussion. Why? Because the investigation is so limited by the Government that if they were perfect judges they could not do anything under those charges which the Government did not desire them to do. So that nothing has been said against

these judges—nothing could be said against them. The Minister of Customs referred to some indefinite person, a member of Parliament or journalist, who had spoken about the judges, and I will follow that up and say that, so far as my experience goes, and so far as regards my view of the bench, I endorse the views expressed so well by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), and I believe a degradation of the bench occurs when judges are appointed to enquire into political offences. I believe no judge can leave his position where he has to decide between subject and subject in matters civil and criminal, and can come down from the bench and enquire into the filth and scandal of political life, and return to the bench as pure as when he left it. I do not believe they should be so employed. And why? Because that is not the duty which judges are appointed to perform. They are never appointed to enquire into the character, morals and acts of members of Parliament. Their duties are wholly different, and the moment you bring them to decide conflicts regarding members of Parliament, regarding the expenditure of money in different constituencies, you render them less capable of satisfactorily discharging their duties when they return to the bench. It is because I respect the judges more than do hon. gentlemen opposite, who are always talking about purity, that I do not want to bring them down from their elevated position, that I do not want to stain the ermine by appointing judges in sympathy with themselves perhaps, or judges who may not be in sympathy with them, to conduct an enquiry of this character, particularly when their directions are not so extensive as to permit them to enquire into anything connected with the case. What will the judges think when they read the charges made by Mr. Edgar against the hon. Knight? What will the judges think when they find that Parliament, which referred this matter to them, declined to accept the charges as made, but changed them to suit themselves and then referred them to a commission? What would the judges think, if they had the power which the hon. member for Assiniboia thought they possessed in regard to this matter, if in a prosecution it was agreed between the parties that, in place of getting at the facts, one of the solicitors overcame the other and prepared the case simply to suit himself and submitted it to the judges, when the judges themselves knew that it was their duty to enquire into the whole facts of the case and that they were sworn to investigate it?

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

After Recess.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair, at six o'clock, I was addressing myself to the question of the principle of pursuing parliamentary investigations before the judges. I claimed that it was not in the interest of the judges themselves that this should be done, and it was not pretended on behalf of the Government that this method should be pursued in all cases. It becomes a question then as to what cases shall be sent to the judges, and as to what degree of guilt shall attach before the case shall be investigated by a parliamentary committee. Who shall be the judges of the extent of the guilt? Shall the Government always decide what cases shall be of sufficient importance or of sufficient gravity to go before a committee of the House, and what cases shall be sent to the judges for investigation? For myself, I look with considerable alarm on the proposition to remit to the judges the investigation of questions of this kind. I do not think it will add anything to their ability, or to their fairness, or to the weight of the decisions that they will render upon matters which come before them in their strictly judicial capacity. I do not desire that the judges shall hear anything of Government plotting, know anything concerning party machinery, understand anything of political corruption, or be tempted to condone or to whitewash national robbery. It is for them to sit in judgment upon matters that come before them in their judicial capacity, and the discharge of their duties should not be interfered with by Parliament relegating to them investigations of this kind. When the air is full, when Parliament is full, of all manner of charges—and I enquire not now as to the truth or falsity of these charges—when the people are everywhere asking what amount of truth there is in these charges, when they are looking about to know whether in federal or in local politics something is done which ought not to be done by the various Governments: then I say it is well that we should have at least one place to which the people can look as sacred and beyond the control of political faction. It is to the highest possible degree in the interests of the people, that they should know that at least the bench is free from the political and other influences that prevail in this country. For that reason, I deem it to be much better in the interests of the bench—and that ought to be a primary consideration—that we should investigate in Parliament the charges which are made on the floor of this House. It may be of some little importance to watch the method which the Government have pursued in the three graver charges which have been brought before Parliament during the last and the present sessions. The first was investigated by a committee of Parliament and condoned; the second was declared outlawed and denied; and this present charge is declared to be unspecific and vague and is shelved. If the vagueness of the charge has anything to do with it, then it could be easily disposed of. In this connection the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), whom I regret to see is not in his seat, said, that if the judges were shown to have failed, then Parliament would further enquire. Did he anticipate that the judges were going to fail? If he did, and if Parliament is to further enquire, I think it is a fair argument that Parliament should enquire at once, and thus avoid the difficulty. The hon. gentleman mentioned that Mr. Blake and the leader of the Opposition could go before that commission, but there is a very important question involved there. Even if the charges were as made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), is it to be supposed that these gentlemen are to go before the commission at their own expense? If there has been wrongdoing it is as much the duty of the Government to see that the wrong-doing is ferretted out and punished, as it is the duty of the Opposition. Certainly the Government ought, at all events, to bear the expense of seeing that wrong-doing is brought to light. It was a

little amusing to hear my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) state that he had studied these charges with the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and other distinguished lawyers. He did not state that he took any of the hon. gentlemen in the Opposition into his confidence, but he went before judges who would at least have no bias against his preconceived notions of the case. It might be said of that hon. gentleman, as he himself said in that marvellous pre-delivered speech as published in the Ottawa *Citizen:* that Ichabod might be written over his own efforts. I remember listening to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) speak in this House of "the green-grocery policy of the Government." What has changed him to his present position of being a decidedly keen advocate of anything and of everything the Government propose? Why is he now so ready upon all occasions to be their chief champion? I fear, Sir, that he has gone to the green-grocers and purchased a large supply of leeks, and that having partaken of that most savory vegetable he is changed from being a critic of the Government, to be their most dutiful slave. In that pre-delivered speech to which I refer, and which was not a posthumous writing of this distinguished gentleman, he asks: Was the curse of Ichabod upon them? "Unstable as water thou shalt not excel." That is a new rendering of the word. I can imagine the old patriarch, as he described the character of his wayward children, looking forward through the centuries to the use of the word which, to his old yet fervent imagination, never was coined—"unstable as water thou shalt not excel." The explanation may, I think, refer to the hon. gentleman, but is there any such explanation? When I heard him speaking, I could not help thinking of that speech published before delivery, with which he attempted to bolster up his political friends. This ancient classic is a dangerous book to quote from unless a man has a great and varied knowledge of it. When the wife of Phineas, in her dire extremity, saw the ark taken and her husband and father-in-law dead, she gave this word to the Israelites: "Ichabod, thy glory has departed."

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). Speak for yourself.

Mr. FRASER. I am talking about a book of which the hon. member for Victoria, Cape Breton, knows no more than the hon. member for Assiniboia; it is Greek to him. I was about to say I could not help thinking, as he attempted to go from one position to another, that he had learned, at the feet of the Gamaliel from Albert, that the true Ichabod could be written over that speech, because it did not indicate the wit or the elegance or the ability which the hon. gentleman bestowed on the subject before. Now, Sir, so much for the hon. gentleman. Let me say that I think Parliament should enquire into this matter, because it must not be forgotten that any investigation made by the judges will be unsatisfactory. In the first place, it is the sole right and duty of Parliament to try and rid itself of anything unworthy of Parliament. Suppose, for example, that the judges who are appointed, against whom I say nothing, should refuse to have the press admitted while the investigation went on; suppose that they should declare that they would investigate this matter in private; or suppose they should see fit not to make any report for two or three years or until after the next general election. What is to prevent them? Nothing whatever. There is such a thing as judges at an investigation refusing to allow the press to be admitted; and there is such a thing known in the history of this country as judges not giving in a report for two or three years. I think, Sir, that Parliament cannot afford to rid itself of its duty, or to give up its right; and, therefore, I think that we should take the method proposed by the leader of the Opposition. In the second place, it is in the interest of honest government that Parliament should enquire into allegations of wrong-doing on the part of any of its members. That may strike the Ministry as rather a strange statement. All men who are desirous of doing right have no objection to the most stringent enquiry and to the most careful surveillance, and, therefore, the Government itself should feel that it is in its interest that Parliament here, in the presence of the Opposition, should enquire into everything relating to the Government, and this is clearly a case relating to the Government. Then, it is good discipline for the individual members of this House to know that their conduct can be enquired into. If a majority—and when I speak of majority, I speak not of any political party—can do this, then a member will not feel that his acts must be enquired into if it is in the interest of the party he supports that the investigation should stop. A man may become such a power in his party, though not a member of the Ministry, as to make it very dangerous for a Government to enquire into his conduct; and therefore all members should feel that it is in their own individual interest that Parliament and Parliament alone should enquire into these matters. I think all members of Parliament need the strengthening influence of their fellow-members, and all should feel that that influence is one of the best forces behind them urging them to do right. But, Sir, higher than all these things, I think it is the best security of the people, if they can feel that Parliament can and will purge itself. While the other considerations are not only necessary, but of very great importance, this one is of higher importance than any other. How is Parliament to be held in that respect by the people in which it ought to be held? How are the people to feel that Parliament will deal with all interests affecting them in the best manner? Just to the extent that they understand that Parliament will deal with everything respecting the individual members of Parliament in the best manner. There is no way in which you can get the people to feel that Parliament is all that it ought to be, except by seeing that the axe is laid at the root of the tree in Parliament first, that judgment begins at Jerusalem. Now, Sir, I spoke a moment ago about what we had gone through during the last year or two, and what we are going through now. I admit that bad as Parliament may be, it is not as bad as it is sometimes represented to be; but nothing would raise it so high in the public estimation as the knowledge that when wrong-doing existed in Parliament, Parliament would be ready to enquire into it. Who are to set the example before the people? Do you demand of the people that they should act well? Then, apply the principle here, and see that you act well yourselves. If you have received a mandate from the people to do the people's bidding, do it in the

spirit of all that is best and highest in their interest. Then, let us show that we are not afraid; and I am sure that, consulting our individual interests, we would do the best possible thing in making this enquiry. I think no member of Parliament should ever plead a statute of limitations, or plead that this man or that man would be involved. If our actions are all that they should be, then Parliament may enquire into them without any detriment to any of us. For these reasons I think that the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition is entitled to my vote; and, though it is a small matter what shall become of our vote to-night, it is a great matter in this respect, that we are making history, and it may be pointed to as authority for subsequent actions. I felt the force of that when the Minister of Customs took the very vote of a few days ago, and claimed that that vote having been passed, it was a bar now to the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. Now, I know that is binding upon us so far as the vote of this House is concerned. But there may be votes of the House that are not in the best interests of Parliament or the people, and we may reconsider them, although I have no hope that this will be reconsidered. But at least we ought all of us to state what we individually believe, not in the hope of changing the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, but to put on record what we think right in the best interests of the country. In view of the history of the mother country, from which we can get the best information on this and every other question, and in view of all the considerations I have given, I think that the method pursued by the Government is not in the interests of good government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At the risk of prolonging the discussion, I feel compelled to draw the attention of the House to some of the points before it, because the discussion seems to me to have wandered into matters entirely foreign to the business before us this afternoon. I shall not be tempted even to dispute the statement of the hon. member for Guysborough, that he is the only person in this House who possesses any knowledge of the Scriptures, although that might be a tempting subject of discussion. I shall not follow him or those who have contended that, for various good reasons they have expressed, these charges ought to be investigated, because the House has already decided that they shall be investigated. The Minister of Customs this afternoon was perfectly right and logical in maintaining that the question before us has to be considered in view of the resolution adopted on the 4th of May, when this House practically decided the question which has been debated this afternoon. Let me call the attention of the House to what our action has been on this question. We have discussed it this evening as if what should be done in this matter were entirely an open question; but on the 4th of May the House came to the resolution that:

"In the opinion of this House, it is expedient that enquiry should be made as to the truth or falsity of the allegations and charges last mentioned, and numbered respectively 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 (being the allegations and charges included in the original statement of the said James D. Edgar, and those made in the course of the debate thereon), and that for that purpose the House deems it proper and convenient that the evidence relating to such allegations and charges should be taken by one or more commissioners to be appointed under chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada and having all the powers mentioned in said chapter, and that such evidence should be laid before this House when completed."

And the House added to that the rider:

"That the names of the said commissioner or commissioners be submitted for the approval of this House before his or their appointment;" which was agreed to on a division."

Every member of the House will remember that the resolution was come to after ample thought and ample discussion. We had a debate extending over two whole days and lasting nearly the whole of the second night; and it only remained for the Government to submit to this House the names of the commissioners who might be considered competent and reliable to take the evidence on these charges. In pursuance of that duty, we laid before the House this afternoon the names of two eminent judges of the Superior Court of the Province of Quebec. I am glad to know that in making that selection, we chose gentlemen against whom, in the course of this discussion, not a single word has been said, either as to their fitness in point of professional attainment or as to the fairness with which they would undertake and perform the duty entrusted to them. I do not accept at all as an interpretation of the silence of the Opposition in that regard the explanation given of it by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), because that would be a most ungenerous one to these two judges themselves and a most degrading one to the Opposition. The explanation which he gave was that, for the purposes of this discussion, the objections which might be expressed to these two judges were waived for the present; that it might be there were grave objections to them, but that the grave objections to the whole procedure so far outweighs all considerations of the fitness of the judges as to make discussion of their fitness inappropriate at present. Sir, the Opposition owed it, as their first duty to this House and the country, to suggest any single objection which could be urged as to the fitness or impartiality of these judges. If they entertained the slightest suspicion that they were professionally unfit, or disqualified by personal or political bias, it would not have been illogical, even in the discussion they have pursued this afternoon, to have taken the ground that, while they preferred another course, namely, a reference to a committee, if the majority of the House preferred the course of appointing commissioners, they had this or that objection to urge against the fitness of the two men suggested. On the contrary, I am disposed to give the members of the Opposition in this House credit for far greater sincerity and candour, and to trust implicitly to the statement offered by their leader, and to come to the conclusion that the two names submitted to the House are above reproach and beyond doubt, as regards the fitness and propriety of our choice. Now, then, I submit that that was all that ought to have come before the House this afternoon. I shall not for the present raise any question of order as to this amendment. I have the greatest possible doubt that it is in order. The House, on the 4th of May, having come to a resolution that these charges should be referred, for the taking of evidence, to commissioners, I submit that it is improper, or at any rate an evasion of the rules of the House to introduce a resolution now saying that the charges shall not be referred to com-

missioners but shall be referred to a committee of the House. While not taking any point of order in that regard, because I am aware of the *finesse* which is repeatedly resorted to for the purpose of evading the rules of Parliament as regards the repeating of motions or bringing motions forward for the purpose of negativing resolutions which have already been adopted, I still must protest against the unfairness and want of candour of the Opposition in raising a discussion on this point and moving a resolution like this in the face of the solemn decision the House has already come to —a decision which would be completely, although indirectly, reversed if this amendment should be adopted. Now, I propose, without relying upon any question of order as regards the fitness of the amendment, to take up point by point the objections urged by hon. gentlemen on the other side, not only to the adoption of the resolution I moved this afternoon, but to the mode of procedure which the House has already deliberately decided to adopt, and as regards which the passage of that resolution is but another step. The statement made by the leader of the Opposition in introducing his amendment was that this is a matter peculiarly within the province of the House, a matter affecting the powers of this House, and its procedure in dealing with members against whom charges are brought, involving the question of their fitness to sit and of their unlawful interference with the freedom of elections to seats in this House, and that, consequently, it is a matter in which this House ought to be the only judge. I have to remind the House again that, under the terms of the resolution of the 4th of May, no less than by the terms of the resolution to-day, this House is still to be the judge. The hon. member, therefore, in raising the cry that we are seeking, against the old practice of Parliament, to deprive this House of its customary power and authority over its members, was attempting, perhaps without design, to divert the attention of the House from the real issue, the real issue being simply this: whether it is a convenient practice, with regard to charges of this kind, to have the evidence taken by royal commissioners and have it submitted for the action of this House afterwards. In the next place it was said that this procedure was unprecedented. We have called the attention of gentlemen who have raised this argument on other occasions to the fact that they were unable to show a single precedent for the making of this charge. The simple assertion that no such thing as that which is charged here ever existed in any other country is only the refuge of a coward or a fool in debate. Does not every one know that electoral corruption has passed through all phases in the history of the British House of Commons from the time when members sat boldly in Parliament paid a salary by the king for their votes, from the time—and that not very long ago—when a member was not afraid to rise in his place in the British Parliament and say: "I have paid my money for the right to speak in this House and I intend to speak here," down to the time when, greater electoral purity having been established by the statutes of the country and especially by the new mode of procedure which we are following by analogy in this case of a reference to the courts, the slightest act of political corruption has been held enough not only to vacate the seat of the member but to send to prison those who have been concerned in it? Does not every one know, therefore, that this question has passed through every phase in the British House of Commons, and that charge after charge has been made and investigated there, so that, if a single precedent, such as that contained in charge No. 10 of those put forward by the member for West Ontario, could have been found, it would have been brought forward; but any one who reads the history of that Parliament knows that, when charges were brought in there and investigated by committees, sometimes charges against members of having obtained their seats by corrupt practice, afterwards by the procedure under the Grenville Act, and afterwards by the procedure under the Act which relegated the trial of such cases to the courts, during all the practice of more than 200 years, no such statement as that which has been eliminated from these charges has ever been preferred to the House of Commons or any attempt made in that House to appoint a committee on such a charge. My attention was called this afternoon to the fact that there was an attempt made in 1809, when charges were made against two members of the British Ministry of having carried on political corruption in order to secure the election of political supporters to the House very much in the style in which paragraph No. 10 was framed by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). It was vague, as his charge was vague, but the House declined even to allow the hon. gentleman who made that charge to withdraw it, and, though he and his supporters urged that, instead of there being a trial at the bar of the House, which was then sometimes the course pursued, there should be a trial by a committee, not only was his motion voted down but he was not allowed the courtesy of a withdrawal. However, I attach comparatively little importance to precedents in matters referring to the procedure of the House when we have the plain sanction of a statute. If we were taking the matter entirely out of the House, I would be willing to meet hon. gentlemen in debate and would discuss the matter in the line of precedents, but it is sufficient for me to know that, as far as the judgment of the case is concerned, we are still leaving it in the hands of the House of Commons of Canada, and simply adopting a convenient and expeditious mode of conducting the trial, and one we think that will command more public confidence as to its fairness than any procedure on the part of a committee of this House would command. It is quite enough, in considering whether or not that procedure should be adopted, to know that we have the sanction of law and the authority of a statute for proceeding as we are asking the House to do. The leader of the Opposition seemed to think there were precedents against it. There are no precedents against it whatever. No one will contest the principal assertion of the hon. gentleman that Parliament has frequently appointed committees, that it has frequently taken evidence by committees, but is there a single authority to show that the mode of taking the evidence by Royal Commission is not as expeditious, and as convenient, or that in any sense whatever it is repugnant to parliamentary institutions? Not only has no precedent been cited to that effect, but not the slightest suggestion of an argument has been made or a phrase uttered which could be dignified with

the name of argument to show that there is anything repugnant to parliamentary procedure in such a manner of taking the evidence. I do not say that cases cannot be cited as to the appointment of committees to take evidence, but I do say that the cases which the hon. gentleman did cite were inapplicable. In 1890 a committee was appointed to investigate the charges against Mr. Rykert, as the hon. gentleman has stated, but those charges were totally different from this. They did not refer to election trials, they did not seek to re-try cases which had already been tried in the courts, as paragraph 10 of the charges of the member for West Ontario did. They did not seek to evade and circumvent the law laid down by this Parliament as to the trial of corrupt practices at elections, but they accused that member with having abused his position as a member of this House for his own profit, and with having made untruthful assertions as to the administration of certain departments of the Government, and as to the influence he possessed upon other members of this House. The assertions referred to in the charges which were made against him were practically admitted to be untruthful, and in the course of the statement which that member made to the House—a statement which was admitted by members on both sides of the House to be quite inadequate as an answer to the charges—he desired a reference to a committee of the House in order that he might be heard more fully there. The argument that I made to the House in support of the proposition to grant a committee was that the hon. member, standing in his place, had not answered the charges but had desired to be heard elsewhere in answer to them. As regards the investigations of last year, the motion for a committee was in no way analogous to this. It related entirely to charges against a great public department in regard to the expenditure of public moneys; and from the first hour I spoke on this question I admitted that it is not only the right, but the invariable practice of the House to appoint committees to investigate charges of that character. The hon. the leader of the Opposition went on to criticise the arguments we had made against appointing a parliamentary committee by asking if the Postmaster General would suffer by the fact that a committee consisting of members of this House appointed to investigate charges of this kind would probably be affected by political bias and that their judgment would be suspected by the public in consequence of that circumstance. The fact that the Postmaster General might not have to suffer by that or might be suspected of profiting by it, is one of the best reasons why that practice should be departed from. Every one knows the cry that went up from that side saying: "Give us a committee almost all from your own side of the House; give us only one from our side upon that committee;" not that the Postmaster General should not suffer, but that, if the result should be an acquittal, the finding might be tainted in public opinion, and that they might still attack the Postmaster General by insinuation though there might be no stain whatever upon his character. The next argument the leader of the Opposition urged was that the investigation ought to take place in public, it must be under the public eye. I fail to see why the proceedings of a court of justice, or of two of Her Majesty's commissioners sitting as a court of justice, are not just as open to the public eye and public hearing as a committee of this House would be. We were told by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that these commissioners might decide to keep their court closed, to keep the press out of the investigation. There have been public enquiries by Royal Commissioners in this country before now, but I am not aware that that course has been pursued in any one of them.

Mr. LAURIER. It has been done by one of the commissioners for this very investigation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In what case?

Mr. LAURIER. In the case of a Royal Commission held by Judge Routhier.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not aware of the circumstances If the leader of the Opposition, in answer to my argument, after some 20, or 30, or 40 Royal Commissions have sat in this country, is only able to show one instance in which the press was excluded, in which the public were kept out, and when we have named as one of our commissioners, a judge, who, he says, did exclude the press, and still he has taken no exception to his appointment, I think he is not very much afraid that the press or the public will be excluded from this investigation. I cannot imagine why there should be the slightest apprehension of the exclusion of anybody from the enquiry. There may have been in the case the hon. gentleman refers to—but I do not know what case he means—some reason for the exclusion of the press; it may have been done by the desire of both parties that the investigation should be conducted in private. But as regards this investigation, no one can conceive any reason why the Royal Commissioners should sit in private any more than that a committee of this House should sit in private; and a committee of this House is just as likely to act in that way as Royal Commissioners. Now, the next statement which the leader of the Opposition made was that these charges were garbled. I think that that was very scant courtesy to this House, which adopted this statement of the charges as a fair statement of them. But, in spite of his assertion that the charges have been garbled, I venture to say that it is an accurate and fair statement of what the charges of the hon. member for West Ontario were; and that no honest man, unless he is entirely biassed by political prejudice, will say that the statement is not a true and fair statement of the charges preferred by the hon. member for West Ontario. I submit that charge No. 10—leaving out of consideration, of course, the mere clap-trap with which the charge is clothed—is one of such a character that no charge analogous to it will be found in the records of any Parliament in the world; it is an attempt to try, as was explained by members who went into the details some time ago, some sixty or seventy elections, some of them already tried and closed; and the verdicts and decisions of those cases are to amount to nothing if a member can stand up in his place, and, for the purpose of aspersing another, can declare that in the course of sixty or seventy election trials, a member of this House is guilty of corrupt practices. Paragraph No. 10 is a vague statement which I suppose everybody will admit to be an unfair one to refer to a committee. The other statement which we have omitted is likewise an unfair one, because it

means that if one of these companies did not pay money to the Postmaster General, some person in the interest of these companies might have done so which would allow the hon. member for West Ontario, without the statement of a single particular—and this is what the hon. member for Bothwell would like so much—to range over, perhaps, a thousand names for the purpose of proving that somebody in the Province of Quebec gave a subscription for election purposes in some one of these twenty-two counties mentioned, if not in the general election, in some of the numerous bye-elections that took place. I am in the judgment of the House in saying that these are statements that it would not be fair or reasonable to refer to a committee of this House. I deny, as respects the other charges, that they have been altered or garbled at all. Why, Sir, take the statement about which a good deal has been said, that the Postmaster General was a member of the construction company. That in itself is not a charge, that in itself is not alleged as an offence at all. It simply alleges by way of what lawyers would call pleading evidence, that he had opportunities of knowing what was going on, and of profiting by any money that could be got from the Lake St. John Railway Company. It matters not in the judgment we have formed upon this question whether he was a member of the construction company or not; if he was guilty of having conspired with anybody to obtain public moneys, or to divert public moneys from their proper use, he ought to receive the punishment which is due to that offence, even if he were not a member of the construction company, and even in the same measure as if he were a member of the construction company. In so far as the omission of paragraph No. 10 with regard to the elections in these twenty-two counties, has any effect upon the other charges of having received money, it simply amounts to this: it alleges that having obtained public moneys improperly, he spent them for certain specified purposes. But I repeat, as I said before, with regard to the membership of the construction company, that if he conspired to obtain these public moneys, or to divert them from their proper use, or to get other public moneys in place of them, or to get other public moneys for his use in any way, it matters not where he spent the money or how he spent the money, he ought to receive a just measure of punishment at the hands of this House, or of any tribunal which has power to award punishment for such an offence. If it means anything more, if it means that he is to be tried for corrupt practices in these counties, I repeat that he has to be tried in another way, and that as regards many of these counties, the trial has already taken place, and the results arrived at are conclusive. Why, Sir, if any other course were adopted, if the course to which the hon. member for Bothwell is so passionately attached, were to be followed up, many members of this House who have come back from their constituencies, members against whom personal charges of corruption have failed, would be in a position where we could say to them: That is all very well for the judgment of the court which tried you, but we have discovered other evidence against you since, evidence that was not in our possession then, which will show that you were guilty of corrupt practices in that election. We will try you again, and you must not plead the statute of limitations or the decision of another court. If this course were followed, then hon. gentlemen opposite would sing another tune. They would not talk about technicalities, or the statute of limitations, but they would talk about the individual rights of members of this House, they would talk about the tyranny of a brute majority in this House, they would talk about British parliamentary institutions being overridden by the strength of a mechanical majority of this House. Now, Sir, I repeat again that I do not pretend to say that in the range of parliamentary practice there may not be found precedents for almost anything. You can take this volume of precedents before me, and if you like to go back to the ages to which the hon. member for Bothwell has gone—ages to which no man claiming the name of Liberal should be otherwise than ashamed to go back either for parliamentary precedent or for the maxims of political creed—you can find there case after case in which the majority of the House of Commons expelled this man and that man for offences for which they had no more right to try him, Mr. Speaker, than have the pages at your feet. They expelled a man from the House of Commons because he opposed a Bill and said that it would be equivalent to doing judicial murder to pass that Bill; they expelled another man because he was the author of a criticism of the book of common prayer; they expelled this man and that man because he wore his hat the wrong way, until parliamentary institutions became a laughing-stock. But show us, from the time when British institutions had fair-play, when the rights of constituencies were respected, and when the majority did not count for everything, any case conflicting with the practice we are asking this House to adopt in this case, and you will have thrown something into the discussion better than has been contributed from the other side of the House down to the present moment. The next statement which the leader of the Opposition urged was this: He said you have so altered the charges that the hon. gentleman who preferred the original set declared he could no longer prove them. Mr. Speaker, while I deny that we have garbled the charges in any way, or that we have attempted to do so, I do not deny that the charges have been changed. They have been changed by the hon. gentleman who made them, and by the hon. gentlemen who spoke in support of them. Why, Sir, within ten minutes of the time he took his seat I called the attention of this House to the fact that the charges were vague and unspecific in two or three important particulars. I called the attention of the House to the fact that while the charges contained what, in the public estimation, would be an accusation of a conspiracy to obtain public money, or a conspiracy to divert public money, or a conspiracy to get more public money voted to a company from which the Postmaster General was alleged to be drawing money, nothing of the kind was actually stated in the charges, and it was still open to the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), if he failed to prove them, to slink out of them and say: "That was not the interpretation I put on them when I made them." The hon. member for West Ontario spoke a little afterwards in the debate, and he said: "What I charge is a conspiracy to obtain public money." What the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) declared the resolution meant, in his estimation, was a conspiracy to obtain public

money and a conspiracy to corrupt the electorate by that public money. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was equally distinct. But when the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) made that statement, as to that being what he meant, my colleague the Minister of Public Works and one or two others of us said: "Put it in your charge then, and you shall have all the investigation you want." Why did he not put it in his charge if that was what he meant? He had no idea of doing so; but, taking him at his word, we put it in his charge for him, and when we did so, he stated at once, "I cannot prove that charge any longer." If the hon. gentleman cannot prove that charge any longer, he has to thank himself for his untruthful interpretation of the charge, and he has to thank the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for South Oxford, who, for the purpose of convincing the public that we were burking enquiry into a fair and *bonâ fide* charge of actual corruption and conspiracy against the Postmaster General, put an interpretation on that resolution which he shrank from putting on paper himself, and which, when put there, he said he was no longer able to prove. That is the only sense in which the charges have been altered, except by eliminating the two broad and general statements to which I have referred. But as regards the statement of a conspiracy, the charge of a conspiracy, the charge of improperly dealing with public money, the charge of improperly getting public money out of one of those companies and getting its exchequer refilled by votes of Parliament, they are there in their breadth and entirety, and in fact, they are broader, as the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) stated; and I shall be very much surprised indeed, if the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), coming to the investigation of these charges, as I think on second thought he will deem it best to do in deference to public opinion after having made them in his place in this House, has any reason whatever to complain that the charges as they now appear, are not broad enough to enable him to prove every crime that he stated in his place in this House was of the character he intended to prove, and that he meant to charge by the language of the charges which he himself framed. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) followed with another succession of arguments against the practice which the House had already resolved to adopt, and his main argument was, that the established practice of Parliament was to resort to the procedure of impeachment, and that no charges of improper administration made against a member of an Administration, or a member sitting on the benches of private members, was dealt with otherwise for ages. That is quite irrelevant, because this is not a procedure of impeachment. This is an attempt to insist that the House shall conduct this enquiry by a committee, and that the House shall pronounce judgment. We submit to take the evidence by a commission, and we say that judgment will still remain in the House; but if the argument of the hon. gentleman amounts to anything, it is that the House should not pronounce any judgment at all, because he says that the established practice is that the procedure is to be by impeachment, which would result in the trial taking place somewhere else, if it could take place at all under our constitution. Then the hon. gentleman insists that the privilege of members is to be invaded by this mode of procedure, and that we have no right to call on the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) to appear before the tribunal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am glad to know that I am stating the hon. gentleman's arguments correctly at all events, and if we cannot agree with respect to anything else we can agree that I am stating the hon. gentleman's views correctly, although in stating the arguments I have been afraid lest I should do an injustice. Did any one ever hear of a man occupying so contemptible a position in public life as to make nine or ten of the gravest accusations which can be made against a public man, depriving him of honour, of character, of title, of a seat in this House and a seat in the Government, and when it is proposed that he should go before a judge and give his evidence, shrinking behind the privilege of a member of this House, and saying we had no right to call him there? If there is an atom of manhood in his composition, body or soul, he will meet the man whom he has accused before any tribunal where British law will be administered and fair-play will prevail, he would not be nice about the tribunal; he would not care if the charge came before this whole House or before a committee of this House, much less would he care if it came before a court of justice, constituted of judges, against whose fitness his friends have not one word to say on this occasion. And, if the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) deserts the tribunal, and backs down from these charges, because, as his leader has said, he can no longer prove them; then if the public of this country do not brand him as he deserves to be branded, I much mistake the honesty and manhood of Canadian public opinion.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Postmaster General has got the business in his hands.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has anything to say, I hope, if he wishes to interrupt me, he will at least interrupt me in a tone of voice in which I can hear him.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not hear him. I presume the hon. member does not sit there to talk to the reporter merely. If he has any remark to make, I shall have to call him to order to insist on his speaking in a tone of voice in which I can hear him and answer him. Now, Mr. Speaker, the next point which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) took up was, that the procedure which we have asked the House to adopt was in effect practically admitting that the House is unfit to take the evidence, but to pronounce judgment, because judgment is to be pronounced here. Everybody knows that this procedure has been urged upon the House for the sake of convenience, and not with any regard for unfitness on the part of the House or on the part of a committee; otherwise than persons can be said to be in a certain sense unfit who are committed by political bias to a certain set of opinions for or against the person accused. But it would be just as fair, or just as unfair, for me to urge that because the leader of the Opposition

this afternoon proposed that the evidence shall be taken by a committee and reported to this House, the inference to be drawn is, that the House is unfit to take the evidence, but still fit to pronounce judgment on the case. Are we not all familiar with courts in every part of this country where the proceedings are begun, but where the evidence is all taken under the authority of the court by some officer altogether outside of the region of the judge who is to pronounce the decision? That is the mode of procedure that for convenience we adopt in this case. Can it be said from the procedure of those courts which we are following here, that while the judge is fit to pronounce judgment he is unfit to hear the evidence? Then the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in his rage about precedents, admitted that there was one precedent for this course.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I did not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sorry that we have to differ for once, but I shall prove in a moment to the hon. gentleman's own satisfaction that he did. He cited the Parnell case as being a precedent for enquiry by commission, into matters which were not suitable, or were inconvenient to be enquired into by a committee of the House of Commons. In many respects the two cases are quite unlike, but in other respects they are alike. It was not a question of the seat of a member, or a question of charging corruption, or charging malversation of the public funds. In these respects and in many others the case was quite different; but it was a matter affecting the character and the privileges of a member of the House of Commons of England, and for the sake of convenience and of expedition, and above all for the sake of the impartiality and efficiency of the enquiry, Royal Commissioners were apointed, and they were appointed not only to hear but to try. As soon as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) got his precedent fairly launched before the House, he commenced to quarrel with it, and to declare that it was a most unfair proceeding, and that the effect of it was to put a whole nation under trial without any accusation at all. I think that the fact that the hon. member quarrelled with his own precedent would justify me in declining to give him another one. When he cites one and quarrels with it, I do not flatter his docility so highly as to suppose that he could quite agree with any precedent which I would give hon. gentlemen opposite, especially the hon. member who has preferred the charges. I will not trangress by referring to a past debate, and so I will refrain from mentioning what that hon. gentleman said, but the hon. members opposite this afternoon have declared that this enquiry will not go forward before these Royal Commissioners. They have implied that while they have great confidence in trial by a committee of this House—even though it be a committee of partisans of the Postmaster General, with a heavy majority against the friends of the gentleman preferring the charges—they would rather have trial by newspaper than trial by a court of justice. That is more impartial, more constitutional, and more to their taste it appears, because it does not admit of the same refutation, the same defence, and the same reply that I trust will be permitted if these commissioners should be appointed. There has been a good deal of discussion this afternoon about the possibility of the enquiry being enlarged, if the charges be found too narrow. If the hon. member has further charges to make in connection with this matter, and if he finds that the present charges are too narrow and restricted for the evidence he has to offer, then, if he will make them plainly and emphatically, and will make them within the jurisdiction and authority of this House, he shall have further reference to the same or to another commission. But as regards that matter, he and his friends of the Opposition are just in the same position as they would be before a committee of this House. I do not understand that the argument presented by gentlemen on the other side is that, if a committee of the House were appointed, they would take evidence without any regard to what the charges were, and that anything and everything which the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) may choose to pitchfork before them, should go into the evidence and be put before this House. I suppose that a committee of this House would be bound as fairly and strictly and as reasonably by the rules which regulate such an enquiry as these judges would be. Their conduct it is true, their rulings it is true, would always be subject to the authority and correction of this House, and the House could make further reference to them if necessary, but such is the case with the Royal Commission itself. As I said before, at any time the charges could be enlarged if they are not broad enough to cover everything which the hon. gentleman has said. They do certainly cover everything which the hon. member has stated was intended to be covered by the charges, excepting these statements with regard to elections which are not proper matters to be tried here. A good deal has been said by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) and I shall only refer to it in a very few words, as to the wisdom of appointing judges to try questions which are connected with politics. In that respect the hon. member deserves credit for having said the only thing pertinent to the question before the House which was said from the Opposition benches this afternoon. My hon. friend will see that if there is anything in his objection, and I think there is nothing, it has come at least forty years too late; because the best wisdom and experience of the Parliament of the mother country, and afterwards of Canada has decided, that the most fitting tribunals to decide political questions, involving questions of purity and questions of impurity as regards elections and as regards everything touching the security of the foundations of public life and of electoral liberty, are the courts of justice. After struggling for a century or two to establish its absolute right to decide all such questions itself, and having vanquished the courts in the struggle, the House of Commons asked its co-ordinate branch of the Legislature to join it in declaring that it should denude itself to that power and transfer jurisdiction to the very tribunals which are now said by hon. gentlemen opposite to be unfit to carry on investigations of a political character. But, Sir, I deny altogether that judges are tainted with impurity, or lessened in public respect, by having to enquire into matters which are distasteful to persons of purity, persons of taste, and persons of impartiality. It is said that to enquire into matters touching electoral corruption stains and degrades the judges, and that they would return to their duties of deciding between man and man not as pure as they de-

scended into that enquiry. If that were so, there would be very few judges in this country whose characters would be worth a pinch of snuff, because their first duty day after day is to enquire into charges of the most degrading offences that can be charged against humanity; and it is an astonishing nicety of taste to say that they would come back impure from an investigation into political charges, but would come back pure from another investigation into charges alleging every kind of vice of which human nature is capable. Moreover, if there is anything in that, we must have a very degraded bench in this country at present, because since last we sat in this House, some fifty political cases have been tried by these very judges, they have descended into the political arena with fatal results to about forty members of this House, and it is something new to be told that after having tried these cases they have gone back impure to discharge the ordinary duties of the bench. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need detain the House any longer. I repudiate for the friends who act with me, as well as for myself, the statement that we have made any attempt to garble these charges. I admit that we have eliminated two broad and general statements, asking the judgment of the House as to whether they were fit charges to be made or not. As to the discussion which has been raised this afternoon, as to the necessity for an enquiry and as to the necessity for this House to hold its jurisdiction in the matter, neither the authority nor the business of the House will be impeded by the procedure we have asked this House to adopt. We may go on with our other business, and we have still plenty to do to carry us late into the summer, although this investigation go on at the same time or as soon as it can be undertaken. This course is not contrary to the rules of the House, does not deprive the House of any of its privileges or dignity, and is not inconsistent with any precedent that can be cited to the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The tone of the hon. gentleman to-night is so different from the tone he adopted on a former occasion that it would be amusing and interesting to contrast them if the rules of the House permitted; but I shall endeavour to confine myself within those rules and not make any improper reference to a previous debate. The House just now is engaged in the important duty of determining whether very serious charges made by a member of the House in his place in the House against another member of the House, accusing him of having been guilty of a gross violation of the law, and a breach of public duty, shall be investigated in a manner in which similar charges have been investigated in the Parliament of Great Britain and the Parliament of Canada for many years back. The hon. gentleman has chosen to introduce a new precedent. He has chosen to strain the law authorizing the appointment of Royal Commissions, which law was passed, as he well knows, for the purpose of investigating charges made against subordinate members of the Civil Service. The law never was intended to be applied to charges made against members of Parliament acting as such, and it is a violent and strained interpretation of the law which the hon. gentleman asks this House for the first time to adopt, to refer to a Royal Commission appointed by a member of the Government certain charges made against that member. On the very face of it, Sir, it revolts our sense of common justice that a Minister of the Crown should have the right to appoint a commission to try charges made against himself. I say our common sense of justice, as derived from the precedents and practices of English jurisprudence, revolts against that idea; and with that is combined the fact that although the hon. gentleman said there was hardly a thing that we could not get a precedent for in parliamentary history, yet during his long and laboured address, we waited quietly and calmly for him to produce one precedent which justified his action on this occasion, but found him dumb. If parliamentary practice bristles with precedents, how is it that the Minister of Justice is not able to bring to this House, in order to satisfy the consciences of the members behind him, one precedent of a commission appointed to try a charge made by a member of Parliament in his place in this House against a member of the Privy Council, affecting the right of that gentleman to remain a Privy Councillor, accusing him of gross violations of public trust? How is it, I say, that out of the thousand and one precedents which he says the books bristle with, he was unable to produce one? The hon. gentleman is starting out on a new course; he has changed his mind. At one time he thought he could persuade his followers that these charges were so vague that they could not be enquired into at all; and when public opinion in the House and out of it taught him that he was stretching the line a little too far, that he was going beyond what public opinion would justify, he wheeled around and said, I will mutilate the charges preferred, and then I will refer them to a commission appointed by myself, in the appointment of which the gentleman incriminated has a very powerful voice. Now, Sir, let us see exactly in what position the House stands at this moment. Certain charges were preferred by the hon. member for West Ontario against the Postmaster General. The question in the first place is by whom the charges should be tried; and in the second place the question is, has the House in the resolution it adopted referred the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario to any tribunal? On the first point, it is admitted by the Minister of Justice—he could not help but admit it—that the House is a proper tribunal. There is no question about that; there is no question about the right of the House to refer this question to a committee of its own choosing. The precedents show that it is not only the power but the duty of the House to refer it to a committee. The only answer the hon. gentleman makes to that is: We have a statute by the construction of which I am enabled to withdraw from the House the duties which properly belong to it, and refer the matter to a Royal Commission. Has the hon. gentleman ever heard of a member of Parliament being hauled before such a commission to prove a charge made by him in the House? Has he the power to drag the hon. member for West Ontario there? He knows he has not. He knows he is violating the rights of Parliament in attempting to do it. My hon. friend behind me referred to the possibility of that commission being held with closed doors. The judges can do as they please. They can shut the doors to the reporters of the press if they choose. One of the safeguards the country has in an enquiry taking place before the

proper tribunal is the publicity which is given to the examination. Sir, that tribunal we knew would be composed of a majority of the hon. gentleman's friends; we knew that we would be in the small minority on that committee; but from the facts we had in our possession, we never shrank for a moment from going before a tribunal composed of a majority of our opponents, and pledging ourselves to prove the truth of the charges we alleged. But the hon. gentleman argued a long time to show that there were precedents. Taking the precedent of 1873, Sir John Macdonald himself agreed that the charges then made should be referred to a committee of the House, and only referred them to a Royal Commission afterwards because at that time the committees of the House had not power to administer an oath. The House was not in session, and the committee had no power to administer oaths any way. Therefore there might be some excuse, under those circumstances, for resorting to that, although not in my opinion. But to-day we have the power to administer oaths, and we have precedent after precedent for adopting the course that the Opposition propose. Only twelve months ago when charges just as serious, affecting the character of a member, as high as the Postmaster General, were preferred in this House, the invariable practice of Parliament was followed and the charges referred to a parliamentary committee. The Minister of Justice has attempted to use his own choice expression, which he repeated several times to-night, to sneak out of the effect of that precedent by saying that the charges made last year, known as the Tarte-McGreevy charges, were levelled simply at the maladministration of public moneys in a public department. He knows very well that not only were such charges made, but that charges of personal corruption were made against the Minister involved, and the Minister of Justice did not scruple then to refer them to a committee, and because of the publicity thus given, the whole country became alive with the disclosures made before that committee, and, as the hon. gentleman knows, the Government was shaken to its foundations by the revelations.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) "Oh, oh!" says the hon. gentleman. Does he not know that not once, but two or three times, the existence of the Government was trembling in the balance, owing to the fact that independent members on that side would not support such corruption any longer? He knows it well; and it is because of the effect of that enquiry before that parliamentary committee that he resorts to this subterfuge to avoid publicity, and attempts to throttle the charges made. But I have a more serious charge to make against the hon. gentleman than the withdrawal of these charges from the proper tribunal and their reference to an improper tribunal. The hon. gentleman says he did not hear any complaints made as to the *personnel* of this commission. It was not the place of the leader of the Opposition or any of those who took the ground we do to refer to the *personnel* of that commission. The Minister of Customs was entirely wrong when he said the leader of the Opposition had complimented the appointees as men eminently fit for the position. The leader of the Opposition expressed no opinion as to their fitness *pro* or *con*. He expressly said he would not express any, because he did not think the reference to them was a proper reference at all, and I agree with him, and I do not think any reference to the *personnel* of the commission has been heard from this side. But the argument made use of by my hon. friend behind me was to this effect, that it is not advisable, in the public interest, to refer political matters to a judicial tribunal, that it is impolitic to drag the judges down into the squabbles of party, and he said, if you do drag them down and impose upon them the trial of party squabbles, you will be very apt to taint the ermine with suspicion: and I agree with the hon. gentleman. Giving the judges power to try whether a Privy Councillor, who has the power to promote them or increase their salaries, has been guilty of a high crime or misdemeanour, is a very hazardous experiment. I say nothing personal, but I say the precedent is a dangerous one. I say you are taking a course calculated to drag down the judiciary from the high and independent position it is essential they should occupy in the administration of justice. Now, let us come to the more serious and grave charge made on this side. The hon. member for Ontario (Edgar), when he preferred his charges in this House, did so in language so plain and clear that a school-boy could not help understanding it. He told the House specifically that the Postmaster General was a member of the Construction Company formed under the original chartered company and that as a member of that Construction Company, he had the means of knowing and he actually did know what became of the subsidy voted by Parliament. My hon. friend told you from his place in this House that he did not charge that this money was paid to the Postmaster General by either the original company or the Construction Company, but it was paid by other parties acting under them; and you have gone deliberately to work and withdrawn from his charge every word under which he could have proved what he intended, and inserted words deliberately for the purpose of preventing him from proving what he intended. I will challenge the attention of the hon. gentleman a moment to the fact that the Minister of Justice, with all his experience, took good care, while making general statements, to avoid reading the record. He did not read to this House and compare the original charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario with mutilated charges which the Minister of Justice prepared and moved. He did not do it, because if he had, it would have shown clearly to the House that the statement he made that the charges had only been mutilated by omitting the 10th section, which had reference to the expenditure of the money among the electoral districts, and by omitting the words "persons interested in the company," was not correct, and that those were not the only omissions and mutilations. The second charge, which my hon. friend from West Ontario asked should be referred to a committee, reads as originally framed:

"2. Arrangements were entered into by the said railway company whereby the expenditure of said subsidies was made by a Construction Company through or in conjunction with one H. J. Beemer, a contractor, and the said Beemer and those who assisted him in financing for the said railway works, received the benefit of the said subsidies."

That is entirely omitted. Will the hon. gentleman

explain to his followers why he deliberately omitted that serious charge? He has not done so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have done so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will see that that is entirely omitted. Then again go to section 4:

"4. That the said Sir A. P. Caron was, during the whole, or the greater part of the said period, one of the members of the said Construction Company, and thus had means of knowledge of, and did know of the dealings with the said subsidies and their destination after they were paid over by the Government to the said railway company."

Why was that omitted? The charge is specific that Sir A. P. Caron did know what became of the subsidies after they passed from the Government, of which he was a member, to the railway company and the Construction Company, of which he was also a member. That is one of the most serious charges of the whole indictment. It has been wholly omitted, because the knowledge on the part of Sir A. P. Caron of the destination of those moneys would implicate him in criminality if proved. Then we come to the next charge, number 5, which is omitted altogether:

"5. That during the said period and while the said railway was being constructed in part by means of said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money out of the said subsidies, and from moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same."

You talk about vagueness. Was there ever a charge or indictment framed more specifically than that? We charge, in the first place, that Sir A. P. Caron was a member of the Government which voted the subsidies; and in the second place that he was a member of the Construction Company and knew what became of the subsidies after they were paid over by the Government; and in the third place that he personally and corruptly received the moneys—and you have had the indecency to eliminate every one of these charges from the indictment. The corrupt intent, the corrupt receipt, the foul violation of public trust, the corrupt knowledge—you eliminate them all. More than that. You eliminate the fact that the moneys were corruptly received from parties beneficially interested in the subsidies and from moneys raised on the existence of the subsidies. The hon. gentleman in his charge told you point blank and I think he was foolish in doing so because it indicated to you the mode in which you were to change his motion, "I cannot prove that there was a conspiracy with the companies, I cannot prove that the moneys were paid to Sir A. P. Caron by one or the other or both of the companies, but I can prove that he, being a member of the Construction Company, knew what became of the moneys, that he personally received them, and that he had a personal knowledge of the corrupt use of them." Where is a word of that hon. member to palliate or justify or excuse such conduct as this, and yet the House is asked to believe that the fragmentary charge which has been prepared by the Government themselves and submitted to a commission of judges chosen by themselves, amounts to the same as the charges preferred by the hon. member for Ontario. Then, further on, you will see that there has been a design and an improper design in the manner in which this resolution has been framed. Why do I say there has been an improper design? We shall see. The original charges are first set out in full in the resolution, and then the House deliberately eliminated three principal charges from it and formed a new resolution with those charges omitted, and in the last section they refer, not to the charges preferred by the hon. member for West Ontario, but to the resolution with those three charges eliminated, and those are referred to the judges in specific words. "What we refer to you," they say, "are charges 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10." So, when the judges read the commission, and see the powers they possess, they will see that, while three distinct charges were originally made of corrupt knowledge, of the corrupt receipt of money by the Minister and of violation of public trust by him, the House did not refer those three charges at all, and every member knows that, if the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) went into that court and attempted to give evidence on any of the three charges which have been directly eliminated, the judges would say: "We have no jurisdiction over this matter, it is perfectly true that Mr. Edgar preferred this charge, but the House of Commons struck it out and did not refer it to us, and how can we take evidence upon it?" It is plain, and, for fear that there should be any dispute, the hon. gentleman incorporates the original charge with these three distinct paragraphs in it and follows that with his resolution with the three paragraphs omitted, thus directly bringing it to the cognizance of the judges that they have no jurisdiction over those three charges—it is to my mind as plain as noonday that there has been on some one's part a desire to thwart and burke public enquiry and to prevent those charges being investigated. If evidence were offered to show that Sir A. P. Caron was a member of the Construction Company, it would be ruled out as not being contained in the charge. If evidence were offered that arrangements were made with Beemer, the contractor, it would be ruled out. If evidence were offered to show a corrupt knowledge on the part of Sir A. P. Caron of the disposition of these moneys or to show that a receipt was given by him for part of these moneys, that would be ruled out. They say they broadened the charges. Let us see. I call attention to paragraph 3 of the Government's amendment:

"That, during the said period, and while the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway was being constructed in part by means of said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron knowingly aided and participated in diverting the said subsidies from the purpose for which they were granted."

If it stopped there, it would be all right, but it goes on:

"By receiving for election purposes from the said railway company or from a construction company formed for the construction of the said railway or from one H. J. Beemer as manager thereof or contractor of the said railway, large sums of money."

The member for West Ontario did not charge that. You know he did not charge that. You know he said he could not prove it. He said the money was not received from those companies or from Beemer but from other parties who were beneficially interested, and you deliberately eliminated the words "parties beneficially interested" in order to burke the enquiry. A stronger attempt to throttle and burke a charge against a public man was never known in the history of Canada. Then it goes on, following what I have already read:

"And did further knowingly so aid and participate by obtaining from the said companies or one of them the payment out of said subsidies."

No such charge was ever made. You know it was not made. You have made it out of whole cloth. You have put it there in order to throw dust in the eyes of the people and to make the people believe you have substantially referred to the judges charges made by the member for West Ontario, and to deceive the people, when you know you have not referred the charges at all. The charges in regard to the Temiscouata road are the same. The charge I distinctly make to-night is this, that you have eliminated the main portions of the accusation charging corrupt knowledge and corrupt receipt of public moneys, that you have deliberately omitted the words which enabled the hon. gentleman to prove from whom the moneys were received, the manner in which to trace out where the railway subsidies went when they left the original company. They did not go into Sir A. P. Caron's hands from the original companies or from Mr. Beemer, but by an arrangement made by Mr. Beemer through other parties. That is what he says, and then you ask credit for having made this reference to the judges of the land. It is a shame and a disgrace to Parliament. The hon. gentleman, in starting out, said he thought he could have taken a point of order that this resolution was not in order, but, if the hon. gentleman had read carefully the proceedings of the House, he would have seen that you have never determined upon the charges of the member for West Ontario at all. You have introduced a new resolution altogether and have passed upon the original resolution of Mr. Edgar with a rider, but have never passed upon the resolution itself introduced by him. We challenge you here to go before a committee of your own choosing if you dare, and the member for West Ontario tells you he has the evidence to prove up to the hilt the corrupt knowledge, the corrupt payment, the corrupt receipt, the violation of the public trust by one of your own colleagues, a member of the Privy Council and a member of the Government, and you dare not accept the challenge. You will go to the country and say you sent those charges to a commission, knowing that you have not the pluck to do it, and you know that, if you did, your Government would be shattered to the four winds of heaven before the committee had sat a week.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Some of those hon. gentlemen who are disposed to be jocular may not know the facts, but when a member of the House makes a charge of this kind, he should have a chance to prove it. Talk about political cowardice. The hon. leader of the Government in this House talked to-night about political cowardice. If there ever was a man who should be ashamed to use the word, it is the hon. gentleman; it is the man who went down to Halifax, and on a public platform called Heaven to witness that if anybody would bring a charge against a member of the Government or a member of the House, be he high or low, that charge should be investigated.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You would like to sneak out of it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman's challenge was accepted, a charge was made against his own colleague, a Privy Councillor who sits at his own board, a charge as serious as ever was made against a public man, that he perverted moneys which were voted by this Parliament, that he violated his public trust, that he obtained moneys voted to build a railway and used them for the purposes of electoral corruption to return himself and his friends to power; and the very man who made the challenge, who, on a public platform, called upon everybody to come forward with the charges, now says: I will not refer your charges to a committee, but I will make a new charge and refer that. Sir, I tell him to his face there never was a greater exhibition of political cowardice in this House or out of it, and I do not think the hon. gentleman's friends are very proud of him, I do not think they are very proud of the position which the Government holds in this case. I am not going to discuss the precedents which have been cited here, but I cannot help referring to a statement which the hon. gentleman made. He says: I have now referred this charge to a commission, and if there is an atom of fair-play in the soul of the hon. member for West Ontario, he will meet the accused before these commissioners. What a valiant challenge! What a noble man he is! He wants the hon. member for West Ontario to go before a tribunal that the man charged selects for himself, and appoints himself. He wants him to prove, not the charge which he made himself, but the emasculated charge, emasculated by the Postmaster General himself and his friends in such a way as to enable them to escape from the serious responsibilities which would follow from the proof of the charge preferred. Sir, it is a burlesque upon justice to ask these judges to sit and try these charges, not being the charges preferred; it is an infringment upon the rights of this House, it is degrading the judges themselves, it is trifling with the powers, and responsibilities and duties of the members of this House, and it is practically shielding the gentleman charged, rightly or wrongly, with malversation in office and a gross breach of public trust.

Mr. WELDON. It occurred to very many members on this side of the House when we had the pleasure this afternoon of listening to the leader of the Opposition for a few minutes, that beyond all question he was opening again and anew a matter which had been finally closed some weeks ago. It occurred to more than one of us that it would be proper to take a point of order and have a ruling from the Chair, for the reason that a well-known rule of order should be regarded, the well-known rule that when Parliament has made up its mind and has made a clear declaration, you cannot again open up that matter and begin a new discussion upon it during the same session. Now, there can be no doubt, I think moderate men opposite will agree, old parliamentarians will agree, that hon. gentlemen opposite have gone beyond their right in opening up this matter, and bringing upon the House this afternoon a discussion upon a subject which was decided on the 4th of May last. The proceedings of this day have followed a motion made by the Minister of Justice which, as it is written on the Order Paper, asks that this House do approve of the appointment of the gentlemen who have been nominated by the Administration as judges to sit upon a commission to take evidence in regard to charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario. Now, the authority of the House to deal with this matter, is pursuant to an amendment moved by the hon. member for

North Simcoe at the close of that memorable debate, of which the words are:

"That the name of the said commissioner or commissioners be submitted to the approval of this House before his or their appointment."

Whatever power we have in this matter is pursuant to that motion, and what we have to do now is to say whether we will or will not accept those whom the Administration have nominated. The leader of the Opposition said he would not speak on the only question which was properly before the House, but he has chosen to speak and to set the bad example to his colleagues, of leading the discussion over ground which had weeks ago been traversed. I regret that some members on this side did not formally take the point of order and have a ruling from the Chair, for it is true that we can in this occult way, by a side wind, open over and over again a discussion which we thought concluded, open up matters as to which the House has made up its mind and has given a declaration, there will be no end to these discussions, the sessions will be interminable, and we will never know in any session when matters have been finally disposed of.

I have but few words indeed to say upon the merits of the question. There are two separate and distinct statements contained in the amendment made by the leader of the Opposition. One is that the charges which are proposed to be submitted to a judicial tribunal—not to be finally dealt with, to be sure, by that tribunal, but to be finally weighed, and measured, and dealt with by this House—are different charges from those made by the hon. member for West Ontario when he first brought this matter before this House. The answer has been given, not once, nor twice, but three times or more, from this side of the House, that the charges differ in being wider. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) has given some specific statements of matters which in his mind were material allegations in the charges made by the member for West Ontario, and which he says cannot be established under the reference that will be made to the Royal Commission pursuant to the amendment of the Minister of Militia. I took as rapidly as I was able to take while he was speaking, a statement of two or three of the more important matters which he said were of the essence of the charge, and which the tribunals would not be able to hear under the new charges. He said that it was an important matter to prove that which was charged by the member for West Ontario, namely, that the Postmaster General was a member of a Construction Company in this Lake St. John Railway matter. I grant him that is an important statement of fact, I grant him that is an important thing to prove, but I would like to know, in the name of all the rules of evidence known to English law, how an attempt to prove that could be ruled out by any tribunal?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Because it was charged in the indictment preferred in this House, and directly eliminated from the charge by the House.

Mr. WELDON. What in the world have these two gentlemen who will sit on this commission, to do with such matters of ancient history? Let the hon. member answer me that. We give them a distinct refefence, we put before them distinct charges, we ask them to take evidence and report this evidence. They know what we refer to them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You give them that, but the reference does not.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. member knows as well as I know, that it is perfectly competent for them, and there is no rule of evidence known to the English law whereby the commissioners can exclude evidence when the counsel for the prosecution asks to put that evidence in, proposing to show that the Postmaster General is a member of the Construction Company.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They can only take evidence on the charge referred to them.

Mr. WELDON. I thought the hon. member was frank and candid in this discussion, but I must challenge his candour when he gives an answer like that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said they could only take evidence on the charges specially referred to them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is a matter of evidence.

Mr. WELDON. It is a matter of evidence, and they have abundant opportunities to prove their charges. Now, for my part, I find it very difficult, as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) said this afternoon, to understand what some of these original charges mean. For example, article 5 contains, if I understand its meaning at all, the very gravamen of the Edgar charges: nevertheless that clause 5 in the original indictment of the member for West Ontario seemed to me to be extremely difficult to understand. It was ambiguous, and there are other hon. members who, in private conversation, were unable to agree as to the precise meaning of the language. Now, if they, in the frankness and freedom of private discussion, were not able to agree as to its meaning, was it a fair statement to put before a tribunal as an indictment of a public man? Now, the charge in that famous article 5, that the Postmaster General had corruptly received certain sums of money from certain sources, meant one thing or another. If it meant that, which is the extreme meaning of that phrase, he had a guilty knowledge, then to be sure he was charged with a high crime and misdemeanour, one of the gravest known to the state. On the other hand, if the phrase "corruptly received" meant differently, that he had received money not in view of a corrupt bargain, past or future, but for the purpose of political corruption, for the purpose of buying votes subsequently, it was a phrase of a very different meaning. I submit that the gravest meaning that can be put on it is contained in the language of the new charges, and that the lighter meaning is also contained in the new charges, and therefore every material matter which Parliament is bound to investigate is contained in these new charges. The hon. gentleman read article 3 of the new charges by piecemeal. I will read it again in full.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I read every word of it.

Mr. WELDON. I will read it again:

"3. That, during the said period, and while the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway was being constructed in part by means of said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron knowingly aided and participated in diverting the said subsidies from the purpose for which they were granted, by receiving, for election purposes, from the said railway

company, or from a construction company formed for the construction of the said railway, or from one H. J. Beemer, as manager thereof, or contractor of the said railway, large sums of money out of the said subsidies, and out of moneys raised upon the credit of the same."

The hon. gentleman said those words were not in the charge, although they are contained in it.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I said they were confined to receipts from the company or from Mr. Beemer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not the point.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman said there were three sources from which money had been obtained named in the original charges, and that two had been eliminated. I knew he was wrong and I found he was wrong on referring to the text. The words I referred to are in the new charges, although the hon. gentleman said they were not:

"And also, during the said period, did further knowingly so aid and participate by obtaining from the said companies, or one of them, the payment out of said subsidies, and out of moneys raised by the said companies, or one of them, on the credit of the same, of large sums of money for election purposes, and to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government of which he was a member."

That charge is broad, and coupled with our knowledge of the rules of evidence that must be applied in trying a man on such charges, it is obvious it will cover almost all the ground so far as the Lake St. John Railway is concerned, covered by the original charge. But the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) did not read other important charges. If the hon. gentleman will read articles 7, 8 and 9 in the new charges he will find that the words are wide enough to cover every single element that he stated had been omitted. In his concluding remarks he stated that in the original indictment it is charged that the Postmaster General had improperly obtained money. He will find that the wording of these new charges is wide enough to include that element. Let me read articles 7, 8 and 9 of the amended charges:

"7. That the said Sir A. P. Caron misappropriated public money for the purpose of corrupting the electors of Canada, to wit, a portion of the moneys voted as subsidies as hereinbefore stated.

"8. That the Crown having been advised to appropriate large sums of money for public purposes, to wit, the said subsidies, such moneys, or a portion of them, were diverted from the purposes for which they were so appropriated, and placed in the hands of Sir A. P. Caron for the purpose of corrupting the electorate in certain portions of Canada.

"9. That the said Sir A. P. Caron had an understanding, when the said subsidies or some of them were voted or recommended, with one or more of the railway companies participating in said appropriations, or with a person or persons interested in said appropriations, that the moneys so appropriated by Parliament, or portions of them, should go to him."

These are almost the identical words which the hon. gentleman said were not in the new charges. I do not know what words could more fully describe the very allegations which the hon. gentleman says have been omitted from the charge. His first point which I wish in the strongest way to disentangle and disassociate from the others, is that we have garbled the charges. We deny that charge. We heard those hon. gentlemen, in a formal motion, embody ten charges, some of which were ambiguous. We were disputing among ourselves as to what they meant. We were unwilling that any man should be tried on phrases that possessed a double meaning. We listened to the debate, and we heard the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), the leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Bothwell, and still more strongly the hon. member for South Oxford, declare what in their opinion these charges meant, and when we understood their meaning, we said: "They come with one set of vague charges to be referred to a committee, and if they cannot prove those charges in their graver meaning, they will hark back and say we never made such charges as are now suggested." They were submitting to a tribunal of this House certain charges, which they might claim had a narrow meaning, but they were at the same time submitting to the people of the country other and graver charges, and we have simply said to them: "You have appealed to public opinion on these charges which you say mean so and so, and we have now placed that charge before a judicial tribunal." That is exactly what the amendment means. Hon. gentlemen opposite have too often and too long been in the habit of making one statement here, and with high coloured speeches have distorted it elsewhere, a large party in this country would believe their assertions and understand the charges as interpreted in those speeches. With perfect justice we now say: You must not go before the public with one charge and appeal to the House with another charge; we accept your own formal charges, as defined by yourselves, and these will be investigated. Mr. Speaker, I come now to the second part of the amendment—to a matter entirely distinct. If a man, knowing nothing of Canadian politics, were sitting in the gallery of this House and were told that grave charges were being made against a Minister of the Crown, that from this side of the House a motion had been made to refer them to a tribunal consisting of two judges of the Supreme Court, for the purpose of taking evidence and no more, and that these judges would hand in the evidence and Parliament would then deal with the case as it thought fit, and that this motion was met by hon. gentlemen opposite with a counter-motion to the effect that these charges should not be referred to two judges but to a committee of this House, he would ask himself what odds does it make. He would ask by what means will you get the fairest trial? Will a select committee of 5 or 7 members take the evidence more fairly than two judges? We must keep in mind the very important statement made this afternoon by the Minister of Justice, that, in the instructions to this commission, it is provided that when the two judges differ as to the admissibility of evidence, the evidence shall be admitted. Is it according to common sense that two judges will take evidence more unfairly than a committee of this House? Who appoint the Royal Commission? The Government nominate the members, the House controls the appointment of the commission, and to-day we are exercising our control. The control of the Government over this commission is no more and no less and no different from the control of the Government over a committee of this House. Let us look at this matter fairly. In what manner can the colleagues of the Postmaster General influence this commission? How can they any more taint it with a political complexion than a committee of this House is tainted with a political complexion? Hon. gentlemen opposite are well aware that on any select committee a majority will be of our party, and that the party sympathies of a

committee will be against hon. gentlemen opposite. Can it be urged that evidence will be taken more unfairly by the judges than by members of this House? The judges possess greater skill, greater learning, and calmer temper than we possess, and they will take the evidence more fairly. They will take the evidence more fairly, and under all considerations of justice, of convenience, of lessening the expense, and of not keeping the House unduly in session waiting for the report of its committee, the tribunal of a Royal Commission is the most satisfactory. I do not know one single point which hon. gentlemen on the other side have made in favour of a parliamentary committee that could not more strongly be urged in favour of the appointment of those judged to hear the evidence. If I were in a taunting spirit I could congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite upon their conversion to a belief in the impartiality of a committee of the House. Last year we had a trial of a Minister of the Crown and other persons by a parliamentary committee, and the trial went on for three or four months, and those of us who were members of that committee could not at all events be reproached with indolence; yet all that we, the members of that tribunal received after four months labour in the long hot summer here, was to be posted by Liberal papers from one end of the country to the other for having brought in a whitewashing report. When, I ask, have hon. gentlemen opposite been converted to the belief in the fairness of a trial by a parliamentary committee? Hon. gentlemen opposite by their own intolerant writings in their party newspapers, and by their injudicious utterances on the stump and in Parliament, have thrown so much discredit upon a parliamentary committee, that to-day, by reason of the discredit they have heaped upon it, it has not the authority in the country that it should have. I contend that you get a fairer taking of the evidence before a commission of judges, and I say that the evidence taken by them will be--which is a very important matter for us to consider—more generally accepted in this country. I have carefully followed the discussion on this matter in the past debate to which I cannot refer, and the discussion of to-day to which I can refer; and I was struck with a degree of confusion which seemed to be in the mind of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in regard to this matter of parliamentary trials of public men. There was the most perfect confusion in his arguments. I will not say that he deliberately misled the House, but he has made a long argument hopelessly confusing the distinction. which is the essence of the English law, between enquiry by a committee of the House of Commons and a parliamentary trial or trial by impeachment. The hon. member's whole argument is as empty as an upturned glass in that respect. No one challenges his argument as to the power of impeachment: but it is an argument for one-half the Parliament—corresponding to the Senate in this country—to hear and try, and for the Commons to go on and accuse. That is what impeachment is. That is the kind of trial by which man after man was struck down in the cases to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friend is mistaken. There was not a trial by impeachment in any of the cases to which I referred except in the case of Lord Melville, and I pointed out, that before an impeachment could take place at all that an enquiry must be had if the facts were not already known, and the business of the parliamentary committee appointed by the House of Commons is to obtain possession of the facts.

Mr. WELDON. To obtain possession of the facts in order to go on with the impeachment. The hon. gentleman spoke of cases so long ago as the Duke of Suffolk, and of Latimer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I referred to the rule that was established in the time of Edward III, which is still a part of the law of Parliament, and which is still quoted as the law of Parliament. The hon. gentleman may repudiate it, but if he will examine the most elementary text-book in the library he will find it was so recognized.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman has entertained the House with elementary text-books to a much greater length than I propose to do. I still say that when he was pointing out the power of Parliament to deal with cases of this character, this allusion was to cases of impeachment. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not yet proved that any material element of the charges which this House is in duty bound to try has been omitted from the Edgar charges, and they have not proved that the tribunal to which I refer is any more under the control of the Administration than the tribunal which they seek. But they themselves have discredited the tribunal to which they now appeal, and, therefore, I shall for one vote against the amendment proposed by the hon. the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking part in this debate, but some of the remarks made this afternoon by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Chapleau) lead me to take the floor. The hon. Minister, without meaning any one, said that injustice had been done to the Hon. Judge Routhier, that he had been wrongly accused of having improperly conducted the enquiry made from 1884 to 1887 on the affairs of the North Shore Railway. The Minister of Customs, as I have just said, named no one as having formulated that accusation against this magistrate, but as I am the one who spoke of Judge Routhier in connection with that investigation, I think it my duty to attend to this part of the speech of the hon. Minister and to prove that I was right in speaking as I did. I am ready to prove that what I said in the former debate is true, and I add that we have a right to recuse this judge when the question is of holding an investigation on charges similar to those which were brought against the Conservative party in 1884. There is one thing to which I wish from the start to draw the attention of the House, and that is that this Hon. Judge Routhier, after having been appointed as a royal commissioner, could only report some four years after his appointment. I say that a judge who takes four years to deliberate about a case like this, and who takes so long to send in a report is not such a man as the House should entrust with the duty of holding the present investigation. I say he is not such a judge as it behooves us to call upon to investigate as grave charges as these brought against the Postmaster General. How can we believe that there will be no denial of justice in

referring the charges before the House to such a man? How can we hope for justice from a judge who takes four years to make up his mind what to do, and make his report? From the experience of the past we cannot hope for a report in a reasonable time, and I maintain that it would be a denial of justice to appoint him. I must say also, Mr. Speaker, that the words of the Minister of Customs do not exactly reflect the view which I expressed on the matter. Here is what I said:

"I have nothing to say against the character of this distinguished magistrate, but as he alone had the carrying out of the enquiry, without the help of a counsel for the accusing party, and as he naturally did not know where the guilt rested, nor what witnesses could enlighten him, he simply called a few witnesses designated by public rumour, and there was the end of it. And what has been the result of this enquiry?"

In concluding my remarks I also added:

"Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Government has been afraid to have the truth known, they have been afraid of the revelation of turpitudes such as came to light during the late investigations. They prefer appointing some safe man as a commissioner, shut him inside of four walls, and let him sham an investigation out of reach of the press and the public so that nothing can be known."

These are the charges which I made against Judge Routhier. Well, I hold that those charges are totally proven, when, as I have just shown to the House, this magistrate took four years to submit his report to those who had appointed him a Royal Commissioner. Morever, I find in his report an address delivered at the opening of the proceedings of the investigation by the Hon. Judge Routhier, and in this address I find the proof of what I have said. Indeed, I find that on the very first day his intention was to exclude the press, to gag it, to prevent it from making any comment on his manner of holding this investigation, on the evidence heard or on the persons incriminated. I say that this attitude of the judge showed that he had no intention of holding a serious investigation, but, on the contrary, that he wanted to prevent the truth from being known, that he wanted the enquiry to be pursued behind closed doors. Let me read, Mr. Speaker, the words of his opening address:

"I have," says he, "no objection—at least until further order—to admit the public and the newspaper reporters to the sittings of this commission.

"But in order that it should not become an obstacle to our proceedings, I desire the press to be content with reporting faithfully the evidence without any comment.

"I would consider as a hindrance to the work undertaken any attacks and criticisms directed against either the commission or the witnesses or against persons who may be incriminated by the evidence. Should such abuse take place, I would be forced to deny the press the admission which I fain grant it to-day. It is when the commission shall have done its work that judgment can be passed upon it and upon the matters entrusted to it."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the manner in which this judge proposed to proceed while being a commissioner to enquire into charges similar to those which we now have before us. I accused him of having wanted to keep away the public, to deprive it of information by the means of the press on the proceedings of that commission. I now prove by his own address that he was willing enough that the press be admitted, but only on the express condition that it would abstain from comments. He practically said to the press of the country: I will admit you to the sittings of the commission, but on the condition that you shall pass no opinion on what goes on here, that is to say, I deny you the right of making any comment either on me or the witnesses whom I will call. Is this not a denial of justice? Is this not acting as a secret commission would do? What is not in effect a secret commission which the Quebec Government meant to institute by means of this man? If the contrary is claimed, I will ask why the press was to be deprived of the privilege of commenting on this public business, of saying how things would be going on, of informing the public regarding the persons who might be incriminated in the course of the investigation of the charges? I say that evidently the Government have read that report, and that they have undoubtedly acted upon the record of this magistrate in choosing him. One would think that it is because the Government do not want a public investigation that they have selected Judge Routhier. The Government found in him a judge well disposed to meet their views and they nominated him. But there is more. They have evidently gone over that report of Hon. Judge Routhier. They have seen that this honourable judge has laid down legal principles which completely exonerate the Postmaster General, and they said to themselves: Here is a man who is perfectly qualified for the position of Royal Commissioner; here is the man we want to pass judgment over the Postmaster General. Here is, indeed, one of the statements made by Hon. Judge Routhier in opening the proceedings of the Royal Commission:

"Suppose Mr. Sénécal did subscribe to the general elections of 1881, as is claimed, I see no necessary connection between such subscription and the vote of the elected members of the House given in 1882 in favour of the sale.

"In order to establish this connection it would be necessary that from the time of the elections in 1881, Mr. Sénécal should have intended to form later on a syndicate for the purchase of the railway, and should have secured from that time the support of the candidates which should have been promised to him in consideration of his subscription.

"Without such a correlation between the two acts and the two dates, the subscription to the elections of 1881 could not be considered as a corruption of the vote given in 1882 by the elected candidates.

"Such is the jurisprudence established in the matter of controverted elections. The vote of an elector in favour of a candidate is not vitiated by the only fact that this candidate previously did a good turn for this elector, or procured him some advantages, without any reference to an election to come. The same principles should guide us here. Otherwise we should say that all votes of a member in favour of the Government or in favour of the Opposition is corrupt because it is the Ministers or the leaders of the Opposition who have contributed to his election by their influence, their work or their subscriptions to the election fund."

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) What is that book?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The proceedings of the Royal Commission on the sale of the North Shore Railway.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) What page?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Page 8 of the Commissioners' Report. Before considering this finding of Hon. Judge Routhier, I will take the liberty to explain briefly the course followed in this investigation, and the manner in which he pursued it. In 1882 a charge had been made by Mr. Stephens, of Montreal, to the effect that a great number of Conservative members elected to the Quebec Legislature owed their election to moneys which had been given them or subscribed for their election by Mr. Sénécal, then Superintendent of the North Shore Railway. It appears that these charges made in 1882 had been rejected

by the Assembly, and that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Chapleau), then Premier of Quebec, had prevented an investigation of the charges formulated by Mr. Stephens. It also appears that the Minister of Customs still holds the same principles, that is, that one has a right to buy counties and the Province of Quebec *en bloc*, but on another hand Parliament or the Legislature has no right to investigate how the elections were made and owing to what means the returned members occupy their seats. I see that he is following the same course that he did then. In 1884 this hon. Minister had ceased to be Premier of the Province of Quebec, and I believe that the present President of the Senate (Mr. Ross), who was Premier at that time, had promised, in order to reach that position, that an enquiry would be made into all the charges brought in connection with the North Shore Railway Company. And at the beginning of the session of 1884 the Quebec Government promised that that investigation would be held. During the same session, in 1884, Hon. Mr. Joly having from his seat in the House renewed the charges formulated by Mr. Stephens in 1882, the Government, through the Attorney General (Mr. Taillon), declared that the Royal Commission, which was to be Judge Routhier, would see to the enquiry, as well into the charges made by Hon. Mr. Joly. I find on page 1995 of the Debates of the Quebec Legislature of 1884, Mr. Taillon saying:

"Moreover, the Government grants more than is requested here."

That is to say, that the Government wanted to go further than was requested by the Hon. Mr. Joly. I also find that another Quebec Minister, Hon. Mr. Lynch, spoke as follows (page 1404):—

"The province is to know the whole history of this railway, not only the end but also the beginning, and the middle. It will be made, not with the aim of stigmatizing this or that man, but I may say, as a Minister addressing this House, and the people of the country, I desire to know whether there was any fault anywhere. I know of none personally. And if I had known of any I would not now occupy the position I hold to-day, Who more than I is interested in knowing the truth? I desire to know if it is true that Mr. Sénécal has spent large sums in the elections of 1881. I do not know it."

So we find the Government saying, in 1884: We are going to allow an enquiry into the accusations formulated by Mr. Joly, we are going to appoint a Royal Commission to enquire into all the facts relating to these accusations, and, therefore, it is useless to refer the matter to a special committee of the House. Well, what did we see, Mr. Speaker? At the very opening of the Royal Commission, we find Hon. Judge Routhier using the following language:—

"But there are other accusations which my commission would not admit of going into. One of them, formulated by Mr. White, is in the following terms: 'That L. A. Sénécal rewarded the Conservative party for having sold him the eastern section of the road on conditions ruinous to the province, and that he gave to Sir Hector Langevin $100,000, and other sums, the amounts of which were spent in favour of the candidates of the Conservative party in the general elections for the House of Commons of Canada in the month of June, 1882. * * *'

"Two other accusations, which in reality are but one, cannot find place within the limits defined by my commission, as they are formulated. They refer to the general provincial election of 1881, and allege that Mr. L. A. Sénécal subscribed, at that time, certain moneys for the election of ministerial candidates, who, subsequently, in 1882, voted for the sale of the railway."

Thus, here is Hon. Judge Routhier, who doubtless had read the speech of Hon. Mr. Taillon, and who says: Those accusations are not specific; they are not especially mentioned in my commission; I refuse to investigate those charges. Well, we find ourselves to-day in the same position as our friends of Quebec in 1884. We have formulated exceedingly serious charges. The Government answer: "It is not necessary to refer these charges to a special committee; the Royal Commission will enquire into all those things, it will see whether these charges are well founded or not." And when the Royal Commission is called to hold an enquiry into these accusations it will say: "I have not the right to go into that." Hon. Judge Routhier, in his opening address, decided from the first what question she would have to examine, "Suppose," said he, "that Mr. Sénécal should have subscribed for the elections, should have bought counties wholesale, should have practised corruption, should have bought up the whole provincial representation, we have nothing to do with that, there is no harm in it." Now, we are charging, to-day, the Postmaster General with having spent money illegally in the elections, with having bought a part of the representation of the Province of Quebec by means of that money, and we are asked to refer the investigation of these charges to a judge who has already decided that such accusations could not hold. I understand that when one goes before a tribunal one has a right to refuse judges who have already pronounced on the matter at issue. Now, we see that Judge Routhier has already pronounced on the question. Secondly, it is almost certain—at least experience is there to show it—that we will not have any report for three or four years, and that finally this judge will look upon the charges as he did in 1884, and will say they are not founded. I believe that the Government, instead of showing this cowardice—I use this word so often used to-night—and giving this work to judges, should say frankly to the House that they do not want an enquiry. I have charged Hon. Judge Routhier with wanting to say that it was not necessary for counsels to appear before the commission, and conduct the investigation in order to find the guilty. I find a statement to that effect in the report from which I have quoted. However, it was perfectly well known that the majority of the facts which were the subject-matter of the investigation of 1884, were unknown to him, as they had occurred during his absence in Europe. He therefore had no personal knowledge of these facts, and yet when counsels presented themselves before him to help him in his work, to find out the truth, to lay hold of the guilty, he declared that he needed none. Here is what he says in his report:

"It has been claimed also that the Government should have had before the commission, a serious, experienced counsel to represent the public interest and prepare the case.

"Several answers are to be made to this criticism.

"First, it will not be held, I presume, that the Government should have selected this counsel among their opponents; and on another hand they would have exposed themselves to a fair criticism in choosing this counsel amongst their friends, since in reality the Government themselves are among the accused before the commission.

"It may perhaps be said then that the Government should have taken this counsel from among the few members of the bar who take no part in the political struggles; but suppose the counsel be absolutely indifferent to politics, he would nevertheless have had to act according to instructions. In reality it would have been the Government themselves, through their counsel, who would have prepared the case in which they were to be tried, and would have circumscribed the field of the investigation.

It seems to me that such a proceeding would have been open to many attacks, and would not have been wise.

"In the second place, if the Government had been represented by a counsel before the commission, there is ground to believe that the Opposition, through their leader, Hon. Mr. Mercier, would have claimed equal right of representation as accusers. Likewise, and with no less reason, the former Ministers, such as the Hon. Messrs. Boucherville, Joly and Chapleau, against every one of whom were accusations into which I have had to enquire, could have appointed a counsel for their defence before the commission. It goes without saying that Mr. Sénécal, who was really the principal party accused, could have claimed the same privi ege, and I would in justice have had to grant it to him.

"Now, I ask, when would a commission so organized have seen the end of its labour? Of how many volumes would the report of a commission so conducted have been composed? Can any idea be formed of the expense it would have involved?"

Well, Mr. Speaker, is it not reasonable to believe and say, from the experience gained in an investigation like that, where so many facts were to be put before the public, and where the accusing party should have been represented by counsel, which the commissioner refused, saying that he alone was able to conduct this investigation and to decide how the guilty should be detected, is it not reasonable to believe and say that the Government were inspired by an altogether different motive than that of making the truth known, when they made the choice of this judge to enquire into the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar)? This conviction is still strengthened when I consider the manner in which he conducted the investigation so as to prevent the Government and the party who supported them in Quebec to fall under the public contempt. Indeed what did we see when he examined Mr. Sénécal, the principal party implicated in the affair? Mr. Sénécal answered evasively the question put to him; he was content to say that there was no special understanding between him and the Conservative candidates in 1881. After an answer so evasive, so beclouded, it was the duty of the judge to learn the truth, to endeavour to find out if moneys had been given to secure the elections of those candidates. Nothing of that was done, Mr. Speaker. He was content with such an unsatisfactory answer. I do not want now to make a crime of this against him. I understand that he had no interest in the case. I do not say either that he wanted to prevent the truth from being known. Only it seems evident to me that he did not know the case sufficiently to conduct it himself, and that consequently we are not to hope that in the investigation which is now to take place, we will get due latitude and satisfaction. I wish it to be well understood that I do not especially speak against Judge Routhier, but that it is against the system itself that I raise my voice. I hold that a judge who is not familiar with a whole case needs a serious and able counsel to inform him. If we cannot have all the required latitude in this investigation, I do not see how this House could consent to refer this matter to such a Royal Commission as is proposed by the Government. As it was said by the speakers who took the floor before me, the charges against the Postmaster General were altered and changed by the Government. It was said that those charges were not definite enough, that they were too vague, and after having heard the speeches which were pronounced on this side of the House, the Government decided to grant an enquiry. But what do we see? The enquiry is to be held, not into the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), but into accusations framed by the friends of the accused. Unfortunately, that is what is to happen. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) observed with much reason that one of the most important accusations had been eliminated, namely, that the Postmaster General was a member of a construction company having a contract with the Government. I myself have called attention to the importance of such a charge. Indeed, we find in the Act concerning the independence of Parliament that a member cannot be a member of a company having a contract with the Government. If the charge such as made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) was proven, the accused Minister would be liable to expulsion from the House. Why was this charge done away with? The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) said that the truth of these charges could be proven before the commission, and that the latter could not refuse to hear evidence on that point. How can a member who knows, I have no doubt, the rules of evidence, say that the commission will have the power of hearing such evidence when the Government took care of eliminating this charge? The hon. member fully knows that the Royal Commission will refuse to allow this evidence to be produced. If we say to the commission that Sir A. P. Caron was a member of the construction company, that he consequently knew where the money had gone, the commissioner will say: We have nothing to do with that; that charge was struck off; how can we enquire into that? I believe the commissioner will be perfectly justified in that. And from that I conclude that we will not have a satisfactory investigation. The pretension of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) is, therefore, untenable. I do not wish to dwell any longer on this question. I believe I have sufficiently established that Hon. Judge Routhier, in view of his course in connection with the investigation of which I spoke, in view of his refusal to enquire into facts which the Ministers who had appointed him had permitted him to investigate—is not a competent man to sit on a Royal Commission similar to that appointed in 1884. This hon. judge having denied the press the right to make the public acquainted with the proceedings of the commission, and forbidden any comments on the evidence and persons incriminated, I repeat it, this judge is not competent to be a member of such a commission. But there is still more. On similar charges as are made to-day, this gentleman has declared himself unwilling to admit such charges as well founded, even if they were proven. We, therefore, have the right o excusing him, and I believe that the House should not accept him as a judge in the matter. As to Hon. Judge Tait, I have absolutely nothing to say against the respectability of this magistrate. He is certainly one of the most upright judges we have in the District of Montreal. But there is a circumstance of a particular nature, of which I will take the liberty of reminding the House. For many years this hon. judge was the partner of the present Prime Minister. He owes him the position he occupies, and consequently, I think it would have been a duty for this magistrate to refuse taking part in this investigation. Why draw back the judges into the political arena? Why pull them down from the exalted position they occupy unto

the level of politics? Why degrade the bench in forcing upon it the doings of politics? Have we not had enough of that in the recent enquiries made in Quebec? Was it not enough to have judges vilified —and often justly so—for leaving the bench in order to take a hand in the fights of the Conservative party? I hope we have had enough of such a spectacle. If the Government were anxious to see the administration of justice keep to its dignity and integrity, they would never permit judges to come down into the political arena and preside over commissions of this character. It is in the interest of politics and of the country itself that such charges be ventilated before a regular committee of the House. I repeat it: I think it a mistake to appoint judges on commissions like this. And I hope that for these reasons the Government will allow a genuine investigating commission to be appointed, composed of members of this House; instead of referring these charges to judges already committed on the question, and who have declared such charges absolutely meaningless.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not intend to address the House on this important question until I heard some of the remarks which have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, while it is within the duty of Parliament to thoroughly investigate the charges made against the hon. Postmaster General, I do not see how we can, in justice to the country, and in justice to the constituencies that sent us here, refuse to take up and thoroughly investigate these charges. The Minister of Justice proposes to refer them to a Royal Commission. During the last few years, we have had some experience of trying charges before committees of this House, and I think the success which has attended the labours of those committees has been such as to warrant us in continuing the same course. The hon. Minister of Justice, shortly after he became a member of the House, was called upon to prosecute a charge against the then member for Lincoln. That committee discharged its duty so efficiently that the member accused was expelled from the House. Then, a charge was made against the late hon. member for Quebec West, and a committee of this House investigated that charge so thoroughly, and I am quite sure to the entire satisfaction of the people of this country, that he was expelled from this House. Then, we had a charge made against the late hon. Minister of Public Works, which a committee of this House investigated, the result of which was that that hon. gentleman suffered to such an extent that he considered it his duty to retire from the Government. I think that all these experiences would warrant us in believing that the best and most efficient enquiry would be obtained before a committee of this House rather than by a Royal Commission. I was amused at the efforts made by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) to show that all the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario were embodied in the amended charges brought forward by the hon. Minister of Militia. There was one charge, however, that was completely eliminated, that is charge 10, relating to the bribery of at least 21 constituencies with money secured from different sources stated. Not a vestige of that charge is found in the amended charges. The hon. Minister of Justice said that the hon. member for West Ontario would be guilty of cowardice if he refused to appear before that commission and declined to prove his charges. I would like to know, in the position of the matter as it now stands before this House, whether it is the hon. member for West Ontario who prefers the charges or the hon. Minister of Militia. The hon. member for West Ontario made certain charges against the hon. Postmaster General, but the hon. Minister of Militia chose to take the business out of his hands, and brought in amendments which almost entirely altered the whole case. These amendments were adopted, and the hon. Minister of Militia now becomes virtually the prosecuting member; and the duty will devolve upon him to appear before the commission and to see that those charges, as he amended them and presented them to this House, are properly prosecuted before that commission. We have the names of two judges submitted to us for approval as the commission. If we had a committee of this House, that committee would not be drawn from one side of the House only, but there would be upon it members from both sides; whereas these two judges are from one political party only. They were both Conservatives, and were undoubtedly hand-in-glove with the Postmaster General prior to the time they went on the bench, and they are no doubt in sympathy with hon. gentlemen opposite. Therefore that will be a one-sided tribunal. But suppose one of those judges should refuse to act. We have no assurance to-night that they have given their consent to act. They may have done so, but the Minister of Justice has not assured the House that they have. Suppose one should refuse to act, the taking of the evidence would be hung up for another year until Parliament met again, when another could be appointed. Suppose again that one of those judges should die, the whole proceedings would be hung up for a year until another man could be appointed to take his place. There is also to be considered that after the commission is appointed the hon. Postmaster General will of course remain in the Cabinet, an adviser of the Crown and a member of this House, until such time as the evidence is reported to this House and this House takes action upon it. In the case of Sir Hector Langevin, it was thought prudent, whether he did it of his own will or whether it was urged upon him, that he should resign his position in the Cabinet during the time that investigation was in progress. But under the present arrangement the hon. Postmaster General will remain a member of the Cabinet to advise and generally direct the investigation going on; because in reality it is not merely the Postmaster General who is on his trial, but the whole Cabinet. The fact is that during the last four or five years, at one time or another, we have had hon. gentlemen opposite on the political gridiron. No less than three members of the House, one a Minister of the Crown and the others prominent supporters of the Government, have been deprived of their positions in the House. It was one plunge out of one pool of political corruption into another from time to time and session to session; and every year it is evidently getting worse. Now, the hon. Postmaster General says that his hands are clean, and we are bound to accept that statement from him until such times as a committee of this House has carefully investigated the charge that lies at his door. If after that thorough investigation the committee reports that the statement made by him, that he is free of any guilt, is correct, the hon. gentleman

will be freed from the charge that now hangs over his head. If the hon. gentleman's hands are clean, the Government should give him an immediate opportunity to prove it before a committee of this House. I do not think this leaving the matter to a Royal Commission will at all satisfy the country. I am satisfied that a large majority of the people of this Dominion will look upon this proceeding as nothing short of a farce. Suppose that the judges report to this House the evidence, and suppose that on the evidence reported the House should declare that the Postmaster General is not guilty. Suppose a committee of the House should declare that the Postmaster General is not guilty, I would like to know if hon. gentlemen opposite are under the impression that the people of this country would be prepared to accept a verdict of that kind. I do not think they would. When they took the two judges from the hon. gentleman's own province, personal friends of his own, I would like to know if, in doing so, the Government thought that no other province was interested in this matter but the Province of Quebec. Is it not a matter of vital interest to the whole Dominion? If it is, why not have a judge taken from each province, or why not have a percentage on the commission taken from the ranks of the Opposition? It will appear to the people of this country as a farce, and an intended farce, when you take the two judges from the hon. gentleman's own province, personal friends of his, the creatures of the Cabinet of which he is a member and looking forward to higher positions on the bench possibly, for the services they may render under this commission. We have seen such things in the past, and may see a repetition of them in the future. It is quite clear that the Minister of Justice and hon. gentlemen opposite are afraid of committees, and I do not much wonder at it. The experience of the Minister of Justice, since he became a member of this House, of investigations by committees is not calculated to reassure him. Every committee of this House which has sat upon a member on that side or a Minister of the Crown, has proved a sufficient number of the charges advanced to expel the accused from the House or compel the Government to remove him from the Cabinet. I would respectfully refer the Minister of Justice to the cartoon in *Grip* last week, which, I think, fairly illustrates this whole question. It shows clearly the position the Postmaster General occupies, and that occupied by the judges who are to try him, and also the position in which the prosecuting attorney stands. I would like to know if hon. gentlemen opposite expect that Mr. Edgar will dance attendance on the Royal Commission from Quebec to Montreal and possibly Toronto, or one cannot tell where, within the limits of the Dominion, all summer, at his own personal cost? It is neither fair nor reasonable to expect he will consent to do anything of the kind. Were the investigation held here, and Parliament should be the highest and best tribunal to judge of its own purity and of what is right, my hon. friend from South Ontario would not be put to the expense of securing prosecuting attorneys to appear before the commission, and the country would besides be saved the cost which will attend this investigation before the Royal Commission. Those judges will not work for nothing. The witnesses who appear before them will have to be paid, besides all the legal talent employed on both sides, whereas before a parliamentary committee, the counsel on each side would be voluntarily supplied by the House, and the cost would be little to the country compared with what it will be under this commission. It is much to be regretted that the Government should deem it necessary to take the course they asked the House to consent to. Had we gone into the investigation when the charges were first made, the probability is that by this time all the evidence would be concluded. I have no doubt my hon. friend from West Ontario would have produced his evidence with very little delay, the duty relegated to this commission of taking the evidence would have been finished, and we would have all the information in our hands and be able to dispose of the matter this session. When the question was first brought before the House, the Minister of Justice intimated that it was his intention to ask his followers to vote it down altogether without any reference whatever. His speech on that occasion clearly indicated that he had no intention whatever of appointing a Royal Commission. He poohpoohed the whole thing, and called upon his followers to vote it down; but after the Conservative papers—a very respectable wing of them—as well as the Reform papers had discussed the question, the Minister of Justice, like the darkey's coon, came down. He found it would not do to take the high-handed course he indicated. He found, when he felt the pulse of the Dominion, that the people nor their representatives would not tolerate these charges being allowed to drop without any investigation, and the result was that, as the best way out of the difficulty, he asked the House to consent to a reference to a Royal Commission. I am quite sure that the Government could have found among the judges in Ontario, some who could very creditably discharge this duty, and at least one could have been named for that province, but they preferred taking the two from Quebec. That will be looked upon as a one-sided investigation, however it may turn out, and the people will not be satisfied, and it is quite clear that when that Royal Commission comes to take the evidence, it will take it under all the rules and restrictions followed in courts of law. We know pretty well what they amount to. We can easily understand that if a judge or commissioner is disposed to favour a party, it is a very easy matter to choke off evidence by raising technicalities. We are quite cognizant how objections are raised in the courts and rulings asked for in matters of procedure, and we know perfectly well that judges, in many cases, overrule certain questions and proceedings which they do not consider within the exercise of the rights of any prosecution or defending attorney. Now, if an investigation of this kind is going to be hampered in this way, the probabilities are that the very limited evidence which will be submitted to this House afterwards will not enable this House to come to an independent decision, and we may have next session the very same discussion over again, which we have had this session, and may have a determination on the part of the Opposition to press the reference of the whole question to a committee of this House for the purpose of taking evidence. I should not be at all surprised at that. We have heard the voice of the Minister of Customs to-night for the first time during this session. I am not at all surprised that he should oppose the

investigation before committees, whether an ordinary standing committee or a special committee. Last year he went through a course of investigation himself before the Public Accounts Committee during two weeks, and he only escaped by the skin of his teeth. From time to time exposures were made with regard to the manner in which the affairs of his own department were conducted, which proved very clearly that there were a number of irregularities and that, if he was not aware of them, he was not fit to preside over any department. I do not wonder that he chooses this opportunity to raise his voice in opposition to a parliamentary committee, because he has a very vivid recollection of the searching investigation to which he was subjected last session. I was rather amused at the reference to the resolution of the 4th May. Hon. gentlemen opposite stated that that of itself was a precedent for the course which is now being adopted. Surely a resolution of that kind cannot become a precedent until it is acted upon, and so far that resolution is stillborn. No investigation has taken place yet, and it is no precedent. We were opposed to it, and we are still opposed to the Royal Commission on the ground that the House is abnegating its rights and casting off its responsibilities. We have a criminal Bill before us. Suppose we decided to refer that to a commission, and we might as well do that as this, though it is not so serious a matter. It is our duty to give our time to the consideration of the matters which come within our sphere, and past experience proves clearly that charges of the character laid at the door of the Postmaster General are one of those matters which every member should give close attention to. Those charges should be at once investigated. It is no matter to trifle with. I do not say that the hon. gentleman is guilty. I do not know whether he is or not. He says he is not, and we are willing to give him the benefit of the doubt, but the House should at once proceed to investigate the matter and come to an intelligent conclusion. Royal Commissions are not likely to come to better or more unanimous decisions upon a matter of this kind than a committee of this House is. A Royal Commission which sat in Quebec recently did not come to a unanimous decision, one of the judges holding that the charges against Mr. Mercier were not proven, while the other two considered they were, though not to the full extent. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) said that a committee of this House last session was pronounced by members of the Opposition to be a whitewashing committee. The hon. gentleman should be aware that it was so pronounced by some of the Conservative journals, and if he takes the most absolutely independent papers, which are not Tory or Reform, he will find that they called that committee a whitewashing committee. The Toronto *Mail* pronounced it a whitewashing committee, and surely he will not say that the *Mail* is a Reform journal or controlled by members on this side of the House, as some hon. gentlemen say the *Globe* is, but incorrectly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What makes you think the *Mail* a Tory journal.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not say it was; I said it was an independent paper. We have a vivid recollection of some duties performed by a judge recently. We have the pitiable and unfortunate, and I may say disgraceful exhibition of some duties performed by Judge Elliott in the city of London. Will any one say that he has not shown himself to be a partisan? It is a wonder that the Government did not associate him in this commission. He would have been admirably suited to their purpose, because no doubt he would have brought in a report just such as they wanted. The report he brought in in the London election shows that he would be prepared to bring in any report suitable to the party to which he belongs and of which he is a pronounced admirer. I was rather amused by the remarks of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and certainly, in all my experience in this House, I never knew a member who could descend from the sublime to the ridiculous as my hon. friend can and as he did to-night. He evidently got into a tight place, but it is amusing to notice the difference between his tone now and that of last year. Last year some charges were made against the Minister of the Interior, and he was talking about anonymous letters and charges. We know that last year the hon. gentleman said some very hard things about the Minister of the Interior. We do not know how it is that his mouth has been closed, and he is so ready to defend the cause of the Government in a case of this kind, but I think it may be due to what is shown by the Auditor General's Report, that the Regina *Leader* and the hon. gentleman drew last year $8,504.35 from the public treasury. I suppose that explains the fact that the hon. gentleman is coming so rapidly into line, and that he is willing now to stand by the Government in the present crisis.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for Assiniboia said something with regard to the hon. member for West Ontario employing the talented barrister of Toronto, the Hon. Mr. Blake. I dare say that Mr. Blake would very admirably discharge the duties of prosecuting attorney. He has discharged duties of a similar kind before, and if he were in this House I am sure he would wake up the echoes by his denunciation of the course that has been adopted by the Government with regard to this question. He would undoubtedly point out in very plain language the scandalous exhibition we have seen and the degradation that has overtaken this country, by this House abnegating, session after session, the duties that properly devolve upon it to investigate matters of this kind. I do most sincerely deplore the evident descent in the dignity, I might almost say, of this House, that has been taken place during the last ten years. Why, Sir, this country would not stand ten years ago the course that has been adopted by the Government on this occasion. But the people have become accustomed to this kind of thing, and are disposed, perhaps, to shut their eyes and their ears in the hope that matters will get better. But I think they are becoming disgusted with the manner in which public affairs are being discharged by the Government of this country, and the way that public money is being squandered and scattered in all directions. I am exceedingly sorry we were not allowed to bring this matter before a committee of this House. We could not only have saved a very large amount of money, but we could have made a thorough investigation. I have not the slightest doubt that if a

committee had been granted, the experience of the past would have been repeated, and in all probability the same treatment that was meted out to Mr. Rykert, and to Mr. McGreevy, and to the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) would have fallen to the lot of the Postmaster General. I do not wish that it would, not by any means. I should earnestly hope that the member for West Ontario would fail; I should be rejoiced, for the credit of the country and for the credit of the Government, if he failed in proving his charges, but I am afraid he would not. I am rather disposed to think, from the evidence that we have in the *Globe* from day to day, and the vouchers that have been published showing the disposition of this fund, that the charges that have been made are only too true. After seeing these vouchers that are being published from day to day, it is a matter of surprise to me that men occupying a dignified position in this House and in this country, can face the public of this Dominion and still retain a seat in this House.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Laurier,
Bain (Wentworth),	Leduc,
Beausoleil,	McMillan (Huron),
Beith,	McMullen,
Bowers,	Mills (Bothwell),
Brodeur,	Paterson (Brant),
Christie,	Perry,
Colter,	Proulx,
Davies,	Rider,
Dawson,	Rinfret,
Devlin,	Rowand,
Edwards,	Sanborn,
Flint,	Scriver,
Fraser,	Semple,
Geoffrion,	Somerville, and
Innes,	Vaillancourt.—32.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Lippé,
Bain (Soulanges),	Macdonald (King's),
Baker,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Barnard,	Mackintosh,
Bennett,	McAlister,
Boyle,	McDonald (Victoria),
Cameron,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cargill,	McLennan,
Carignan,	McLeod,
Carling,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Chapleau,	McNeill,
Cochrane,	Madill,
Costigan,	Mara,
Curran,	Masson,
Daly,	Mills (Annapolis),
Davin,	Montague,
Davis,	Ouimet,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Patterson (Colchester),
Dewdney,	Patterson (Huron),
Dickey,	Pridham,
Dupont,	Putnam,
Earle,	Reid,
Fairbairn,	Robillard,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Rosamond,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Ross (Dundas),
Foster,	Simard,
Fréchette,	Skinner,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Smith (Ontario),
Gordon,	Sproule,
Guillet,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Temple,
Hazen,	Thompson (Sir John),
Henderson,	Tupper,
Hughes,	Turcotte,
Hutchins,	Tyrwhitt,
Ingram,	Wallace,
Kaulbach,	Weldon,
Kirkpatrick,	Wilson, and
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (Brockville).—79.
LaRivière,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Prior,	Mr. Edgar,
Mr. Ross (Lisgar),	Mr. Watson,
Mr. Dugas,	Mr. Bruneau,
Mr. McKay,	Mr. Forbes,
Mr. Hearn,	Mr. Choquette,
Mr. Stairs,	Mr. McGregor,
Mr. White (Cardwell),	Mr. Gillmor,
Mr. Bergin,	Mr. Macdonald (Huron),
Mr. Joncas,	Mr. Fauvel,
Mr. Corby,	Mr. Gibson,
Mr. Cleveland,	Mr. Carroll,
Mr. Girouard (Jacq. Cartier),	Mr. Préfontaine,
Mr. Grandbois,	Mr. Guay,
Mr. Bergeron,	Mr. Sutherland,
Mr. Gillies,	Mr. Mulock,
Mr. Wood (Westmoreland),	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. Coatsworth,	Mr. Allan.

Amendment negatived.

Main motion agreed to, on the same division reversed.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has not voted.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have paired.

ADJOURNMENT—CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND—WRIT FOR PONTIAC.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In moving the adjournment of the House, I may mention, in consequence of the subject having been asked about on two or three occasions, that in the Newfoundland *Gazette* to-day a notice is inserted that the extra duties on Canadian products levied under the Inland Revenue Act of 1891 will not be collected, and a notice has been given by telegraph by the Newfoundland Government to its officials, to grant bait licenses to Dominion fishermen on the same terms as to Newfoundland fishermen, giving similar bonds. The Government of Canada, under the provisions of the Act respecting the Duties of Customs, has therefore removed by proclamation to-day the duties on fish and fish products from Newfoundland.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me for calling his attention to the fact, which I have learned to-day, that the writ for the election in the County of Pontiac has not been issued; and I understand that even the returning officer has not been appointed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am surprised to hear that, because I was informed that it had been issued last Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand, in point of fact, that it has not been.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will make enquiry, and if it has not been issued, it will be issued tomorrow.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 30th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FISHERY REGULATIONS.

Mr. FRASER asked, Have the Government received any petitions from the County of Guysborough

regarding the new fishery regulations? Do the Government intend to alter these regulations?

Mr. TUPPER. There was a petition received from the County of Guysborough, touching the new fishery regulations, with respect to lifting mackerel nets, and the Government does not intend to alter the regulations. I might add that the petitioners have misapprehended considerably the scope of the new regulations referred to, and I think the explanation will go a long way to satisfy them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In what way did they misapprehend it?

Mr. TUPPER. As to the mackerel nets set outside the limits off the shore. There is no intention of interfering with them in the slightest.

I. C. R.—ACQUISITION BY A COMPANY.

Mr. FREMONT asked, Whether, in view of the large and annually increasing deficits in the working of the Intercolonial Railway, which have become a heavy drain upon the revenue of the Dominion, the Government would be disposed to give that railway to a responsible company, which would, in consideration thereof, build a railway bridge over the St. Lawrence at Quebec, build a short line between Edmundston and Moncton, and run the road in such a manner as to comply with all the military requirements of the Imperial Government, and afford all reasonable accommodation for the business of the several provinces through which it runs?

Mr. HAGGART. I may say there has been no proposition in this direction made to the Government.

WRIT FOR FRONTENAC.

Mr. SPEAKER. A vacancy having occurred in the representation of the electoral district of Frontenac by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, namely, the office of Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Ontario, by the Hon. George A. Kirkpatrick, I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to issue a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I wish to call the attention of the House to the remarks made by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) on the 19th inst., in my absence, in which there is the following personal reference to me:—

"Notwithstanding the fact that you sent your Secretary of State up there to handle the boodle, we carried the constituency of North Perth. We know when the Secretary of State goes what influence he carries with him, and he did not go up there this time without the necessary influence, but in spite of all that influence we have carried North Perth; we carried it by an increased majority notwithstanding all the efforts put forth, notwithstanding the little subscriptions you got from certain senators in the other Chamber to take into North Perth. I suppose it is understood that these things are all secret, that the outside public know nothing about it. But there is a little bird that whispers the secret, and notwithstanding all the efforts you put forth, an honest man has been elected there to-day."

In reply, I wish to say that I never in my life took money for election purposes or corrupt purposes of any kind into any constituency in Ontario, that I did not take one dollar into North Perth, that I was never entrusted with any subscriptions raised in the Senate Chamber or elsewhere to be sent to that constituency, and that, as far as I am concerned, the hon. gentleman had no justification whatever for referring to me in the terms he considered himself at liberty to use.

Mr. LISTER. I suppose I have the right to say something in answer to the hon. gentleman?

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House.

Mr. LISTER. There is a charge made here that I unjustifiably attacked the hon. Secretary of State in his absence. I suppose, as the House has allowed the hon. gentleman to make his statement, I will be given the right to answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would be very inconvenient that discussions should be allowed to take place without any motion being before the Chair. The House has on many occasions allowed members to correct statements made regarding them; but I do not think a discussion would be in order without anything being before the House. It would not only be an inconvenience, but would lead to trouble.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LISTER. If the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to look over the rest of the debate that took place during the all-night sitting, he would have found that the Minister of Finance made statements more utterly indefensible than any which he can pretend to say I made, and he has not attempted to formulate them in any way. I desire to say to the Secretary of State that, in the statement I made there, I did not intend that the meaning should be conveyed that he himself gathered the money, or that he himself spent the money in the constituency, but I assert here, and, if the Government will give me a committee, I think I can establish, that not only in North Perth but in other counties in which the Secretary of State was conducting elections or assisting in elections, large sums of money were spent in the interests of the Conservative party in order to carry those counties for the Conservative candidate. I think any hon. gentleman here will give the Secretary of State more credit for sagacity and prudence than to imagine that he would personally collect the money or would expend it individually to bribe those constituencies. We know very well that money has been spent and spent in large sums, and that the Conservative Association of the Province of Ontario, of which the hon. gentleman was the chief for several months at all events, had gathered together a very large fund, and that that fund was spent very liberally during the bye-elections that have just taken place. My hon. friend went into West Huron. Will the hon. gentleman pretend to say that large sums of money were not spent in West Huron, or the public men who got on the platform there did not state that, if the people wanted various things they were clamouring for, the dredging of the harbour and other things they wanted from the Government, they would have to support the Conservative candidate?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who was it made that statement?

Mr. LISTER. I do not say you made it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who was it?

Mr. LISTER. Any number of people made it. About 50 people invaded that riding. There were Mr. Moore and Mr. Boyd and other gentlemen who did not seem to have any business there except travelling through the riding. It was the common talk on the streets that, if West Huron wanted favours from the Government, they must return a supporter of the Government, and in the press of that day it is clearly stated.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who was it who made the statement on the platform?

Mr. LISTER. Of course it cannot be expected that the hon. gentleman would make any such statement. Of course he did not in the County of Haldimand promise any post office or a bridge over the canal. None of these things were done in Haldimand, and of course the hon. gentleman would not go into West Huron to make such promises. Of course the hon. gentleman did not sign that proclamation which was brought to bear on the electorate of the County of Haldimand, and therefore it would not be possible for me to charge him with going into the County of Huron and making those promises. But he will find the press of the county holding it out that, if the people wanted favours from the Government, they must return a Government supporter. I think that took place only a day before the election. I assert here that money was spent corruptly in West Huron, and in Monck, and in Northumberland, and in Prince Edward, in the interests of the Conservative party. I never intended to say that the Secretary of State either collected the money or paid it himself. He was the president of the Conservative union before he became a member of this Government. I say that union had a large fund, and that fund was used corruptly to carry elections in this country. No one would say that the hon. gentleman, the general of the forces, the captain of the company that went into those counties would do that work himself. It is well known that there are other men to do the work, and it was done in these counties to which I have referred and also in North Perth and in South Perth. We have seen the letter signed by Mr. Ingram's brother in which he says that "R. Ber. has not arrived." What did that mean? Where did the money come from? What was that but money to carry the elections one way or the other? In West Huron it was stated that South Perth would be carried at any cost. South Perth was carried, and we have evidence, I think, that will show that it was carried by the most corrupt means.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I am not going to indulge in the vague, vituperative recrimination of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. Coming from the same section of the country as myself, and professing for me the private friendship which he does, I thought it very much out of place for him to attack me in my absence. I only repeat that he is entirely inaccurate in every charge he has made against me. As to the Liberal-Conservative union, I am prepared to submit their receipts and expenditures to the leader of the Opposition, or to any member from Ontario whom he may name. Not one dollar was spent corruptly of the money collected by that association, and, when the leader of the Opposition sees how we stand financially, he will see how different the facts are from what has been stated in the speech we have listened to by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Lister). West Huron is now before the courts, and the other ridings referred to are before the election courts, and when these cases come to trial it will be seen what foundation there is for the charges made by the hon. gentleman. I might make use of the *tu quoque* argument and refer to the tournaments which we have had in the courts during the last twelve months with the hon. gentleman's party, but I rose only in self-defence, and not to attack the hon. gentleman. I leave him to his own sense of honour. He has retracted every charge he has made against me, but he has thrown out innuendoes, suggestions and hints in regard to things of which he can have no personal knowledge, and about matters which will have shortly to be decided by two judges of the Superior Court of the Province of Ontario. The public will then be able to judge of the accuracy or inaccuracy of the hon. gentleman's statements. Meantime, I repeat that I have no knowledge of the truthfulness of any statement made in this printed copy of *Hansard* by the hon. gentleman, or of any charge which he has made in the remarks he has just addressed to the House. So far as I am concerned, knowing that his friends will have full opportunity of dealing with me in the cases of West Huron, South Perth, Monck or any other constituency that he has named, I am prepared to leave my defence to another time, because I know that, no matter what is said upon this side of the House, the spirit which the hon. member has aroused on the other side of the House renders it impossible that any opponent can receive justice at their hands in this House.

Mr. GUILLET. I wish to say a word in reply to the remarks of the hon. member for West Lambton in regard to West Northumberland. I deny the foul slander he has thrown across the House. If there was ever a pure election conducted by the Conservative party, it was the last election in that riding. We unseated the Liberal member for that riding for acts of the grossest corruption and personation on the part of his supporters during the election of 1891. They did not dare to protest the last election, because they were afraid of being exposed, but we were not afraid of a protest. We knew we had conducted the election honestly. Of course there was a good deal of money expended, because an enormous number of meetings were held, and the legitimate expenses were very large. That election contest was conducted by the Conservative party solely upon the policy of the Government, but we had to meet with gross corruption on the other side, and with a great number of personations. A gang of personators was organized in Toronto by the notorious Preston and sent through the riding, and a large number of these got in votes. We have two of them in gaol now. We have proof that the local wire-pullers of the Opposition acted in collusion with the Liberal party in the acts of corruption of which that party was guilty. I say that it comes with ill grace for the hon. member to charge us with corruption in view of the notorious violations of the law, and the gross acts of corruption of which his party was guilty. We know that they

obtained a large number of tickets from the Grand Trunk ; I do not know how they were obtained, but I know they were obtained by Preston, and if they were paid for, they constituted an illegitimate expenditure and a violation of the election law. They not only infringed the election law by this bringing voters into the riding, but by paralyzing the local voters with liquor. We have discovered all these things, and they will be attended to in due time ; but I deny in the most positive manner the charge that the election in West Northumberland was conducted improperly on the part of the Conservative party.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

COAL OIL.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) (for Mr. CAMPBELL) moved for :

Return showing the quantity of coal oil, and also kerosene oil, imported for consumption in Canada from the 1st day of July, 1891, up to the 1st day of May, 1892. Also, the amount of duty collected on the same.

He said : The coal oil question has now become one of great importance, and we hear much about it in election times. The people complain of the excessive price of coal oil in this country compared with the price of that article on the other side of the line. As a large amount of coal oil is used in this country, more particularly by the working classes and the farmers, and as the residents in towns and cities have resorted largely to electric and gas light, therefore a large additional expenditure falls upon the poorer classes of this country who use coal oil. I am not opposed to the National Policy in respect to coal oil, because free trade in oil would be unjust to the oil men ; but I am opposed to the excessive duty of over 100 per cent in favour of the coal oil interest, because this enables them to control the whole industry, and gives them a monopoly in the industry of refining oil. When we consider the quantity of oil used in this country, the excessive duty becomes a very heavy burden upon those who use coal oil.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to draw attention to the rule with regard to an hon. member moving a motion which stands in the name of another member. The rule is as follows :—

"A member may not propose a motion in the absence of another who has placed it upon the Notice Paper, except with the general consent of the House. Merely formal motions for the adoption of reports or for certain papers to which there is no objection, are frequently permitted to be made, but all motions involving discussion must be proposed by the member in whose name they appear on the paper."

Mr. LAURIER. No objection has been taken.

Mr. SPEAKER. I thought it well to draw attention to the rule, so that the House may know what the rule is. If the House desires the discussion to go on, I have no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). This being the last private members' day, I thought the Government would not object to my moving this motion, especially since the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) is absent. He requested me, in his absence, to move if for him, and as it is a question of considerable importance, I hope the Government will permit me to proceed with it. However, I will sit down and hear what the leader of the House has to say. I suppose silence gives consent. Well, as I was about to remark, I consider that the refiners of Canada have a monopoly in the industry of refining oil, and this monopoly imposes a much higher price upon that article than they would be able to do if the duty was reduced considerably. The duty now is 7½ cents per gallon. We imported in 1890-91, 5,070,000 gallons, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, upon which we collected $365,000. Now, it would be supposed, at first glance, that $365,000 was the amount of duty paid, but that is not the fact. The duty on coal oil is 7½ cents per gallon, then there is 1 cent for inspection, and 1 cent rate on barrel, which makes 9½ cents protective duty on coal oil in favour of the refiners of Canada. That amount comes to $466,000 between the duty direct and payment for inspection and duty on barrels. Coal oil is imported from the other side by wholesale dealers. They are supposed to make their price on the cost of the article, together with the duty and other charges. The profit of the wholesale importer, 20 per cent, which is the ordinary price charged, will amount, on a total duty and charges of $466,440, to $93,288, which would make the duty and the increased price, by reason of the duty, before it leaves the hands of the wholesale importer, $559,728. The oil passes from the wholesaleman to small dealers, and they, of course, place on an average 40 per cent of profit on the article, owing to the difficulty of keeping oil, and the heavy insurance involved. 40 per cent on $559,728 gives $223,728, which will be charged as profit on the original duty and the profit of the wholesale merchant, which would make the total, by reason of the duty, $783,639, or nearly 15½ cents per gallon. Suppose the duty was wholly removed, the account would stand thus : The original cost of No. 1 white American oil at the present time is 7 cents per gallon in Buffalo.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that wine gallon or imperial gallon ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Imperial gallon.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It is not wine gallon, which is somewhat less than imperial. Placing the profit of the importer at 20 per cent, the cost would be increased by 1·4 cent, and giving the small dealers 40 per cent profit, as I did in the other case, it would amount to 3·4 cents, which would place the cost to the retailers at 11·8 cents per gallon, if the duty were removed. If you add 11·8 cents to 15·4 cents, the exact figures in the other case, you get 27·2 as the price of American oil sold in the Canadian market. It will thus be seen that my calculation is perfectly correct, because from 27 cents to 30 cents per gallon is the price of American oil at retail in the Canadian market. Some accounts put in by the Government showed that American oil cost them 30 cents per gallon. Let me give another calculation. It will thus be seen that the increased cost of imported oil is $783,639 by reason of the duty. How much do we increase the price of oil refined in Canada by reason of the increased price which the duty enables the Canadian manufacturers to put on as an extra price by reason of this duty by which they are protected ? The Canadian people consume about 15,000,000 gallons of coal oil, 10,000,000 gallons of Canadian in addition to 5,000,000 imported. The wholesale price of Canadian oil at the present time is about 11½ cents, or

rather it was 12 cents when I obtained the quotation. Supposing the duty were reduced, we would at least bring Canadian oil down to the same price as American oil. We would, therefore, obtain it at 7 cents per gallon wholesale, if we could obtain American oil for 7 cents in American markets; that is to say, we would obtain Canadian oil at 7 cents per gallon at most—which would be a saving of 5 cents a gallon under reciprocity. The total cost of the 10,000,000 gallons of Canadian oil in the wholesale market would be $1,200,000. I exclude from this calculation the wholesale merchants, because Canadian retailers generally deal direct with Canadian refineries, and the middlemen do not appear so much as dealers in the Canadian article as they do with respect to American oil. Taking 40 per cent profit to retailers on this sum of $1,200,000, we have $480,000 as the increased price of the oil, by reason of the duty, which is given to the Canadian refiners as a protection. This brings the selling price up to $1,680,000. If the price of Canadian oil were to fall to 7 cents, the price of American oil, the total amount at wholesale price and 40 per cent profit, would be $980,000, as compared with $1,680,000, or a saving to the Canadian people on Canadian oil alone of $700,000. Adding that $700,000 to $783,639, which is the amount paid as duty and inspection, and duty on barrels and profits charged on the duty by the Canadian consumer on imported oil, we have a total amount as the result of the duty of $1,473,639. We will be met with the argument that this large duty is necessary to sustain and develop the oil industry in Canada. A few words, therefore, in regard to that industry will be in order. In 1881 the refineries of Canada employed 379 men. According to the last census bulletin, No. 8, the oil refineries of Canada, numbering 20, employed 270 men, or after ten years of protection, 109 less than in 1881. Again, it would pay the Canadian people to superannuate every man who is engaged in the refining business in this country, What would be the cost? We have 270 men to deal with. The average wages of mechanics in cities and towns in 1889 was $447. So these 270 men would earn $120,690 a year. Suppose the country undertook, in addition to superannuating the men, to buy up all the tools and machinery in those refineries. According to the last census bulletin, the value of machinery and tools in those refineries was $516,510. Further, it would pay the country to pension every one of the refiners at $10,000 each. There are 20 refineries, and accordingly the sum required would be $200,000. The total cost, first, of superannuating the men; second, of purchasing the machinery and tools of the refineries; and third, of superannuating every refiner, would be $836,200, or a saving of $647,439. No hon. gentleman on either side of the House can fail to see the fallacy of protecting an industry which collects from the people such a large sum of money as does the coal oil industry, and, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, although I am favourable to extending to these men a reasonable protection, it is wrong, I think, in the interest of the consuming population of this country, to extend to the refiners a protection of 100 or 125 per cent. I believe that the Government should take this matter into their serious consideration, and determine whether the oil refiners of this country should receive more protection than the average manufacturers in the other districts in Canada. If the Government should come to the conclusion to reduce the duty on coal oil, they will be doing what is largely in the interests of the people who are obliged to use a large quantity of coal oil every year. It is an article of prime necessity, it is not an article of luxury, it must be used by the masses of the people, and it should therefore be placed at their disposal at as cheap a price as possible. It was stated in the House last year that the lowering of the duty on sugar removed a burden of taxation off the shoulders of the people. The result of that very good act on the part of the Government was that the price of sugar fell in the market, and the consuming public were able to buy it cheaper. In the same way, if the Government should reduce the duty on coal oil from 7½ to, say, 5 cents a gallon, it would relieve the people of at least one-third of the burden which they are now obliged to bear in this matter. I am quite sure that if the duty were lessened the people of the country would receive a corresponding benefit. It was for that reason that I moved for these papers, so that we may learn whether as large a quantity of coal oil is imported as before, and also for the reason that the matter may be brought to the attention of the Government. I hope they will consider this question—not upon the basis of free trade, because I do not contend that coal oil should be put upon the free list; for so long as we have the National Policy in this country it is only right and just and equitable, that protection should be given to the oil producers as well as to every other industry, along the lines of justice. I, therefore, trust that the Government will try to see their way clear to reduce the duty upon coal oil to 5 cents a gallon.

Motion agreed to.

EDUCATION AND LANGUAGES IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG moved:

That it is expedient that power be given to the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories, after the next general election of members of said Assembly, to deal with all matters pertaining to education and the use of dual languages in the courts and in the proceedings of the said Assembly; providing, however, that no school section, as at present constituted, shall be interfered with without the consent of the parties composing such section.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this resolution, I wish to say that I am not moving it for any party or any set of men. I consulted no one in preparing the resolution, and I have not been asked by any member of this House to move it. I have taken this action altogether upon my own responsibility. It may be asked: Why not let the matter rest? Sir, the matter will not rest. It is one of those questions that, like Banquo's ghost, will not down, and session after session we have to meet it, and it is neither the part of good statesmanship nor of sound public policy to leave the question in abeyance. I do think that there is surely some way in which the question can be satisfactorily settled and set at rest forever. In moving this resolution I may say that I am not tied down to its terms, because any just and honourable and fair means of settling the difficulty by whomsoever moved will have my hearty support. In the resolution it will

be seen that I take the ground that the matter should be left altogether to the people themselves to settle. That is the ground that I have always taken, and I am confirmed in this view of the case by the opinion of my hon. friend the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Two years ago, when the question of the dual languages was before the House, that hon. gentleman moved an amendment to the Bill to leave the matter entirely in the hands of the people of the North-West Territories. I approved of his amendment and I intended to vote for it if it had been reached; and, Sir, what was good in the case of the dual languages, I believe would be equally good in the case of separate schools, and that the only sound policy is to leave the matter for the people of the North-West to deal with. There is another matter introduced in this resolution, and that is that the school sections of the North-West as at present constituted shall not be interfered with without the consent of the parties composing the section. The reason that I was induced to admit that clause in the resolution was because a friend of mine pleaded that certain parties had established school sections there on the strength of the law as it at present stands, that in that way a sort of vested right had accrued, and that it was unfair to interfere with these rights. I agreed with him in that, and I consented to allow that clause to be inserted in the resolution. I know that there are some eminent men in this House and out of it who do not hold the doctrine of provincial rights. I remember that two years ago the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), speaking in the city of Montreal, made use of the following language:—

"We are told that the Liberal party has always taken for their motto, that no matter what the Local Legislatures may do, so long as they act strictly within their power, the Dominion authorities would not exercise any interference. In other words, we have forced upon us by the introduction of such a policy, the pernicious doctrine of States Rights: a principle which has been crushed out in the United States by the most gigantic war which the country has ever witnessed."

Now, Sir, knowing the intelligence of the hon. gentleman and his knowledge of constitutional history, it is hard to believe that he was perfectly sincere when he made that assertion. What are the facts? In the rebellion there was only one single question of state rights at issue. It had been held from very early times by eminent jurists in the United States, and amongst others by Jefferson and Calhoun, that as the states had come into the federation as independent states, they retained to themselves the right to secede for cause if they saw fit. The great question at issue, then, was whether one or more states had the right to secede. The southern States contended that they had the right and acted upon it; the northern States contended that they had not the right, and determined to prevent them acting upon it; and the question was settled, not by an appeal to reason, law or equity, but simply by the largest battalions and the heaviest artillery; and the question of right or wrong remains unsettled to the present day. But what I want to insist upon is this, that not another single state right was ever called in question; and if there is one part of public policy more than another which the people of the United States are united in supporting, it is the doctrine of state rights. If those rights were to be infringed, north and south alike would be determined to maintain them, and would fight to the death rather than allow them to be sacrificed. And, Sir, they are wise in doing so. Extended over a large area of country, with different interests and with different questions coming before them, they can only hope to maintain the union by a strict adherence to the doctrine of state rights. And, Sir, is this principle less important in the country in which we dwell? We occupy an enormous extent of territory; our country is peopled by different races, with different feelings, religions and interests: and if we are going to be a united and prosperous people, I believe we can only be so by a strict adherence to the doctrine of provincial rights. Now, Sir, I wish at the outset to point out that I do not ask that either the language or the schools of the people in the North-West shall be in any way interfered with. When we speak about separate schools, we are apt to think of schools established by people of the Catholic faith; but if you look at the Act under which those schools were established, you will find that the same provision is made for every religious denomination; and is it not a fact that we have schools for at least four different religious denominations in the North-West, each one of which receives public support? Again, I say I have no intention whatever of interfering with either the separate schools or the language. All I ask is that the people of the North-West shall have the power to settle that matter, which rightfully belongs to them, for themselves. I may here say, Mr. Speaker, that I was one of those who opposed the establishment of separate schools in the Province of Ontario when that was first agitated, and I did it because I was in favour of a uniform public school system. I believe that it was for the advantage of the country that such a system should be established and maintained. However, when once the law gave permission for the establishment of separate schools, and when once they were established by law, from that day to this I have done, in my own humble way, everything that lay in my power to make those schools as efficient as possible. If they had to exist it was the part of good policy, the part of justice and right, to make them just as efficient as they could possibly be made. I am free to confess that the law has not worked the great harm in Ontario that was anticipated from it. I believe that in towns and cities it has done no harm at all; in the rural districts the only harm it has done has been that it has compelled the people to maintain two weak schools instead of one strong one; and in the public schools of Ontario, so far from the rights of any religious body being interfered with, those rights have been strictly respected, with the result that the majority of the children of Catholic parents in the Province of Ontario attend the public schools to-day. I know that it is objected that some religious denominations wish to have religious teaching in the public schools, and maintain that that can only be had from denominational school sections. Perhaps, Sir, I am not able sufficiently to appreciate that objection. Many members in this House know that I am one of those who do not believe that it is the duty of the state to teach religion at all—that that duty devolves upon the churches. Now, what I want to point out is that the public schools of our country are from the foundation to the

topmost stone altogether state institutions. The school section is formed under laws enacted by the state; the school-house is built by men amenable to the state; the money to pay for the building is collected by the state, and is paid over to the contractors by the state. The teachers in our public schools are men and women examined with regard to their fitness for the position by men appointed by the state, under rules prescribed by the state; they are appointed to their positions by the state, and their salaries are paid out of money collected by the state, under pains and penalties imposed by the state. So that from the top to the bottom our public schools are simply and solely state institutions; and holding, as I do, that it is not the duty of the state to teach religion, I am opposed to establishing a public school for that purpose by the state. Some may be inclined to ask if I am opposed to religious teaching altogether in the schools. Well, there is one form of it that you cannot prevent. I happen to have had opportunities of becoming acquainted with a great many of the teachers, both male and female, in our own Province of Ontario, and I say deliberately that I do not believe that a better class of men and women exists in the country; and if any one, man or woman, who accepts the position of public school teacher is under the influence of true religion, they will teach that religion whether they are compelled by the law to do it or not. They will teach it, not in dogmas or in set lessons given to the scholars, but they will teach it by giving good advice, by restraining the evil they see and encouraging the good, and, most strongly and most powerfully of all, by the example they will set to the scholars. Unfortunately, our teachers are not all of that class or character; and I ask hon. gentlemen here who have children, if there is a teacher in their section who scoffs or laughs at religion, whether they want such a teacher to teach religion to their children? If they do, I can only say for myself, Heaven save my children from such religious teaching. I have another objection to separate schools, and it has always been a very strong one, although you may, if you wish, call it a sentimental objection. I happen to have a few people of the Roman Catholic faith in my riding, and they happen to live in my own township and to be my own neighbours; and I say that no better neighbours any man need wish for—good, honest, upright people, ready to perform all the duties of neighbourhood and citizenship. I say again no better class of people could a man wish to live amongst. But the point I want to make is this. Their children are just as good as mine, and I hope mine are as good as theirs, and I do not want to see a wall of separation built up between them. I do not want the implication to exist that there is some disability, either on the one side or the other, or some reason why they should not associate together. I do not want it to be inferred that one side is, in some way or other, not the equal of the other, and that they cannot be allowed to grow up and be educated together. No; I want them to grow up together, to become acquainted with one another, to understand each other's feelings and aspirations, to be prepared, when they go out, to take their place in governing the country, to be able to see eye to eye, and to live together in harmony for the well-being of their common country. That is the strongest objection I have to separate schools. And now with regard to the question of dual languages. I wish to say at the outset that I have not the slightest sympathy with, but, on the contrary, hold in utter abomination the idea that it is the duty of the majority of this country to stamp out the language of the minority. That, I believe, would be neither good policy nor good statesmanship. Nor do I believe that mixed races are any source of weakness to the country. On the contrary, I consider them a source of strength. I need only point to the mother country, to Great Britain; and where, I ask, is there a country in which the people are of more mixed blood? Had the attempt been made which it was sought to make two or three years ago here, to stamp out in England the language and institutions of the conquered, would the English people occupy the place they do to-day? Suppose that Norman William, when he conquered the Anglo-Saxons, determined, as some very advanced legislators of the present day want to determine, that it was expedient, in the interests of the national unity of the country, that there should be unity of language among the people, and endeavoured to stamp out the Anglo-Saxon, do you think he would have succeeded? Norman William was not such a fool as to try it. He knew these things were under the operation of natural laws more potent than any human laws, and was perfectly willing to leave these laws to their own operation. And what is the result to-day? Why, the very language we use in this House and in which the majority of us express our views is not the language of any one people in the British Isles. As a learned philologist said, while the Anglo-Saxon may be considered as the foundation and the mortar that connects the fabric together, yet the fabric itself is built up of contributions from almost every language, ancient and modern; and if the attempt had been made to make any one of these languages permanent, do you think for a moment that Britain would have been the country she is to-day? I remember, two years ago, when my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) was speaking on this question, that he instanced the people in the north of Scotland as an example of the necessity for unity of language; and I may say here, and I think the House will agree with me, the great vigour, intellectual activity and the push and perseverance of the people of Great Britain to-day is largely due to the fact that they are a people of mixed blood. Any one who has studied the laws of heredity knows that the kingly men and queenly women have in all days been the result of the union of different but cognate races. We find it has had that effect in Great Britain and wherever else such a state of things has existed. The hon. member for North Bruce instanced the case of the highlanders of Scotland and the feuds which existed between them and the people of the lowlands, and he said if they had all spoken the one tongue these feuds would not have existed. Now, I have always a great respect for my hon. friend, because I know he is thoroughly honest, but I must take the liberty of differing from him in the conclusion he drew. I am very doubtful if any such result would have followed the speaking of the same language. Why, at that time when the bitterest feuds existed and the hottest fighting was going on between the two peoples, the very same thing was taking place between the south of Scotland and the north of England, where the people spoke the same tongue. But

suppose we grant for a moment that it would have been better had the people in the north of Scotland spoken the same language as the people in the lowlands, in the south of Scotland, could you have compelled them to do so? Suppose we had had then some very wise legislators, men of advanced liberal opinions, who thought it was expedient, in the interests of the national unity of the country, that there should be community of language among the people of Scotland, and suppose they had tried to compel these people in the north of Scotland to speak the language of the south, do you think for a moment they would have succeeded? I know something of these people, having lived amongst them all my days on most intimate terms with them, and I know that had you attempted anything of the sort, you would never have been successful. You might have cut them to pieces, inch by inch, you might have made a desert and called it peace, but you never could have compelled them to give up their language. And why should such an attempt ever be made with any people? Sir, it is a God-given birthright, the language a man or a woman speaks, the language they learned at their mother's knee; and no state or no man has the right to attempt to stamp it out. Are you to suppose for a moment that our French-speaking neighbours of the Province of Quebec and other parts of the Dominion are less tenacious of their national rights than the people of the north of Scotland? No, I believe that they feel as strongly the rights which they enjoy, that they have the same sentiments these people have, and will resist to the death every attempt to suppress their language. I believe it would be the most foolish, the most suicidal thing for the country, the most arbitrary thing any country ever attempted, to try to stamp out their language. I do not wish to detain the House any longer. I say again I believe it is the part of good statesmanship and sound policy to try and find a solution of this question, and I say that, if we are honestly desirous to do it, we can succeed. We have rather a difficult country here to govern, separated one part from the other by thousands of miles, with different interests to conciliate, different races to work with, different languages amongst us—all these things are, perhaps, hinderances in the way of governing the country, but I believe, when we meet these in an enlightened, honest and intelligent spirit, there is no danger that we shall not succeed. If we apply to others the golden rule to do to them what we wish to be done to ourselves, to put ourselves in their places, and to try to see how it would be if we looked at it from their standpoint, and to deal with them accordingly, it will make us a contented and a prosperous country.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sorry the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), when making this motion, has limited it as he has done. If the principles he has avowed in his speech are correct, his resolution does not bear out that speech, but is rather contradictory. I think that this clause in his resolution:

"Providing, however, that no school section, as at present constituted, shall be interfered with without the consent of the parties composing such section"—

is one which will lead to difficulties of very many kinds, that will cause legislation to be very difficult to enact and will defeat the very object he pro-

poses in the speech we have just listened to. I think the time has come in the North-West when they may safely be given all those powers which have been given to the Legislatures of the other provinces, and more especially with reference to this question of education. We have in those Territories a people who are certainly not inferior to their brethren in the other provinces of the Dominion. They are largely the pick of the older provinces, the enterprising young men who have gone from the other provinces, have built up homes there, intend to reside there, and during the few years they have been there have given exhibitions of energy and intelligence which are the pride and admiration of Canadians of every part of this Dominion. It is not right to limit the power of these men to regulate their local affairs, and the matters relating to education which every province in the Dominion exercises fully, barring those restrictions which have been placed upon those matters in Ontario and Quebec, restrictions which many of us in Ontario, not only Protestants, but many members of the Roman Catholic church, regret, that these separate schools have been established and confirmed in our province. The right to deal with education is one that the Confederation Act specifically gives to the various Local Legislatures. They are now laying the foundation of their educational system in the North-West. Powers that may be properly exercised some years hence may be a good deal more safely and properly given, I believe, to those Territories to-day. They are laying the foundations of their educational system, but if certain restrictions are placed upon their powers, then, after a larger population has gone in there and they have perhaps been established in separate provinces or given the complete powers of Local Legislatures, this question which might now be settled without difficulty, will cause discord and disunion as it is causing to-day in the Province of Manitoba. I think this Parliament at this time will be doing a wise act in handing over the complete powers in regard to education to the North-West Assembly. We need have no fear that the North-West Assembly will not legislate wisely and well. They are interested. We cannot say that we only have the interest of the North-West at heart. The men who are living there, who are devising schemes for the opening up of that country, have a deeper and more intelligent interest and a wider knowledge of these matters than we have here, representing every portion of the Dominion. We will therefore be doing our duty, we will have the blessings of people yet unborn, if we give the full powers in regard to educational matters to the Legislature of the North-West Territories. Then, with reference to the question of the language, two years ago we passed a resolution which was considered a compromise measure, but was endorsed very heartily by members of this House. That was brought into force by legislation during the last session. I think that legislation, though not going as far as I would wish to go myself, was in the right direction, and, as it was a compromise measure largely meeting the views of those who think as I do, it received no opposition from us. I think perhaps that clause might have been left as it was. It was a compromise, it was answering the purpose, because I think the question of the language under the recent legislation will solve

itself. If it is the interest of the people that it should survive, it will survive; if it is their interest in the North-West that it should die out and become obsolete, it will become obsolete, and I think that might have been allowed to stand on the Statute-book as it is now. But, in regard to the other matter, I feel more strongly than ever that we will be making a great mistake if we refuse now, when the opportunity occurs, to enact legislation in regard to education in the North-West Territories, which will settle difficulties which will otherwise inevitably arise, which will cause heart-burnings, trouble and disagreement in the North-West, and I, therefore, move that all the words after "That" in the motion be omitted and the following inserted :—

In the opinion of this House, the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories should be empowered to deal with all matters relating to education in the said Territories.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a few words upon this very important question. It has been several times before Parliament; on several occasions we have discussed the whole question with regard to the dual language in the North-West, and also in regard to separate schools. Now, for many years back the question of separate schools, not only in the North-West but in some of the Maritime Provinces, has caused a great deal of strife and bitterness, and has given considerable trouble to the Government, and to members of Parliament generally in dealing with it. For my part, had I been in the House at the time the North-West Act was passed, I do not think I would have given my sanction to a full-fledged system of separate schools being established in that country. My impression is that under the circumstances it was imprudent. At the same time, we know well that in Ontario where separate schools have been in existence for many years, the Catholic population of that province, as was stated by the hon. gentleman who moved this motion, have not taken advantage of that system in many cases, and we find that they are sending their children in increased numbers to the common schools. Now, I do not think that it is an easy matter to wipe out by law anything that was looked upon as a privilege by a certain class of the community; I have never read, in fact, where such a privilege has been abolished by arbitrary enactment of this kind. People belonging to the Catholic faith have certain conscientious convictions of their own; they claim that it is their right and their duty to give their children a certain amount of religious education in connection with secular education. I do not wish for a moment to challenge their convictions upon that point. The fact of the matter is, in my humble opinion, we are going too far at the present day, in our educational institutions, in the direction of secularism. I differ from my hon. friend who made this motion, in that I believe that if we had a little more religious instruction in our common schools, it would be better for our rising population. Now, with regard to those schools in the North-West, as I said before, it may possibly have been an error to encourage their establishment; at the same time, they are there. While I am willing to consent to the full exercise of all powers by any province that are duly exercised by other provinces, at the same time there is no rule without its exception, and if any exception at all should be made to this rule, it should be to protect the conscientious convictions of a minority. Now, these schools have been established there, and while I would have preferred to see a partly common school system established, I would rather a thousand times have separate schools than to drive out religious teaching altogether from these schools. I would favour such a curriculum in our common schools as would allow every class to take advantage of them. If our Catholic people object to their children attending such a school, I would rather a thousand times consent to separate schools than to abolish religious teaching altogether. That is my view with regard to separate schools. Now, I am quite willing, as I said before, to coax our Catholic friends out of the use of these schools, and to induce them to come in with the rest of the community and educate their children along with ours. If they are not willing, however, to do so, if they claim, as they have a right to do, the privilege of educating their children in their own schools and teaching them certain dogmas of their own church, I do not wish for a moment to deprive them of that right. I would claim that right myself, and am willing to accord it to them. Now, let us look at the condition of things in some of the states that have been referred to by my hon. friend. I think the school population of the State of New York is about 800,000 between the ages of five and sixteen. I have heard it stated on good authority that 200,000 of these children never attend a Sabbath school, never receive any religious instruction in the family, and, perhaps, never hear the word God mentioned unless in profanity. Now, these parents have no desire to send their children to a Sabbath school or to any place where they would get religious instruction. Would it not be a hundred times better if these children got a sprinkling of religious instruction in the common school rather than none at all? What a magnificent regiment for his Satanic Majesty to have such a large number of children in one state from among whom to get recruits for murderers, for thieves, for robbers and for suicides—for that is the result of a secular education, if we are to trust the public prints of the United States. I think it is better, in my opinion, that we should even consent to a separate school system than that we should have no religion taught in the schools at all. We have in the Province of Ontario, a model school system, which is lauded throughout the British Empire, and has been referred to in other countries as well. Those, even, who have differed with the men who established that system, have taken the opportunity on several occasions to praise our school system in Ontario. We have in that province separate schools; they are under the same inspection as our common schools. The teachers in those schools must receive their certificates at the hands of the same examiners as those who teach in the Protestant schools. They have got to conduct the schools much in the same way as the other schools are conducted; but they are allowed certain privileges in the teaching of the Catholic catechism, I presume, and other things that are recognized as necessary by the Catholic Church. That is about the only difference between the separate schools and the common schools, so far as I can learn. Now, we are getting along in the Province of Ontario without any particular friction. I know that in the town in which I live myself, there

was sometime ago a separate school, but there is none to-day. The reason is that the Catholic people in that section decided that their children would, perhaps, get a better education in our common schools; at least they decided to take advantage of the privileges that were offered them, and they have virtually dropped their separate schools and are now sending their children to our common schools, and I hear of no complaint. Now, I have not the slightest doubt that if an agitation had been got up in the Province of Ontario to take from these people the right to have separate schools, the probabilities are that we would have a separate school in my town to-day. Wherever you force by legislation people to part with a privilege, then you generally find they resent that action. I understand that in the Province of Nova Scotia there is no separate school system. I should like to know if separate schools are not established there? I am informed that such is the case. I raise no objection to giving the people that privilege if they want it. I think the people of Nova Scotia are acting wisely in given the Catholics that privilege if they ask for it as their conscientious right, because it is not right to trample on the concientious convictions of any class. A few words with respect to the dual language. My reason for voting for the Bill introduced by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was in order to reach the question of the dual language. I do not wish for one moment to interfere with the right of any man to use any language that is his birthright, that has been used by him from infancy. I do not think the remarks of the hon. member were at all in point on this question. I do not think it was the intention of the hon. member for North Simcoe in his Bill to declare that no man should be allowed to speak French; I think the only intention was to prevent the necessity of having all proceedings published in French and English. I have been led to understand that this is the law now. For example, if a subpœna was issued to a man, under the present terms of the North-West Act he would have the right to demand that it be served on him printed in English and French. I do not think that is necessary. There are only 1,500 people in the North-West whose language is French. For the sake of that number, I do not think it is right that we should be put to the expense of printing the entire proceedings of the North-West Council and all legal documents both in English and French. Moreover, very great difficulty might arise sometimes. If we permit the proceedings in court to be conducted in either language, I can easily imagine that a lawyer might commence to address an English jury in the French language, and it would be very awkward if they did not understand what he said. I do not think it is necessary that we should continue that system. While I am willing to allow the people in the North-West the right to use their own language in their own families, and the right to have interpreters in court if they cannot speak English, it is absurd to continue the present condition of things and publish all proceedings in the North-West Council in both languages when there is such a very limited French population there. When the North-West Act was passed it was perhaps thought that there might be a very large influx of population from the Province of Quebec or from France itself, but this has not proved to be the case, and in fact a great many of the people from Quebec go across to the United States instead of to our Canadian North-West. If the French-Canadians poured in in very large numbers and claimed the right to use their language in the courts and in general proceedings, I would not deny it to them, but to go to this expense for the sake of 1,500 people is absurd. For this reason, I am willing to vote to eliminate the French language, and at the same time I am ready to grant the North-West every provincial right to which the people are fairly entitled. But in regard to the proposal to abolish schools which have been established there, and maintained by people who may have gone there for the purpose of taking advantage of them, I cannot consent to wipe out these schools by a majority vote unless the people were disposed to part with the privilege they now enjoy. Of course we have Protestant schools of several denominations there. I believe there are Methodist schools, and I understand a deputation came down here and waited on the Government for the purpose of obtaining a grant for a school, perhaps for an Indian school. There are also Presbyterian and Baptist schools. It is not necessary that all these different schools should exist. There is no conscientious conviction on the part of the Presbyterian which forbids him sending his child to either Methodist or Baptist schools. I think all the Protestant denominations can well unite on the common school system in the North-West. I am satisfied we can do that as well there as in the Province of Ontario. I would endeavour to make the system as acceptable as possible to our Catholic friends, in the hope that they will take advantage of it instead of persisting in opening separate schools; but to pass legislation to give the majority power to compel the Catholics to avail themselves of this system is not a proper mode of reaching the desired end, and I do not think the end desired by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) will be gained in this way. These are my views with respect to separate schools, and also with respect to the dual language.

Mr. DEVLIN. I have listened, with considerable amazement, to the doctrine which has been given to the House by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. To be perfectly candid, I must say that I could not understand altogether what the hon. gentleman stated. He spoke on the question of education in the North-West, and he gave his own views. But the hon. gentleman does not seem to understand that this, in the Catholic faith, is a matter of principle. The hon. member for West Middlesex introduced a motion and said at the beginning of his remarks that he did not want to interfere with the French language or the separate school system in the North-West. As he warmed up and proceeded with the subject he soon did away with the separate school system there. He said that there had been opposition also to the system of separate schools being introduced into the Province of Ontario. I ask the hon. gentleman how, having had an experience of the system of separate schools in Ontario, he has any more reason than his fellow-citizens of that province to feel dissatisfied with the result of the experience of these schools? Only a few years ago a battle was waged in Ontario on the lines of this question, and we well remember the cries then put for-

ward. We well remember the arguments used in order to defeat what to-day is a benefit in this province, as well as in the Province of Quebec, the separate school system, and no doubt the hon. gentleman on that occasion was obliged to confess that the separate school system in Ontario was a success. At all events, if he did not by his speech and vote make that confession, I am happy to say that the Protestant population of the greatest province of this Dominion declared that the separate school system of Ontario was a success. The hon. gentleman wants no religious teaching in the schools. What does he want? Does he invite the godless school? He has to choose between the religious school and the godless school. If he wants the religious school, believing in his own views, he will want the Protestant school. If he does not want the religious school, he is confronted with the godless school; and as this is a religious country and we have to deal with christian people, I think they will not have the godless school. We know what has been the experience of the godless school in more than one country. We know that the godless school and godless philosophy did about as much mischief during the last century in the old world as war, pestilence and famine. It must be understood that with us as Catholics it is a principle that we must have our Catholic schools. We are face to face with that problem. If the hon. gentleman wants the religious school and the Protestant school, we have no objections to offer. The Protestant is proud of his faith. He is ready to defend it against all attacks, he is ready on all occasions to stand up for it, and he would scorn us, and justly too, if we were to interfere with his rights. Why not let it be done to us as we are willing it should be done to them? Do we interfere with their rights? Look at things as they exist in the Province of Quebec. There, Sir, and proud I feel to say it, the minority is treated with justice, and is treated more liberally than even the minority in the Province of Ontario, since grants are made in Quebec for the cause of superior education which are not made in the Province of Ontario. Will the hon. gentleman, after the experience we have had in the Province of Quebec of these separate schools, say that the system is a failure? The late Hon. Thomas White, if I remember well, himself admitted that the minority was treated with exceptional fairness, and Sir William Dawson, President of McGill University, who was at least as good a champion of Protestantism, and at least as sturdy and solid an exponent of Protestant thought as the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), or as the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace), or as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), was also ready to confess that the Protestants of the Province of Quebec had nothing to complain of, and had in fact received the fullest measure of justice from their Catholic fellow-countrymen. We have already since the beginning of this session voted large sums of money to open up the North-West Territories. What does the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) propose by his motion, and what does the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) propose by his amendment? The latter proposes to tell the Catholic people of the Province of Quebec that to the North-West they must not go. That is his proposal.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, no.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. member for Wellington says "no, no." What does he understand in the matter? The proposal of this motion, and of this amendment is to tell Catholics, that in the North-West Territories the same law will be invoked in a year or two as was applied by Mr. Greenway in the Province of Manitoba, and will it be contended for a moment that that act of administration on the part of Mr. Greenway has promoted increase of population or increase of good feeling among the people of Manitoba? That law is yet before the courts. A decision has been rendered against it here in the Supreme Court, and I express the hope that that decision will be confirmed by the Privy Council in England, and that fair-play will be extended to the Catholic population of Manitoba. Sir, adopt this motion before the House, pass a law denying to the Catholic population of the North-West the schools which they ask, and to which they are entitled, and you will tell the Catholic people in every province of this Dominion, that to the North-West they must not go, because steps have been taken to prevent them living there. You go across the ocean and you ask for your immigrants for this country. You expend large sums of money to bring them here; but, Sir, if you adopt this motion, you will refuse to our young men of the Province of Quebec the right of entering into these Territories. What right have we to do these things? To our Catholic people that great domain was given by Providence just as much as it was to any other portion of the population of Canada. I shall certainly vote against the proposal of the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong); I shall certainly with pride and happiness vote against the amendment proposed by the member for West York (Mr. Wallace), because I believe in conscience that because I am a Catholic I should no more be trampled upon, than my rights should be no more sacrificed, and my privileges should be respected as much as those of any other man of any religion in this Dominion. I know, Sir, that there has been charged against me in connection with the motion I am about to make, that because the other day I voted against the Bill introduced by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I am not in favour of Canadian Home Rule. It is false. It is not the case.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss a motion that is not before the House.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am not discussing it, Mr. Speaker. I am just putting myself right with regard to the statement that has been made against me in connection with my vote against the motion introduced the other day by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Well, Sir, all I ask for my co-religionists in the North-West is the same treatment which is accorded to the Protestants of the Province of Quebec, and which the Catholics of the Province of Ontario enjoy. I believe that by voting down the motions which are presently before the House we will be acting in the interests of the honour and the peace of Canada, and I believe, furthermore, that by following out this course we will be laying the foundations of making the North-West contented, of making it the seat in future of

large cities and large centres of population, where the tiller of the soil may work peacefully, successfully with honour and advantage to our common country.

Mr. SCRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say first, Sir, that you were in error in naming me as the seconder of the motion now before the House. I did not consent to second the motion, but I did not dissent from your connecting my name with it because of my desire to be courteous to my neighbour, the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong). I am not in favour of this motion in all its details. So far as the part relating to the dual language is concerned it expresses my views; views which I took the liberty of giving to the House when the motion relating to that question was before us at a previous session of this House. I then expressed my sympathy with the motion of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), which was to the effect that the question of languages should be left to the decision of the people of the Territories; but so far as the question of separate schools is concerned I take a somewhat different view. Allusion has been made by several hon. gentlemen to the position held by the Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec in relation to their school system. I am one of that Protestant minority, and I am here to express my concurrence in the statement already made, that the Protestant minority in that province has been treated since Confederation, with perfect fairness and with full liberality by the Roman Catholic majority. The Protestants of that province could not live there were they not accorded the privileges in regard to the education of their children which they now enjoy. Holding the views which Roman Catholics do conscientiously hold, and they being largely in the majority, if we had a common school system there, and but one school where all religious tenets would be taught, the Protestants would not and could not possibly accept it. This being the case, and it being the fact that we have been, as I have said, treated with perfect fairness and perfect liberality in the Province of Quebec, I do not see how Protestants, taking a proper view of this question, can fail to consent to extend to their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens the same privileges which they enjoy themselves. I cannot give my support to a proposition which would deprive the Roman Catholic population of the North-West from the enjoyment of the privileges which the Protestants of the Province of Quebec have enjoyed and do enjoy, and I believe will continue to enjoy in the future. I cannot consent to give my support to a motion which at some time or other—if it would not have that immediate effect—would compel the Roman Catholics of the North-West to either allow their children to grow up in ignorance, or to send them to schools which it would be a violation of their religious convictions to send them to. Therefore, I am opposed to a portion of the motion of my hon. friend from South Middlesex, and I am also opposed to the amendment moved by the hon. member for West York.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I wish to say just one word upon this question. Two years ago, when the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) introduced a Bill in regard to separate schools and the dual languages, my intention was to vote for the Bill. Afterwards an amendment was adopted, which I called a compromising amendment, and against which I voted, and the Bill was not reached to vote on. I said then, as I say now, that this is a question which the Parliament of Canada must face, either to-day or some day in the near future, and we might as well look it fairly and squarely in the face, and decide now what is best to be done. The North-West Territories will soon be a province. They have now very largely the powers of a province. The people who live in the Territories have gone there for the purpose of working out their future destiny, and making the very best they can of the circumstances in which they are placed; and I think we would be derelict in our duty if we did not give them control over their own affairs, and say to them: You can have separate schools if you please, or a national school system if you please, and you can have both languages if you please, or only one—decide for yourselves. That is a question which this Parliament must face; and I cannot, for the life of me, understand how those who have been for years talking of provincial rights, and declaring that the provinces should have full and complete control over matters of a local character, can vote against giving the people of the North-West power to say what form of language or what kind of schools they will have. If their future is to be in their own hands, they must have power to work out that future; but if we place burdens upon them, I think there will be in the future a great deal more trouble excited by these questions than there is at the present time. Therefore the sooner we put the question right the better. At present the country is new, there are not a great many people there, and the majority will be disposed to be fair to the minority. They might consider it in their interest to continue the present condition of affairs; but if the majority should decide against separate schools or the dual languages, then the responsibility will rest upon that majority, and will be taken from our shoulders; and these sectarian questions, which cause so much irritation and unpleasant feeling, will be removed from this Parliament. I am satisfied that the Roman Catholics in the North-West will have nothing to complain of if we take this course, for I believe that the majority there will be just as favourable to giving them their rights as the majority in this Parliament. That is the reason which leads me to favour the amendment which has been moved; and while I support that amendment, I say to the people of the North-West: This is a question entirely of a local character which you have to settle; on your shoulders rests the responsibility of working out your own destiny, and you have the right to say whether you will have separate schools and the dual languages or not. I hold that that is the fair way to dispose of this question, and I feel assured, though I am not a prophet nor the son of one, that the members of this House will have to come to that conclusion before they are five years older.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would not be disposed to interpose at this stage of the debate but for the fact that, owing to the order passed on Friday last, this discussion must come to a vote before six o'clock to-day, as it cannot be resumed this session.

Mr. LAURIER. Oh, yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thought there was an intimation given by the hon. leader of the House that the remnant of this day which is left to us is to be taken from us. Well, Sir, I agree most heartily with the sentiment that has fallen from the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, a sentiment which found utterance in the beginning of this debate, in the speech of the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution—that this matter must be faced, that it will not down; and it is in the interest of all of us, seeing how unfortunately the question excites both racial and religious feelings and prejudices, that at the earliest possible moment we should face it, deal with it, and determine it. Now, we have given to the North-West Assembly already very large powers. With the exception, perhaps, of the control of money, which I hope at an early day will also be granted to them, they have almost all the powers of a provincial assembly. That being so, those who in this House have declared that they are not to have the full power and control in the matter of education, have at least the responsibility resting upon them of showing why the authority of the North-West Assembly should be limited in that regard. We know perfectly well that it is in accordance with the spirit of the federal system under which this Dominion is governed, that the subject of education is one of local concern; and while I do not go the length, and have never gone the length of saying that in no case, in the general interest of the Dominion, should this Parliament or this Government interfere in matters which in a narrow sense are of local concern, I hold as strongly as any hon. member on the floor of this Parliament that in ordinary cases, within the scope of our legislation, local matters should be dealt with by the local bodies and the local assemblies. Now, Sir, if that be accepted as a preliminary doctrine, I want to know why it is that in the matter of education this Parliament undertakes to say that the North-West Assembly shall not have the full control? I want to know why it was that years and years ago, long before the North-West was settled, this House enacted as one of the organic laws regulating to the North-West Territories that they should not have full, absolute and unlimited power in the matter of education? I have never heard any answer given to that question. I have never heard any suggestion offered why it was that the North-West should not have the same liberty that the other provinces have, all except the Province of Ontario and Province of Quebec; and we know the special reason which existed in the case of those provinces. I have heard it said, forsooth: Wait till we grant them full autonomy; wait till we create different provinces in the North-West; and when we create different provinces there, and endow them with full provincial powers, then it will be time enough to give them full authority to deal with education. Why should you deny them the right to consider and to deal with the question of education? I can perfectly well understand the feelings which actuate my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. I respect their feelings and views; and if it were advisable in this country to give effect to their views, I should not be heard saying anything against them. But I am unable to see the fair-play on the part of Roman Catholics, who believe, and I respect their belief, that no education is complete unless accompanied by religious teaching, in denying to the other religious bodies, many of whom hold the same views, equal justice in that regard.

Mr. AMYOT. We do not deny to Protestants the right to have separate schools.

Mr. McCARTHY. Practically you do. Take the Province of Ontario. There is a public school system there and a separate school system for the Roman Catholics. Now take the Protestants of my church, many of whom would desire to see their children taught in their schools the tenets of their faith as the Roman Catholics are taught theirs in the separate schools; they are not given the privilege of having separate schools. However, I do not desire to enter into a discussion of that here, but, speaking for my own province, I must say I would like to see the power given that province to deal with the school question as other provinces deal with it; and should the majority in that province think it would be better that we should have a system of education free altogether from religious teaching, I should desire their view should prevail. I respect the views put forward by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and realize that there is a great deal in what he has said with regard to secular education, but I hold that the provinces should be allowed to work out this matter for themselves. They are the parties most competent to deal with it; and I would like to know why it is this Parliament undertakes to say to the people of the North-West that in any ordinance they may make regarding education, they must always enact there may be a separate school in every locality in that country. I think the burden of proof is upon those who desire to control the power of the people of the North-West in that direction, and I am prepared to listen with every attention to any argument in support of that restriction and limitation. Therefore I am in favour of the motion the hon. gentleman has brought forward, that power should be given the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories to deal with all matters pertaining to education, but am not in favour of his limitation that no school section shall be interfered with without the consent of the parties composing it. It is an insult to the North-West to say to them: You must keep perpetually these schools, scattered here and there, as separate schools unless the particular locality consents to the legislative body dealing with the matter. Let us trust them, let us give them full power to deal with the matter themselves. If the hon. gentleman is sincere in his views of provincial rights, he will not have any reason for regretting the trust he will repose in the people of the North-West in this or any other respect. I did not move in this matter when I brought forward the question of dual language two years ago, and the reason I did not was this: I have not altered my opinions in the slightest respecting it, but I felt we ought to have an appeal from the people of the North-West, I felt that we ought to have a representation from their Assembly before interfering in a matter which I believe to be so absolutely of local concern. If they were satisfied with the law as it exists, it would be unnecessary and mischievous to bring forward any motion in this Parliament respecting it. But we know that they have petitioned this House to free them from the restrictious imposed, and give them power to deal with the school system as they

think proper. This has been twice represented here, once in the form of a petition and again in the form of a resolution by which the people of the North-West desires to remind the Parliament of Canada that they already asked for interference in that regard. When we reflect that the people of the North-West are rapidly attaining the position, as regard population, of some of our smaller provinces, I ask the members from Prince Edward Island: On what grounds do you venture to say to the people of the North-West that they are not as competent to deal with this school question as you are? I ask my hon. friends from British Columbia why they are not willing to allow the people of the North-West to deal with their own schools. In all probability, in the next ten years, the people of the North-West will outnumber both the provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, which, I do not suppose, would be willing to part with their power as regards education, or consider any interference with it by this Parliament as other than a gross outrage on their liberties and rights, yet they are unwilling that the North-West Territories should have the same right. It is not necessary for me to discuss the question in any other respect. I do not presume to say what the people of the North-West will do, but all I ask for them is liberty to do what they consider is proper and right. I do not enter into the discussion as to whether there ought or ought not to be separate schools. I think, to say the least, it would be injudicious to bring on the floor of Parliament a discussion as to the merits of either system; but I want the House to understand that as long as that enactment remains on the Statute-book, so long do we compel the North-West to have separate schools. I want every member to realize the responsibility that he is taking in that regard. In his own province he may be content there should be no separate schools; but when dealing with the North-West, where there is no large population, and from which there is no large representation here, he considers this question as a matter of no consequence. But he is responsible to the whole people for saying there should be separate schools there, although he must admit this is a matter with which it would be far better to leave the local authorities to deal. Now, as to the question of dual language, I do not accept the advice put forward by any of the hon. gentlemen who so far have addressed us. I trust I have grown wiser a little since my last effort, and I do not desire to excite, in this discussion, the same feelings that were aroused on a former occasion. Not that I do not hold as strongly to the views I held then, not that I do not think it would be in the interests of all the people of this Dominion if we spoke the one language and believed in the one theory of government, and so on. I do not at all retract my opinion in that regard; but I quite realize this, that my hon. friends from Quebec took the motion I made, which did not name the Province of Quebec but only affected the North-West Territories, as an attack upon what they regard as an institution they pride themselves upon possessing in that province. We are dealing now with the North-West, with that great country which, before many years, will overshadow the eastern part of the Dominion, with this territory which, before many years, will be the heart of the Dominion of Canada, and we are laying the foundations there of several great states. Now, is there an hon. gentleman in Parliament who believes that, if he had to formulate a constitution for that country, he would lay down as a part of its laws, as the foundation of its existence, that the people should speak two separate tongues? That is the problem we have to deal with there. It is not the question of the Province of Quebec. It is not the rights that have grown up in regard to the Province of Quebec, but we are now dealing with another part of the great Dominion of Canada, and what I want to know is, is it wise or prudent or statesmanlike that we should, in establishing the North-West Territories, at once say there are to be two races holding an equality before the law and that we desire not their assimilation, not their amalgamation, but their perpetuation as two distinctive races, just as they are unfortunately in the Province of Quebec at the present moment. I am not dealing at all with the loyalty of the French Canadian. I am not dealing from that point of view, but I am simply dealing with the wisdom or prudence of our saying that, in a country where it is the interest of all that we should be united and should form one nationality, we should lay down the rule that there shall be two languages and consequently the two racial distinctions and the cleavage which has existed unhappily in other parts of this Dominion.

Mr. AMYOT. Unhappily?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I say to my hon. friend, unhappily. I think he will agree with me, not least amongst the hon. gentlemen who share his views, that it would be better for all of us if we all spoke English or if we all spoke French.

Mr. AMYOT. Let all speak French.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. En Français.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend has me at a disadvantage there. I think my hon. friends, if they thought this matter out for themselves, if they did not allow themslves to be swayed by their passions, would think as I do. The proposition which I intend to submit to the House as an amendment to the resolution is in accordance with the view that we here should deal with this question of language. It is not a matter of local concern that Germans, for instance, should go into our provinces and decide that the German tongue should hold sway. Surely no one will say that a matter of that kind partakes of local concern. I repeat what I have said on other occasions that, if there is anything more important than another in the formation of national character, it is the question of language, and that is a question for this Parliament, having assumed the position of the mother of several states. We are establishing states in the North-West, and in that sense we are an imperial power, and it is for us to say, and we have in fact said, that, with the exception of the Province of Quebec, when we got our charter, the English language was to be the language of the people of this country. We have said in the Province of Quebec both languages might prevail. We said in this Parliament, at that time largely represented by a large proportion relatively of the French Canadian race, that the two languages should hold equal rank, but with regard to the other Provinces, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, British Columbia when she afterwards came in, and Prince Edward Island, there is no such rule existing, and as the

foundation of our system we have it that the English tongue is to prevail. Then why have the two languages in the North-West, and least of all why have them in the way in which they are left by the so-called compromise amendment? Formerly it was permitted to the people in their Legislative Assembly to speak in both languages. It was enacted that the records of that Assembly should be recorded in both languages, that the proceedings of the court should be in both languages, and that the laws should be published in both languages. A so-called compromise was made, but whom was the compromise made between? Perhaps my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition could tell, perhaps my hon. friends on this side could tell also; but did any person making that compromise represent or profess to represent the North-West? There is my hon. friend, for instance, from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Is that part of the bargain he made on behalf of the North-West? The political leaders on either side of the House, anxious to get rid of a difficult question, politically speaking, thought this was a compromise which might be agreed upon, but I should like to know who were the parties who made that compromise, and why it should be regarded as sacred? What does it effect? What benefit has been derived from the compromise? We gave the people of the North-West power to say they should not speak both languages in the Legislative Assembly? What do they do? Like practical men they said: You can speak in any language you please, and, if one or two gentlemen there who speak French are fools enough to address in that language the great body who speak English, they will soon drop that, finding that they would take nothing by their eloquence. As to their proceedings, however, they are only to be recorded in one language. There again as practical men—and it shows what practical men will do—they say the mischief is not in the language in which the people speak, because no one pretends that there should be any interference with the sacred right of speaking in any language a man chooses, but in pursuing in our system a duality of language, if we believe, as I believe, that it is against the best interests of our political system. Then they dealt with it as practical men and said the proceedings of the Assembly should only be recorded in one tongue, and that is English. But we did not settle the question. The mischief to be got rid of, the difficulty to be obviated is not because a few people there speak French, but because we are encouraging in the North-West a system of duality of race by holding out the two languages as taking equal rank and holding equal sway in all proceedings. Then take the courts. One of the hon. gentlemen pointed out the practical mischief which arose from having the two languages in the courts, and there is a great deal to be said as to the practical view of the matter. But I am dealing with it on higher grounds. I am not dealing with this from any antipathy to any race in this Dominion, but on the higher ground that it is to the interest of us all to prevent any question of that kind arising in the future, and to have it perfectly understood at the outset that the English tongue is the language of the people of this Dominion. It is better for all parties to realize that at the earliest moment. Why should the subject be remitted to the people of the North-West? If I merely looked at this from the practical point of view, it would not make the slightest difference. If we give the North-West Assembly the power suggested by this resolution, they will decidedly exercise that power and repeal that law, but why should we hand that over to them? We are responsible here for imposing that law; surely we are the proper parties here, if we believe it is not right, to remove it. Why should we cast that as a bone of contention among the people of the North-West? Why should not this Parliament, treating it as a matter of imperial importance, in the sense in which I use that term, remove from the Statute-book that law which this Parliament so unnecessarily put upon it, and do away with the distinction which exists in regard to the North-West and not in regard to any of the rest of the Dominion, that there are to be the two languages there? Without occupying the time of the House upon a subject in regard to which my views are pretty well known, I desire to move an amendment in order to put my views on record in a formal way. I accept what my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) has moved as far as the schools are concerned. I do not accept either the motion or the amendment, so far as the language is concerned. I say that here is the proper place for us to settle this question of language, and therefore I move:—

That all after the word "That," in the original motion and the proposed amendment, be erased, and that the following be substituted instead therefor:—

"It is expedient that the limitation and restriction upon the authority of the Assembly of the North-West Territories in the matter of education, and the enactments respecting the use of the French language in the courts and the compulsory publication of its ordinances in that tongue, should be repealed."

It will be seen that I move simply that the restriction should be repealed, leaving with them the power which they have now on the subject of education, as it stands to-day, but that on the subject of language, that enactment shall be eliminated from our Statute-book.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not my purpose to support any one of the motions in your hands. I shall endeavour to address myself to the observations with which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) closed his speech. The hon. gentleman has expressed himself as holding the doctrine enunciated by him two years ago in this House. Sir, I entertain to-day the same views I expressed then, and for the same reasons that I opposed this proposition then, I oppose the proposition which he now submits. The hon. gentleman has said that the question of the dual language in the North-West Territories is a national question, whereas the establishment of public schools is purely a local matter; and he is in favour of what he calls the principle of Local Government in the Territories, but he is in favour at the same time of disregarding that principle so far as the use of the French language in the Territories is concerned. Now, Sir, we may learn something from what has transpired elsewhere where the people are of different nationalities. The hon. gentleman is of the opinion that it is highly desirable there should be no language spoken in this country but one, and in his opinion it would be best if that language were the English language; but it would be better that we should all speak French than that some of us should speak French and some English. I do not hold to that view at all. I am dis-

posed to maintain my rights to speak the English tongue, whether in Parliament or out of Parliament, and I am disposed to concede to my French fellow-countrymen the same privilege that I claim for myself, of expressing themselves in that language which they believe will best serve the purpose of conveying their thoughts and presenting their views on all questions, whether those questions be public or private. The hon. gentleman ought to remember that we have in Canada upwards of one million people who speak the French language. They have in Great Britain upwards of one million people who speak the Welsh, and they have been in contact with an English-speaking population out of all proportion larger than the English population as compared with the French in Canada; yet after a period of several hundred years, the people within the limits of Wales still speak the Welsh language, and the Welsh language is used in all local matters, whether they relate to political or social affairs, in a more marked degree than it was used a hundred years ago. If we look at our neighbours across the border we find that when Louisiana was acquired by the United States, the French language was spoken, and the Government so far from interfering with the use of the French, allowed the people to speak either, as they saw proper, and it is only some 12 or 15 years ago that the French language ceased to be used as a public language in the State of Louisiana. If we look, again, at the territory that was acquired from Mexico in 1844, and a portion of which was converted into the State of California, we find that the Spanish language was spoken in the southern part of the state and used as an official language amongst that section of the population that could only speak Spanish, until, I think, 1876. And when you go into some of the northern states to-day, where the population is largely Norwegian, I believe that the Norwegian language is spoken in the schools, that Norwegian teachers are employed, and that Norwegian books are used, simply because the children have but a short period of time to spend in the public schools, and unless they are permitted to do that, the recent comers from the northern portion of Europe would be unable to give their children an effective education at all. Now, the people of the United States have so far proceeded upon the assumption that the question of the unification of the population and their use of their own language, or of the English language, is a matter which will regulate itself if it is left alone. I have no doubt that that will be the case with regard to the North-West Territories. If there is a large influx of French population there from the Province of Quebec, they will carry the French language with them, and it will be perpetuated for an indefinite period. If but a small number go, and if they diffuse themselves among the other portions of the population, then they will, in the course of a few years, cease to speak French, because the use of a language is a matter of convenience, and whether the people use the one or the other, will depend entirely upon the solution that convenience gives to the question. I should think that Canada has difficulties enough without undertaking to put forward any active exertion, as it seems to me is being done here, for the purpose of creating new, or of reviving old difficulties. So far as the North-West Territories are concerned, if you were to provoke a contest between two-fifths of the population and the other three-fifths over the subject of language, I do not think you would do much to promote immigration into the North-West Territories; on the contrary every effort put forward in that direction would lead to strife, and to the division of the country on the basis of race, and serious mischiefs would ensue, because you would neutralize the energies of the population by directing them into abnormal and perverted channels. I am not going to say more on the subject of language. I do not think it is a matter calling for very much discussion. I believe the experience of civilized men everywhere has been the same, that this is a question with which no Government can effectually deal, and every attempt to deal with it will only effect serious injury on the population. I should like to know what has been held out to every person where civilization exists to-day as one of the strongest evidences of the despotism, of the barbarism of Russia, but her treatment of Poland, her attempt to force the Russian language on the Polish people. And when England a few years ago entered into a discussion with Denmark to prevent a conflict between Denmark on the one side and Austria and Prussia on the other, she pressed on the Government of Denmark not to attempt to force the use of the Danish language on those provinces in which the German language was spoken, and they pointed out in that correspondence what an unfavourable impression on the public mind of the world Denmark would make if she undertook to deal with her subjects in Schleswig-Holstein in the way she had attempted. That is not simply the opinion of Great Britain alone. It is the opinion on which civilized men and statesmen have acted everywhere except where despotic government exists, as that which exists in Russia. But I pass away from this subject of language, because there are a number of hon. gentlemen who are interested in the question, and I have no doubt it will be discussed by them, and I turn my attention, and I invite the attention of the House, to the view which has been expressed on sovereign rights, the rights of self-government, by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), as applying to the people of the North-West Territories. Let us look for a moment at the subject of the British North America Act. Those people as a community have had no voice in the distribution of power, no saying as to what powers should be allotted to the Federal Government or what powers should be allotted to the Governments of the different provinces. That is a question which was settled not by them, but a question that was settled for them. It was the public men who took part in the formation of the constitution who determined that question, not merely for the provinces which as corporations under the British North America Act were united, but for all those political corporations that became provinces under the Act for all time to come. I do not understand this doctrine of sovereign rights, of local self-government as it has been put forward by the hon. gentleman. I understand that where a central Government holds a large extent of territory on its own account over which it exercised sovereign jurisdiction, it determines not merely what shall be the extent of its own authority, but it determines all questions of general policy in the constitution of the union between itself and the provinces. Let us look, for instance, at the question as shown in the history of the United States. For instance, the

constitution of the United States was not framed by 40 states; it was framed by 13. All the states that came in subsequently had no voice in determining the extent of their local authority; they had it determined for them. It was determined by those who first instituted the Government. If you adopt the other view, that put forward by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), you would have no such thing as a permanent government at all. Why should the people who are rotting in the churchyards of the Province of Ontario and in the Province of Quebec, who framed the constitution 30 years ago, determine for us what these constitutions shall be? There is such a thing as continuity in government, and the people who go into a territory go there with the understanding that the character of the Local Government, subject to the provisions of the constitution, shall be such as the central Government, that exercises the sovereign authority in the first instance, shall determine for it. That is as I understand the constitution. That is the doctrine recognized in the constitution of the neighbouring republic. What does that constitution say? It says that each state shall have a republican form of government. Can the state determine that the government shall be some other form? Can the state determine to adopt a form of government incompatible with the constitution? No. The powers of the state depend on the constitution given by the original thirteen states. They made the constitution in the first instance, and the other states that have come in subsequently took that constitution in accordance with those provisions, subject to be altered only in the way the constitution, as framed by the original thirteen states or by the people of those states, provides. I hold in my hand Mr. Cooley's book on "The American Constitution," and I wish to read a paragraph from that work with respect to the jurisdiction of the United States over the government of the territories, and hon. gentlemen will see that this doctrine of squatter's sovereignty which has been put forward here to-day has never found a place in the government of the territories of the United States—or at all events it found a place but for a moment of time, which led to a civil war, and which was superseded by the results of that war. The Government of the United States have power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territories. That is the power we possess. That is the power which we used when we formed the North-West Territories. How far we should retain the government in our hands, how far we should entrust the government to the people of the territories was a matter of expediency, a matter to be determined by experience and by local circumstances. If this doctrine is to be applied to a territory, it is equally applicable to a municipality, and yet we do not recognize it with respect to any municipality. In a province, is a city, or township, or town permitted to determine the extent of its own power or the character of its municipal institutions for itself? Can we determine for each city, town or township these powers? Let us see what is said on this matter by Mr. Cooley. He says:

"It is no doubt most consistent with the general theory of republican institutions that the people everywhere should be allowed self-government; but it has never been deemed a matter of right that a local community should be suffered to lay the foundation of institutions, and erect a structure of government thereon, without the guidance and restraint of a superior authority. Even in the older states, where society is most homogeneous and has fewest of the elements of disquiet and disorder, the state reserves to itself the right to shape municipal institutions; and towns and cities are only formed under its direction, and according to the rules, and within the limits the state prescribes. With still less reason could the settlers in new territories be suffered to exercise sovereign powers. The practice of the Government, originating before the adoption of the constitution, has been for Congress to establish governments for the territories; and whether the jurisdiction over the district has been acquired from the states, or by treaty with a foreign power, Congress has unquestionably full power to govern it, and the people, except as Congress shall provide therefor, are not of right entitled to participate in political authority, until the territory becomes a state. Meanwhile they are in a condition of temporary pupilage and dependence; and while Congress will be expected to recognize the principle of self-government to such extent as may seem wise, its discretion alone can constitute the measure by which the participation of the people can be determined."

That is the American rule. It is the rule which experience points out to be necessary. These hon. gentlemen insist that before the territory possesses any of these organic elements which are necessary to the constitution of a province and a successful working of parliamentary government, that it shall have all the rights and powers of a province. Experience in the neighbouring republic has not induced them to possess that view. Their experience has been much longer than ours, and I think it would be a great mistake on our part to adopt any view like that. Some hon. gentlemen have said here, that this is a question of state rights, and they have referred to the question of state rights that was settled by the civil war in the neighbouring republic. Why, Sir, there is no question of state rights here, and there is no party advocating anything approaching the doctrine of state rights in Canada. The doctrine of state rights in the United States was that each state is sovereign; not sovereign simply as to the extent of its authority, but absolutely sovereign over all the powers vested in either Congress or the state. It was said that Congress was simply an assembly of ambassadors acting under instructions from the sovereign state, and that the state being sovereign had a right to insist upon withdrawal, just the same as if the great sovereign powers of Europe were represented in a congress of ambassadors, and were not satisfied with what was being done, they could instruct their representatives to withdraw and to repudiate the whole arrangement. That is a doctrine that has never found support in the courts of the United States, or by a majority in the Congress of the United States; and the men anxious for the perpetuation of slavery were in favour of such a doctrine. I would like to know whether any hon. gentleman would say that the Territories should have the right, in the exercise of self-government, to establish slavery? Would a territory in the exercise of its right of self-government have a right to admit the Mormon population from Utah? Suppose you had a majority of people coming to a territory from the State of Utah, who insisted upon legalizing polygamy, would you permit them to exercise that power and to legislate with regard to domestic matters of that kind? Of course you would not. You would repudiate such a claim at once, and you would say that such a power would be beyond the limits of the local constitution. You would not listen for a moment to the proposition, that these people, not having been parties to the original compact, were not bound by it, and before they came in they had a right to

discuss the question how much of the British North America Act they would recognize as binding upon them. The people of this Dominion sitting here, as a matter of public policy will determine how far they will recognize the principle of separate schools and how far they will not, in the establishment of governments in the Territories. A few years ago they thought it was expedient, looking at what transpired in Ontario and Quebec, as these were the larger provinces of the Dominion and represented the greater portion of the population, to give effect in the Territories to the terms of settlement that has been arrived at as a solution of the educational question in these provinces. Whether wise or unwise, that was done. What reason is there at this moment for altering it? Has there been any great grievance sprung up? Has any practical mischief grown out of it? I do not think so, and I think, looking at how extremely sensitive a large portion of the population of this country is upon this question, that instead of it being a wise course to undertake to force upon the attention of this House the consideration of this question at the present time; it is an extremely mischievous course. It is one not in the public interest and one that certainly cannot promote harmony and the well-being of the population of the Territories. Sir, the hon. gentleman, if he will take the trouble of examining into the solution of this question and the results elsewhere, will find that the course taken in the Province of Ontario on the whole produced the most satisfactory results on this continent on the educational question. I do not think that he should come here simply as a political theorist to advocate views of abstract political philosophy and undertake to shape them into law. We ought to look at practical results, we ought to look at the character of our population, we ought to look not merely on what we believe would in the abstract be best for every person, but we ought to look to the prejudices of the people as well as to their principles in so far as we can avoid every ground of friction and of irritation. So far as Ontario is concerned she has recognized the principle of separate schools. She has given to the Protestant minority and to the Roman Catholic population where they demand it, the privilege of establishing a separate school. That has not been done in the various states of the Union; and I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that to-day in the Province of Ontario there is a smaller percentage of the Catholic population in the separate schools than there is in the State of New York in the parish schools where there is no provision made for a separate system. There is a smaller percentage of the Roman Catholic population in Ontario in the separate schools than there is in the parish schools of the State of Michigan where they have no separate school system. What is the practical working out of the Michigan system? It is this: When the Roman Catholic community is dissatisfied, or strong enough, they organize themselves voluntarily into a parish school. They employ their own teacher, and there is no public supervision over that teacher. If the people are poor the chances are that the teacher will be a person of rather inferior education, and the instruction given in these parish schools is altogether inferior to that given in the separate schools of the Province of Ontario. In Ontario you have to-day practically the same class of teachers possessing the same qualifications in the separate schools that you have in the public schools. They undergo a public examination, they receive certificates in the same way, and since the Catholic population has been given representation on the High School Boards, a large number of the children are attending these High Schools. They are receiving their education, they are being employed as teachers, and in many cases they are not giving encouragement to the establishment of separate schools where the public schools give to the Roman Catholic population adequate protection. I say, Sir, there is no public school system on this continent producing more satisfactory results, and being worked out with less friction than the school system of the Province of Ontario.

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

After Recess.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ACCIDENT AT NEW GLASGOW.

Mr. FRASER. Before proceeding to the Orders of the Day, I desire to call the attention of the Government to a matter of considerable importance to a portion of the county from which I come. On last Tuesday a serious accident occurred on George street, in the town of New Glasgow, which is crossed by the railway. There is a flagman at that point, and an excellent man he is, who performs his duty well; but there is a very large traffic on the street, many people passing continually. An old gentleman, a very respectable resident of the town, was killed on the track. The flagman was there, but the old gentleman was a little deaf. Several accidents have occurred at the same point, two or three of them almost fatal, during the past year. I want to call the attention of the Government to the finding of the jury at the inquest, which was as follows:—

"We find that the deceased, John McNeil, came to his death by being accidentally struck by a train while crossing the railway at George street. No blame attaches to the flagman or train hands. The jury would strongly recommend that gates be placed at George street crossing, as the evidence submitted shows the urgent necessity for some improvement upon the present system of guarding the crossing."

That is the finding of a jury composed of leading citizens of the town of New Glasgow, and I have to ask the Government to look at once into this matter, which is one of very great importance to the people there, particularly as a large number of children belonging to the eastern part of the town have to cross the track morning, noon and afternoon going to and from school. I hope the Government will at once have placed there the regular apparatus used in towns. There will be no additional expense, as the flagman who is there now, a very capable man, can attend to it.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). I quite agree with the observations made by the hon. member for Guysborough. I have to corroborate the statement he has made as to the importance of the traffic at that point, and I hope the Government and the Department of Railways will give their immediate attention to the matter. The verdict of the jury urges the necessity of placing gates at this crossing. I do not know that that would have prevented the lamentable accident that occurred, but I am certain that the construction of gates there will be the means of providing against accidents in the future.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will bring this subject to the attention of the Minister of Railways as soon as possible, and I am sure that everything will be done that is possible to avoid such deplorable accidents in the future.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask the Government when the return in reference to the number and cost of Royal Commissions will be brought down?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think I told the hon. gentleman that on Monday last I would either have the return or some answer to his question, and the return was given to me to be laid on the Table on that day; but I found that it was inaccurate in some respects, and had to be corrected. As soon as that is done it will be brought down. It included charges that did not refer to Royal Commissions at all.

Mr. LANDERKIN. As to the other return in reference to elections?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I made enquiry about that, and I am told that no such return was ever ordered.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was ordered by the House last session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was told that was not so, but I will ascertain whether it was or not. If it was, the order does not seem to have reached the proper department, for they know nothing about it.

THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. leader of the House intimated to me the other day that he would be prepared at the beginning of this week to make a statement in reference to the intended action of the Government in regard to the Bill reserved by the Lieutenant Governor of Prince Edward Island.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did make that statement to the hon. gentleman, and I received on Saturday a letter from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor containing some explanations on the subject. When the hon. member for Queen's last brought the subject to the notice of the House, I understood from him that the matter was very urgent, inasmuch as in the ordinary course a general election would take place in that province some time during the present summer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Within the year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. And with that understanding I felt that a statement on the subject should be made as quickly as possible. I am now informed that the time for the general election will not be reached until, I think, 1894, at any rate not before the spring of 1893, and the Bill contains no provision which would anticipate that event. If such be the case, I would prefer not to enter into the subject until after the session, when it can be taken up and considered carefully.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will take an opportunity of referring again to the letter of the Attorney General, and I may again bring the matter to the attention of the hon. gentleman. I know that he considered it urgent.

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday. He said: As a number of the members of the House have been engaged in celebrating, in a social and friendly way, the elevation of a member from the ranks of this House to the position of Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, and are in a pleasant frame of mind, I hope I may ask to-night for the courtesy of the consideration at least in committee of the provisions of this Bill. The Bill, I need hardly say, was assassinated or strangled in committee a few nights ago, and subsequently, by the courtesy of the House, it was restored to its position on the Order Paper. The friends of the Bill may, I think, claim consideration for it in committee for two reasons. One is the significant fact that the leader of the Government has been kind enough to intimate that one of the provisions of the Bill would be accepted by him in a modified form. Another reason is that the Bill is advocated by a very large and very respectable portion of the population of Canada. It is endorsed by various church courts, including the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, the General Conference of the Methodist Church, the Synods of the Church of England, the Church Courts of the Baptist Church, and various other religious bodies; and whether it meets with the acceptance and support of the great majority of the people of Canada, it certainly is a measure which is entitled to the courtesy of the consideration of this House in committee. I, therefore, move that the House now resolve itself into Committee to consider the Bill.

House divided on motion of Mr. Charlton:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Laurier,
Armstrong,	Lowell,
Bain (Wentworth),	Macdonald (King's),
Beith,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Bennett,	McAlister,
Bowell,	McCarthy,
Bowman,	McDougald (Pictou),
Boyle,	McLennan,
Brown,	McLeod,
Cameron,	McMillan (Huron),
Carling,	McMullen,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Mills (Annapolis),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mills (Bothwell),
Casey,	Montague,
Charlton,	O'Brien,
Choquette,	Paterson (Brant),
Christie,	Patterson (Colchester),
Coatsworth,	Perry,
Cochrane,	Pridham,
Cockburn,	Putnam,
Colter,	Rider,
Craig,	Roome,
Daly,	Rosamond,
Davies,	Rowand,
Davin,	Scriver,
Dawson,	Semple,
Featherston,	Smith (Ontario),
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Somerville,
Flint,	Sproule,
Foster,	Stairs,
Fraser,	Stevenson,
Gibson,	Sutherland,
Gillmor,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Temple,
Hodgins,	Thompson (Sir John),
Ingram,	Welsh,
Innes,	Wilson,
Kaulbach,	Wood (Brockville).—77.
Landerkin,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Godbout,
Amyot,	Gordon,
Bain (Soulanges),	Grandbois,
Barnard,	Haggart,
Béchard,	Hughes,
Bergeron,	LaRivière,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Brodeur,	Legris,
Carroll,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Chapleau,	Maclean (York),
Costigan,	McKay,
Davis,	Madill,
Denison,	Monet,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Northrup,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Quimet,
Devlin,	Proulx,
Dewdney,	Rinfret,
Dickey,	Robillard,
Dugas,	Tisdale,
Dupont,	Tupper,
Earle,	Turcotte,
Frémont,	Tyrwhitt,
Geoffrion,	Vaillancourt,
Gillies,	Wallace,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	White (Cardwell).—50.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have had to call the attention of the committee to this clause more than once, contending that it is inexpedient for this Parliament to undertake to deal, as a part of the criminal law, with what hours men should go to work on a paper to be published on Monday, and I will not repeat my remarks. The various features of this clause have been brought to notice, and it has been pointed out that there is power in any Provincial Legislature to prohibit the publication of a newspaper on Sunday, and that the time fixed in this Bill for going to work on a Monday paper is entirely arbitrary, without any foundation in the principle which regulates Sunday observance from a religious point of view. I, therefore, propose to take the sense of the committee by moving that the first clause be struck out.

Mr. CHARLTON. With reference to the position taken by the Minister of Justice, it may be true that the provision with regard to hours allowed for work upon a Monday morning paper is an arbitrary provision. It would have been, I am free to admit, more consonant with the principles of Sunday observance to have entirely prohibited work on newspapers on the evening of the Sabbath, but it was held that such work, to a limited extent, came within the limits of works of necessity. Of course it is necessary to perform various kinds of labour upon the Lord's Day; the sick must be taken care of, food must be prepared, and other works of necessity may be performed in accordance with the spirit of the Divine law; and a full consideration of this question led the committee to believe that a certain amount of labour was necessary in the preparation for the Monday morning issue of a newspaper. The committee concluded that if the employés were allowed to begin work at nine o'clock in the evening, thus permitting their attendance at Divine worship, they could perform the work necessary to get out the paper in time. However, I suppose we must bow to the decision of the Minister of Justice in this matter, if he holds that this provision comes more properly within the purview of provincial legislation; but nevertheless I deem it proper to submit the matter to the House and let the committee decide.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I have had some little experience in the publication of newspapers; and while it is proper that the publisher of a newspaper which comes out on Monday, should be allowed to have the small amount of work required to be done on the Sunday, done during that day, and while that is a matter which should be regulated by the convenience of the persons engaged in the trade rather than by the public at large, yet the distinction between that and the publication of a Sunday newspaper is very decided and distinct, because the latter must necessarily involve a large amount of work upon the Sunday. I certainly shall oppose any motion which has the effect of supporting the publication of a Sunday newspaper; and I shall vote for the clause as it stands because I think the publication of a Sunday newspaper is altogether unnecessary and uncalled for by any considerations of a social, political, or any other nature. This is altogether independent and apart from the publication of a Monday paper. That may involve of necessity a certain amount of work being done on the Sunday, and is a matter for consideration between the publisher and his employés; but the publication of a paper on Sunday involves the necessity of work upon that day, and compels the publisher to order his employés to work then, whether they will or not, bringing them within the class of employés to whom I have referred upon a previous occasion in this connection when I spoke of the employés on Government railways and canals. A printer will have the option of saying whether he will work or not on a Sunday when employed on a newspaper published on the Monday, but in the case of a paper published on the Sunday he has no option. Therefore, I entirely oppose the publication of a Sunday newspaper. It is entirely unnecessary in the general interests of the community, and it forces an obligation on the employé whether he will or not. That, therefore, is a subject in which he is entitled to the protection of the law.

Mr. DAVIN. I certainly cannot think that this committee will for a moment consent to the passing of this clause. To begin with it is utterly illogical:

"Whoever shall on the Lord's Day, either as proprietor, publisher or master, engage in the printing, publishing or delivering of a newspaper, journal or periodical * * * provided, however, that necessary work may be performed after nine o'clock in the evening of the Lord's Day for the facilitating the publishing on the Monday morning of the issue of any daily paper."

So that what my hon. friend wants to do is to characterize work done at 8 o'clock on the Sunday as a crime while the same work is perfectly lawful if done an hour and five minutes later. The thing is absurd. A point may be made against the publication of a newspaper, as a Sunday paper, that in a country like Ontario, where there is a strong sense of the necessity of the observance of the Lord's Day, it may be very offensive to large numbers of people to have boys running about, as they are in New York, Chicago and elsewhere, selling papers. The general sentiment of Ontario is that people should go respectably to church and attend to their religious duties on that day, and they do not want to have men hawking newspapers in the hotels and elsewhere. Therefore a man sitting in a House like this should give some weight to that feeling; but when we once agree that a newspaper

should be got ready at any time on the Lord's Day for publication on the Monday morning, to say that it is a misdemeanour to do that at 8 o'clock which it would be all right to do at nine is a piece of folly. All that my hon. friend really wants is that certain outward decencies shall be observed; and I can easily fancy that it would be an outrage to the conscience of a man like himself to see men at work setting type on a Sunday. I believe the late Hon. George Brown, when he published the *Globe*, and his office was one that could be inspected by the public, and who was a pillar of the Presbyterian Church, had the windows of his office all pasted up with newspapers on that day, so that the people going to church could not see his men at work.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is a slander.

Mr. DAVIN. It is not; I know what I am talking about.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I know, too.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about when he talks like that. He knows well that ever since the *Globe* has been a daily paper the men have worked in that office on Sundays, and I know it would have been very offensive to the late Hon. George Brown if people going to church had been able to look into his office and see his men at work. I say more than that, I say that his doing that, instead of being a piece of hypocrisy, would have been a decent yielding to the sentiment of the community in which he lived, because he must have known that, though he had his men at work on the paper on the Sunday, there were strong puritanical elements in the community that would be outraged if they were aware that people were working on the Sunday on the paper which they would comfortably unfold at their 7 or 8 o'clock breakfast on Monday morning, when they read the news which had been telegraphed and set up the previous day. I voted for the second reading of the Bill, because, on principle. I am in favour of a decent observance of the Lord's Day, but what decent observance of that day have we as legislators here to ask? Have we to ask that our observance of the Lord's Day shall be enforced on other people as far as their private action is concerned? We have no authority to provide here that men shall so act that their souls shall be saved. What we have to deal with are questions which concern the decent ordering of the community for which we make laws. If a man prints his paper all day on Sunday, if he has his men working all day on Sunday, we have nothing to do with it, and it is no offence and should be no offence against the laws of the country, but it would be a different thing if he engages in his business in any way which would prove offensive to the tender consciences of a certain portion of the community, because nothing, I suppose, can be more consonant to a wise view of legislation than that the religious sentiment of every member of a community is to be respected and should not be unnecessarily offended. So I say the thing is, to begin with, stamped with absurdity, to make that a misdemeanour at 1 minute to 9 which is all right 2 minutes after 9. That is drawing it very fine on the part of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton.) I hope the committee will not listen to such an absurd clause.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has laboured hard to excite himself and to make that ridiculous which is very plain and very commendable. He talks childish nonsense when he speaks of that as being lawful after 9 which is not lawful before. We know that that which it is lawful to do at 5 minutes after 12 is not lawful 5 minutes before 12.

Mr. DAVIN. That is a very different thing.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There must be an hour fixed. The principle is that unnecessary work shall not be done on the Lord's Day. It is believed that a large number of the people of the Dominion are opposed to Sunday newspapers. They think that they are unnecessary, and that their publication on that day is an offence against the rule of the christian religion, and this section simply provides that no newspaper shall be published on the Lord's Day, but a proviso is added that the work necessary for the Monday paper, after the services are over, after the day is practically over, shall be allowed. If 9 o'clock is too early, make it 10, but do not talk childish nonsense. Either alter the hour or strike the proviso out altogether if you think you can publish your Monday morning paper by beginning at 12 o'clock. The section is fairly well drawn and is intended to prevent the publication of Sunday newspapers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We have two things to consider here, what legislation is necessary and by whom. Now, so far as the first clause of this Bill is concerned, I do not know how it is in all the provinces, but in Ontario we have dealt with it. Any one who will turn up the statutes of Ontario will see that Sunday observance is one of the subjects upon which legislation has been had, on the ground that it is a matter of police legislation, that it is a civil right coming within the jurisdiction of the provinces under the 92nd section of the British North America Act. This Bill provides that there shall be immunity after the hour of 9 o'clock on Sunday evening to engage in newspaper work, and that is treated as a work of necessity. I do not know upon what ground it is treated as a work of necessity. Suppose men commenced to work at 12 o'clock, it is true that they could not get the paper out as early as if they commenced at 9, but if there is any excuse for violating the last three hours of the Sunday because you cannot catch the 4 o'clock mail on Monday morning and if you do not catch that mail your newspaper will not reach your subscribers until a few hours later than if you were allowed to use the last three hours of Sunday for this particular work, there does not appear to be any reason for fixing an hour at all. In the Act of Ontario there is no such exception. The law is stricter in this respect than my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) proposes to make this Bill, and I would like to know, if you pass this Bill, which is to govern? Is it the law of Ontario in the Province of Ontario, or this statute? Suppose a newspaper man undertook to set type after church on a Sunday evening and some one who regarded it as an offensive proceeding brought him up before the police magistrate, and he should plead this statute, does any one suppose this would protect him against punishment under the statute of Ontario? I do not think so. I think the question is one of civil rights, regulated by the provincial law, and I do

not think that by simply declaring it a misdemeanour and thus trying to bring it within the purview of a department of law in which it has not been previously placed, you can prevent its being a matter of civil right. There are certain things with which the provinces cannot deal with. They cannot say whether the officers of the Dominion Government shall be employed on Sunday or not, whether the canals shall be kept open on Sunday or not, whether the post offices shall be kept open in Sunday or not, whether the Government railways shall be run on Sunday or not. These are all under the jurisdiction of the Government here, and these are all proper matters to be considered by this House, and if my hon. friend proposes legislation on these subjects, they are all, in my opinion, within our jurisdiction. Let us, in undertaking to deal with this subject, consider what belongs to this House. I do not think we ought to assume that other governments will not discharge their duties, that the people in the provinces who sent us here for the purpose of acting within the provisions of the constitution, and who elect men in the various provinces to legislate on the subjects that have been assigned by the constitution to the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces, will not discharge their duty. I do not think we are called upon to exercise a fatherly oversight, a paternal care, with regard to the matters that fall within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces. Let us leave to them to deal with what belongs to them; let them be responsible to the people. If they fail in the discharge of any duty that the constitution has imposed upon them, let us be content with the proper discharge of the duties that the constitution has assigned to us. Now, it is for us to say whether the post offices shall be kept open on Sunday, it is for us to say whether the canals shall be kept open on Sunday, it is for us to say whether the public offices of the Government of Canada shall be kept open on Sunday, it is for us to say whether Government railways, or railways under the jurisdiction of this House, shall run on Sunday. These are subjects that belong to us, and they might be dealt with, I apprehend, as matters of departmental regulation so far as they are under the control of the departments, or they might be dealt with by legislation in this House. My hon. friend proposes, in the second clause of his Bill, and in the third clause, and in some others, to deal with these subjects that properly come within our jurisdiction; and if the House is disposed seriously to consider this subject, if it thinks there are abuses that ought to be corrected, if there are men employed in the public service that have not an opportunity of observing Sunday as they desire to observe it, as they think it ought to be observed; let us consider their conscientious scruples, let us consider what the public thinks is necessary for the decent and orderly observance of Sunday. Let us look at this matter as a christian community are disposed to regard it; but let us, in dealing with this subject, confine ourselves to those matters which are properly within our jurisdiction, and if we discharge these, I think we will do all the public have a right to expect from our hands. If there are provinces that have not legislated on this subject as some members of this House desire—I do not know how that may be, it may, or it may not be so—they must address themselves, it seems to me, under our constitutional system, to the legislatures of those provinces to deal with the matter in the way that they think best. They must seek to elect men to those legislatures who will carry out their views, and if they fail in that, then the matter must so rest. It is not a part of our duty to undertake to usurp authority, simply because we feel that those duties are not properly discharged by somebody else. I think there are matters here that ought to be seriously considered by us, and we ought to seek to meet the public wishes and expectations so far as we can; but with regard to those matters that are in other hands, surely we ought to let them alone, and let them remain in the hands in which the constitution has placed them.

Mr. CHARLTON. The position taken by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) with regard to the first section of this Bill, and which amounts substantially to the assertion that this House has no jurisdiction in the matter, is one to which I cannot agree. It is true that this matter might be legislated upon by the Provincial Legislatures. Each Provincial Legislature in this Dominion might make laws with regard to the publication of Sunday newspapers, and it is perfectly within their jurisdiction to do so. But it does not follow from that admission that this House has no power in the matter, that the Dominion of Canada has no power with reference to matters pertaining to the publication and circulation of literature in this Dominion. This Parliament has control over the copyright; it is the only source of power for making regulations with regard to the transmission of literature or printed matter through the mails; it is the only power that can prescribe what class of literature shall not be transported through the mails; it is the only power that can provide with regard to the importation of books and newspapers into this Dominion; and taking these facts into consideration I believe that the power rests more properly with the Dominion Government than with the Provincial Governments as regards regulations concerning the publication of newspapers upon the Lord's Day. If we are to have laws with regard to this matter at all, it scarcely needs argument to prove that great advantage would result by having a uniform rule throughout the Dominion. If one province has a law differing in character from the law of another province, it can easily be seen that difficulties will arise, collisions will occur, that would not occur in the case of a uniform law.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. What difficulties would arise?

Mr. CHARLTON. There may be a Sunday newspaper published in Montreal, and the publisher may claim that he has a right to circulate his newspaper in the Province of Ontario, and he may claim that it is an infringement upon his privilege as a citizen of the province where he is acting in accordance with the provisions of the law of that province, to debar him from exercising the same privilege in a neighbouring province. It is easy to see that in the matter of newspapers, collisions would arise by reason of the different laws prevailing in the several provinces. So much for the question of our power with relation to this matter. Now, I am free to admit that this provision with regard to work on Sunday evening on

a Monday morning paper, is one that did not meet with my approval, and it was inserted by the committee as a concession to that sentiment which considered this Bill as unduly harsh and severe in its provisions. I am perfectly willing to admit that the provision would be more consonant with the Divine law, would be more logical in itself, if it permitted no Sunday work whatever. I am perfectly willing, therefore, to strike out this proviso; I am not only willing but exceedingly anxious it should be done. I am quite willing to meet the views of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I recognize the force of his objection. I am willing to meet, in this respect, the views of my hon. friend from Bothwell. I can realize the force of the objection he raised when he says that there may be a law in the Dominion differing in character from a law of a province; and that the law of a province could entirely prohibit labour of this character, while the law of the Dominion might allow such labour, and consequently there would be collision. I, therefore, beg to move that this clause be amended by striking out the words:

Provided, however, that necessary office work may be performed after 9 o'clock in the evening of the Lord's Day for the purpose of facilitating the publication of the Monday morning issue of any daily newspaper.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not deny that as soon as we say that such and such a thing will be a misdemeanour, we have jurisdiction in that matter. We may pass a law to make it a misdemeanour if a man looks at the moon. As soon as we say that a thing is a crime or an indictable offence, that thing falls within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, but should we create a misdemeanour and assume jurisdiction without necessity? I do not think so. If we make conflicting laws upon subjects which are within the domain of the Local Legislatures, we will be mixing up things without any good result. I ask, what is the object of the hon. gentleman in pressing this special clause, when he is told that all the Local Legislatures have passed laws with regard to this matter? Is it his object to attach his name to some Bill whereby he may be regarded as a most serious christian? I wonder if his constituents sent him here to promote legislation of this kind? In the Province of Quebec we keep the laws when passed, but generally we adopt the best possible mode of keeping Sunday—each one keeps it according to his own conscience. We do not allow any one to preach to us on that matter. When we want some instructions about conscience we look to the directors of our consciences and to our own studies. We have laws passed by the Provincial Legislatures, and I do not see that any good object will be attained by enacting the present Bill. It is clear that if we do not make the Sunday work in a printing office a misdemeanour, we have no jurisdiction. Section 91 of the British North America Act gives us jurisdiction respecting the criminal law. Section 92 gives exclusive power to Provincial Legislatures over municipal institutions and local works. Surely this is a local work—working in a newspaper establishment. The hon. gentleman must know that Local Legislatures have passed laws for the maintenance of good order in all manufacturing establishments and places where a large number of people are employed. Now the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) wants to impose on British Columbia, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces his views of municipal regulations and the maintenance of order. This is not fair. When we entered Confederation we were assured that all these municipal affairs would be left under the control of each province, and to-day it is a breach of the good faith which was pledged, to try and legislate in this direction. We now want to instruct the police of Montreal and Quebec in what way they should keep order within their respective cities. We want to force on the people of the Dominion views respecting the management of their local affairs. The hon. member for North Norfolk may be the best example to be found within his church, but when a large body of the people of this Dominion do not believe as he does, by what right should he impose, by legislation, his views on others? I take the Jews, who are very numerous in our province and other parts of the Dominion. The Lord's Day for them is Saturday. By what right does the hon. gentleman prevent them from working on Sunday? Where does he find in his Bible, or religious books, any right to impose his views on that class of the community? When we seek to enforce religion by legislation we commit a great mistake, and by enacting too much legislation we will embarrass the whole Dominion, and we should avoid legislation on subjects which we were not sent here to deal with. A committee has been sitting for a long time on the Criminal Code, and all manner of possible and impossible crimes have been sought out, and yet we are now proposing to complicate that codification of our laws by introducing more new offences. The exclusive powers of Provincial Legislatures under the British North America Act include:

"(10.) Local works and undertakings other than such as are of the following classes: (*a*) Lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs and other works and undertakings connecting the provinces with any other or others of the provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the province; (*b*) Lines of steamships between the provinces and any British or foreign country; (*c*) Such works as, although wholly situate within the province, are before or after their execution declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada, or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces."

All other local works are within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. If there was any great abuse existing, if in certain of the provinces the people were not behaving properly on Sunday, then I would be ready to declare in this Parliament that the time had arrived to create certain acts a misdemeanour. But to-day there is no trouble that I know of. In the Province of Quebec I do not know of a single complaint regarding a newspaper working on Sunday. I know, indeed, that some religious papers have, with the permission of the authorities, worked on Sunday, and I do not see any harm whatever in doing so. Perhaps it is better to work in that way than to oblige people to do nothing on Sunday, because when you do nothing ostensibly, the people do wrong in secret. I believe we should not encourage puritanism. We should be bold enough to tell the people that they can follow their consciences in this free country. We must respect the religious opinion of every one. Under these circumstances I claim we should not assume that we have the power to create a misdemeanour as is proposed, and thus bring the subject within our jurisdiction. The time has not arrived for such action, and circumstances do not demand it, and so long as we do not create as a misdemeanour working in a newspaper

office on Sunday, then we have no jurisdiction. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. DAVIN. I want to point out why I cannot agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) when he states he will strike out the proviso in order to comply with my wishes. The hon. gentleman I suppose has read Mr. Spurgeon's sermons and the sermons of Dr. Talmage. These sermons are reported on Sunday, and indeed the sermons of all leading preachers are reported on that day. What is the difference between newspaper work done by reporters on Sunday and that done by compositors? Is there any difference?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says there is a decided difference. He seems to be in the same position as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). The hon. member for Queen's denounced childish excitement, and proceeded to exemplify what he denounced. He argued that I was very illogical, because I objected to an arbitrary hour, and he said there must be an arbitrary hour. Certainly there must be an hour to conclude the Lord's Day; but it is not arbitrary, it is the conclusion of the day, 12 o'clock. I may say that the proviso—but he has abandoned it, and it is only in reply to the hon. member for Queen's that I refer to it—the proviso I say is as ridiculous as a pious Roman Catholic would be who would say on a Friday: I intend to observe the rules of my church and not eat meat, but I think I will have half a mutton chop; I should feel that if I had eaten a whole mutton chop my immortal soul would be imperilled, but I think I will have half a mutton chop and that will be all right. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) who referred to childishness, is yet so childish himself that he says there must be an arbitrary hour at which to commence work on the Sabbath, and he declared that I was very ridiculous because I pointed out that it was an utter absurdity to make that a misdemeanour at five minutes to 9 o'clock on Sunday which would not be a misdemeanour at five minutes past 9. I cannot vote for this clause even if this amendment were to be adopted, because, as I say, all over this country, and all over England, wherever there is an eminent preacher, a reporter, who is one of a staff of a newspaper, takes down what is said and transcribes it, and that work is as purely newspaper work as the composition.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a work of necessity.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says it is a work of necessity, and let me ask him is it not a work of necessity to do the typesetting at 7 o'clock on Sunday evening in order to get the newspaper out?

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman says "no," but, nevertheless, I must believe that there is no difference in principle between the work of the reporter and the work of the compositor.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am surprised at the remarks of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He knows perfectly well that the religious world benefits largely from the reporting of the sermons he refers to.

Mr. DAVIN. And from the compositors who set them up.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask how the report of these sermons can be taken in any other way than when they are delivered. If they are spoken on Sunday, how could they be reported on Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday or any other day of the week. The religious world has benefited immensely in the past by the reporting of the sermons of such eminent men as Mr. Talmage, or the late Mr. Spurgeon. As I said before, these sermons are a necessity in the interests of the religious world, and the reporting of them on Sunday, the day on which they are spoken and the only day on which they can be reported, is sanctioned by the several religious denominations.

Mr. DENISON. One reason I had for voting against going into committee on the Bill, was that I believed it deals with matters over which the Local Legislatures have control, and that I believe some clauses of it at all events should be taken up by the Provincial Government of Ontario, and by other Provincial Legislatures. We have had for some time past a Detroit and a Buffalo Sunday paper sold in the streets of Toronto. Before that I do not think there was any wish on the part of the people of Toronto for a Sunday paper, but the fact of these foreign Sunday papers being sold in our streets was I have no doubt the reason of an attempt being made, which I believe is persisted in, to have a paper published in Toronto on Sunday. I think that the Sunday paper is not necessary or desirable, therefore I will support this clause.

Mr. FRASER. I trust that the motion of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) will not prevail. I think that it might be perhaps sufficient for us at the present time to drop this particular clause for the reasons pointed out by the Minister of Justice. I do not pretend to set my opinion against his as to whether or not this clause may not be perfectly consistent with the legislation of the various provinces, but let us vote upon that question. Having decided by such a large vote that we should consider this matter let us not by voting for the motion of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) shelve it altogether. If it is a question worthy of our consideration—and I submit it is much more worthy of consideration so far as our powers go than hundreds of other questions we consider here—then let us not attempt to play with the matter and simply say that we shall now cease discussing the question altogether. Let us ask ourselves: Is there anything in this Bill that comes within the powers of this Parliament and which it is necessary for us to pass? I was struck on a former occasion when discussing this Bill by the remarks made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and I thoroughly sympathize with him, because I believe there is much in this Bill that lies within our powers to legislate upon. For myself, perhaps I am not as strict a Sabbatarian as I should be, and I agree that we have no right to legislate upon religious matters, but I do say that while we cannot pass any legislation whereby a man should be made to do or not to do what he sees fit on the Lord's Day, yet we should come to the assistance of our fellow men, and legislate that no man should be compelled to work against his will on the Lord's Day. That, I believe, is perfectly within our province. Let us decide whether men who have to depend for their livelihood upon Government works or on railways shall not be compelled

to work on the Lord's Day, unless they want to. Let us come to the assistance of our fellow men who are often in the position of not wanting to work on the Lord's Day, and yet are compelled to work against their conscience. Let us address ourselves as men to this legislation, if there is anything in it that we are empowered to pass, and do not let us shelve it by the subterfuge of voting for the motion that the committee should rise.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Mr. Chairman, as one having some practical experience of the working of a daily newspaper, I desire to say a word or two on the clause of the Bill which is now under consideration of the committee. Perhaps my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) will permit me to let him into a professional secret. He wants to know how it is that sermons of Mr. Talmage or of the late Mr. Spurgeon, or any other eminent pulpit orator, can be published unless they are reported on the Sunday morning. I may tell the hon. gentleman that as a matter of fact, these sermons are prepared, not days, but weeks in advance, and that Mr. Talmage may take a summer vacation, travelling through Egypt and the Holy Land, but yet his Sunday sermon appears regularly every Monday morning in dozens and dozens of newspapers throughout this country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is the way of all great men. The Stratford speech of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was the same.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Exactly. I am quite willing to believe that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in asking that the proviso be left out from this clause has had it in view to protect the publication of Monday morning papers as it has hitherto been carried on, and that what he desires to exclude is the Sunday morning paper. I have not a word to say on this latter point. If it is the sense of the House that there should be no Sunday morning papers I am perfectly willing to fall in with that view. But I would point out to the hon. gentleman that in eliminating the proviso, unless I read improperly the language of that clause, he has made the case of the Monday morning paper worse even than it was under the clause as originally drafted in the Bill. He proposes, as the clause is printed in this Bill, to allow those engaged in the publication of the Monday morning paper at least three hours work on what is commonly called Sunday. If he strikes out the proviso, he does not give us even the three hours, and we are compelled to cease work at 12 o'clock on Saturday night, and begin work again at one minute after 12 on Monday morning, for the publication of Monday morning's paper. Let me mention the case of the newspaper with which I am connected, the Montreal *Gazette*. When we took hold of that paper twenty-two years ago, it was the practice to close the forms, that is, to cease composition, at 2 or 3 o'clock on Sunday morning, and then go to press and complete the printing of Monday morning's paper, so as to avoid Sunday work and to give the compositors and the other employés an opportunity to keep the Sabbath day. We considered, however, that it practically made no difference, so far as the observance of the Sabbath day was concerned, whether we took five hours on Sunday morning or five hours on Sunday night; but there was this disadvantage in the old practice, that we lost twenty-four hours of news for the Monday morning's paper; so that instead of breaking the Sabbath on Sunday morning, we broke it on Sunday night for the benefit of our readers. I venture to say that the hon. member for Norfolk has been breaking the Sabbath for years by reading Monday morning's paper. If the Parliament of Canada adopts this Bill without the proviso, it will place a large premium on the publication of the evening papers. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side spoke of compulsory work on Sundays. Any man who knows anything of the publication of a morning paper knows than in addition to the regular staff of compositors, there are always about a printing office a certain number of substitutes; "subs" is the ordinary term. No compositor is compelled to work if he desires not to work. There are substitute printers always available for the vacant frame if the man to whom it belongs does not turn up, or has conscientious scruples. If he chooses he need only work five days in the week, and give the sixth day to a "sub." Now, do you mean to tell me that if I write an editorial article on Sunday afternoon, I would come under the provisions of this Bill?

Mr. CHARLTON. No, you would not.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Well, I do not know what the legal interpretation of this section may be. I do not know whether it is broad enough to relieve an editor or a reporter from penalties for working on Sunday or not; but I say that it ought to be broad enough to do so. We may receive during Sunday morning important dispatches which call for comment, and we must write that comment in the course of Sunday, because our copy must be supplied to the compositor by 7 o'clock in the evening. That is the ordinary rule; and if the terms of this section cover, as they seem to do, the publication of a newspaper in its broadest sense, the sense that would, I suppose, hold the company who are advertised at the foot of the last column of every newspaper as the legal publishers, no man having a proprietory interest in a newspaper could venture to engage in the work of that newspaper during that day. I am bound to say from my experience of the working of a daily newspaper that it is utterly impossible to confine the men engaged in the publication of such a newspaper to any particular hours of the day. You can prevent the publication of a Sunday newspaper, and if that is the sense of the committee I am entirely with it; but so far as the production of a Monday morning newspaper is concerned, if it is going to be a newspaper abreast of the times, and if you are not going to place a premium on the evening newspaper, you must give those engaged on it as much latitude as they now enjoy. The clause as at present printed gives us three hours permission to break the Lord's Day, but if you strike out the proviso, what I am afraid of is that we cannot break it at all—we would have no latitude at all. If the object of the clause is to prevent the publication of a Sunday newspaper, and I have not a word to say against that, it ought to be redrafted. But if it is intended to aim at the Monday morning newspaper, I am totally opposed to it.

Mr. McMULLEN. In reply to what the hon. gentleman said in reference to my statement in regard to reports of sermons preached on Sunday by Spurgeon and Talmage, I wish to say that he may be correct in regard to Talmage, but I know

he is not correct in regard to Spurgeon. I have been in Spurgeon's church and heard him preach and I know that his sermons were taken down: but if the hon. gentleman had read his sermons, he would know that his first work on Monday was to correct the sermons which he had preached on Sunday.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This will not extend to that case.

Mr. McLEOD. It seems to me that the object of this section is to prevent the publication of newspapers on Sunday; and if its meaning in that respect is not clear, let it be amended to make it clear: but do not oppose the clause generally. The question is, does this Parliament think it best that newspapers shall be published on Sunday? Notwithstanding the point raised by the hon. member for Bothwell my opinion is that we have the right and the power to legislate in reference to this matter, and if I had time I think I could convince him that such is the case. The section may not be worded exactly as it ought to be, but I would not like the Parliament of Canada to seem to favour Sunday newspapers by voting it down. The objection has been made, particularly by the hon. member for Cardwell, that this will interfere with the publication of the Monday morning's paper. I understand that the mover of the Bill inserted the proviso in deference to that objection. In some cases it seems absolutely necessary that work should be done on Sunday, but Sunday work should be confined entirely to those cases; and it seems to me that the proviso meets those cases. But I would not care to see Parliament vote down the section, for no one has come forward yet and said that it was right and proper that newspapers should be published on Sunday in Canada, as they are in various cities.

Mr. BOWELL. It seems to me the object the hon. member for North Norfolk has in view is amply met, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned. The point put by the hon. member for Bothwell struck me as being very pertinent—that, looking at this law, there can be no necessity for our legislating on this particular question as regards Ontario, even with respect to the selling of a Sunday newspaper. If you look at the first clause of chapter 203 of the Consolidated Statutes of Ontario you will find it reads as follows:—

"It is not lawful for any merchant, tradesman, artificer, mechanic, workman, labourer or other person whatsoever, on the Lord's Day, to sell or publish or expose or offer for sale or to purchase any goods."

Now, I take it a newspaper is goods if you go on the market and sell it, just as much as any other commodity. The hon. member for Queen's shakes his head.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say it would be a very nice point.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think it is. The clause continues: "Chattels or other personal property." I think that covers it, if the words "goods and chattels" do not, "or any real estate whatsoever, or to do or exercise any labour" certainly does. I suppose that would bring the hon. member for Cardwell within the purview of this law if he wrote an editorial on Sunday in the Province of Ontario as "work or in any ordinary calling." It then exempts the carrying of Her Majesty's mail, either by land or water, or postal contract, or the selling of drugs and medicines and other works of necessity and works of charity. These are the only exceptions to the performance of labour on the Lord's Day. If these very objectionable newspapers, to which the hon. member for Toronto has just referred, Detroit *Sun* and *World*, or any paper of that character, are brought into the country, their sale should be tabooed. Probably if they were brought under the notice of the Minister of Customs, he might confiscate them under the clause forbidding the introduction of immoral literature. One thing is quite certain: the illustrations in those papers, the character of their work, the reports of police courts and other literature of that description, certainly should be brought within the law so as to prevent their circulation. Now, I take it under this clause, if any person in the town of Windsor, or in any of the border towns, or in the city of Toronto, were to arrest the newsdealers who deal in those goods and sell them on Sunday, or probably any other day they could be punished under this law which imposes a penalty of $400. This law goes a long way beyond the mere sale of the goods, chattels or personal property. Political meetings are prohibited on Sunday. Profane swearing, games, amusements, hunting, and shooting, and fishing, and bathing in improper places are also prohibited. Then Sunday excursions are equally prohibited, and there is a penalty imposed of $400 for the commission of each of those offences, so that, as far as Ontario is concerned, it seems to me that the provisions are quite ample to meet the case to which the hon. member for Norfolk calls the attention of this House and concerning which he desires legislation. If he desires to apply all the penalties provided in this clause to all other sections of the Dominion, that is another point altogether. I shall leave the constitutional lawyers to discuss the question as to whether we have the power to make a law here which would contravene the provincial law, or leave the two laws upon our Statute-books and then let the Province of Ontario and the Dominion fight the matter out as to which has the right to deal with the question. I am fully in accord with the sentiments uttered regarding the circulation of the newspapers to which I have referred, as I think they have a demoralizing effect; but I am also of opinion that the hon. member for North Norfolk has for his object, if I understand the purport of his Bill, to make provision for the observance of the Lord's Day in accord with the doctrine laid down in the Scriptures, therefore I dissent *in toto* from the remarks of the hon. member for Queen's when he says that this Parliament has the right to say that the Sunday shall end at 9 o'clock. If I understand what is meant by the Sabbath day, it is an ordinary day of 24 hours. The hon. member for Queen's says it is childish to argue that it would be a misdemeanour to do certain work 5 minutes before 9, while 5 minutes after 9 it would be quite legal and religious to do. I am fully in accord with the views of the member for Assiniboia on this point. I deny the right of this Parliament to say that the Sunday shall end at 9 o'clock. The hon. member for South Oxford, who is in the habit generally of taking others to task when they use expressions he thinks they should not use in addressing their fellow members, must have been asleep when he heard the improper language used by the hon. gentleman on his right.

(Mr. Davies) when he said my hon. friend from Assiniboia was childish and puerile in his manner of treating this question. That may be a less offensive mode of giving expression to an opinion as to what is considered childish than I used the other night, when I was taken to task for having designated the interpretation put upon my language as very improper and beneath the dignity of the position I hold. But I am prepared to admit that any language of that kind is not beneath the dignity of the hon. gentleman who sits opposite. However, this is a serious subject, and I leave the constitutional lawyers to discuss the point I have mentioned. I may say I am not so fully in accord with my hon. friend from Cardwell as to the absolute necessity of Sunday work, even on a daily newspaper. If it be a necessity for the existence of man, physically or intellectually, that he should have a newspaper on his breakfast table on Monday morning, well and good. But I am not willing to admit the necessity of doing certain work on Sunday in order that his appetite, whether intellectual or otherwise, may be fed on a Monday. Then comes the question as to what constitutes a work of necessity. Is it necessary for our existence that we should have a newspaper on Monday morning? I do not believe it is. Neither is it necessary that we should have these sermons to which my hon. friend refers reported on Sunday, for the reporting of them is just as much labour, and indeed far more so than some other labour. It is certainly arduous labour for a reporter to sit down and report a rapidly delivered sermon, such sermons, for instance, as I have heard preached in the Tabernacle in London by the reverend gentleman to whom my hon. friend refers. But the great majority of sermons published regularly on the Monday—and my own personal experience in this is in accord with the statement made by the hon. member for Cardwell—are prepared not only the day before but weeks before. Why, in the town in which I live sermons were printed in the paper on Saturday while the reverend gentleman who gave birth to them was spending the summer on the continent of Europe. He had prepared them, they were stereotyped, and sent all over the country and published. There may be other sermons which are reported in the way stated by the hon. member for Wellington. There may be others in which reporting takes place as stated by the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), but that is not a work of necessity. If it is a work of necessity to have the sermons reported on Sunday and printed for Monday morning, what reason can there be for not having a newspaper published for Sunday reading? Take the *Christian Guardian* and other religious papers. You see no politics in them and nothing but what is of a religious character. There are the papers of the Anglican and the Presbyterian and the Methodist and the Baptist and the other bodies, these papers form the Sunday reading in half the homes of Ontario. As long as the papers are of that character, there can be no harm in them. Coming back to the point to which I called the attention of the committee, I cannot conceive, as far as Ontario is concerned, that there is any necessity whatever for the passage of the clause before the House.

Mr. COATSWORTH. If we pass this clause at all, I think we ought to pass it as it is printed. I have been surprised at some of the arguments in regard to the fixing of a time. In all our laws we have arbitrary times fixed. For instance, a man can get a glass of liquor in Toronto legally and lawfully at 1 minute to 7 on Saturday evening, but no saloon keeper is authorized to sell after 7 o'clock, and if he does so he commits a misdemeanour. A bailiff can distrain on me between sunrise and sunset, but if he attempts to do so before the one or after the other, he is liable as a trespasser.

Mr. BOWELL. Can he do it on Sunday?

Mr. COATSWORTH. Certainly not, because the law says he is not to do it. An argument of the kind brought forward as to the fixing of hours is open to the charge of childishness, though I would not like to make that charge as so many hon. gentlemen have offered that argument. Take the question of burglary. A man may enter my house at 1 minute before 6 o'clock in the morning, and be guilty of burglary, whereas, if he does it 1 minute after 6 it is a different and a much lighter offence. So we do fix the time arbitrarily for all classes of offences. I am sorry the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has proposed a change in the clause. Though there is no doubt, as the Minister of Militia says, that the law in Ontario is that no work shall be done before 12 o'clock; we know that that law is winked at and that there is not a daily newspaper in Ontario on which work is not done on Sunday evenings from 8 or 9 o'clock until the paper issues. We should take a practical view of this matter and allow the necessary work to be done. My own conviction is that a Monday morning paper is a necessity. We have to take into consideration not only the absolute necessity, but the necessity arising from our surroundings, our business and other surroundings, and I think we are forced to the conclusion that the Monday morning newspaper is a necessity, and that the work required on the Sabbath evening to prepare it for issue is a work of necessity. While I am favourable to the principle of the Bill on the whole for two reasons, not only to have the Sunday preserved as the christian day of rest, but also to have it preserved as a day of rest for our workingmen, I am inclined to think that the hon. member ought to abandon the first clause. Suppose a newspaper man put his men to work on Sunday evening, he is free from any penalty under this measure, whereas under the law of Ontario he is liable to a penalty if he commences work before 12 o'clock on Sunday night, and I think it would be unfortunate to have a conflict of law of that kind. If the Province of Ontario chooses to wink at that law and to allow newspaper men to start working at 8 or 9 o'clock on Sunday it is no concern of ours, but it would be unfortunate for us to come into direct conflict with the provincial law, and perhaps it might result in an appeal to the Privy Council and to our law being set aside. I am so impressed with the arguments which have been adduced that this is a matter for provincial legislation that I think we ought not to pass this clause. However, I am in favour of the general principle of the Bill. I think my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) put the matter very nicely when he said that we have not only to look at this question as christian people desirous to preserve the sanc-

tity of the Lord's Day, but also as protectors of the rights of workingmen, and, if we place them in the way of working on the Lord's Day, we are offering them a temptation and are also offering temptation to their employers to use their services. The result in the United States has been that Sunday is no longer Sunday. It is a day of work and not a day of rest. It is a day when men are compelled to work for fear of losing their situations. For these reasons I am in favour of the principle of the Bill, and, although I think my hon. friend should withdraw this clause, still, rather than see the Bill thrown out, I would vote for it as it stands.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am opposed to this clause and to some others in this Bill. If the promoter of the Bill has based his demand for such a measure simply upon the ground of religious principle, I am sorry I have to tell him that I do not recognize his mission as an apostle of religion. If it is to be a matter merely of christian zeal or of virtue, it should be canvassed outside of this House and by other means. I object to transforming Parliament into a pulpit. I say we are not to be dragooned to church or to be dragooned into heaven. I do not want to be forced into the path of christian life by an Act of Parliament. If this is the principle at the foundation of this Bill, this is not the place for it. We have men who have received a mission to teach us, and it is not in Parliament that this should be taught. There is a ground upon which such legislation might be demanded, that is, on the ground of not tolerating on the Lord's Day of practices which might be obnoxious or offensive to other people. I do not admit that this would be reasonable. But if it is so, it is a question of municipal law. If it is a nuisance to publish a paper where some people would be offended by it, the nuisance must be put down by municipal authority. As my hon. friend has said, it might be a question affecting the relations between labourers and employers, and there might be a question of a contract entered into between an employer and a labourer. Then the question comes, who has the right to regulate that? A labour contract is essentially a civil right, and must be regulated by the Provincial Legislatures and not by this Parliament. In the province from which I come everybody knows that the views entertained by the majority concerning the observance of the Sabbath, are not the same as those entertained by the minority of the population. Still, we have no dispute over that subject in our province; the people of different creeds live together in harmony, notwithstanding those differences; but if any legislation was to be had on that subject, it would have to come from the Provincial Legislature. We arrange these matters ourselves, and I do not want the majority of the province from which I come to be subjected to special legislation by this Parliament on matters regarding which it has no right to legislate. It is true we can decide by an Act of this Parliament that it is a crime to smoke in the street on Sunday, but sensible people would not think of passing such an Act. This Parliament might make it a misdemeanour to have an excursion on Sunday, or to ride in a carriage on Sunday; we might make it a misdemeanour to sing on Sunday, or to play a piano; we might do so, but we shall not do so. A great deal is being done in my province towards conciliating the feelings of the minority on this question. For instance, the bishops of the church to which I belong have forbidden a very old custom, that of holding public meetings on Sunday for political purposes during elections. Some of our bishops have forbidden this custom in deference to the sentiments of a portion of the population. For the reasons I have stated before, I am opposed to this Bill, and I think the subject should be left to be dealt with by the Provincial Legislatures.

Mr. SCRIVER. I cannot allow one statement of the Minister of Customs to pass without remark. The hon. gentleman says that the bishops of his church have forbidden the holding of public meetings at church doors on Sunday, in deference to the views of the surrounding Protestant population.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. SCRIVER. I do not agree with him at all.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I know it.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think they were actuated by higher motives than that. I believe that they forbade the holding of those meetings because they considered the custom was injurious to the morals of their people. How can the hon. gentleman reconcile his statement with the fact that this command on the part of the bishop has taken effect in portions of the province where there is no Protestant population whatever, in the district of Quebec, notably, to a greater extent than in the district of Montreal?

Mr. AMYOT. I beg your pardon.

Mr. SCRIVER. I am confident that I am correct on this point, and that the hon. gentleman is wrong. I believe that the dignitaries of the Catholic church saw that loose views prevailed among some of their people with regard to the observance of the Sabbath, and they used their powerful and beneficent influence in the right direction. That is all I have to say on that point. Now, I would call attention to the first clause of the Bill. I confess that I feel very strongly on the question of the publication of Sunday newspapers. I would not for a moment set up my opinion on the constitutional point against that of men learned in the law who have spoken on the subject; but it is evident that there is a conflict of opinion with regard to this matter among those who are best qualified to judge on the floor of this House. I am convinced that if there be provincial legislation with regard to this question, it is either insufficient or the legislation is not enforced, and there is room for action on the part of this House. It seems to me that it is competent for this body, within constitutional lines, at all events, to legislate for the prevention of any great and general demoralization on the part of the people. My belief is that one of the greatest causes of the demoralization of certain classes of the people in the United States, that has taken place of late years, has been the publication of Sunday newspapers. I have passed a good many Sundays in large cities of the United States within the last two or three years, and I have seen enough to convince me that the circulation of Sunday newspapers has led largely to a neglect of the proper observance of the Sabbath day; and more than that, it has led to positive demoralization. I have not read those newspapers very extensively, I confess; I would not do it, I would consider myself degraded by doing so. But I have looked

into them enough to be satisfied that they contain matter which is not only unfit for the perusal of the rising generation on week-days, but specially unfit for their perusal on the Sabbath day. This demoralization in the large cities of the United States has gone to such an extent that I consider it very important, in the best interests of this Dominion, to prevent the publication of Sunday newspapers obtaining a footing in this country as it has obtained a footing in the neighbouring republic.

Mr. AMYOT. I must tell my hon. friend that he is wrongly informed about the prohibition to hold political meetings on Sunday. In the diocese of Quebec they are not forbidden, and we hold them every Sunday in election times. I may tell my hon. friend that if there was anything intrinsically wrong or immoral in holding political meetings on Sunday, they would be forbidden in the diocese of Quebec as well as in every other diocese. That fact goes to corroborate what the Minister of Customs has said, that in the diocese of Montreal, where the Protestant element is considerable, political meetings on Sunday have been abolished out of deference to Protestant sentiment.

Mr. LAURIER. They are abolished in Three Rivers.

Motion that committee rise, negatived: Yeas, 29; nays, 35.

Section 1, negatived: Yeas, 29; nays, 56.

On section 2,

Mr. CHARLTON. I place in your hands, Mr. Chairman, the following amendment prepared by the Minister of Justice, which it is understood meets the views entertained by him. While I would prefer the section as it stands, I recognize the necessity of taking not what I would desire to get, but what I can get in connection with this legislation, and if the Minister of Justice does not see fit to permit the whole section as it stands to pass, or rather give his sanction to the passage of the section, I will be content, if it is the sense of the committee, to accept the amendment, rather than obtain nothing at all. The amendment is as follows:—

1. No canal belonging to the Government of Canada shall be operated for traffic on Sunday except from the hour of midnight on Saturday to 6 o'clock in the morning of Sunday, and from and after the hour of 9 o'clock at night on Sunday.

2. In the case of urgent necessity, arising from the pressure of business caused by an interruption of traffic or by the approach of the close of navigation, the foregoing provision may, from time to time, be suspended or varied by Order of the Governor General in Council, but no such Order in Council shall continue in force for a longer period than four weeks from the making thereof.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 3,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no doubt the railway business is one in which Sunday is transgressed very frequently without any great necessity. I have no doubt there is a great deal of shunting and work of that kind done which might be avoided; but it seems to me that any clause of this kind should be very carefully considered by those who are well acquainted with railway work, and framed in a way different from this section. The section prohibits in a very ambiguous way this kind of railway work. The section reads:

"Any railway superintendent, traffic manager or person, by virtue of whose authority and command railway cars or trains are on the Lord's Day loaded at any railway station in Canada, or despatched from such station when loaded, or permitted to continue a journey (except in the case of live stock and perishable goods) with Canadian local freight."

I do not pretend to be a railway man, but I cannot derive any meaning from these words. The words are not "trains having live stock on board or perishable goods," but "except in the case of live stock and perishable goods." We have not made any previous mention of live stock or perishable goods. I presume the language means trains loaded with live stock. The section does not say whether one head of stock is sufficient to enable a train to go through, or that a train cannot be run without a certain number of live stock on board. This should be defined. Again, what is Canadian local freight. Each railway manager understands what is local freight on his own road, but there is no means of defining what local freight is as regards all the railways. What is local freight on one road is not considered such on another. The section further says:

"Or any person as aforesaid who directs local passenger trains to be run on the Lord's Day (except one milk train)."

I have asked railway people what they would consider a milk train, and each of them has given me a different interpretation of what it may be. But if it is a train having milk on board simply, or a train having one can of milk on board, or a train supplying one locality with milk, it will be very easy to avoid coming within the section, which will amount to no prohibition whatever. A manager who wants to run a train will have enough milk on board to do so. The section continues:

"Any such special trains as are necessary for the purpose of conveying medical aid and means of relief in cases of accident, or to persons injured or afflicted with sickness or of conveying persons to visit dying relations, or for the purpose of conveying the means for extinguishing fire to places requiring such assistance or for other acts of assistance or mercy."

Is it sufficient that there should be some person on board a railway train who is going to convey medical aid or to visit a dying relation; or does it mean that all persons are prohibited from riding in trains except persons who have that charitable mission on hand? Then again it says:

"For the purpose of conveying medical aid and means of relief in cases of accident, or to persons injured or afflicted with sickness, or of conveying persons to visit dying relatives, or for the purpose of conveying the means for extinguishing fire to places requiring such assistance, or for other acts of necessity and mercy, or directs empty cars to be moved from station to station within the territory of Canada,—shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanour; but through passenger trains each way, with their necessary connections, shall be permitted by any trunk line of Canada."

I do not know what distinction can be instituted as to what a trunk line is, but there is a greater difficulty still in defining what through passenger trains are, because on each railway they are different. One could understand for instance that a train running from Montreal to Mile End would not be a through train, but would a train running from Montreal to Ottawa, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, be a through train? I do not know whether it is or not, but on some railways it would be. I suppose that on a railway running from the Pacific to the Atlantic a train must run all the way in order to have the right to run on Sunday. I think

that a through passenger train might, perhaps, on some railways, be one which would run to more than one station. Then we come to sub-section 2, which says:

"At such time as the laws of the United States shall make corresponding provision, no through freight in transit from one point on the frontier of the United States to some other point on the said frontier, shall be allowed to pass over Canadian roads on the Lord's Day, except live stock and perishable goods."

It would be a matter for proof what the laws of the United States would be whenever a prosecution would take place. When we want to adopt a provision like that, it is unusually provided that the law shall be proclaimed when the Governor in Council is informed that the laws are passed in the foreign states referred to. The Bill says that this law shall come into force whenever the laws of the United States make corresponding provision, but one does not know whether that refers to the law of Congress or to the law of particular states. For instance, from New York into Canada there might be a through freight train prohibited or allowed. I think that that subject requires careful and artistic drafting, which can only be done on consultation with experts, and after a very careful consideration. It would be better, considering that it is a quarter past 11 o'clock, for the committee to rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again, and the hon. gentleman who has the Bill in hand can in the meantime consider carefully what improvement he can make in this. For my part, and I presume I speak for a large number of the members of the House, we would be willing to adopt the provision to prevent a good deal of the ordinary, and, what seems for Sunday, unnecessary labour of shunting and moving cars and freight. But to adopt a clause with that end in view, which is so loosely framed as this, would simply be to make a dead letter. I, therefore, move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose I may be permitted to make a few remarks in reply to the objections taken by the Minister of Justice to section 3 of this Bill. It is very true as observed by the Minister of Justice that this is a section of very great importance, one requiring very great care indeed as to the phraseology of the Bill, and requiring consultation with railway experts in order that no mistakes shall be made in the provisions contained in the section. That is exactly what we have done. The committee had upon it representatives of the railway interests, and the managers of all the principal railways in this country were consulted in reference to this section; and a considerable portion of this section, that portion of it which the Minister of Justice criticises most unfavourably, was actually suggested and the words drafted by the then manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, Sir Joseph Hickson. I believe that the section, as it now stands, is satisfactory to the railway managers of this country, and the only objections which have been raised against it are objections raised by those who desire to curtail Sunday labour on railways, the objection being that the provisions of the section were altogether too liberal with regard to Sunday traffic. The hon. gentleman raises the objection that this Bill will permit the running of trains provided they put one car on with milk, or that they put one or two animals on the train, or that there is a doctor on board going somewhere to render assistance in case of an accident. The language of the Bill refers to special trains run for the purpose of works of mercy. It does not refer to regular trains, but the special trains rendered necessary by an emergency such as a conflagration in a town, or in case of a railway accident, or some catastrophe that required special exertions to be made. That portion of the Bill was drafted by Sir Joseph Hickson himself. The hon. gentleman says he does not understand what a through train is, but railway men understand what it is. A through train is a train that makes connection at the other end of the road in a foreign country or in Canada. A train from the Suspension Bridge in New York to Windsor, connecting at one end with the New York Central and on the other end with the Michigan Central, is a through train.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. A train from Halifax to Vancouver.

Mr. CHARLTON. A train from Halifax to Vancouver would be a through train. It would make connection with the steamer. A train from Montreal to Ottawa would be a local train. The Bill allows the necessary communication to be made with through passenger trains. The condition of railway travel was taken into consideration by the committee, and it was found to be utterly impossible to limit a road in its operations in such a way as to prevent the running of through trains on Sunday provided those competing lines in the United States were allowed to run Sunday trains, and it was found necessary to allow these roads the privilege of running Sunday trains in connection with their foreign business, in order that they can compete with other lines.

Mr. AMYOT. Would not that be a sin on Sunday?

Mr. CHARLTON. It was a work of necessity, because you could not adopt a law that would ruin the railways in their business.

Mr. AMYOT. They should not make money on Sundays.

Mr. CHARLTON. The committee were obliged to recognize the necessity of this. They could not adopt the strict requirements of the Jewish Sabbath. They were dealing with this question as a civil question. They were endeavouring to secure their civil rights to the people of this country who desired to have Sabbath rest and christian privileges, and they were not dealing with this question on a religious basis at all. The American lines are carrying freight from Chicago, St. Louis, and various western points to the seaboard, and the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk connect with all the Vanderbilt lines, the Baltimore and Ohio and the Pennsylvania Central system. If we were to make a provision that prevented the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway from forwarding their freight received from American connections on the Lord's Day, we would place them at a disadvantage that would be ruinous in competition with the American lines. But we can make provision with regard to local freight, and I contend that we ought to make that provision. We found that we cannot make a provision with regard to this through traffic until there is a corresponding provision made in the American law. The hon. Minister of Justice says that we do not provide whether it shall be the law of the States or

the law of the United States. It says the laws of the United States—not any particular state, but the United States. Railway traffic is controlled by the Congress of the United States, which has appointed an interstate commission for that purpose, and we can make no provision applicable to our roads that will not be consonant with the provisions of the American law without putting our railways at a disadvantage. It was the desire of the managers that that should not be done, and we have carefully guarded, so far as we could, the interests of the railway companies; and I believe that we have a Bill which meets with their approval, because it has been before the House for three sessions, and, so far as I am aware, it has never received any unfavourable criticisms from any railway manager in Canada. The provision in regard to perishable goods and live stock is, I think, clear enough. It might be well to say, "except in the case of car loads"; but live stock is only shipped in car loads. I am quite ready to admit that the clause is of such importance that it should be carefully sifted, and I am not disposed to say that the position taken by the Minister of Justice is entirely out of the way. Perhaps we are not prepared to say at this moment whether the section should receive the saction of the committee or not, but I believe that it is not liable to the objections which the hon. Minister of Justice supposes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman somewhat misunderstood my point. He understood me to contend that the term "through train" was not understood by railway men. My point was that each railway man understood it as applicable to his own railway. This clause, as the hon. gentleman explained to us, was drawn by the manager or the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and he drew it in a way which he could not object to. No doubt all his trains that run on Sunday are through trains in that sense: but what would be through trains on the Grand Trunk would not be through trains on a great many other railways, and on many of those railways trains that would be defined by Sir Joseph Hickson as through trains never run at all. There are many through trains that do not run into a foreign country or connect with a steamer. There are many railways only 40 miles, or 80 or 100 or 200 miles long which run through trains, but they would not be through trains in that sense. As regards the second provision, that certain things shall happen when the United States law shall provide certain things, I merely mentioned to the hon. gentleman, as a precaution, that the State of New York, for instance, might some day provide that through trains should not run on Sunday, and his view would be that we should stop them in Canada. The hon. gentleman says that it means the federal laws of the United States. But there never will be a law of Congress forbidding the running of a train on Sunday, because Congress has not power to pass it. It has power to regulate trade and commerce by the running of trains through different states, but it has no power to make anything a crime or an offence except in regard to regulating trade and commerce. But if the proviso satisfies the hon. gentleman, I have no objection to it. The hon. gentleman tells us that the section has been framed by persons skilled in railway matters; but it may be that, in addition, it requires to be drafted from a legal point of view, so that it will not be capable of misinterpretation or of being entirely set at naught; and the difficulty that occurs to my mind with regard to the advice which the hon. gentleman has taken, is that he has been advised by a gentleman who has been impressed with this clause in a way that will suit one railway in Canada or perhaps two, but may not suit the others. However, it is for the committee to say.

Committee rose and reported progress.

RETURN ORDERED.

Copy of all correspondence, papers and reports relating to the investigation into the conduct of William Prosser, fishery overseer for the district fronting the County of Essex, on Lake Erie, and his dismissal from office.—(Mr. Allan.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 31st May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. FRÉMONT. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would call the attention of the Government to the fact that there was an Order of the House dated the 20th March, for some papers respecting the Experimental Farm which are not yet produced. They relate especially to the French correspondence of that department. Since that time, I have received several letters complaining of the same irregularity in the French correspondence, and I think those papers should be brought down as soon as possible. I have received since several letters and complaints, and amongst them a letter from a party in the district of Quebec stating that he wrote to the department and received no reply until five weeks had elapsed. This is not the way in which to treat French correspondents who want to get information.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. This morning I received a letter from a priest in my county stating that many times he has asked for information and bulletins, and he has never received an answer, and he asks me if anything can be done. I am told that the Seminary of Quebec have asked for copies of papers from that farm and have not received any answer. I do not know what the reason is, but this morning I received about the tenth letter on that subject within two or three weeks. No satisfaction whatever can be got from this department. There must be something wrong, and I hope the Minister will see that some man will be appointed who understands French and can write in French, so that he will be able to answer these communications promptly.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As soon as the Minister of Agriculture arrives I will ask him what is the cause of the delay. On the day that the

motion was passed the Minister assured me that there was a French-speaking gentleman from the Province of Quebec appointed to attend to the correspondence from that province, and there has been another person appointed since to that staff who is perfectly efficient in French and in English, so that no further delay is likely to occur from that cause.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I am told that there is a gentleman there who understands French, but he has not the time to look after the correspondence. If there is another one he cannot be there very often because of the many complaints we have had, and this gentleman is supposed to be employed to show people about the farm.

QUEBEC JUDGES' TRAVELLING EXPENSES.

Mr. FLINT. When are we likely to have the returns as to the travelling expenses of the judges in the Province of Quebec, which were ordered some time ago ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot say that it will be very soon, because communication has had to be made with every judge in the province.

Mr. LAURIER. It ought to appear on the returns.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No ; the hon. gentleman requires more details than appear in the returns. They have been asked for, but, if there are any particular items which the hon. gentleman desires to have in the meantime, if he will send me a memorandum, I will see that they are brought down.

ISSUE OF WRITS FOR ELECTIONS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). At a very early period of the session, I moved for a return as to the bye-elections, the period when the warrants were issued, the time that elapsed before the issue of the writs, and the cause of the delay. There was laid on the Table shortly after that motion was made a return showing the period when the warrants were issued, but, up to this hour, there has been no return showing the period that elapsed between the issue of the warrants and the issue of the writs, and, although I have frequently brought the matter to the attention of the House and have been promised that the return should be made without delay, up to this moment the information has not been given.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Secretary of State is looking after that matter personally, and he will be in the House in a few moments.

THE WRIT FOR PONTIAC.

Mr. LAURIER. Has the writ for Pontiac been issued ? I understood from the hon. gentleman on Friday that the writ had been issued, but now I understand it was only issued yesterday.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Saturday.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the hon. gentleman tell me from memory who is the returning officer ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know the name, but the date is the date I mentioned on Friday evening, the 21st June.

THE WRIT FOR FRONTENAC.

Mr. LAURIER. Has the writ for Frontenac been issued ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, and nomination will be on the 10th June.

FARMER DELEGATES' REPORT.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I want to say to the Minister of Justice that he promised that the report of the British delegates of the tenant farmers would in all likelihood be laid upon the Table last week, but it has not yet been brought down. When may we expect to get it ? I have had several communications from my constituents, asking me to procure copies of it as soon as possible.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume the hon. gentleman refers to the Farm Delegates to the Maritime Provinces ?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Yes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The reports have been received, and there is no objection to bringing them down. I will lay them on the Table in a day or two, if the motion be adopted that they be brought down.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

Mr. LAURIER. Apart from the dispositions of this Bill, to which it must be my unpleasant duty to allude presently, the very fact that this measure has been postponed and put off until, I may say, the dying hours of the session, is in itself sufficient to deserve the most severe censure of this House. We are now entering the 13th week of the session, and to-day for the first time this Bill is brought up for discussion. Parliament was opened on the 25th February, and this measure was announced in the Speech from the Throne. It should even then have been ready when Parliament was convened, but it was not until the 29th day of April that the measure was introduced, that is to say, more than two months after it had been announced. Now, on the 31st day of May, when Parliament has been in session for over three months, and when prorogation ought to be within sight, the Bill is now called up for the second reading. This procrastination, whatever the cause may be, whether it be negligence or design, is unpardonable and most culpable. I protest, and I believe the House ought to support me in protesting, against this system, for system it is. It cannot be called negligence, after so many repetitions of delay. I protest against this system too long indulged in by this Government, of delaying their most important legislation until the last days of the session when members are naturally anxious to get away to their own business. Sir, as everybody knows, this House is not recruited from a privileged class. The members of this House are not men of leisure ; they are mostly, if not all, engaged of necessity in the actual pursuits of life, and there are few of them who can be, without great prejudice, removed from their active spheres of occupation for so long a period at a time. Now, however, whatever may be the inconvenience, the cost, the sacrifice, this measure has to be debated, dis-

cussed, canvassed, with all the attention that its importance deserves. Coming now to the measure itself, the House will remember that when the hon. gentleman introduced it three or four weeks ago, he stated that it would be found on examination to fair and impartial to all parties, and that to it could not be applied the odious term of gerrymander. For my part, I must say I received this statement with mixed feelings of gratification and diffidence, hoping that perhaps the hon. gentleman would find it possible to be as good as his word and shake himself free of the unsavoury traditions attaching to Bills of this kind, but at the same time fearing that perhaps the weight of those traditions would overbear his professed good intentions, and by them curbed to the ground. The hon. gentleman had not proceeded very far before my hopes began to waver, and they soon vanished completely. As the hon. gentleman proceeded in his speech and came to those portions of the Province of Quebec with which I am personally familiar, it became evident to me, either that the hon. gentleman meant to be supremely sarcastic, or that he was not the author of the measure which he had introduced; and that in the midst of his labours he had not had time to give it all the care and the attention which were necessary to enable him to see what the consequences of such an enactment would be. But now, the hon. gentleman has had time to consider his measure, and if to-day he does not recall the words of encomium which he passed upon it at first, I am sure that even yet he has not given the attention to that measure which he ought to have done, as otherwise I am sure he would refuse to have anything to do with it. But the hon. gentleman gives it the authority of his name, although I think I do him no injustice if I say that it is not altogether his production. I think I am within the limits of truth when I say that this measure, in so far, at all events, as the Province of Quebec is concerned, is not his own production. It is an open secret that, in so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, this measure was incubated in a committee room in another branch of the Legislature, where it was prepared by two or three legislators more particularly interested, a fact which I am sure is not of a nature to impress any one with its fairness. But if the hon. gentleman was in earnest when he spoke as he did, he must have been greatly surprised at the comments of the press upon that measure which he pronounced to be fair and equitable to all parties. I will not speak of the comments of the Liberal press, because in this country party lines are so tightly drawn that, perhaps, a man may rightly object to be judged by the comments of his opponents in the press; but if the hon. gentleman was in earnest when he spoke, he must have been greatly shocked at the comments of the independent press. The hon. gentleman is aware that the independent press of the country, with scarcely an exception, has been unanimous in condemning that measure which he pronounced fair and equitable to all parties. It has been condemned by the Toronto *Mail*, it has been condemned by the Montreal *Star*, it has been condemned by the Montreal *Witness*, and it has been condemned by the Ottawa *Evening Journal*. Sir, if the hon. gentleman was in earnest he must have been surprised, not only at the comments of the independent press, but at the comments of the press of his own party. The measure, forsooth, received the sympathy and the endorsation of the press of his own party, not, however, because in the estimation of that press, the measure was fair and equitable to all parties, but because, to use a well-known phrase, it was another measure to dish the Grits with. Let me recall to the House the language used by one of the ministerial organs of the Government. The Hamilton *Spectator*, speaking of the measure, used the following language:—

"Reformers raise the cry that the reapportionment is a gerrymander, and announce their intention to block the wheels of legislation, unless it should be so changed as to give them an advantage. If they take that course we earnestly recommend Mr. Abbott to make it a gerrymander, and to secure a party advantage wherever it is possible to do so."

The Liberal party want no advantage. We claim here nothing but fair-play and justice, nothing more and nothing less. As to Mr. Abbott, it was quite useless for the organ to tender him this advice, because Mr. Abbott, or Sir John Abbott, as I should call him, was quite up to the level of his organ, and the measure which has been introduced secures an advantage for his party wherever it is possible to secure an advantage, or at all events wherever it was possible to secure a sweet morsel out of the general hodge-podge. Indeed, I have been told, and I have reason to believe, that we have been saved redistribution in the Province of Quebec simply because it was not possible for all friends of the Government to agree as to who should be sacrificed, otherwise the district of the city of Quebec would have been rearranged as is proposed with respect to the district of Montreal. Sir, this measure, which the Minister of Justice has professed to declare to be fair and equitable, I denounce to the House to-day, and in doing so I place myself in the judgment of the House, as an infamous attack on the minority, and I declare it to be an unmanly scheme in order to obtain by legislation for the Conservative party seats which they would not be able to obtain by any other method. To characterize it as it should be characterized, there is no other term to apply to it but the term from which the hon. Minister himself recoiled, and to call it an odious gerrymander, and nothing else. In the discussion of this measure, I may say at once that so far as the details are concerned, I shall confine myself to the Province of Quebec. Some other hon. members on this side of the House, who are more familiar than myself with the other provinces, will deal with the details of the measure in so far as they affect their own provinces. In so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, and I may say for that matter in so far as Ontario is concerned, there is absolutely no *raison d'être* for this Bill. There is a *raison d'être*, there is a legal necessity for this Bill in some of the other provinces, in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba, because there, under the terms of the constitution, the representation has to be remodelled in consequence of the census. The representation of the Maritime Provinces has to be decreased, the representation of Manitoba has to be increased, and therefore, so far as these four provinces are concerned there is a *raison d'être*, a legal necessity for the measure. But in so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, and in so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, there is no legal necessity whatever

for this measure, because according to the census the Province of Ontario was to remain as at present in regard to its representation; and so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, I submit that the only reason which has been given for redistributing Quebec is not a tenable one. The only reason given for redistributing Quebec is the alleged necessity of increasing the representation of Montreal. I am not prepared to admit for my part that Montreal is at all entitled to increased representation. It is admitted generally, it is admitted specifically in this Bill, that there is to be a difference between the representation of urban populations and the representation of rural populations. That object is obvious. Urban populations are represented generally to a greater degree than are rural populations, because urban populations generally furnish to rural populations many of their members. Take the city of Montreal. According to the last census, the city of Montreal had a total population of 180,000. The County of Hochelaga, which to some extent forms part of Montreal, has a population of 82,000 souls; so the total urban population which may be called the population of Montreal is 262,000 souls. There are, for the County of Hochelaga and the city of Montreal, sitting on the floor of this House four members, or one member for 65,000 souls. It has been stated on the floor of this House by the hon. gentleman who introduced this measure that the unit of population in the Province of Quebec was 22,800. The unit of population in Montreal under this Bill is not 22,800; but as Montreal and Hochelaga are given seven members, there will be one member to every 37,000 souls. The Bill itself, therefore, acknowledges that the unit of population which is said to be the proper and legal unit for rural populations, is not admitted in the Bill itself for the city of Montreal. And there is reason for it. The city of Montreal is represented on the floor of this House in other constituencies. It is represented in this House by no less than thirteen of its citizens. Montreal is not represented simply by its own members. It is represented by Sir Donald Smith, member for Montreal West; Mr. Curran, member for Montreal Centre; Mr. Lépine, member for Montreal East; Mr. Desjardins, member for Hochelaga; Hon. Mr. Chapleau, member for Terrebonne; Hon. Mr. Ouimet, member for Laval; Mr. Bergeron, member for Beauharnois; Mr. Beausoleil, member for Berthier; Mr. Préfontaine, member for Chambly; Mr. Girouard, member for Jacques Cartier; Mr. Brodeur, member for Rouville; Mr. Pelletier, member for Laprairie; Mr. White, member for Cardwell. Now, in the face of these facts I have reason to repeat that the city of Montreal does not speak on the floor of this House simply by the three members who have been elected within its precincts, but it has thirteen of its citizens to speak in its behalf. I do not complain of the fact whatever. I hope we shall never come to the American system under which no man can be elected unless he is a resident of the electoral district which he is ambitious to represent. But I do say this, that so long as the urban population of Montreal continues to supply the rural constituencies with members at this rate, there is no reason whatever why Montreal should be more largely represented than it is at the present time. But there is something more. Supposing that Montreal was entitled to a larger number than its present representation on the floor of this House, the proposition which I submit to the House, and it is the cardinal proposition to which I call the attention of both sides of the House, so that if Montreal is entitled to larger representation than at present, and as the Province of Quebec is confined to 65 members and no more under the terms of the Constitutional Act, then the changes which must take place in consequence of the increased representation of Montreal ought to be such as to leave the equilibrium existing now between party and party the same after redistribution as now. The proposition I lay down is, that under this Bill one party should not gain an advantage over the other. What I charge against this measure, what I have already stated against it is this, that under the pretense of giving the city of Montreal a larger representation than it has to-day, the Government have taken a most unfair advantage of their opponents. The Government appear to be willing to secure the advantage of securing several seats by the arrangement proposed in the Bill. If hon. members will look at the measure they will see that in the Province of Quebec 25 constituencies are reconstituted. These 25 are the following:—Montreal West, Montreal Centre, Montreal East, Laval, L'Assomption, Joliette, Montcalm, Berthier, Jacques Cartier, Chateauguay, Laprairie, St. John's, Iberville, Rouville, Chambly, St. Hyacinthe, Bagot, Richelieu, Yamaska, Verchères, Napierville, Hochelaga, Three Rivers, St. Maurice, and Ottawa. Mark you, out of these 25 constituencies which are reconstituted under this Bill, the Government carried at the last election 12 and the Opposition carried 13 seats, and accordingly upon the floor of this House those constituencies are represented by 12 members on the ministerial side and 13 members supporting the Opposition. The ministerial constituencies are the following:—Montreal West, Montreal Centre, Montreal East, Laval, Joliette, Montcalm, Jacques Cartier, Laprairie, Bagot, Hochelaga, Three Rivers, and St. Maurice, total 12. The constituencies held by the Opposition are:—L'Assomption, Berthier, Chateauguay, St. John's, Iberville, Rouville, Chambly, St. Hyacinthe, Richelieu, Yamaska, Verchères, Napierville, and Ottawa—13. Or, in these 25 constituencies, the Opposition hold a majority of one, and now, Sir, by the result of this Bill which is proposed to the House: this Bill which it is impossible to characterize by any other term than an odious gerrymander, this minority of one to the Government is converted into a majority of five to the Government, or a net gain of seven seats. These are the figures, and taking the figures just as they were at the last polling day, and supposing the votation to be the same as last time, the Government will have under the new Bill: In the city of Montreal: the division of St. Mary's with a majority of over 500, the division of St. James with a majority of 100, the division of St. Lawrence with a majority of 1,000, the division of St. Antoine with a majority of 2,000, and the division of Ste. Anne with a majority of 1,200; the division of Hochelaga east with the majority of 381, the division of Hochelaga west with a majority of 678, Laval with a majority of 648, Joliette with a majority of 278. Montcalm with a majority of over 500, Jacques Cartier with a majority of 556, Laprairie with a majority of 151, Chambly with a majority

of 108, Bagot with a majority of 248, and Three Rivers and St. Maurice with a majority of 345. Under this same Bill, the Opposition would have on their side L'Assomption with a majority of 41, Berthier with a majority of 194, Chateauguay with a majority of 246, St. John's and Iberville with a majority of 712, Rouville with a majority of 700, St. Hyacinthe with a majority of 230, Richelieu with a majority of 415, Yamaska with a majority of 195, Ottawa North with a majority of 84, and Ottawa South with a majority of 330. Now, Sir, we will be told as a justification for this Bill: "What can you complain of under these figures? The principle laid down by the Minister of Justice when he introduced this measure, was that the object of reconstructing these constituencies was to bring them up to the standard of 22,800 souls, and if in constituting these counties they were brought up to that standard, it would be a fact which could not be objected to." But, Sir, I call the attention of the House to the fact that, although the Minister of Justice stated on the floor of Parliament when he introduced this measure that the object of the Government in revising the constituencies was to bring them up to the unit of 22,800, yet there is not a single one of these counties where this proposition has been carried out. There is not one which has been brought up to the standard which was mentioned by the Minister of Justice. I will pass over the city constituencies which do not come within the rule of the unit of population, and I will review the rural constituencies; and first of all *à tout seigneur, tout honneur*, as we say in French, I will take the County of Laval, which is represented by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. The population of Laval according to the last census was 9,436, and by the Bill the County of Laval is to receive from the County of Hochelaga five parishes, namely, Sault au Recollet, St. Joseph de la Rivière des Prairies, St. Léonard de Port Maurice, Longue Pointe and Pointe aux Trembles, and this will bring the population of the County of Laval to a unit of—what, Sir? Of 22,800? Far from it. Not to the unit of 22,800, but to a total of 16,504. That is to say, the County of Laval, instead of being brought up to the standard of 22,800, lacks 6,000 souls of that number. But, Sir, there is another difference and there is another result from that arrangement of figures. My hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, had a very substantial majority at the last election. It has always been supposed that the County of Laval was very safe for the Conservative party; but Shakespeare has said somewhere, "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown." My hon. friend from Laval is now crowned king of the district of Montreal, if I mistake not, and his head is apparently uneasy under the crown which he wears, because he was not satisfied with the majority of 534 which anybody would think sufficient, but he has increased it by this little manipulation to a majority of 645.

Mr. OUIMET. Where do you find that? I am glad to hear it, but it is the first time I knew it.

Mr. LAURIER. It may be the first time our friend has considered it, but if he looks through the blue-book he will probably find that it is correct. I must say, however, that the figures are not mine, but they have been supplied to me by my hon. friend behind me.

Mr. OUIMET. You had better look it up yourself.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well. We are only commencing this discussion to-day and we will have occasion to review these figures again. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to tell me, then, what will be the result of the change that has taken place?

Mr. OUIMET. I do not know.

Mr. LAURIER. You do not know. If the hon. gentleman does not know he had better not speak, or he had better wait until he does know before he speaks.

Mr. OUIMET. If I speak from the figures of the last election I would be 50 behind.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, you would be 600.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Behind?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, ahead.

Mr. OUIMET. We will see about that.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman takes issue on the fact, and I will be glad to settle that with him before the debate is over. Now, Sir, I will take another county, and in this county I have verified the figures myself. The population of the County of Joliette last census was 22,921, and I am sure the hon. gentleman will not dispute that. Now, 22,921 is as near the unit as a population can well be. Although this county has the unit of population required by the hon. gentleman who introduced the measure, yet the parish of St. Paul is removed from the County of Joliette, and thereby the population of that county is decreased to 21,436, so that at the very outset, instead of bringing the population of the County of Joliette up to the required unit, the difference which is made puts it farther away from the unit than before. But, Sir, there is an operation which is performed by this change in the population of the County of Joliette, and upon this I challenge the contradiction of the hon. gentleman. By taking away the parish of St. Paul from the County of Joliette, the majority of the hon. gentleman who now represents the county, and who was elected by 60 majority last election, is increased to a total of 278. Before the last election the county had been held by the Liberals, but in order to carry it for the Government a promise was made of a railway through the parish of St. Jean de Matha, and with the promise of a railway and other devices, the county was carried by 60 majority, which is not a very large figure. Now, the parish of St. Paul, in the County of Joliette, which gave to the Liberal candidate 218 majority—I may say that the parish has been a Liberal parish for fifty years past, and has never wavered in its allegiance to the Liberal party—the removing of that parish from the County of Joliette increases the majority of the sitting member, according to the returns of last election, to the figure of 278. Now, what becomes of the parish of St. Paul under this Bill? The parish of St. Paul is added to the County of Montcalm. Probably it may be said that the object of doing this is to bring the population of Montcalm to the unit of 22,800. Let us see if that is the case. The population of Montcalm, according to the census, is 12,131, and by the addition of the parish of St. Paul, it is brought to the figure of 13,616, that is to say, 9,000 short of the

unit of 22,800. I pass next to the County of L'Assomption, which has always been an uncertain county, carried sometimes by the Conservatives and sometimes by the Liberals. The Liberals have held it since 1887. Mr. Gauthier, the gentleman elected last time, carried it by a majority of 78. The population of L'Assomption is 13,674. The parish of Berthier is taken from the County of Berthier and added to L'Assomption, bringing its population up to 14,661, very far yet from the unit; but the majority of Mr. Gauthier is thereby reduced to the figure of 41. On the other hand, the population of Berthier, which according to the census was 19,836, is reduced to 18,849, and the majority of my hon. friend who represents that county is increased from 157 to 194. Now, I pass to the County of Jacques Cartier, which had a population of 13,832. From the County of Hochelaga five parishes are taken and added to the County of Jacques Cartier, giving it a population of 19,482, still 3,000 from the unit; but this brings the majority of my hon. friend who represents that county to the figure of 556, a pretty fair figure to start an election with. Now let us come to Laprairie. By the census that county had a population of 10,800; but three parishes are added to Laprairie—Ste. Philomène and Chateauguay from Chateauguay, bringing the population up to 15,184.

An hon. MEMBER. With the post office.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, and a post office. Though there was a promise of a post office, it was not considered enough to carry the county. The hon. gentleman who carried it last time for the Conservative party, carried it by only 54; but with the addition of these Conservative parishes from Napierville and Chateauguay, his majority is increased to 151, with the post office besides. The County of Chateauguay is rather strangely dealt with. Four parishes are added from Napierville—St. Edouard, St. Cyprien, St. Rémi, and St. Patrice de Sherrington; but two parishes are taken from Chateauguay—Ste. Philomène and Chateauguay. If these two parishes had been left in Chateauguay, they would have brought the population of the county to something over 22,000, just about the unit, whereas now it is only 19,681. But these parishes were needed in the County of Laprairie. The counties of St. John's and Iberville are united. St. John's had a population of 12,282, and Iberville a population of 11,893, that is a united population of 24,175. But there is a curious feature about this. The parish of Lacolle has apparently been forgotten; what has become of it is a secret of the gods. By the map it is a part of the County of St. John's, but if we look for it in the Bill we cannot find it. It seems to be transferred to the County of Missisquoi, where it may perhaps do some service for my hon. friend who represents that county.

Mr. BAKER. It will come to the front by and by.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. And the post office, too.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, and the post office, too. The County of Rouville has been very curiously dealt with also. Five municipalities have been withdrawn from it:—Marieville, Richelieu Village, Ste. Angèle, Ste. Marie de Monnoir and St. Mathias. But there is added to it from Bagot the parishes of St. Dominique and St. Pie; from Verchères the parish of Belœil, and from St. Hyacinthe, the parish of Ste. Marie Magdeleine. This brings the population of Rouville to the figure of 18,789, and the majority of my hon. friend who now represents that county so worthily, to no less than 700. It was at one time said that the Grits were hived in Ontario. This time it is the Rouges who are hived in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. OUIMET. You are complaining that the Conservatives are hived also.

Mr. LAURIER. I was not complaining of it. I was just showing how it worked.

Mr. OUIMET. You complain in both ways.

Mr. LAURIER. Now I come to Chambly, which is now represented in the interests of the Liberal party. By the census it had a population of 11,704. Two parishes are added from Verchères—Varennes and Ste. Julie, and four from Rouville—Richelieu, Marieville, Ste. Marie de Monnoir and Ste. Angèle. This brings the population up to 19,882, 3,000 below the unit; but it converts the majority of 87 of my hon. friend into a Conservative majority of 108. St. Hyacinthe, which had a population of 21,433, has been deprived of Ste. Marie Magdeleine, and has had added to it the parishes of St. Antoine and St. Marc from Verchères, giving it a population of 22,868; but the majority is reduced by just one-half, from 500 to 250. Now I come to the County of Bagot, which seems to carry off the palm from all others. It had a population of 21,695 by the census. Two Liberal parishes, St. Dominique and St. Pie, are withdrawn from it; one parish, St. Marcel, is added from Richelieu; and two parishes, St. Guillaume and St. Bonaventure from Drummond, making the population 21,655. This is a reduction of 40 in the population, but it has the effect of increasing the majority of 53, by which the hon. gentleman who now represents the county holds his seat, to no less than 248, a very substantial figure. With regard to Richelieu, I have nothing particular to say, beyond mentioning the fact that its Liberal majority is increased to about 400. In Yamaska, the Liberal majority is increased from 170 to 195. Three Rivers and St. Maurice are united—Three Rivers with a population of 8,834 and St. Maurice with a population of 12,267, making a united population of 21,101. The County of Ottawa is divided into two. It has a population of 64,000 souls, and the hon. gentleman told us when he introduced this measure that the object of the division was to create two ridings with a population of 32,000 each. Now, let us see how that is carried out. Ottawa North will have how many? 32,000? No, but 17,329. Ottawa South will have how many? Not 32,000, but 17,000. The majority in Ottawa North will be only 84, whereas in Ottawa South it will be 330. There may be a hope of carrying Ottawa North for the Conservative party, while there is such a narrow majority, and especially while the country is so new and has such an unsettled population. The result of this Bill is to turn the majority of one against the Government to-day to a majority of five in their favour. Will any one tell me that the ministerial professions which were made here have been realized? Will any one suppose that the object of this redistribution was to bring those constituencies to an average of 22,800 souls each? There can have been no such intention. There is

not one instance where the average is reached by the remodelling which has taken place. There can be but one object, and that is the sinister object of gaining to the Conservatives constituencies which they do not hold to-day or hold by very precarious tenure. And if there could be any doubt whatever as to the sinister object of the Government, if there could be any doubt as to their intention to take an unfair advantage of their opponents and stab them in the back, let me call the attention of the House to the comments which are to be found in the chief organ of the Government in the Province of Quebec, *La Minerve*. This Bill was introduced on the 29th of April, and on the 22nd of May *La Minerve*, among other comments on special subjects had this:

"The Liberals of St. Hyacinthe have lost their cheerfulness, but on the other hand Mr. Brodeur looks upon the future with confidence."

This is very plain. The Liberals of St. Hyacinthe have lost their cheerfulness—why? Because their majority has by this measure been reduced to one-half of what it was, whereas the County of Rouville, represented by Mr. Brodeur, has been made a Rouge hive. Then passing to Chambly, this paper says:

"Mr. Préfontaine thinks he will run for some other constituency besides that which he represents to-day."

What is the inference? It is very plain. By the Bill which had been introduced two days before, the Liberal majority of Chambly had been turned into a Conservative majority of 150. This clause of the law is simply adding insult to injury and shows the spirit in which this measure was conceived. It was designed by its authors to swamp their opponents; and in a moment of unguarded frankness the whole truth came to light, as I have just shown. I do not propose to discuss the details of this Bill. I do not propose to go into any other province, but some of my friends will follow me and show how their provinces are affected; and everywhere it will be seen that the spirit is precisely the same. Everywhere it will be seen that the spirit of unfairness and injustice prevails. Now, no criticism would be complete which, while it shows the defection of the Bill, would not show, at the same time, the true principles which ought to be applied in a measure of this kind, not only on this occasion, but on all similar occasions. Sir, it is a cardinal feature of British institutions that we have representation by population. That principle was not obtained in this country without, as everybody knows, great agitation, an agitation which, I am sure, the veterans of former struggles keep in memory. According to our constitution, every province is to be represented in proportion to its numerical strength, and the proportion of the other provinces is determined by that of the pivot province, the Province of Quebec, whose representation of 65 members cannot be departed from. This Bill has for its ostensible object the carrying out of that feature of the constitution which requires that, after every census, the representation should be apportioned again according to the movement of the census. I may here remark that this Bill is a very suggestive comment upon what was known as the National Policy—a name which at one time commanded some respect in the provinces and evoked some enthusiasm among hon. gentlemen on the other side. Then it filled their mouths with praise, but to-day they no longer pronounce it with the same gusto. By this Bill the Government has declared to the world that, after twelve years of the National Policy, the population of Ontario remains what it was and its representation remains unchanged, whereas the population of New Brunswick has decreased, and its representation has decreased, owing to this policy. The population of Nova Scotia has likewise decreased and its representation is lessened by one; the representation of New Brunswick is lowered by two, and that of Prince Edward Island by one. Should this state of things continue for another decade, the veterans of former days who fought for representation by population will have cause to regret the success of their efforts, because it would have been better for their provinces had their representation remained stationary. But whether the population of this country increase or decrease, it is a necessity after each census that the representation of the different provinces must be remodelled according to their population; and what I submit to the House is this, that this redistribution should not take place according to the whim or the fancy or the selfishness or arbitrariness of the majority, whatever may be that majority, but that it should be carried on on fixed, determined, well understood principles, to be applied on this and all other similar occasions. In some quarters the suggestion has been made that the duty of redistribution should be referred to a commission of judges specially appointed; in other words, that Parliament should divest itself of its powers in this most important particular. Sir, I am bound to say at once that this is a proposition which my friends and I would not favour either upon this or any other subject. I am bound to say that we would not entrust to any this duty and privilege which properly belongs to Parliament. Moreover, this proposition implies a singular want of confidence in parliamentary institutions. It implies that in a matter of this kind the majority would never be able to rise above the low temptation of strengthening themselves at the expense of their opponents. I am sorry to say that there is some ground in our history for such a conclusion; but, on the other hand, I am happy to say also that the mother land affords an example where the majority, composed, I am still more satisfied to say, of the Liberal party showed itself equal to the highest conception of equity and justice upon such an occasion; and the majority in this country are charged with having on similar occasions abused their power, still the conclusion to which I and my friends come to is, not that Parliament should on that account deprive itself of its power, not that a sound principle should be departed from, but rather that we should appeal to the majority to rise to a nobler conception of their duty and do in the country what the majority composed of the Liberal party did in Great Britain. On this side we are not disposed, even with this glaring abuse of the power of the majority, to come to the conclusion that Parliament should divest itself of its rights and privileges. We stand by the principle that the inherent power of Parliament must on all occasions be exercised by Parliament itself. In Great Britain on only one occasion has Parliament divested itself of one of its inherent powers, namely, the trial of controverted elections; but there were obvious reasons for taking that course. In the matter of controverted elections, the law was not the common law but the statute

law ; it was a statute enacted by Parliament ; and the contest of rival claimants in such a matter is just as much a judicial contest as any other controversy between party and party ; and, therefore, it was quite proper that contest should be judicially adjudicated upon. But apart from this judicial question, if it were admitted that there may be questions as to the solution of which Parliament can be conveniently, superseded by another body, that would be, I think, fatal to parliamentary institutions ; and, moreover, I may say that, if a majority of Parliament cannot be trusted to do justice in a matter of this kind, to refer the matter to a commission would be begging the question and not solving it, because what would happen ? If the majority of Parliament could not be trusted to do justice in such a case, the commission would be appointed by the same men who, according to that, could not be trusted to do right. The commissioners would be stamped with their own image, swayed by their own spirit, and no greater justice could be expected from the commissioners than from the body that appointed them. No, we stand upon the authority of Parliament itself, but we submit that, while Parliament should exercise that power it should be exercised in a spirit of moderation, fairness, equity and justice, after the precedent we find in the mother country. Similar questions have come up in the Imperial Parliament, but there the solution has been very different from what it has been here. In 1884 the Government of Mr. Gladstone introduced a measure to extend the franchise to a large class of Her Majesty's subjects that had hitherto been deprived of it. It was then estimated that two million electors would be added to the roll. It was anticipated that a large proportion of those would be on the Liberal side. It was generally admitted that there would be such a disproportion between the voting power of the existing constituencies that redistribution should take place, and at the same time the Conservative party, then in Opposition, expressed the dread lest perhaps the Government of Mr. Gladstone might introduce into England the system which has become well known in American history and which has introduced a new word into the English language with which we are very familiar here. But Mr. Gladstone not only repudiated that, but he took an early opportunity on the floor of Parliament to hold it up to the scorn of the country in language which can be well quoted to this House. He said :

"I am bound to say that I proceed upon this principle and basis—that it is absolutely impossible to construct any large measure of redistribution, in my opinion, which shall not be a measure favourable on the whole to popular liberty. I am sorry that in a great and august Assembly ingenuity has been exercised to import from across the Atlantic words which belong to the vocabulary of slang. I shall not recite any of these words ; but I do think that the standard of parliamentary language is not unimportant and there is an increasing necessity for paying attention to it. I frankly own I can conceive making a small measure of redistribution which shall be a surreptitious and dishonest measure ; but if the measure be a large one—I do not know what human ingenuity can accomplish. I am sure that no ingenuity which I can command or which my colleagues can command, could by any possibility enable us to produce such a measure other than favourable to the general liberties of the people. Therefore, it is our desire to approach the subject in a large and comprehensive spirit."

These words of Mr. Gladstone were not pronounced upon the Redistribution Bill, but on the second reading of the Representation Bill, and then he approached the subject of the redistribution and stated that on the subject of the franchise there were between one party and the other vital differences which could not be reconciled, but, as far as redistribution was concerned, it was advisable that both parties should concur in framing a Bill, and should agree upon the principles and the dispositions of that measure. Let me quote again his language on that occasion :

"But this question of redistribution, however, from its complexity, is necessarily more open to variety ; and fortunately, as it is much less a subject of vital difference between the respective parties, we desire, and we not only desire, but we feel that we should endeavour if possible—and I cannot say yet whether it will be possible—to make the measure of redistribution what, unfortunately, we could not make the measure with regard to the franchise, the work, not merely of the majority of the House, but one which should receive the approval of the House at large. I do not say it will be possible to attain that aim : but I do say it is our duty to strive to attain it, and not only our duty, but it will be our satisfaction to strive for it ; and if we are able to carry the great mass of opinion in this House without reference to party differences, I can only say that it will heighten the satisfaction with which we shall regard the consummation of a great work."

Now, this language of Mr. Gladstone will be more appreciated and better understood if I remind the House that at the very time when Mr. Gladstone was using that language, on the 6th November, 1884, he had made overtures to the leaders of the Conservative party to join with him in framing a Redistribution Bill. In corroboration of the statement I now make, I will quote from a book entitled "The Life, Letters and Diaries of Sir Stafford Northcote" by Andrew Lang, at page 205, of which there is this extract :

"On Sunday, October 26, Lord Norton came to me with a letter which he had received from Gladstone, referring to a conversation they had at Grillion's in July or August, when Gladstone had asked him what it was that the Conservatives wanted,—if it was that the urban element should be kept as much as possible out of the counties, he (Gladstone) agreed with us. Gladstone had now noticed some expressions of Carnarvon's at some public meeting, and taking a hint from them, he suggested some kind of intermediaries who might draw the scheme of redistribution. This had brought Adderley (Lord Norton) to town in a hurry, and it was obvious that Mr. Gladstone expected him, for we were all three in the Chapel Royal, and I observed some significant glances as he saw Norton come up to speak to me."

Now, you have it here, according to the testimony of Sir Stafford Northcote, that Mr. Gladstone made overtures to the leaders of the Conservative party to have their concurrence in the framing of a Redistribution Bill. One would imagine that offer would be readily accepted by the Conservative party, but such is the spirit of fairness in England that Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote would not consent to the negotiations unless they were assured that their hands would be perfectly free in the debate, and it was only on that assurance, given by Mr. Gladstone, that they consented. Let me quote the language of Lord Salisbury, who referred to the whole subject when the Redistribution Bill was introduced into the House of Lords on the 18th November. After having stated the overtures made by Mr. Gladstone, and the objection that he made that he was not sure whether his hands would be free or not, he continued as follows :—

"I requested an hon. gentleman—a relative of mine, Mr. Balfour—to communicate with members of Her Majesty's Government in 'another place' in order to ascertain whether my interpretation of the noble Earl's language was correct, and whether an entire surrender of our liberty with respect to the Franchise Bill was a condi-

tion precedent to any consultation as to details of the Redistribution Bill."

Then he goes on to tell what passed between Mr. Balfour and the members of the Government, the enquiry made by Mr. Balfour to the members of the Government as to whether the hands of the Opposition would be free with regard to the Representation Bill, and the Government answered through Lord Hartington, on behalf of Mr. Gladstone, as follows :—

"We should receive a request for consultation in a spirit of trust, and, assuming that the intention was to come to an agreement, should not ask for an adequate assurance beforehand."

Then Lord Salisbury continued as follows :—

"Of course, the importance of that statement it is impossible to exaggerate. According to it, it is now possible for us to go into communication with Her Majesty's Government with respect to the details of the Redistribution Bill."

And he concludes his speech in the following language, which I commend to the attention of the House :—

"Now, my Lords, I have nothing further at this present moment to say, except that I have welcomed with very great satisfaction the disposition which Her Majesty's Government have shown to meet this House in a manner which they justly conceive as agreeable to the position which they have taken up, and yet which fully satisfies the requirements which we have made. I only earnestly hope that our communications will commence at a sufficiently early period, and that in conducting them the Government will remember and act up to the full spirit of that which they said last night, namely, that the difficulty, if it arose, would not arise from their side."

Now, upon this proposition made by Mr. Gladstone to the leader of the Opposition, several conferences took place, and at last the details of the Bill were settled between the two parties. In confirmation of what I say, I will refer hon. members to a well-known book, the Annual Register of 1884, page 252. After speaking of the overtures for negotiations made by the Government to the leaders of the Opposition, the book goes on to say :

"During the next fortnight, the process of arrangement was steadily pursued, Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote attended the meetings of the Cabinet, and conducted the negotiations with the specially selected delegates of that body."

Now, what I have to say upon this occasion is that the course which was followed in England should be followed in Canada. What we ask is that the spirit of fair-play which induced Mr. Gladstone, upon a matter of this kind, to appeal to his opponents to assist in framing a fair and equitable measure, should be followed in this country. What we propose is that this measure of redistribution should be framed by a committee appointed in the same manner as the standing committees of this House. At the opening of every session the leaders of both parties, under the sanction of the House, meet and appoint the standing committees. This rule is invariably followed, and we propose that it be followed in respect to this measure. This was the principle followed in England by Mr. Gladstone, and accepted by Lord Salisbury, and this is the principle which I propose to this House. Before I sit down I will move this amendment :

That all the words after "That" in the said motion be omitted, and the following be inserted instead thereof:—"That Bill No. 76, an Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons, be referred to a conference or committee to be composed of both political parties to agree upon the lines or principles on which a redistribution Bill should be drawn."

Sir, it seems to me that the proposition involved in this amendment ought to commend itself to the judgment of every man in this House who cherishes British precedents, British institutions, and above all, British fair-play. The periodical redistribution of seats in this House is a standing order of our constitution. It is not a matter as to which the Government are free to act, which they can repudiate or which they can accept ; if it were so, it would be open to each party to deal with it in a manner best suited to its own interests, in the conception which both parties hold of their own rights. But it is not such a matter. The Government in introducing this Bill are simply carrying out an organic disposition of constitutional law, and we submit that it would be a monstrous consequence if, when the Government are carrying out an organic disposition of the constitutional law, they were to carry it out in such a way as to steal an advantage over their opponents. What I propose to the sense of justice to every man in this House is that this application of the law should be made in such a manner that both parties shall remain with the same advantages they now possess. Now, how is such a redistribution to be effected, I want to know ? By a conference of both parties which would be entrusted with drawing a Bill. How could that end be better gained than by following the example of moderation, justice and fair-play which was given by the Parliament of Great Britain ? Sir, we believe in constitutional government. It is not perfection, I grant, but it has made the mother land what it is to day. We have applied it to our own country, and we do so with great pride and a great flourish of loyal trumpets. We believe in constitutional government ; but, Sir, a constitutional government which has been the most perfect instrument of freedom yet devised among men, would be nothing but an instrument of despotism, if it were not carried out in the spirit of justice followed in Great Britain. The Government in this House profess to be strong ; they assert that their policy is popular, they assert that the population of Canada is with them. Sir, if they are sincere, if they believe the population of the country is with them, if they believe their policy is popular, why should they fear to meet their opponents in a fair field ? I am not here to claim any privileges from the majority of this House, but I am here to stand up for the rights of the minority. Sir, the majority of the people must rule. That is fair, that is proper, that is lawful, and what we want is that the voice of the minority may be heard, unshackled, untrammelled, and unfettered by the ingenious and cunning devices of a majority in this House. We want the voice of the people to be heard when it is expressed according to the conscience of every man, and when it has been so heard, be it for us or against us, we shall loyally abide by it.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman has been very eloquent indeed, more especially in the latter part of his speech, but I cannot say that he has been as practical as he has been eloquent. It is all very well to advocate an adherence to the practice of the British Parliament, to cite what has been said by the great men on the other side of the Atlantic, and to suggest a remedy, which is no remedy, in my opinion, and to come down and say that this Bill ought to be referred to a select committee

of the House. Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say that there is nothing in the proposition which commends itself to me. I say that if the discussion on this Bill is carried on in the same spirit on the other side of the House as we intend to carry it on this side of the House, there would be no advantage to be gained in referring this Bill to a select committee of five or more. Allow me to suggest this, that if the discussion is conducted in the fair spirit which we intend to display, this Bill will be dealt with in a much shorter time than if a select committee were sent to Room 42 or 43, where two or three members could keep us for at least six months. The majority of this House will deal with it in a fair spirit, as the Government has shown in the preparation of the Bill. It is a very poor reward to those who have spent their time and labour to do more than justice to the Opposition, even at the risk of meeting with the reproaches of our own supporters in this House, to be told by the leader of the Opposition that there is nothing but treachery in this Bill and that it exhibits a violent desire to obtain an undue advantage at the next elections. I observe some hon. members laughing; but I know in their inner hearts they fully appreciate and believe what I now say. This Bill gives them greater advantages, if we may judge of the future by the past, than they are entitled to; and I am going to prove it. The leader of the Opposition may wax eloquent when he declares that he desires nothing but the free, untrammelled expression of opinion of the majority of the people: but I will show him that from the beginning, whenever the party of hon. gentlemen opposite have governed this country, they have never done it with a majority. Take only the last election, and if hon. gentlemen opposite want further figures we will furnish them with as many more as they desire, and investigate the returns of the Province of Quebec. The figures showed that the Conservative majorities in that province in 1892 was 14,333 votes and the Liberal majorities 10,463, and 38 Liberals were returned to represent the Liberal electors while 27 alone represented the Conservatives of the province. According to the number of the electors we were entitled to a reversal of the representation in this House. We were entitled to 38 members, while the Liberals, who are now saying we only want to obtain a majority by treachery, ought to have sent here from the Province of Quebec only 27 members; but instead of the Conservatives returning a majority of 11 members to support the Conservative Government, the Opposition with a minority of 3,870 votes sent a majority of 11 members. We are ready to meet hon. gentlemen opposite in every way, and I say it to our friends, who might believe there is something in the eloquent speech of the leader of the Opposition, which appeared to come from his heart, that there is nothing in it, and what we have done has been done in fairness and in justice, and if we have obtained any advantage, which I deny, we have at least done nothing than regain the advantage that hon. gentlemen opposite had obtained unduly over us. The leader of the Opposition has reproached the Government with having brought down this measure in the last hours of the session. I hope we are in the dying hours of the session, and a good many members entertain the same hope; and I repeat that if this Bill is discussed with fairness on both sides, at all events with the fairness we intend to display, these dying hours will not be very long and we will all soon return to our homes and resume our respective occupations. Every one knows that in order to prepare this Bill we required the census returns. When did we obtain them—how many days before this Bill was submitted to this House? Hardly a fortnight. The Government worked hard in order no to be open even to the criticism of the independent press, that independent press whose comments I have read with a great deal of attention. But it only finds fault; and it is so easy to make a good reputation for yourself when one has only to find fault with others. When the independent press found fault, it ought to have done what the leader of the Opposition himself ought to have done, to suggest the principles on which this Bill ought to have been drawn, different from the way in which it has been drawn. I caught the hon. leader of the Opposition in the contradiction. While he was talking of "hiving" the Liberals he accused me of having hived the Conservatives in my own constituency, when the only difference will be one against me of about 50 votes, that is if my electors do not change their opinions, and I am not ready to charge that the result of this Bill will be that if this Government were to do anything wrong the electors still would not change their opinions. We have had experience in this regard, and that not so very long ago. Hon. gentlemen opposite will remember 1878. Did not the electors change their opinions when they left the Liberals, who occupied the Treasury benches with a majority of 78, in opposition with a minority of 85? It is a very poor compliment for the leader of the Opposition to pay to the independent electors, to those independent electors in whom he trusts so faithfully, to express fears that the men who profess Liberalism at the last election will vote Conservative at the next election. At all events, the electors of his province have shown themselves not to be made of that stuff, and having voted Mr. Mercier, his bosom friend, into power by a majority of 27, two years afterwards they returned Mr. DeBoucherville by a still larger majority. This Dominion Government does not depend for its maintenance in power on this Bill, which the hon. gentleman designates a gerrymander Bill; but this Government depends on its own deeds, its own policy, the merits of its members and the merits of its supporters, and nothing else will maintain us in office if we are going to be here after the next election. I am tired of hearing this nonsense talked about the corrupt Conservatives and the great and virtuous Liberal party, when we know very well what the members of the Liberal party are, what they have done in the past, and what they proved to be when in power, not only here but elsewhere. I repeat that the Bill has been prepared by the Government with a view to causing the least dissatisfaction possible, as well amongst our friends as amongst our opponents, and also to make the least changes possible; but at the same time with a view of remedying certain discrepancies in the populations of certain counties. I think I will be able to explain and to prove to the satisfaction of the House that we have in good faith carried out that principle with regard to the Province of Quebec; and that we have carried it out with the greatest fairness, not only to our friends but to our

opponents as well. If hon. gentlemen opposite have so many things to complain of as they pretend, let them show where their grievances are. Do they want every constituency in the province to be composed of a unit of population 22,800?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. OUIMET. If they want that we are ready to give it to them. Do they want the discrepancy to continue as in my county, for instance, which had a population of something over 9,000 souls? If they do, let them say so. I repeat again that the Government have acted in the preparation of this Bill in a spirit of good faith, and with the intention of doing justice to all. Was it possible for us to shut our eyes to the fact that the County of Ottawa with a population of 64,000 had only one member? It was not. The hon. leader of the Opposition has said that the division of the County of Ottawa has not been fairly made. I think the hon. gentleman has no ground for that pretension, because according to my mind the proposed division is fair and just, and if he can show me by any reasonable argument that it is not fair, I pledge myself that for my part I will endeavour to change the proposed division of that county. The County of Ottawa went Liberal in the last election, and if you will take the returns at that election for both parts of the county as now proposed to be divided, you will find that they represent a Liberal majority in both ridings. What interest could the Government have in dividing the county, so that according to the returns of the last election it would again elect two opponents of the Government? Surely there is no injustice in that. I hope, however, that the County of Ottawa will see that they have been badly represented by their present representative, and that they will learn that if they want to stand in line with the true national policy of this country they should elect two Conservatives next time. However, the issue will be fought here as elsewhere on the merits and demerits of the Government and on nothing else. I am ready to admit the figures given by the hon. gentleman, when he says that in one division of the county the population will be 17,000 and in the other 47,000. The hon. gentleman at present representing the County of Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) came to my office the other day. I think he came very reluctantly, and although I may be deceived and do not want to insinuate anything, I suspect that he would rather have the county remain as it is now proposed in this Bill. We are ready to give fair-play in this matter, and fair-play has been given to the satisfaction, I believe, of every reasonable man. The County of Ottawa is divided lengthwise in order to facilitate a more easy and natural division ten years hence. There is no doubt that in ten years the County of Ottawa will be entitled to three members, and in the division which will take place then, it will be only a question of drawing a line from the Ottawa River to the line now dividing the northern and southern parts of the county. That was the reason why the proposed division was made, and I may say that it was made on the strength of suggestions coming from both friends and foes of the Government. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to have that county divided in any other way, let them say so, and they may get their wish. Now with reference to the County of Hochelaga. Do hon. gentlemen opposite think that it was fair-play to have that county, with a population of 80,000 persons, represented by only one member? I maintain that it was entitled to increased representation, and I think any just and reasonable man will agree with me in that. The rural portions of the County of Hochelaga have been detached at each end, and one portion added to the County of Jacques Cartier to which it was contiguous, and the other portion to the County of Laval, leaving the remaining portion of Hochelaga to be divided into two counties with an average population of 35,000 each. What can hon. gentlemen complain of in that division? Hochelaga has been represented by men of great renown in the Liberal party. Have the successors of Sir A. A. Dorion degenerated so far, and become so much ashamed of the bad figure they cut when they were opposed by my hon. friend the present representative of the county (Mr. Desjardins), that they are afraid to face the people of Hochelaga on their political programme? It was for years an out-and-out Liberal constituency, and if it is not a Liberal constituency to-day it is because the people have confidence in the policy of the Conservative party. We depend on our political programme to carry the elections, and neither in Hochelaga or elsewhere do we need a gerrymander to remain in power as the representatives of the people of this country. Our desire and our ambition is to appeal to a patriotic people desiring the prosperity of their country, and we believe that on that appeal we will succeed. According to the reasoning of the hon. leader of the Opposition, the city of Montreal is represented by gentlemen representing adjoining counties who reside there. We say, let the adjoining counties be represented. Are we going to transfer the surplus population, in order to give the southern part of the province, that is, that part south of the Island of Montreal, more than its proper representation? I say we shall give it what it is entitled to, and no more. The southern counties, from Huntingdon on the west to Nicolet on the east, are now represented by 13 members, while their population would not entitle them to 10 members; but we leave them 11 members. I think they ought to be satisfied. Having to provide an additional member for Ottawa County, an additional member for Hochelaga, and two additional members for the city of Montreal, we had to take these members from somewhere; and, to be fair, were we obliged to take them altogether from Conservative counties? We gave our hon. friends an additional Liberal member for Ottawa County; and we gave them a chance of having an additional Liberal member for Hochelaga. We did more; we joined together St. Maurice and Three Rivers, two Conservative counties, and in so doing removed one Conservative member from amongst us. Were we obliged to take all the new members from our own counties? I say no, we were not in justice; and our hon. friends are not entitled to it, unless the hon. leader of the Opposition is ready to say that he wishes to come here as he came in 1891, having a large minority of the votes in the Province of Quebec, and a large majority of the representatives. That is what they want, Mr. Speaker; there is nothing else, and they cannot show anything else. Then, we join Iberville and St. John's. Hon. gentlemen complain that we have left out Lacolle; but Lacolle, as its name in French implies, will

have to be stuck somewhere, and we will stick it, I hope in the fairest way, to the county to which it naturally belongs, that is, the County of Missisquoi.

Mr. BAKER. Hear, hear.

Mr. OUIMET. As to the County of Laprairie, my hon. friend expended a great deal of eloquence in speaking of the great gain that my hon. friend Mr. Pelletier had achieved, by getting into his county the parishes of Chateauguay and Ste. Philomène.

Mr. LAURIER. And St. Michel Archange.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, in Chateauguay there was a majority of one for Mr. Brown, the present member. In Ste. Philomène there was a difference of four. In St. Michel Archange I think it was twenty-four.

Mr. MONET. It was 106.

Mr. OUIMET. So much the better for my hon. friend. I would not like to throw upon some other person's shoulders the responsibility for the great crime of having prepared this arrangement. I may just as well inform my hon. friend, in order to prevent him striking as far as the Senate with his sword, that I was the author of that iniquity.

Mr. LAURIER. You do not boast of it.

Mr. OUIMET. I do boast of it. I looked at the map, and I tried to take the best counties possible. Now, coming to Chambly, we have added to it parishes in which large Liberal majorities have existed for a great many years. Of course it was only fair that we should balance that gain of our hon. friends by adding some of our own.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman may say "hear, hear." The only balance he wants to have is a minority of the votes and a majority of the representatives. That is the kind of justice he thinks ought to be carried out in this Canada of ours—give the Grits the majority of the representatives and the sweets of office, although they are representing only a minority of the voters of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the hon. gentleman agreed that the division of Richelieu was fair enough: he said he had nothing to say against it. As to the County of Bagot, I do not think my hon. friend who represents it has achieved any gain by having the two parishes from Drummond and Arthabaska. If he had, he would have had only what he deserved. As to the County of Rouville, my hon. friend from that county must be happy; but he will never be happy on that side of the House; the heaven for him is here. Now, when the hon. leader of the Opposition concluded his speech, he gave us the precedent of what had been done in England. I had expected that he would have kept nearer home. I had expected that he would perhaps have suggested, as some of his friends in the press have suggested, that we ought to have a commission of judges. But no; the judges have a very bad reputation on that side of the House, and all justice has a very bad reputation there. When I saw that he did not suggest the judges, I thought he would have gone for a precedent to the great empire province, that model of Canada, I thought that that great and pious man would have been brought in and exhibited for our veneration and imitation. I had expected that Sir Oliver Mowat would have been called in, and we would have been told how wrong we were not to profit by his example. But he thought the precedent would be too inviting for us; he always distrusts our virtue. He believes that the Conservative party are too great partisans of fairness and justice to their opponents not to follow the example of the one who, in everything else, he is ready to uphold as a model of virtue. I am not prepared to say that this Bill is not open to criticism. I am not prepared to say that something else should not have been done, and I believe that if fair amendments be proposed, we would be disposed to take them into consideration and perhaps accept them if they were really fair and reasonable. I say that frankly, but I hold that it is unfair on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite not to give us the credit of having acted on principles of justice in order to avoid throwing the country into agitation, and in order to make the changes in the fairest manner possible. We have done this, not with a view of depriving these gentlemen of their majorities, but to make the situation at the next elections as fair to them as we could expect them to be for us, and I hope the result of the next elections will show this.

Mr. LAURIER. I rise to a personal explanation. The hon. gentleman challenged the figures I gave a moment ago as to the result of the redistribution in his own county, when I stated he would gain 111 votes, which would bring his majority to 645. I have gone over the book, and I reassert my statement, and defy the hon. gentleman to contradict it.

Mr. OUIMET. They do not amount to anything, and therefore I did not take the trouble of going into these figures. I may inform the hon. gentleman, however, that I expect to be re-elected by the same majority.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman should not have contradicted me as he did.

Mr. OUIMET. Just contradict the 3,870 majority we had in the Province of Quebec at the last election with 11 members in minority.

Mr. CHARLTON. The party opposite, responsible for this Bill, is a party which prides itself upon its loyalty to British connection, its reverence for British precedents, and its desire to administer the affairs of the country according to British customs. If it be honest in these professions, I am unable to understand why the proposition made by the leader of the Opposition should not at once be accepted. We have had placed before us by my hon. friend a statement of the proceedings in the Imperial Parliament upon the occasion of the redistribution in the year 1884-85. He gave us an account of the course pursued by the party then in power and by the Opposition, and we learn that the Hon. Mr. Gladstone did listen to the proposition made by the Opposition, that they should be taken into the confidence of the Government in a matter of so great importance affecting the welfare of the whole country; and the course taken by Mr. Gladstone was eminently creditable to himself, and one which avoided friction and disturbance and secured the passage of a Redistribution Bill satisfactory to all parties and in the interests of the country at large. Now, the Government, in my opinion, are not acting in that spirit to-day in dealing with a similar

measure. So far from copying British precedents, they have gone to another source. They are following in the footsteps of predecessors, not in the mother land, but in a neighbouring nation, and directly in the line of operations that can only be criticised as the *summum bonum* of political rascality. I refer to the system of American gerrymander, and shall refer, before I am done, at some length to the character and fruits of that system and the resemblance which our own system bears to it. I will, however, make a few remarks, before entering this branch of my subject, in answer to statements made by the Minister of Public Works. That hon. gentleman raised the objection to the reference of this question to a joint committee, that it would cause a great loss of time. He said that such a committee would consume six months in the consideration of the question, but that the majority here would dispose of it speedily. I think I may assure the hon. gentleman that a joint committee of the leaders of both sides, meeting for the purpose of arriving at a fair conclusion, would speedily reach such a conclusion, but if the attempt be made by the majority here to settle this question, despite the feelings and interests and protests of the minority, the time consumed by the joint committee for the purpose of arriving at a fair decision will be exhausted many times over by that consumed by the majority in pressing upon the minority a measure against which we protest. The hon. gentleman, in reply to the charge that this measure is introduced in the dying hours of the House, says that he hopes the charge is true, and that he is very glad we are near the end of the session. Well, we are very near what should be the end of the session, and we protest against the introduction of a measure which should have been introduced and considered weeks ago, and the consideration of which requires much time. We protest against its introduction now, chiefly for the reason that a fair and full consideration can only be given it at the expense of great personal inconvenience and loss to the members of the Opposition as well as hon. members opposite, and that should the Bill receive fair and full consideration it must prolong the session far beyond the time it should occupy. He tells us there is a reason for the Bill being introduced so late, and that reason is that the census returns on which it was founded were only received a fortnight before it was introduced. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to tell us, when he informs us that he is the father of this measure and the maker of this Bill—and he is like the man who, it is reported, was a self-made man and worshipped his maker, he evidently worships the work of his hands or admires it very greatly,—does he pretend to say that he was only two weeks considering the details of this Bill before it was introduced in this House, that only two weeks elapsed after the census returns came in before this Bill was prepared? The House cannot accept such a statement. Did we not discuss the census returns last year? Did we not in August, 1891, have all the information which was necessary to found a Redistribution Bill upon? It is absurd to state that the Government had the information only two weeks before the Bill was introduced. The Government could have had the information nine months ago. They have had ample time, but the circumstances remind me of the Redistribution Bill of 1882, which was introduced in the same way late in the session, a Bill of a most scandalous character, which was introduced into the House and pressed through the House without time being given for Parliament to consider its features. In that, one of the greatest crimes was perpetrated in this House, and it was a successful perpetration of a crime.

The hon. gentleman informs us that the party in power do not depend upon a gerrymander Bill for success. Well, hitherto they have depended upon political methods the reverse of fair and honest for success. Ever since I have had any knowledge of their operations since 1878, every measure they have introduced has been designed in such a way as to secure success. That was the character of the gerrymander Bill of 1882, that was the character of the Franchise Bill of 1885, and that is the character of the Bill introduced now. It is designed to secure political success and political advantages, and our hon. friends on the opposite side of the House are still unable to see why we should complain because they propose to secure such advantages as come in in a measure of this kind, because they are the party in power. The hon. gentleman tells us he is tired of hearing about Conservative sins. I should think he would be. He asks what we did when in power. We gave this country an honest government, we gave it an economical government, we reduced the controllable expenditure by $1,700,000, we only increased the gross expenditure by something less than $1,000,000, we were obliged to incur public debts to the extent of about $35,000,000 in carrying out obligations which had been incurred by the predecessors of the Government, but the Mackenzie Government only incurred $90,000 of its own volition; and if the hon. gentleman desired to discuss this point, I might go on to show the honest and economical record of the Mackenzie Government, a record which was deserving of the confidence of the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman is tired of hearing of Conservative sins. It is time the country heard more of them. We cannot cease to talk about them because it happens to be distasteful to the hon. gentleman. We have to make the country acquainted with them and with the reasons why these gentlemen are unworthy of public confidence. We have to inform the country of the manner in which these gentlemen have neglected to discharge their duty. It is the worst Government that ever existed in this country. It is the worst Government that ever existed upon this continent. We have to inform the people on that subject. It is true that it is not in the line of this Bill to discuss these questions, but if the hon. gentleman is tired of hearing of Conservative sins, his fatigue will be very much increased before we are through. He tells us that Ottawa County is fairly divided, and in speaking of it possibly he throws out an olive branch when he says that he is ready to make the matter right if the division is not a fair one, and that, if fair amendments are proposed, they will be considered. We are glad to hear that, of course.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. If that is the spirit that actuates the Government, and my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says "hear, hear" to it, let us have a conference on the matter. These questions can be better arranged, and can be arranged in a very short time by a few leaders on each side

meeting together, than by any general desultory discussion in the House. If the Government desire to do what is fair and just, let them adopt the precedent of the Imperial Parliament in 1884, and let the leaders of the Government and the leading members of the Opposition meet and state their views. Let the Opposition state their grievances, and let the Government meet them. That is the way to put the Bill on a fair basis, but if they refuse to do that, we are justified in assuming that the assertion of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is one which we may take with a considerable allowance. If they refuse that consultation between the leaders, we must assume that they intend to press the Bill through, and that, if the Bill contains unfair and improper provisions, they intend to stand by them. We can assure them that, if the proposition to deal fairly with the Bill is not met, the battle upon this will not be settled as soon as a conference might be, at all events. The hon. gentleman tells us that the Grits want the majority in this House based upon the minority of votes, and that it is that desire on the part of the Grits that the Government party intend to resist. The Government displayed its cunning in there distribution of Ontario in 1882, when, although the popular vote in that province gave a majority very small one way or the other, by the manipulation of the gerrymander the Government secured two seats to one for the Liberals in that province, and while in the last general election the Liberals had a majority of 5,000 of the popular vote in that province, they have barely 34 representatives out of 92 at this time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You are giving the bye-elections in one case and the general election in another.

Mr. CHARLTON. The bye-elections were brought on one after the other, and a horde of boodlers were let loose in those counties.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is no answer.

Mr. CHARLTON. Did not the hon. gentleman refer to the bye-elections, and shall I not be allowed to refer to the grounds on which they were carried, to the wholesale and retail bribery which took place, bribery from the promise of a railway subsidy to the purchase of an individual voter, to elections which took place one after another and counties which were bought out in detail? That explains the result in the bye-elections.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You have not answered my question, though.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps I did not hear it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I asked the hon. gentleman whether he was not giving the general election figures so far as the popular vote was concerned, and not giving the bye-election results so far as the representation in this House was concerned.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was giving the general election figures so far as the popular vote of the majority was concerned.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then you have given the representation in the House according to the general election.

Mr. CHARLTON. I stated at the same time that the Liberal representation in this House is about 34 seats.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What was it after the general election?

Mr. CHARLTON. I will take the trouble to look up the returns, and inform my hon. friend tomorrow. I have not made out the returns on that basis.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A majority of 8,000 in the popular vote, and a deficiency of four in the majority here.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That has nothing whatever to do with the bye-elections.

Mr. CHARLTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have to discuss a proposition to adopt the British method, and we stand up here to-day to protest against the American method. The American method has been adopted in this respect, and although the party on the opposite side are sticklers for loyalty, are in favour of British connection, and go for Imperial Federation, it is the party that borrowed their fiscal system from the United States, it is the party that has borrowed its political methods from the United States, it is the party that has borrowed its principles with regard to Redistribution Bills from the United States. I propose briefly to point out some of the antecedents of the gentlemen of whom hon. members opposite are slavish imitators. I want to show what was the origin of this system, I want to show what have been the fruits of this system, I want to show what kind of political assassination it is that these gentlemen have perpetrated once and are about to perpetrate again: I want to show the whole drift of this astounding scheme of political rascality that has been perpetrated in the United States, and has been copied in this country.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the hon. gentleman passes away from that part of his discourse, would he kindly allow me to ask him a question. When he refers to precedents in England, when he refers to Mr. Gladstone's generosity in consulting with Lord Salisbury about his Redistribution Bill, does my hon. friend recollect that Mr. Gladstone was compelled to do so, that the House of Lords refused to pass his Franchise Bill until he had disclosed something about the Redistribution Bill?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McNEILL. Who says no.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say no.

Mr. McNEILL. Then I say my hon. friend is, as usual, entirely mistaken as to the facts. I say it is a matter of notorious history.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Bruce must remember that he cannot interrupt the hon. member who is speaking.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will give the floor to the hon. gentleman for a few minutes, if he wishes to relieve his mind. Mr, Speaker, whatever may have been the circumstances that attended the negotiations between Sir Stafford Northcote and Lord Salisbury on the one hand, and Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues on the other hand, the fact is patent to this House and to the world that the consultation was held, and if Mr. Gladstone at first prepared a Bill and refused to couple with it the Franchise Bill, if there were divergencies of opinion as to the propriety of putting these two Bills together, it has nothing whatever to do with the question as to whether Mr. Gladstone did consult

with the Opposition, as to whether the leaders of the two sides did or did not meet together ; it has nothing to do with the question as to what led them to hold a consultation that resulted in a Redistribution Bill that was mutually satisfactory to both sides of the House. The fact we placed before the House is that such a consultation was held by Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues with the leaders of the Opposition, that it was held at the suggestion or, if you choose to say so, at the demand of the Conservative Opposition in the House of Commons and the House of Lords : the fact remains that the result of the consultation was a fair and honest Bill, an open Bill, the provisions of which were known to both parties, the provisions of which were discussed by both parties, the provisions of which were settled upon a basis satisfactory to both parties. It is that precedent that we propose to adopt to-day. Now, I will proceed to the discussion of the question that I was about to enter upon when interrupted by my hon. friend from North Bruce. We have a term frequently used here—gerrymander——

Mr. MONTAGUE. We all know the history of it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps we know a little more about it. There was a public man in the United States who was a signer of the Declaration of Independence, named Elbridge Gerry, who became governor of the State of Massachusetts. He was an anti-federalist and he secured notoriety, not because of good antecedents in connection with the revolutionary struggle, not because he was a signer of the Declaration of Independence, but he secured notoriety from an astounding piece of political rascality, and through that he was condemned to everlasting fame in the rogues' gallery. His party in Massachusetts, in the year 1811 perpetrated the first "Gerrymander" ; it was not then called "Gerrymander." They cut up the counties and the districts of the state in such a way as to secure an unfair political advantage, and the name Gerrymander originated in a cut of a district composed of part of the counties of Worcester and Essex being displayed which only needed the addition of wings and a beak to make it look very much like a vulture or a bird of prey ; and the artist, Gilbert Stuart, proposed to call it salamander, but Mr. Russell, the conductor of a paper named the *Columbia Sentinel*, said : No, call it gerrymander. So the name of the author of the Bill was made to apply to the Bill itself, and to the principle then first adopted in that Redistribution Bill for the State of Massachusetts. Now, what was the result of that Bill, this shining example that has been followed once by hon. gentlemen opposite, and which they are endeavouring to follow again though, perhaps, in a somewhat less objectionable manner? The anti-federalists polled 50,166 votes ; the federalists polled 51,766. The federalists had a majority of over 1,600 votes, but the anti-federalists secured 29 senators, and the federalists secured 11. By the provisions of that gerrymander it took 1,730 votes to elect an anti-federalist senator, and it took 4,706 votes to elect a federalist senator ; or it took 2·63 times as many votes to elect a senator on one side as it did on the other. The 51,766 voters were placed at a disadvantage as compared with the 50,166, to the extent of being represented by eleven senators while the others were represented by twenty-nine.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Which province was that in ?

Mr. CHARLTON. That was in the State of Massachusetts, your great prototype, which your gerrymander example comes from. Now, Sir, this of course, was a great triumph of political villiny —there is no use in using soft expressions—it was a triumph of political villainy, it was a system utterly subversive of the spirit of representative institutions, and the followers of these old-time political assassins have the example before them of a very brilliant success, an example where 50,000 votes elected twenty-nine senators and 51,000 only elected eleven. The thing was very well done, it was a fine piece of work, it was hardly exceeded by the Canadian gerrymander of 1882. Although the work of the hon. gentlemen opposite may not have been quite as artistic as the work done under Elbridge Gerry and some other subsequent examples we meet with in other states, it has been equally diabolical. I do not know, if we had not had this practice verbalized by calling it gerrymander, we might not have called it Macdonaldmander, or named it after some one on the Government benches at the present moment. The gerrymander consisted of what ? It consisted of dividing up counties and districts, grouping localities without reference to their contiguity or their natural affinity, but solely with respect to massing the voters in such a way as to secure political advantage to the party in power. It was just as perfect in 1812 as it was in this country in 1882. There have been a great many examples of gerrymander, and I will point to a few of them for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite to show how great the effect may be. Take Ohio. That state has had five gerrymanders between 1880 and 1890, and I want to show what the results of the gerrymanders were, what a curious sort of maps their ridings must have been, and what curious results were produced by the mathematical skill of political manipulators. The first gerrymander was a Republican one, in 1880. Under the distribution then made the Republican vote, 50·09 of the whole, elected 75 per cent of the congressmen, while the Democratic, 47·08 of the whole, secured a representation of only 25 per cent. It took an average Democratic vote of 68,114 for a congressman, as against an average Republican vote of 24,203 for a congressman, or nearly three times as many votes were required of Democrats as of Republicans for a member under the provisions of the gerrymander. This was fine work, and this kind of work in Ohio made free institutions a mockery. It was the work of political thugs ; there was nothing honourable or decent about it, and it was subversive of popular liberty and was contrary to every principle of justice. The next gerrymander was made by the Democratic party in 1882. They arranged matters so that while the Republican vote, 46·09 of the whole vote, secured 38 per cent of the congressmen, the Democratic vote, 50·03 of the whole, obtained 62 per cent of the congressmen. But this result was not entirely satisfactory to the Democrats, because they had not been so successful as the Republicans were in their gerrymander of 1880,

and accordingly they proceeded to another gerrymander in 1884. They unintentionally came nearer doing justice. Under this gerrymander the Republican vote, 50·07 of the whole, gave them a representation in Congress of 47·06 of the whole state representation, while the Democratic vote, 48 per cent of the whole, gave them a representation of 52 per cent. The Republicans then came into power in the State Legislature, and they proceeded to make a gerrymander in 1886, and they did their work very well. Under it the Republican vote, 48·05 per cent of the whole, gave them 71·04 of representation by congressmen, against the Democratic vote, 46·09 of the whole, which gave them a representation of 28·06. The Republican votes required for a congressman were 22,404, while the Democratic votes required were 54,273. The election of 1888 was had on the same distribution. The Republicans were pretty well satisfied with their success and they did not make another gerrymander. In 1888 they reached high water mark. The Republican vote, 49·07 of the whole, gave 76.02 of the whole congressional representation, while the Democratic vote, 47·02 of the whole, secured them only 23·08 per cent of congressmen. Only 26,022 Republican votes were required for a congressman, while of Democratic votes 79,128 were required. Then the Democratic party made a gerrymander in 1890, and this was the fifth gerrymander. Under it the Republican vote, 49 per cent of the whole, secured 33·03 of the congressional representation, while the Democratic vote, 47·05, secured 66·07 of the congressmen. No less than 51,803 Republican votes were needed to elect a congressman, as against 25,109 Democratic votes, or 2 to 1. This Democratic Gerrymander Bill in 1890 introduced a new feature, one which had, however, been adopted in this country before that time. An attempt was made to shut out of public life a prominent man. The district represented by Congressman McKinley, who was elected at the previous election by about 2,000 majority, was gerrymandered in such a way that he was defeated. The Democrats did not absolutely wipe out the district, as was done by the Conservatives here in the case of the constituency represented by my hon. friend to my right (Sir Richard Cartwright), but they gerrymandered it to such an extent that they drove him from Congress; and that is one sample of the rascality perpetrated under this system. I cite this state, Ohio, as an instance, but there are other states that have been subject to the operations of this iniquitous system. During those ten years on no less than five occasions each party endeavoured to surpass the political villainy of the other. It was good mathematical exercise; the maps were good patterns for crazy-quilts, and the Cretan labyrinth was outshone. But the whole system is one entirely inconsistent with popular government; it is a principle that no decent Government ought to adopt; it is a system that cannot be defended; it is a system that honest men on either side of the House ought not to defend, and any man who does defend such a system surrenders every semblance of political honesty and his manhood as well.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How about the Ontario gerrymander?

Mr. CHARLTON. The Ontario Government never perpetrated such a gerrymander as that we are talking of to-day. Political liberty and morality cannot exist under such a system, and the apathy that exists in this country, the dead public conscience, is due to the wholesale perpetration of those political rascalities that have been copied from the United States, and the Liberal party to-day makes its demand in this House, that the evil example shall cease to govern us, that we now drop this example we have been following, and copy the honest, wholesome and healthy example furnished in the precedents of the Imperial Parliament. That is simply what the motion of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition amounts to. It is a motion which will commend itself to the good sense and honesty of this country. It may be voted down in this House, but if the Government does reject this proposition, it does so at its peril, and it will bring down on its own head consequences that they are not likely, if they could foresee them, to invite. The only contribution we have made to the gerrymander literature or phrases is the one originated during the last gerrymander of 1882, when we originated the phrase "hiving the Grits." Hon. gentlemen opposite "hived the Grits" in such a way that while we had almost an equal number of votes with the Conservative partly we had only one representative as against two Conservative representatives; and under the operation of that Gerrymander Act of 1882 that disparity, although it has not been so great on all occasions, has continued to exist. The operation of the Act has been to deprive one class of the population of equal political rights as against another class, two Conservatives exercising power equal to three Liberals. The proportion is as great as that, if not greater, and it has so continued ever since the Bill was passed. The measure was designed to secure that feature. It was a piece of political assassination so far as the interests of one of the great parties was concerned; it was a piece of rascality. I can characterize it by no other words, most degrading to this country, and leading to a state of things which has created two systems of ethics, one for private life and one for public life, and the system of ethics for public life is no system of ethics at all. The gerrymander made and successfully made, the crime perpetrated in 1882, is again attempted to be carried out with respect to the Province of Quebec: not I grant you so flagrant or glaring a violation of public rights, but still an outrage upon public rights is attempted to be perpetrated in Quebec, and an outrage in a lesser degree in the Province of Ontario. The Government are seeking through this Bill to secure a marked political advantage. They are seeking practically to secure an unfair advantage amounting anywhere from 7 to 9 seats. They are not entitled to that advantage. It is a violation of the principles of justice; it is a violation of the principles of representative institutions, and it is an Act calculated to sap the foundations of the liberties of the people. The whole system is un-British, and I wish to read a few remarks from an English Tory writer bearing upon this question. I am sure they will be received with great favour by gentlemen on the opposite side, and I think some of our candid friends opposite will see the force of the statements made by this gentleman referring to the last Redistribution Bill in England.

This article I find in the *Quarterly Review* for 1885. I shall not trouble the House with very copious extracts from it, but I will read a few. The writer says :

"Nevertheless the common instinct was sound and just."

What was the common instinct ? The common instinct was that one party should not frame a Redistribution Bill securing an unfair advantage and press that Bill through by virtue of a party majority, without first consulting the other party as to the principles of the Bill :

"Nevertheless, the common instinct was sound and just. Compromise was wise and necessary. When we last wrote, the political storm had reached an alarming height. When Parliament met, the uneasiness of men who had been, or feared to be, driven further and faster than they willed, rapidly made itself felt. Men of sense and candour, conscious that the quarrel had been pushed to needless and dangerous extremes, found the same temper prevalent among their opponents. Many of our readers must remember the frequent conversations with anxious friends, or staunch political opponents, in which the same expression was repeated almost in the same words. If only the leaders could be brought together in a room ? They are English gentlemen ; they respect and should be able to trust one another. There is nothing they could not settle in an hour's confidential conversation."

Was that writer mistaken that the people placed so much confidence upon the leaders of both parties as gentlemen, that if they were brought together in a spirit of fairness and impartiality they would do what was right and just, and settle the matter in an hour's conversation ? The desire exists here that the leaders of those two parties should meet together to settle this vexed question which troubles the country and threatens evil to the country. If the leaders of those two parties could meet together, at least no harm would result, for they could find out at all events whether they could agree or not, and if they could not agree we would be no further from the solution of the question than we are at the present moment. This writer goes on :

"There are reasons which render the occurrence of an amicable discussion a loyal understanding on any subject especially seasonable. The presence of an anti-English faction in the House of Commons, still more the objects, the methods, and the quality of its adherents—the rise of a new and prominent, if not numerous Radical school, whose parliamentary manners and political morality, not to say its social and economic ethics, might have been imported from Washington."

Sir, these words of this Tory writer in the *Quarterly Review* would apply with special force and appropriateness to the gentlemen who are now pressing this Gerrymander Bill. He could say very properly that their political morality and their social and economic ethics might have been imported from Washington.—

"Nor could there be a more fitting subject of compromise, so that the compromise be on both sides honest, open and loyal, directed not to immediate party advantage but to ultimate national ends, to the preservation, under new conditions and by new methods, of the immemorial spirit and character of our representative system."

What was the object to be aimed at that was worthy the attention of these men ? Was it of no importance that the immemorial spirit and character of the representative system in England should be preserved ? Is it of no importance that the immemorial character and spirit of British representative institutions should be preserved in this Dominion of Canada ? Should we pause to consider whether it is better for us to adopt the rascally American method calculated to subvert popular liberty, the pawn of political gamblers, the weapon of political assassins, the means by which men who would subvert the liberties of the people for political gain would adopt ? I ask, is it better for us to pursue this policy, or should we not pause and consider whether it is not better to preserve the immemorial spirit and character of our representative institutions ? This writer goes on to say :

"The concurrence of the Opposition has paralysed the resistance of the threatened interests, and rendered it possible, as it was not possible even in that flood tide of enthusiasm to disregard all reckoning of votes, and to frame the measure with a single view to the future interests and present convictions of the country."

What does he mean by this ? It looks to me "that the concurrence of the Opposition" means that an invitation to consider the matter on the part of the Government had been accepted by the Opposition. The writer continues :

"But this negative assistance, great as it is, not the whole, is, perhaps, the least part of the service rendered to the scheme and to the country by the chiefs of Opposition. Nor have they merely safeguarded the claims of the Tory party, or confined themselves to securing the adequate representation of permanent Conservative interests and Conservative elements of national thought. The clearness and consistency given to the chief features as evidently show Lord Salisbury's hand as the weakness and deviations from principle of which we shall have to speak betray, by their party tendency and class character, the original authorship of the scheme. Compelled by his position to speak with reserve, while as yet the ministerial plan was undisclosed, Lord Salisbury's bent was never concealed, and the breadth and boldness of his views startled the weak or cautious among his followers less than they surprised and confounded enemies wont persistently to misconceive and misrepresent him. The Radical press has chosen, in the teeth of his well-known views on social questions, in spite of his whole character and career, to regard him as the champion and embodiment of the stolid, immovable, if not reactionary Toryism of bygone days. The blindness and bitterness of party could hardly have been more signally or more absurdly exemplified. Lord Salisbury's administration of India and the Foreign Office—an administration wherein masterly skill and grasp of facts were, till the Midlothian campaign, recognized and admired even by opponents—did not exhibit more signally than his parliamentary speeches the practical tone and temper of his statesmanship, his appreciation of the spirit and tendencies of the age with which it was his to deal. It is a new and striking evidence of his force of character, that a scheme of redistribution not prepared by him yet bears so clearly the impress of his mind, of his lofty point of view, his breadth of survey and boldness in action. Few other Tory leaders have grasped the truth so apparent to Radical tacticians, that, in a constitutional settlement, finality, consistency, completeness, is the paramount interest of conservatism; that the preservation of anomalies and grievances affording ground for renewed agitation, redounds to the advantage of radicalism alone. The time has passed when resistence to democracy was a practical policy. To a force so novel, so gigantic, so irresistible, the checks and balances of old would be applied in vain. Guarantees of stability, securities for the safe and steady working of our constitutional machinery, the future strength of Conservative principles and policy, must be sought in democracy itself. If Lord Salisbury's frankness of utterance failed to disarm suspicion, his confessed ability should have dispelled the favourite radical conception of his policy. He is the last man to dream of crippling or fettering, by complicated arrangements or studied artifice, the giant power to which the doors of the constitution have once been opened, of binding the Titan's limbs in a network of Lilliputian packthread. Of this nonsense, at least, we may hope to have heard the last. The statesman who recommends to the Tory party the acceptance of the present scheme of redistribution must be confessed, even by the ingrained, inveterate credulity of Radical distrust, to have accepted once for all the Democratic principle : to trust the rights of property, the maintenance of order, the equitable adjustment of public burdens, the national honour, the integrity of the Empire, all the cherished aims of his order and his party, to the common sense, the justice and the honesty of the people."

Now, Sir, all we ask of the Government is to go forward in the spirit of honesty, common sense and justice. We ask them to remember the weighty words of this writer, when he says that the preservation of anomalies and grievances, affording ground for renewed agitation, redounds to the advantage of radicalism alone. If we are to establish the institutions of this Dominion on firm foundations, so that they will endure, we must abandon the courses which have been followed by this Government. We must abandon such outrages on popular justice as the Franchise Bill; we must abandon these evil American examples; the party in power must cease to attempt to wrest an advantage from their adversaries by an unfair application of the powers which they possess. They must meet the overtures of the Opposition in a spirit of fairness, and they must recognize that the great people of this Dominion are not created for the advantage of mere politicians and political tricksters; but that the rights of the people are a sacred heritage, placed in the hands of these men, and that they should be guarded by them as a sacred trust.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DEVLIN. It was not my intention to have spoken at this stage of the debate; but inasmuch as reference was made by the hon. Minister of Public Works to the county which I represent in this House, I think it is proper that I should place before the House my position regarding that matter. The hon. gentleman said that I had gone to him reluctantly, and I presume with advice regarding the division of the County of Ottawa. Now, it is but fair that I should give my version of what transpired in connection with that visit of mine to the hon. gentleman, and if I am wrong I am perfectly willing that he should correct me. The facts are these: Last week a public meeting was called in the village of St. André Avelin in the lower end of the County of Ottawa. To this meeting were invited the mayors of the various surrounding municipalities, and the electors of that portion of the county. I also went there and spoke. The object of the meeting was to protest against the proposed division of the county, that is, against the line as it is proposed to be drawn. The meeting was not called by the Liberal party of the county or by any member of the Liberal party. It was called by Conservatives, and leading Conservatives at that, in the lower end of the county. I do not deny that Liberals were present and that Liberals spoke at that meeting; but the fact is, that the meeting was called by prominent Conservatives in the lower end of Ottawa County. Certain resolutions were adopted by the meeting, and delegates, I believe, were instructed to present those resolutions to the Government. The delegates, to the number of about ten, came to Ottawa on Friday morning in order to interview the Government. They obtained that interview on Friday evening, when they were received by the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Customs. I was invited by them to accompany them as the representative of the county. I did not accept the invitation reluctantly; I accepted it cheerfully. I did not see why I should feel any reluctance about going to the Minister of Public Works. He is an officer, not of his own party only, but of all parties in this country, and I think as a Canadian and as a member of this House, I have as much right to approach the Minister of Public Works as any member on his own side. Especially I had no reason to fear the hon. gentleman, who, though he may inspire the regiment on his own side with fear and dread, does not inspire the regiment on this side with any such feelings. We went to the hon. gentleman's office. He received us there, and the object of the delegation was stated by the mayor of the town of St. André, who is not a Liberal but a Conservative. Others followed, and then the Minister of Public Works asked me for an expression of my views. I candidly confess that I found it strange he should do so at the time, as I do not think he was very anxious to carry out my views, since he had never consulted me up to that moment regarding the division he proposed to make of the county I represented. I found it strange, therefore, that before he had received all the views of the delegates he should have asked for mine. At the moment I declined to give my opinion, as I thought, out of courtesy to the other gentlemen present, they should be heard first, and I also thought that the gentleman who had contested the county with me at the last general election and who was present, should also be heard before me. He said that the division proposed was one according to his own heart; and, after he had spoken, the Minister of Public Works again asked me for my views, which I gave. I said I was not in favour of the division as proposed; I said that I was as anxious as any hon. member representing a county whose population exceeds 50,000 or 60,000, to obtain increased representation, and I am sincerely anxious that we should obtain it. At all events these are the facts which occurred at this meeting, and I made no other visit to the hon. gentleman's office regarding this proposed division. The protest came as strongly from the party to which the Minister belongs and perhaps more strongly than it did from the party to which I belong. There were reasons for that, which were expressed on that occasion, and which I could repeat again; but before doing so, it may be well to understand exactly how the figures of population stand in the County of Ottawa. At the last census the population was 49,432; last year it reached the figure of 64,056 according to the census. Consequently it would not only be desirable but natural that increased representation should be given to the County of Ottawa. Now, what we asked for was that instead of having two representatives, we should, in view of the vast and important interests of the county be given three representatives. Sir, the line is drawn from east to west, and there are reasons which in my opinion and in that of others who have approached the Minister should have guided him in drawing that line in a different sense. Equality of population is not obtained by drawing the line from east to west, and I think the line was drawn wildly, because when this Bill was read the first time in this House the Minister of Justice said that that division of the county would give a population of 32,000 in the north and 32,000 in the south. No doubt when the line was drawn, the opinion did exist that such would be the population of each

division, but when we come to examine the figures we find that such is not the case. In the first place on the north side, the population will be much less and will cover a much larger territory than on the south side. I may just as well give the figures. The population of North Ottawa will be 17,329 and that of South Ottawa will be 46,727, the total population of the county being 64,056, so that if the object was to obtain equality of population in the two divisions, then that object has not been attained. Now it is said that the interests of the south are entirely different from those of the north portion of this division. There is a great deal of truth in that remark. One of the principles by which the Government were moved in making this division, if I understood the Minister of Public Works correctly, was the fact that the northern portion is the portion in which the field of colonization is considerable, and reference was made, at the meeting to which I have referred, by the Minister of Public Works to the fact that it was proposed to construct a line of railway through that portion, that in fact this road, the Great Northern, was under construction, and that as soon as it was completed that portion of the county would be rapidly developed. But what, Sir, are the facts? This very morning, in the Committee of Railways and Canals, a Bill presented by this company contained the prayer that the time for the construction of a large portion of this road and especially for its completion should be extended to ten years. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, that the limit is generally, if not invariably, five years; and the Minister of Customs, when the committee said this extension should not be given but that five only should be given, said that the company certainly would have to come back again and ask for another extension. I do not dispute that. I agree with the Minister of Customs that the railway will not be completed in ten years, because the mineral resources of that section are not sufficiently developed yet to warrant the construction of the road in order to make it a paying institution. So that, according to the promotors themselves, this road will not be completed within ten years, and they no doubt will come back for another extension of time and obtain it, and again repeat their prayer. I hope the population in that section will increase rapidly and that there will be every reason to induce the promoters to go on with their work. The road is indeed much needed, and will no doubt bring about rapid development of that portion of the country; but there is no reason why the division of the county now should be affected by the fact that this road is to be constructed. I hold that the line should be drawn not from the east to the west but from the north to the south, and that for many reasons. In the first place, by drawing a line from the east to the west you will virtually make two counties in the north, although they will only contain a population of about 17,000. Why? Let us suppose that an elector in the township of Joly, in the northern portion of the north county, should desire to visit his representative who might reside in the village of Maniwaki. Is there any direct road by which he can reach Maniwaki from the section in which he lives? No, he has to go down to the Ottawa River and to go up to Hull and then to drive 100 miles up the country. Of course, when the Gatineau Valley Railway is completed, he will be able to travel the last portion more comfortably than he can to-day. In dividing the eastern portion of the north county from the west, you have a country which is unsettled and untraversed, you have the valley of the Gatineau, the valley of the Lièvre, and the valley of the Petite Nation. There are settlements in those valleys and there are charming and picturesque spots to be found in them, but between those settlements there are districts through which roads have not yet been constructed, and I know it because I had to go through a great deal of that country myself. I willingly admit the difficulties which exist as to the division of this county, but after drawing a line from the east to the west, where will the *chef-lieu* exist for the northern county? Let us suppose that it will be at the village of Gracefield or at the village of Maniwaki. Then an elector in the eastern portion of the north county has to go through that portion, to traverse the whole of south Ottawa and to go back to his own county in order to reach his *chef-lieu*. The interests of the valley of the Gatineau are different from the interests of the valley of the Lièvre. The people in the northern portion of that county have their dealings with the people of the southern portion. That is their natural market, and their road of travel, and that does not require them to cross the country. So this division, not being based on equality of population, not promoting the interests of the two sections of the county, is an unnatural division. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to say, and I thank him for saying so, that the drawing of the line as he draws it will mean that the Liberal party will have two representatives. Then he abandons the County of Ottawa. Then he concedes that the County of Ottawa has gone back on the policy of the Government now and for good. I hope so. I trust it will remain true to the allegiance it now professes, but still the Aylmer *Gazette*, which is an organ supporting the Government and receiving considerable patronage from the Government, expressed its delight when this line was drawn and expressed the hope there would be two supporters of the Government as a result of this division. It is strange that we should find this expression of opinion in an organ which is supposed to know the feelings of the people of this county. What are the facts? That county sent to this House a supporter of the Government for nearly 30 years, and a supporter who invariably came here elected by a very large majority. His last majority was over 800. On previous occasions it exceeded the figure of 1,500, and for the first time in a period of 30 years, for the first time since Confederation, on the 5th of March, 1891, the County of Ottawa pronounced against the policy of the Federal Government. Because of the verdict given on that occasion, the hon. gentleman no doubt expects that a similar verdict will be given on future occasions. I hope so. To conclude the few remarks I have made, I will say that what we held out for was three members. We have not been granted three members but have only been given two. In view of this, we have asked and we now ask that the line of divison should be fairly and justly drawn. We have pointed out that the interests of the various sections are different and that by drawing the line from north to south these sections could be much better represented. In view of these facts, I think the hon. the Minister of Public

Works, who seems to have charge of this measure, ought to have given Ottawa County some tender consideration, and that he will do well to accept the suggestion, particularly as he said that, if we had any reasonable suggestion to make, he would accept it. He would do well to accept the suggestion made not only by myself, but by prominent friends of his own, men who have supported him on all occasions, to draw the line from north to south. My object in rising was simply to state that I had not gone reluctantly to the hon. gentleman's office, but that I had gone there with others because I thought it my duty. I then stated the position I intended to take on this subject, and I have every reason to believe that, if the Minister is seriously desirous of carrying out what he says he is, the east and west line will be obliterated and a just division will be made giving the county representation by population as it should have.

Mr. LAVERGNE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, owing to the importance of the subject which is before us, I think it my duty to use the language more familiar to me. From the declaration which the hon. Minister made this afternoon he takes upon himself the responsibility of the measure now before the House. I admit that for some legislation, as the fiscal policy, for instance, reciprocity or protection, or some other great questions of similar nature, I understand, I say, that we may not always be of one mind: that we may honestly differ in opinion. I understand, for instance, that a man who lives in a town or city is interested in seeing the population of that town or city increase. As a resident of such town I understand that he may wish for a protective tariff, if he thinks such favourable to the development of the town. I must admit that such questions are so much debated in many countries of this continent and in Europe, that we could not accuse him of dishonesty or of a lack of sincerity for not agreeing with us on that question. The same may be said of many other questions. But on the one which is now before us, I would be astonished if we could not come to an understanding. However, if we consider the nature, the provisions of this measure as presented, it seems to me that we are threatened of being unable to agree. As the hon. leader of the Opposition said, this measure has been severely criticised by the Independent and the Liberal press, and even by a large number of Conservative papers in the country. And if its general lines are examined, it is easy to see its iniquity. Without going any further for an example I take my own county—and this is to some extent what induced me to take a part in this debate—the County of Drummond and Arthabaska. Its population is 43,923. Therefore, according to the standard or unit consequent upon the last census, namely, 22,800, that county has a population which should entitle it to two representatives in this Parliament. In order to put the question under better light, I may establish a comparison between the County of Drummond and Arthabaska and the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil. With its population of 44,000 souls, the County of Drummond and Arthabaska is only given one representative. Now, the two Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil have an aggregate population of 20,000 inhabitants only, and are granted two representatives: that is to say, the County of Vaudreuil will have four times the representation of Drummond and Arthabaska. And Soulanges likewise. I do not mean to say that we can divide the counties perfectly, and give 22,800 souls to every electoral district. Such a task could not be done without parceling and changing the natural divisions of the counties. But I think that the present measure does not bear the character of justice: and if the Minister of Public Works was sincere this afternoon when he said that he would be willing to listen to reasonable suggestions: if he wishes to be just, he will see, among other things to be modified in the measure, that the County of Drummond and Arthabaska, which is really composed of two large counties, and which has only one representative, has not the representation which it should have, especially in face of the comparison which I just made. I ask any man with a sense of justice and sincerity, if he can say that there is any show of justice in the fact that 40,000 inhabitants will be represented here by a single man while 20,000 will be represented there by two? I allow a great difference between rural colleges and those of the towns: but I say that we can fairly compare Drummond and Arthabaska with Soulanges and Vaudreuil. The County of Drummond and Arthabaska forms two electoral colleges in connection with the Provincial Legislature, two registration divisions, two municipal counties and two judicial counties. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is a union of two separate counties, the interests of which are distinct, even for judicial purposes. Vaudreuil and Soulanges are absolutely in the same position. Vaudreuil is a distinct registration division from Soulanges. The same thing obtains for municipal and judicial purposes. It is also a separate county from Soulanges for the purpose of representation in the Provincial Legislature. Therefore, I say that there was no intention of justice in the framing of this measure, or if such intention existed, the Bill was prepared very thoughtlessly. Now, the Minister of Public Works having manifested the intention of accepting fair suggestions offered in good faith, will, if he truly is animated by such intention, join the two Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil and give them only one representative in this House, and will divide the County of Drummond and Arthabaska, and give two representatives to its 40,000 inhabitants. In the city of Montreal, it is true, are found electoral colleges of more than 40,000 souls; the division of the County of Ottawa, such as proposed, will give one of its sections 47,000 souls; but suppose these people are not sufficiently represented, it is not a reason why the same evil should be repeated elsewhere. As the hon. Minister said that he would be ready to accept any reasonable suggestion, I see no reason why the County of Ottawa should not be made so as to give each of the divisions an equal number of people, that is to say some 32,000 souls for each division, which would be much more equitable than putting 17,000 people in one and 47,000 in the other. Before proceeding further I must point out another ground of comparison between the Counties of Vaudreuil and Soulanges and the County of Drummond and Arthabaska. Vaudreuil and Soulanges are two old counties where every census found a new decrease of population, especially the last. The last statistics show a decrease of 682 for Vaudreuil, and 612 for Soulanges, while

during the last decade the County of Drummond and Arthabaska added 6,563 to the number of its inhabitants. There are in the latter county large tracts of land still unoccupied, which gives us the hope of a further increase for the next decade. It might also be stated that in all probability the population of the old Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil will keep decreasing. So, Mr. Speaker, these two counties, the population of which is only 20,000 souls, have undergone a decrease of 1,200 during the last decade, while the County of Drummond and Arthabaska, with a population of 44,000 souls, has increased by 6,500 during the same period. Now, since it is thought proper to modify the electoral divisions of the Province of Quebec, without, however, changing the number of representatives from that province, the conclusion will easily be reached that the two Counties of Vaudreuil and Soulanges, with a population of 20,000, decreasing every day, should be united into one county for purposes of representation, while the County of Drummond and Arthabaska, which has a population of 44,000, which increased by 6,500 during the last decade, should have two representatives. I protest against this mode of legislating on a subject of this importance. Now, in order to be in a position to answer that a diminution of the population of Drummond and Arthabaska is provided for, two parishes are proposed to be taken from the county, St. Guillaume d'Upton and St. Bonaventure d'Upton. In this case, if it is the Minister of Public Works who is to be credited with the suggestion concerning those two parishes, he will surely allow me to tell him that he should have sought better information. This feature of the scheme is altogether extraordinary. The County of Bagot has already, according to the last census, a population of 21,695, that is to say, it is up to the standard in the matter of population. Therefore, there is no reason to make such an addition, while part of the County of Bagot is taken from it and put somewhere else. The least that can be said about this, Mr. Speaker, is that this is pretty clumsy work. If what I will call the natural connections and associations had been regarded, these two parishes of St. Guillaume d'Upton and St. Bonaventure d'Upton would have been annexed to the County of Yamaska. This county now comprises the parishes of St. Guillaume and St. Bonaventure for the purposes of representation in the Provincial Legislature of Quebec. These parishes are also part of that county for registration and judiciary as well as municipal purposes. The fact is that they belong to the County of Yamaska for all purposes other than representation in this House. These two parishes have a combined population of 4,000 inhabitants, which is the exact figure of the census of 1891. Now, the County of Yamaska according to the same census has now a population of 16,058, the annexation of these two parishes to it, would give that county a population of about 20,100. This would bring the county closer to the unit mentioned by the Minister of Justice. From that I may say that the Government have lacked discernment in making their proposed changes. But, thanks to the good intentions evinced by the Minister of Public Works this afternoon, I trust that this will be remedied. If he wants to keep his promise, if he really wants to do justice to everybody, he will consent to have these two parishes annexed to the County of Yamaska. What I have just said of the parishes of St. Guillaume and St. Bonaventure applies equally to other changes, proposed. I might say as much, for instance, about the County of Ottawa. There are also the united Counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, which form a large electoral district and which could be divided. There are on the other hand several other counties which could be united. I regret to say that the county represented by the Minister of Public Works is also one of these small counties. But I beg him to believe that there is nothing personal in my remarks. Laval and Jacques Cartier are two small electoral districts. This anomaly made itself felt to such a degree that certain changes were made to increase the population of these counties. It would have been much wiser, instead, to make these two little counties into one which would have had the required population. The Government has not been wanting in suggestions. The Conservative press itself has made some, which, had they been adopted, would have been an improvement on the measure now submitted. Allow me also, Mr. Speaker, to try this task of making suggestions to the Government. I believe that an equitable adjustment of representation can be brought about having due regard for the natural connections and association to which I have just referred. Justice can be done to the interests at stake without very many changes. Let us begin by the western part of the province. If we do not want many changes, the thing can easily be done without injustice to any. Let us take the County of Ottawa. Instead of being divided as proposed in the Bill, it should be in such a manner as to give each of the electoral districts a population about equal, while it is the contrary which is done. The division adopted for the County of Ottawa is not based on the present population, the contingencies of the future seeming to be drawn upon for its justification. Are we here to make laws which will only be just and equitable in ten years from now? Since the constitution provides for a redistribution every ten years, why should we be told that what is proposed to-day, if not just as to equilibrium in population now, will be so in ten years from now? Moving eastward what counties should we find to readjust? We find Vaudreuil and Soulanges. These counties should be united, for they have not the standard population. The fact is that in studying this Bill, one is tempted to believe that the Government think themselves sure of a majority in these two counties. But I think they are mistaken; the Government cannot depend upon these two electoral districts, for they have belonged as often to the Liberal as to the Conservative party. Both returned, at the last general elections, members who opposed the Government. If since the verdict of these counties has been reversed, it is not a proof that it will not be so again at the next general elections. It is well known that in bye-elections the chances of success for the Government are much better than at a general election. Therefore it is not from a motive of party interest that I advocate the union of these two counties, for, in my opinion, we have as much chance as the Government of carrying them in a general election. We must be guided not by party interest but by our sense of justice and equity. As the Minister of Public Works assured us this afternoon that he would accept any reasonable changes which would be offered, I suggest him this one, which I can

assure him I do without any idea of political interest. My suggestion is only made in the interest of justice, for we do not mean to act with party interests in view. I now reach the city of Montreal. It has been thought that the number of representatives of that city should be increased by two, and that the representation of the County of Hochelaga should be doubled. I am not ready to go into the details of that part of the measure and discuss the manner in which these changes should be made. But I will ask why is the County of Hochelaga treated as it is proposed? Why not instead make only one county of the Counties of Jacques Cartier and Laval. I was very much surprised to hear the Minister of Public Works say that, suppose the Conservative party was to gain something by this Bill, there would not be much harm. Would it not be, said the Minister, but a compensation for the unjust gains made by the Liberals in the past. I protest with all my strength against these words. I fail to see in what the Liberals committed the injustice which the Minister speaks of. There has never been but one distribution of seats for the Province of Quebec. No redistribution has taken place since Confederation. Moreover, I do not know of the Liberals being in power at the time of any of the censuses which were made since Confederation. In 1871, in 1881 and in 1891, there were censuses taken, but the Liberal party was not in power then. How could it be guilty of the injustices spoken by the Minister of Public Works? The Counties of Jacques Cartier and Laval should be united. I fully expect that some small counties of the south shore, represented by our political friends, will have to be united. These counties, the population of which is not enough to justify their distinct existence, will disappear. It is just and we shall not complain. Thus there will disappear a county which for a great number of years returned a Liberal. I regret it for the member who suffers by it, but I understand that it is necessary. Only, I say that the same thing should be done to the friends of the Government as is done to us. I know that this change is unavoidable, and we must submit; but the same should be done also on the ministerial side. I, therefore, say that the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition is entirely justified, and its adoption desirable, so that, by means of mutual concessions, we may reach the proper application of certain principles embodied in the Bill. Now, I admit, for a moment, that Montreal should have a right to five representatives and Hochelaga to two.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Why not four?

Mr. LAVERGNE. (Translation.) You do not propose four; and the reason is that Hochelaga is a town. Montreal is the largest city in Canada. It is admitted that it is a principle of the Government in this measure, that the cities must not get the same representation as the rural counties. Besides, as the leader of the Opposition remarked, Montreal counts thirteen resident members of Parliament. Hochelaga would be entitled to four representatives, if it was to be considered as a rural district, but it is largely composed of the population of Montreal. Indeed Hochelaga and St. Jean Baptiste are wards of that city. There is another reason besides. It is much easier to call the electors of a town together, and to watch their interest, the territory being so much smaller, say two or three miles square, while a county like mine is about one hundred miles long. But I leave to others the care of discussing how the city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga should be divided, and I say that we should, as much as possible, have regard for the county limits, and for that reason Laval and Jacques Cartier should be united. If that was done, there would be only to group four other counties by twos in order to provide for the required increase in the representation of Montreal. For this, let us take, for instance, four counties south of Montreal. We fall among counties represented by Liberals. Make one of St Johns and Iberville; one of Napierville and Laprairie. You would see that each of these two newly united counties would have the standard population. Let us see, for instance, the following populations: Laprairie, 10,900; Napierville, 10,101; St. John, 12,282; Iberville, 11,893; Chambly, 11,754; Verchères, 12,257. Here are, Mr. Speaker, four or five adjoining counties which can furnish new electoral districts. Let four of these counties be made into two new electoral districts; the municipal limits, the natural association in these counties would be respected and justice done, while Montreal would thereby be provided with two more representatives. As to the County of Drummond and Arthabaska, I ask nothing more than its division. This could be provided for by the union of Three Rivers and St. Maurice, which is proposed by the Government. The aggregate population of these two counties is only about 20,000. Let Drummond and Arthabaska be divided, and the proposed measure be limited to these changes. I think no other would be necessary in the Province of Quebec. The public opinion would be perfectly satisfied. Now, would the Liberal party gain anything by this change which would wipe off on the south of Montreal two Liberal counties? I do not think it. As to Vaudreuil and Soulanges, my opinion is that the Government has nothing to gain by not uniting them. Those counties may just as well be Liberal as Conservative next election. It would be an equitable act to join them. But what are we told by the press? What are we told by our Conservative colleagues in this House? We are told that we ought to be very well pleased; that we could be made to fare much worse. This is the only defence made of this measure. "You had better accept it in good grace," they say, "for we could ill-treat you much more." Such is the spirit of justice which seems to animate them. I am pleased to believe that such is not the spirit which guided the Minister responsible for this measure, and I accept in all sincerity his word for it. I am convinced that he would not so gratuitously volunteer his word, as he did this afternoon, if his intention was not honest. I hope that he will accept this suggestion which I offer. I say that the whole gain will be for the Conservative party. We have not the slightest hope of having a Liberal returned in any division of Montreal, owing to the fiscal policy of the Government. I say that with the enormous majorities given the Conservatives at the last elections, all the probabilities are that the new Montreal divisions will return Conservatives. It is also probable, if we judge from the majority obtained by my hon. friend for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) that by dividing his county in two we give an additional supporter to the Gov-

ernment. Therefore, the proposition which we make to-day is not unjust, for if the Bill is modified as suggested by us, the Government will gain three or four supporters. I hope the hon. Minister will see his errors. The trend is now to modify the map so that from six counties on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, which return five Liberals and a Conservative, there will in the future be returned one Liberal and five Conservatives. I choose to believe that no bad intention dictated such changes, especially after the statements of the Minister of Public Works, who volunteered to promise justice. I might say that he was somewhat lead to it by the leader of the Opposition, but the Minister made advances. We accept these advances and are satisfied with burying the tomahawk.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). Hear, hear.

Mr. LAVERGNE. (Translation.) It is probable that if the hon. Minister of Public Works was willing to accept the suggestions we have to make—and they are very modest—the debate would be very short. I will say no more on the question, and I have no doubt that the Minister of Public Works will adopt most of the modifications which I have had the honour to suggest.

Mr. PERRY. It seems to me that the fathers of this youngster are inclined to disown it, as they seem to be very much disinclined to defend it. I do not know whether it is so deformed that they are ashamed to defend it. The only gentleman on the other side who had the hardihood to stand by it is the Minister of Public Works. I notice, since he got to be a Minister of the Crown, his patience is short. I think if I occupied one of the Treasury benches, at a salary of $7,000 or $8,000 a year, I would always be in good humour and ready to stand up and defend my Bills. Now, this youngster is harmless so far, but the moment it receives the Royal Assent it will become very mischievous. It has been shown by the leader of the Opposition, and by other members of the Province of Quebec, that the gerrymander proposed will be very unjust in the Province of Quebec. However, I will not speak of Quebec, but of my own province. I was under the impression that the Government would allow Prince Edward Island to escape; I was under the impression that their vengeance would not be thrown across the Straits of Northumberland to the little Island of Prince Edward. But, Sir, we could not escape. That gerrymander is going as far as Prince Edward Island. I suppose Prince Edward Island is not entitled to any more than five members, as the result of the census of 1891, but why should the Government, in framing that Bill, tamper with the old county lines? In Prince Edward Island we have only three counties—Prince, Queen's and King's. Now, these lines were established something like a century and a quarter ago; the people have got used to those counties, and I think, if the Government had given the subject one moment's consideration, they would not have passed the county lines. But they have done so: they have gerrymandered the Island into five ridings. The first riding is West Prince. Now, West Prince, by the proposed Bill, is supposed to contain lots 1 to 16 inclusive, and the remainder of Prince County is to be called East Riding, with three townships from Queen's County attached thereto, townships 29, 30 and 67. Now the reason why this was done is very obvious. By the proposed arrangement a Liberal member is safe for West Prince with a majority of something like 400 or 500 electors. The remainder of Prince County is called East Prince, and having these three townships attached to it, the Liberals will be left in a considerable minority, thereby giving a fair chance to a Conservative candidate to be returned to support the present Government. According to that arrangement, instead of Prince County, as at present, being able to send two members here to represent the Opposition, it will only send one to represent the Opposition and one to represent the Government. Well, had they even taken lots 20 and 21 of Queen's County and added them to Prince County, it would not have been so bad; even if they had left lot 15 in the West Riding of Prince County, it would not have been so bad. But we know very well who is at the bottom of this thing. I am well aware that a certain gentleman from the Island came here three or four weeks ago, and I am told very confidentially that at his dictation the Government thought proper to divide the counties so as to suit his views and give him a chance at the next election. Well, Sir, in Queen's County it is the same way. It is to be divided into West Queen's and East Queen's, and by taking three townships from King's County lower down and adding them to East Queen's, a Liberal will have no chance there. Therefore Queen's County, in the room of returning two Opposition members, under this arrangement will return one Liberal and one Conservative. Then we come to King's County. I suppose one of my friends from King's County is sure of being returned there, I do not know how the two sitting members are going to settle it between them, whether they will draw lots or fight it out. Now, Prince County has a population of nearly 37,000. Supposing the county was divided into two, each riding would have a population of very nearly 18,000. Now, that is nearer the unit than a great many of the counties in the Province of Quebec will contain under the present arrangement. If you divide Queen's County in two, you will have an ample population, something like 22,000 in each riding. By that arrangement, the people will be left in their respective counties where they have been for years. These lines were established in 1787, I think, and ever since then the people have known their lines. The people of Prince County do all their municipal duties and their law business in the shire town of Summerside, the capital of the county. The people of Queen's do their business in Charlottetown, and the people of King's County do their business in Georgetown, the capital of King's County. By the present arrangement, three townships of Queen's will be dragged over to Prince, and the three townships of King's will be dragged into Queen's, which, I think, is very unfair. Now, this Bill has not been approved of by the press. With the exception of a few Conservative papers like *The Empire*, the press has denounced this Bill. I am sure the Minister of Justice cannot be ignorant of the fact that the press has denounced this scheme. It has been denounced as an unjust measure by the independent press, and I am sure that many hon. gentlemen opposite in their conscience do not approve of the measure. Why, Sir, I am getting

letters every day, not only from my own constituents, but from all parts of the province, I may say, denouncing the measure, and from Conservatives as well as Liberals. The Bill ought to be framed not to suit the interests of one man or one party, but it ought to be framed in such a way as to do justice to both parties. At present Prince Edward Island is represented by four Liberals and two Conservatives; in the last Parliament it was represented by six Liberals. The reason why two Conservatives got in at the last election is not for me to say. Under the new arrangement the Government expect that the Island will return three Conservatives and only two Liberals; that is their idea. Well, Sir, I think it is very unfair. I think that if the House adopted the amendment of the leader of the Opposition we might expect justice. Why is the Opposition not to be consulted? Have the Government become so powerful and so wise that they can frame a measure of this kind without consulting the Opposition? How is it that not one of them has the hardihood to come forward and defend the measure now before this House, with the exception of the Minister of Public Works? It is a most ridiculous position for the Government to occupy—to introduce a Bill at the eleventh hour and then refuse to defend it. What has the Government been doing all this time? We are now in the fourth month of the session, yet this Bill has only come up to-day for its second reading. Why was the Bill not introduced before? I am sure the census has been completed almost 12 months, bulletins have been issued from week to week, and the Government should have been prepared to introduce a measure of such importance long ago in order to afford full time for consideration by the House. I admire the principle embodied in the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition. If this was a measure affecting only the Conservative party in the Dominion, there was no reason why it should not pass without delay, but it affects the Liberal party as well, and although the Opposition may be small in number in this House it represents a large number of the electors, very nearly one-half the tax-payers of this country. The Island might have escaped being dealt with by this Bill. During the next ten years, if the National Policy should be rescinded, the population of the Island might increase, and would be still entitled to six members. Its representation ought, at all events, to be allowed to remain as at present for a few years longer. It is rather unpatriotic for the Government to go to the Island at all, but when they decided to do so for the purpose of gerrymandering it, they should at least not have attempted to alter county lines, for this will create dissatisfaction among the whole people. The inhabitants know the present county lines, they are prepared to abide by them, and they are not prepared to submit to the gerrymander which the Government propose. If they submit, it will be because they are overcome by force, but they will remain discontented, and this state of feeling should not prevail. We should legislate here to make the people happy and contented and to improve their condition. If Prince County was divided, and there were two districts created, 18,000 people would be in one and the balance in the other. Although it would not be quite up to the unit required, still it would be nearly so. If Queen's County were divided across and Charlottetown were divided, you would have a fair representation for two members. If you take King's County by itself, without disturbing the county lines, you would only have 2,000 or 3,000 more people than the number of voters required for each member, according to the unit in Quebec. The Government have not, however, thought proper to adopt this course, but they have interfered with the county lines, and they have done this without consulting any one, except one or two persons, in the Island. I dare say this has been done; but the results will not be satisfactory to the people. The gentlemen who have whispered in the Government's ears and have induced them to take the present course have not represented the wishes of the people of the Island, and the two members who represent the Government side in the Island do not represent the majority of the tax-payers. I merely desire on this occasion to enter my protest against the injustice the Government is about to perpetrate on the people of the province from which I come, and it would be improper and ungenerous, and I would be derelict in the performance of my duty if I did not rise and protest against the injustice which is being perpetrated on our people. I intend to vote for the amendment introduced by the leader of the Opposition, and when the House goes into committee, I shall be prepared to support a proposition to amend the Bill by leaving the county lines as they are, and divide the counties as far as possible so that the population shall be fairly represented as regards numbers: and no doubt the Government, when they have considered the matter carefully, may come to their senses and yet do what is right.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before the question comes to a vote I wish to say a few words on the amendment now before the House, and in doing so I have no intention of indulging in denunciation. The House will bear me out when I say that that is not my usual habit, and that it is only when I get a little provoked I indulge in anything of the sort. The measure before the House, to which the motion made by the leader of the Opposition is an amendment, professes to be one to equalize the representation of the various provinces. Under the Act of Confederation it is provided that this duty shall be done once every ten years. I submit at the outset that the measure before the House, which professes to be a just measure for equalizing the representation, does not do anything of the kind; and I go further, and say that, in view of all the facts connected with the rearrangement, it is impossible to come to any other conclusion than that there is an unfair and ulterior object in view. In proof of this, we do not need to go further than the adjoining county to the one in which we are now. The House is aware that it is proposed to take one township from Russell and join it to the County of Prescott. There is an inequality, but the proposed change does not remedy it in any degree. There is an adjoining county, Carleton, that is below the required unit, and it would have been very easy to have arranged it so that something like fairness might have been secured without doing any serious injustice. The figures according to the census are as follows: Carleton has 21,749 people, below the unit required. The County of Prescott has 24,173 souls, or 2,000 above the number required; and it is proposed to increase that glaring inequality by

adding to Prescott the township of Clarence. The County of Russell, in which Clarence is situated, has, according to the last census, 31,643 souls. Let us see how the relative numbers will stand according to the proposed change. Russell will then have 26,000 odd, while Prescott will have a population of 28,952; so the Government proposal is only shifting the difficulty from one county to another. It does not equalize it in any respect. The County of Carleton which lies alongside both of these counties had, I think in 1882, the two townships of Gloucester and Osgoode taken from it and added to the County of Russell in order as it was said to equalize the population. Whether Carleton was made too small then, or whether it has become too small since, I do not know, but the fact remains that its population is only 21,749 which is a good many below the unit required. Let us see how easy an arrangement could have been made to equalize this. Suppose, instead of taking Clarence from Russell and adding it on to Prescott, Osgoode had been taken from the County of Russell and added to the County of Carleton to which it belongs, you would have had a fair equalization. The numbers would then have stood: Carleton, with the addition of Osgoode, 26,607; and Russell less the township of Osgoode, 26,864, or very nearly the same. Then Prescott, as it stands now, would have had 24,943, while with Clarence added, it has 28,952, or 6,000 more than the number required. Why, Sir, is this gross iniquity being perpetrated? We are told that the measure is fair and equitable, and that the Government has no ulterior object in view; but, Sir, it will be utterly impossible to convince disinterested judges that the thing was done for any other purpose than to endeavour to leave our friend, the member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), at home. Let us take another instance of this gerrymander. It is proposed to take London West, another municipality, and add it to the city of London. It is proposed to go across the River Thames for this purpose. I suppose that the House is aware that there are two of the wards proper of the city of London that are not in it for electoral purposes. The Fifth Ward belongs to East Middlesex, and the Sixth Ward belongs to South Middlesex, and in order, as it is claimed, to equalize East Middlesex and the city of London, instead of taking the Fifth Ward and adding it to the city of London to which it belongs, it is proposed to go across the River Thames out of the city and to take in another municipality and add that to the city of London. Let us see how the figures stand there. The city of London, according to the last census, has 22,281 population, or just about the number required by the standard. East Middlesex, I admit, has 25,569, or about 3,000 more than the number required, but just alongside these two municipalities lies the riding of South Middlesex which has only 18,806. Now, Sir, if any change were to be made why was the addition made to the city of London, which is large enough now, and the population of East Middlesex still left too large? If the Government wanted to make a fair and honest equilization, it was the simplest matter under the sun to do, because London West lies just as near to South Middlesex as it does to the city of London, and the population of South Middlesex is much below the number required. The simple and honest way would have been to attach London West to the riding of South Middlesex. If that had been done the population of the three constituencies would have been as follows: South Middlesex, with London West added, 20,721; London City, 22,281, and East Middlesex, with London West taken from it, 23,654. So that they would have been fairly equalized. Now, Sir, why was this not done? Again I say, Mr. Speaker, that it will be utterly impossible to convince honest and intelligent judges that the division proposed in this Bill was done for any other purpose than simply to confirm the Minister of Agriculture in Charles Hyman's place. The amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition asks that both sides of the House should be consulted in such a serious matter as this. It is a matter affecting both sides, both sides are equally interested in it, and it is not, I submit, fair and honest that one side should make an arrangement to suit themselves by which they have all the advantage, and by which they set the other side at defiance. I was sorry to hear the leader of the Opposition to-day object to the principle of leaving this matter to the judges, but I sincerely hope that the leader of the Government in this House will take this question into serious consideration and decide to leave the redistribution to the judges of the Supreme Court. That arrangement would, I believe, give satisfaction to all parties in this country. I know that it would give satisfaction to me, and I am willing to take the risk, if those judges so think, of having my constituency wiped out of existence if we can only get at a fair and honest redistribution. These five judges of the Supreme Court are men from the different provinces. They know the situation of the provinces and they have time to devote to the matter, and by taking a map and laying it down in their office, in a few hours with the aid of the census returns, they could and would make a fair and honest redistribution and one, I believe, that would suit all parties. I trust that the leader of the Government, instead of persisting in this measure, will appoint these judges to make the redistribution as the Confederation Act gives them power to do. I submit that neither the members of the Government nor those who support them can afford to pass a measure of this kind. I need not tell hon. gentlemen that we are making history here, and that the deeds we are doing now are left upon record. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they wish their names to go down to posterity as the perpetrators of an unjust and unreasonable act? I say that neither the gentlemen who occupy seats on the Treasury benches, nor any other party in this House, can afford to pass an unjust measure in this Parliament. Speaking for myself I would rather step out of this House, and from this day to the day of my death get my living honestly by digging ditches, than leave my name tainted by any unjust act that would cause my descendants to blush. The Minister of Public Works gave us a speech this afternoon and it was refreshing to hear from him, because it seems that our friends on the other side are either afraid or ashamed to defend this Bill. The Minister of Public Works had no such scruples. He defended it and he did it in a bold, open, manly way, and I admire him for it. He claimed that the Government had no ulterior object in view, and that they did not think at all how the Bill was going to affect them in the constituencies, or in the matter of their support in this House. He said that they were

actuated altogether by high and noble principles. He claimed what was perfectly true, that the Government was strong enough to act upon such principles. Well, I can almost fancy the hon. gentleman at the council board admonishing his friends to act in such a manner. He could point out that they would fight under the Franchise Act, which is just now beginning to get in its fine work, that by it they had secured a few constituencies, that by becoming familiar with the running of the machine, they had it in their power to secure a great many more, and that, therefore, they could afford to give a fair, honourable and manly redistribution. Again, he could urge on the Government that by the Gerrymander Act of 1882 they had secured to themselves a great deal of support. For instance, in the County of Middlesex, in the general election of 1891, there was a majority of over 1,100 votes polled against the Government candidates: and yet, Sir, of the four members from that county, I am the only solitary one who votes on this side of the House, while the Government, with 1,100 majority against them, have three supporters from that county. The hon. gentleman could point to such facts as these, and could say to the Government, we are strong enough to afford to do the fair and reasonable thing with the Opposition in this case. He could also point out that the members of the Red Parlour had come down handsomely, that by the funds they had provided, the Government had carried a great many elections, and that the same means could be used in the future: and that was another reason why they could afford to do the fair and reasonable thing. Then, he might have pointed out that the Government had reinstated the officials who had been suspended last year for doing things that were a little crooked, and that there was no danger of their peaching. The same hon. gentleman could point to the fate of the Haggart charges as proof that they had a majority sufficient to vote down anything of that kind, and that, therefore, they could afford to do the fair and manly thing. He could also claim that they had so gerrymandered the Caron charges that the hon. gentleman who first brought them forward would not know them if he saw them again, and that no man would be foolish enough to try and prove them: and he could point out that having got rid of that difficulty, the Government could afford to do the fair and honourable thing in this case. Then the hon. gentleman treated us to another view of the case. He hinted in a gentle way, and with a great deal of courtesy, that if we on this side of the House did not like the measure as it was, may be we would get enough of it. That is the plea of the highwayman, when he tells the poor man whom he has robbed of his money that if he does not hold his tongue and take it peaceably, he will blow his brains out. We on this side of the House do not appreciate arguments of that kind, and what is more, we do not fear them either; no such tactics will prevent us doing our duty to the country. And now, let me just point out the source from which the Government have derived their inspiration. We hear a great deal about loyalty to the old flag and the old land. Sir, I share in that feeling; but the strange thing to me is that whenever the Government go to the old land for precedents, they always go for those precedents which suit themselves; and when they want to do anything unjust, when they want to inaugurate a policy which is going to be hurtful to the country but subservient of their own ends, then they go for precedents to the United States. This gerrymander is from beginning to end a Yankee institution. It was started there and has been perpetuated there, and as the Government imitated the Americans in their tariff policy, so they have imitated them in their gerrymander policy. Therefore, I say again that the Government and the House cannot afford to do anything so disreputable to the country. Strong as they are, they cannot afford to secure support by any such means, and I hope that the leader of the Government will look at the matter in that light, and decide to give us a fair and honest equalization.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, there does not seem to be on the other side of the House any member with the pluck to attempt the defence of the iniquitous and cynical law proposed by the Minister of Justice. It is to be regretted that none of these gentlemen has the courage of asserting before the country the reason which will make him vote for this measure by the Government. It seems to me that the hon. members on the Ministerial side, when occasion offers, should express their views on the questions which come up in this House; and, when such a complicated measure as this is before us, it should be reasonable to expect that they would have the courage to explain the position which they intend to take in the matter. But I understand why they do not want to state the grounds on which they will rest their vote. They would be forced to defend a measure which is indefensible; and not being able to find a single plausible reason for the vote they are to give, they have not the courage to explain this vote. I refer principally to the hon. members for the Province of Quebec, to those who are the authors of the proposed gerrymandering of that province. I refer to the members who have manufactured counties for themselves, who have built up majorities for themselves, and who have not the courage to rise and defend their work. Since these hon. gentlemen are not able to give a single good reason in justification of their vote, we shall continue the discussion anyhow; we shall try and show them that the injustice which they plan against us is grievous, and I hope that the light of the discussion will help them to understand that this Bill must be amended, and that the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition should be adopted. This amendment proposes to refer the Bill to a committee composed of members taken from both sides of the House, in order to give justice and fair-play to the Liberal party which has not been consulted in the preparation of this measure. It seems to me that if a little equity and justice had been used, a few members of the Liberal party would have been consulted regarding this scheme of readjustment. But on the contrary the work was done in the dark. And more. This profound gerrymandering has not been done by members of the Government, but by irresponsible members, by senators whose only work is done only in the interest of their party, by persons who have been put into positions for services rendered their party, and who in return for what the Conservative party does for them, have planned the wiping out of the Liberal party in the Province

of Quebec. But, Mr. Speaker, they are deluding themselves. I trust that the people of the Province of Quebec which they want to rob—I make bold to use the expression—which they want to prevent from being equitably represented in this House, will understand that if is their duty not to support so iniquitous a measure. Another reason why the proposition of the leader of the Opposition should be accepted, is that we are not in a position, from the documents which have been produced in the House, to discuss this question. Indeed, the map accompanying the Bill is entirely erroneous and false. I am not afraid of making this charge against the Government. They put before the House in order to mislead it, a map which is entirely false, which does not show the true boundaries intended to be given to the counties. I say that it is an indignity, a flagrant injustice for the Government to ask us to discuss a measure on documents which are false. I believe that the Minister of Justice does not know that this map is false, and I have enough confidence in his spirit of justice to believe that when it shall be pointed out to him that it does not show the true boundaries of the counties, he will see that the discussion of the Bill is postponed until he furnishes, either to the committee to be appointed or to the House—a correct map. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I will show the Government that for the County of Laprairie this map is false. Was it the intention to deceive the members of this House by furnishing them with an incorrect map? As represented on this map the County of Laprairie would comprise the parishes of St. Edouard and Sherrington, while by the proposed Bill these parishes are not a part of Laprairie, but of Chateauguay instead. The County of Missisquoi is represented on the map as comprising the parish of Lacolle. Now, in the Bill, this parish is nowhere mentioned. At all events, it should be supposed to be a part of the old county to which it belonged, St. John. The parish of St. Cyprien is, according to the Bill, to be in the County of Chateauguay, while on the map it is put into St. John's. The map ought to show the parishes of St. Cyprien, St. Edouard, St. Patrick of Sherrington, as belonging to the County of Chateauguay, because the Bill makes them a part of that county. I say that not a single member would vote for this measure, if the map furnished the House by the Government showed the real boundaries intended to be given to the electoral districts. Nevertheless, the Government moves the second reading of the Bill on documents and a map falsely representing the situation. Now, for the County of Chambly. According to the map, the parish of Notre Dame de Bonsecours would be a part of Chambly, but the Bill puts it into the County of Rouville. If this map had been made in accordance with the facts, if this map gave a just idea of the new electoral districts as proposed by the Government, if it did not contain numerous errors, if, in a word, it were not false, I say that not one member would have the courage to vote for the measure. The same inaccuracy is to be met with in regard to the County of Rouville. A parish has been excluded, according to the map, which should have been put in according to the Bill. If we examine the boundaries of the parishes, as shown by the map, it will be seen that they are erroneously indicated. There is not one parish the boundaries of which are correctly shown. The electoral district of St. Hyacinthe, which is composed of ten parishes, I believe, is falsely indicated on the map. Of these ten parishes, seven are wrongly given. As to the County of Rouville, the inaccuracies which are found on the map are still more numerous. One of the parishes is not shown. I have already pointed out the inaccuracies of the map as to the Counties of Chateauguay and Laprairie. In the County of Laprairie, the parish of St. Edouard is wrongly described. The same obtains in regard to the County of Montcalm. The parish of St. Paul, which is removed from the County of Joliette and annexed to the County of Montcalm, is very wrongly described: the description given of it is not in accordance with the facts. I could go on pointing out the inaccuracies of this map for quite awhile yet: but, perhaps, it would be abusing the patience of those who do me the honour to listen to my remarks. I regret that the Minister of Public Works is not at his seat. Were he here, I would tell him that he ought to have furnished the House with a *bonâ fide* map representing exactly the new electoral districts. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would be a grave mistake to increase, as is proposed, the representation of the city of Montreal. To-day that city has in the House and Senate many more representatives than it has a right to have. It will be admitted that a member, a citizen of Montreal, although a representative of a rural district, is none the less devoted to the interests of the city where he lives. But, Mr. Speaker, it is especially in the matter of senators that Montreal can be shown as having a proportion of influence much larger than it should have. The senators have in Parliament a large share of influence, and this influence plays a great part in the legislation of the country. The Province of Quebec has, under the constitution, the right of being represented by 24 senators: 12 for the district of Quebec, and 12 for that of Montreal. Now, of these 12 senators for the district of Montreal, 7 live in the city of Montreal, that is to say, 7 have interests absolutely identical to those of that city, and must work to promote those interests. Already the disproportion is too large between the influence exercised by the city of Montreal, and that which ought to be the legitimate share of the rural country which surrounds it. Instead of having ten senators to represent the rural counties of the district of Montreal, we have only five, while the city of Montreal, which should have only two or three, has seven. Montreal is also represented in a large measure by the representatives of rural counties who live within its limits. Does not all this give it enough influence without increasing its representation? As to its representation in the House of Commons, we find that the city of Montreal is more that adequately represented. Thirteen or fourteen members of this House are from the city of Montreal. Of course it is the duty of these to reflect the opinion of their counties, but we must not forget either that, through the influence of its papers and of its commercial relations, Montreal shapes to a certain extent the opinion of the neighbouring rural counties. Thus the rural counties are deprived of their due share of representation. Besides, the seeming discrimination against Montreal in the matter of representation, existed as well in 1871 and 1881. And yet no change was then proposed. Why should not these precedents be respected to-day? Oh, the reason is

very simple. The Conservatives walk from iniquity to iniquity, from baseness to baseness, and they will continue to do so until they have reached the bottom of the hill. In a few years, we must expect that they will try to have a law passed to prevent Liberals from sitting in this House. Now the hon. member for Laval, the Minister of Public Works, has claimed that the division of the counties was equitably made. It is not necessary to make a long examination of the facts to show until evident that this measure is one of the most unjust. Neither is it based on the principle of equity set forth by the Minister of Justice when he presented the bill. Thus, we see, as it is explained by the preamble of the Bill, that it was necessitated:

"By reason of the existence of great inequalities in the respective populations of certain electoral districts in the other provinces of Canada"

Thus, as is seen, the ground upon which the Government justify the changes in the boundaries of the counties, is the inequality of population. Well, why not then have followed for the district of Quebec, the principle applied for the district of Montreal? Since this inequality is still greater in the district of Quebec, there ought to have been a change of boundaries for the counties of that district. For instance, Quebec West, which has only a population of 9,000, has not been touched. It will still have the right to send a representative to this House. Is this not an outrage when counties of 15,000, 20,000 and 22,000 inhabitants are changed in the district of Montreal? Since the necessity for this Bill rests on the ground of inequality, why has not the anomaly been removed in that division of the district of Quebec? Again in the district of Quebec I see Montmorency, with a population of 12,000, Montmagny with 14,000, L'Islet with 13,000. And there are a great number of other counties there which have not as much population as the counties which are to be overhauled in the district of Montreal. But my opinion is that there should be no changes in the Province of Quebec, since there is nothing in the law which requires any. We are bound to have sixty-five electoral districts. We have them. Why now change the boundaries of counties, which have existed ever since 1854? These changes are only made with a political end in view. If a spirit of justice had obtained, it would have prevented this gerrymandering of the Province of Quebec, and the Government would have gained by it in public opinion. Now let us examine the opinion expressed by the Minister of Public Works when he said that the Liberal party, although having a majority in the representation, represents but a minority of the votes of the province. I believe that there again he was mistaken, as he was mistaken this afternoon with regard to the majority that his county will give him in the future. Had he wished to be just, he would have seen that this difference comes exclusively from the figure of the population of the city of Montreal. We know that at the last elections that city declared in favour of the Government. We know that in certain divisions of that city the Conservative party had enormous majorities, for the reason that these divisions were entirely under the control of combines and trusts. We naturally had then to expect overwhelming defeats there. The hon. Minister has also contended that the people of the Province of Quebec were extremely changeable. I do not know where he gets his ground for such an assertion, for on the contrary the Province of Quebec is rather set. If anywhere the population has a tendency to change, it is rather in the rest of the Dominion. However, if the people of Quebec are changeable why, then, change the boundaries of the counties, for it is possible that the divisions that have not the required population, may have it in five or six years from now. Then why throw these divisions into confusion by changing to-day their boundaries? The Minister of Public Works said amongst other things that the County of Ottawa as divided will send to the House an additional member favourable to the Liberal party. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister knows too well the state of things in the northern part of the County of Ottawa which is to form the new electoral division not to know the influence which would decide the fate of a Liberal candidate there. No, it cannot be said that this new division will give an additional representative to our party. The northern part of the County of Ottawa is under the control of the Govment of the Province of Quebec in this sense, that much has to be done there for colonization. The people are poor, and they depend upon the Government, which has in its power to give them colonization roads These people having to count with the Conservative Government of Quebec, can it be seriously contended that under such circumstances, this new electoral division is to give the Liberal party an additional representative? The authors of the Bill knew as well as I do, that it was an acquisition for them, and the Minister of Public Works was not serious when he said the contrary. Let us take now the county of Joliette. There was a county where we had good chances of electing one of our men, where there was a good fighting ground. Without any reason whatever, the boundaries of the county are changed, a parish is taken away, and thrown into the County of Montcalm. With this change, I consider the county as taken away from the Liberal party. Why this gerrymandering? The Conservative party is then afraid of the electors? Is the Government and their party afraid that the charges of boodling which gather against them may crush their Cabinet? It is an act of cowardice on the part of the Government. Had these people any dignity they would not commit such an act. The County of L'Assomption is also the object of the Government's solicitude. This county, which was represented by one of our friends, who has to run anew, is considered as a doubtful county. In the last provincial elections we were beaten there by a majority of 200 votes. It would seem from this result that this county should be considered as safe enough for our opponents, however they are not brave enough to face the county as it is; they must go and annex to it Conservative parishes from the second next county. It is said that it is in order to equalize the population of different counties that this measure is presented. Nevertheless, it has been shown that in the County of Ottawa they put 40,000 people in one division, and 17,000 in the other. In the County of Joliette there was, according to the last census, 22,981 souls, precisely the figure of the unit. However, Mr. Speaker, the parish of St. Paul, with a population of 1,485, is taken away from this county the population of which is reduced to 21,436. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the County of L'As-

somption, which has a population of 13,674. A parish is added to it from the County of Berthier with a population of 987. What is the sense, in view of the equalization of the population, to make this addition of 987 souls? This is a county, the population of which has decreased during the last decade, and will continue to do so if the policy of the Government does not change. Why make only this small change, and be under the necessity of going at it again in ten years? Really, Mr. Speaker, what can we think of all this, except that they are afraid to take their chances in this county as it now is? They have not the pluck to meet the electors, and have thought it more prudent to add to the county a Conservative parish. I hope, however, that L'Assomption will remain faithful to the Liberal party and that Mr. Gauthier will be returned again. The population of the County of Berthier is 19,836, and therefore does not reach the unit of 22,800. Nevertheless a parish of 987 inhabitants is taken away from that county. Why this? Here again, Mr. Speaker, the reason is easy to find. They want to carry L'Assomption, and to that end they detached a part of Berthier and added it to L'Assomption. Now, we have Chateauguay with a population of 13,864. By detaching two parishes from this county and adding other parishes to it, a population of 19,681 is reached. Why proceed in this manner? Why take away parishes which have formed a part of it from time immemorial, and add others? Why remove, amongst others, the very parish which gives its name to the county, the very parish of Chateauguay? Why not, instead of annexing these parishes to Laprairie, unite the Counties of Napierville and Laprairie, the aggregate population of which is about 20,000 only? If changes are absolutely necessary, which I do not admit, however, these two counties might have been united. But I am coming to the Counties of St. John and Iberville. I find it strange that these two counties, which are divided by a river of five or six *arpents* in width are united by the Bill, when in the same district of Montreal the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil, which, were they united, would have but a population of 20,000, and which are not parted by a river, are left apart. Why not have joined these two counties? Here is the proof of the iniquity with which the Government treat their opponents. The reason why the Government have not united Soulanges and Vaudreuil into a single county is, that they are represented by two Conservatives, and the reason why they have joined St. John and Iberville, is that they are represented by two Liberals. It is low, exceedingly low on the part of the Government, what they do with regard to Iberville and St. John. Our old friend, the member for St. Jean (Mr. Bourassa) has represented this county ever since 1854. The Government have never been able to defeat him. They find no other way to get him out of political life, than to juggle away his county. I say it is an iniquity, and I am not surprised that the hon. members of the right have not the face to rise and defend such a piece of cowardice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) And I now come to the County of Bagot. Here is a county which must have given a good deal of care to the designer of this movement. Really his name deserves to pass to posterity. And I believe that the debate will not close before the Minister of Public Works reveals his name.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) It is a privileged county with that of Rouville.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) It is a privileged county as that of Rouville. Well, I will quote from a celebrated Roman poet: "*Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*," I fear the Greeks even when they bring me presents. They know that the Government are not able even to-day to carry an election in the County of Rouville, for their standard-bearer has now disappeared. He has been found a situation. He has been given his piece of bread. And now that no victory is to be hoped for, they hive in the county all the Liberal parishes of the vicinity. The Minister of Public Works ought to blush for the work he has done there. The County of Rouville and the five neighbouring counties, viz.: Iberville, Chambly, St. Hyacinthe, Verchères and Bagot were represented by five Liberals and one Conservative. Well, what has he done with these counties? He has wiped out two, and of the four others he attempted to make three Conservative and one Liberal. And that is what he calls privileged counties. The hon. Minister is not particular on this point. He made for himself also a privileged county. However, he declares that his aim is to equalize the representation of the Province of Quebec. And when the unit of population is 22,800, he makes himself a county of barely 16,000. Why did he not make his county 22,000? Can he say? Would it be, perchance, that it would cost him too much money to be elected? Why make his county only 16,000 when Drummond and Arthabaska are left with 43,000? The hon. gentleman is a brave one. You will see. He had 534 votes of majority at the last election; but that was not enough. He gave himself 111 more. But let me return to my friend from Bagot (Mr. Dupont). I would be very much surprised if he were not the author of this Bill, as far as his county is concerned. I believe that he has fixed things to suit his requirements. There were two parishes which did not set well on his stomach. These two parishes were hostile, and every time he showed himself there, they brewed bad blood in him. When he saw that the Government intended to change the boundaries of the counties, he said to himself: That is good, and I am going to try to get rid of these parishes. He had a county with about the unit of population, namely, 21,655; he, therefore, first proceeded to rid himself of the parishes which disagreed with him, and after having thus got rid of his parishes which soured on him, he remained with a population of 21,695. It was a *tour de force*, and I believe the hon. Minister would be wrong in not giving the author's name, so that when the Government have some future gerrymandering to do, they may avail themselves of his services.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) How polite he is.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I do not know that I am using impolite language. The Minister of Public Works, before calling his opponents uncivil, might consider the conduct of his friend, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Chapleau), who was accusing me the other day of speaking of things which I did not know about. I believe that the

Minister of Public Works is wrong in calling me impolite, and that he had better remember the words he used himself this afternoon. He would see they are more uncivil than mine. Besides, I am only using strong language against a Bill that neither he nor his friends dare defend. Now, where the author of the Bill revealed himself a great man, if not altogether as great as the author of the Bagot chapter, it is in the matter of the County of Chambly. At the last elections this county returned a Liberal with a majority of 83. It is not so very much, but the Government asked themselves if they could not get rid of him. It was then that was imagined the scheme of taking two parishes from the County of Verchères and annexing them to the County of Chambly. And then crossing the Richelieu River to go and get from Rouville four Conservative parishes. Here are two parishes divided by an unnavigable river, which for the entire length of the Counties of Rouville and Chambly, is but a succession of rapids impossible to cross. Thus there is no communication. But what do they care for such difficulties, if they can only kill politically the member for that county? But just here is a very interesting detail which throws light on the thought of the Government. There are five parishes on that side of the river. They take the first, but leave the second. Was it of too Liberal a complexion? It might well be so. Then they take the third, the fourth and the fifth. Had the Government furnished a map showing exactly the situation, not one member would have voted for such a measure. Not only are these counties divided by an unnavigable river, but they are also by parishes which have no connection with them. I now come to the County of Verchères. Although the Minister of Customs has refused to assume the paternity of this Bill, and the Minister of Public Works has accepted the whole responsibility for it, I believe, however, that the Minister of Customs must stand for something in the part of it which concerns Verchères. If I am to trust a piece of poetry which has just come to me, the Minister of Customs is not altogether a stranger to the wiping out of the County of Verchères. A man whose profession is law, who is even, if you please, a substitute of the Attorney General in Montreal, and who is no other than Mr. J. L. Archambault, Q.C., has addressed the following verses to the Minister of Customs. As this practical effusion would be in danger of being lost to posterity if it was left to the fate of the newspapers, I will quote them to the House so that they may live in the Debates and reach future generations. This poem sports the title, *The Gerrymandery, a political Epistle-Elegy, dedicated to my friend Hon. J. A. Chapleau:*

Je vous écris, monsieur le ministre des douanes,
Pour dire: de la loi redoutez les arcanes.
Le bill que vous nommez rédistribution,
Pour un petit peuple est terrible invention.
De nos comtés la carte est certes bien difforme;
Mais je crains le budget et la grande réforme.
De la mesure on croit que vous êtes l'auteur:

I was right in saying that the Minister of Customs was no stranger to this Bill.

Je m'en plains, comme fait bien plus d'un électeur.
Pour un gouvernement c'est chose très commode,
Tous les dix ans changer les us et puis la mode.
Vous taillez, mutilez dans les antiques droits.

Here is a man who feels free and easy with law.—

Mr. BRODEUR.

Et, sans rougir, je dis en superbes endroits.
Tenez, voici le cas: C'est un beau nom, Verchères;

Now comes the time for pathos:

Un peuple l'adore en ses espérances chères.
Dans ces lieux fut élu notre illustre Cartier,
L'homme "franc et sans dol," mais pas du tout rentier.
La chose est écrite aux pages de notre histoire;
Ce vaillant y lutta, conservant la victoire.
Plus tard, de votre aile effleurant ce château-fort,
Vous prouvâtes au moins que vous étiez un fort.
Fou de votre destin, je mordis à la pomme,
Qu'aime tant Geoffrion;—c'est ainsi qu'on le nomme—
Est-ce ma faute à moi, si, dans ce fier comté,
Riche en bons candidats, je ne suis député.

This man evidently was aspiring to the representation of this county.—

L'heure allait tôt sonner où l'antique espérance
Des glorieux vaincus briserait la souffrance.
Hélas! on a tout pris, et par tristes lambeaux,
Se morcelle un nom cher, en collèges moins beaux.
Je vous le dis, monsieur, cette loi est bien dure,
C'est robuste parti, qu'un parti qui l'endure.
Fils de la liberté, je promets sur l'honneur,
Venger votre drapeau et le grand déshonneur.

And this is signed, J. L. Archambault, C. R. The C. R. stands for the French, for Q. C. I feel sorry that the Government should have remained obdurate after such an appeal. I think that the Ministers should have put before the House this epistle-elegy, for I fancy it is a rare occurrence that poetry be the language of those who lay claims before the Government. It furnished an occasion to prove to posterity that we have among our people poets who can reach a rare height, the height of ridiculousness. I ask myself why the Minister of Customs wants to wipe out this County of Verchères? Is it because he has been beaten there by Mr. Geoffrion, who has represented this county for so many years? Does he want to avenge the defeat he experienced in that county? I am tempted to believe it, since his friend, Mr. J. L. Archambault says so too. Before concluding my remarks, I take the liberty to remind my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec, that by voting this Bill they will sanction another injustice, much greater than that committed against our friends of the Province of Quebec. I hope that they will not vote for this Bill, and that they will not consummate the measure of iniquity dealt to our fellow-countrymen of Russell and Prescott. These two counties are to-day represented in the Legislature of Ontario by two French Canadians. In the Federal Parliament they are represented by a French Canadian and an English Canadian. Owing to the influence of the French Canadians in the County of Russell, they can not only control the vote of that county, but they can have one of their own returned. The Minister of Justice declared the other day that he intended to take from Russell five or six thousand French Canadians who are there and hive them in the County of Prescott. This is another iniquity. It is intended to reduce the influence of the French Canadians in Ontario. Are we not already exposed enough to the fanaticism of the friends of the Government in that province that the French Canadian population of certain counties should be further deprived of representation in Parliament? The Minister of Railways and Canals declared the other day to a delegation from that district, that this change had been made at his instigation. So averse is he to us that he would hive in a single county all our French Canadian friends, in order to deprive them of their influence. There is no

other reason for that change, and it is the very one that was given by the Minister of Justice when he presented the Bill. Well, you French Canadian Conservatives of the Province of Quebec who have pledged yourselves by writing, according to rumour to vote in favour of this measure, to support all the iniquities it contains, remember at least this scheme to rob us of the County of Russell; this scheme to deprive the French element in the Province of Ontario of a county which now belongs to it. Why not as well make a single electoral college of all the French Canadians of the province? Why not take all those of Essex, and the others disseminated throughout the province, and hive them also in this County of Prescott? I hope that the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec who perhaps at first did not realize this iniquity, will think twice before voting unmurmuringly in favour of the measure now before us. I do not intend to speak longer. They say on the other side of the House that it is useless to discuss the matter since the Minister of Public Works has answered all that has been said. But there is one fact that had not been put before the House when the hon. Minister spoke, and consequently he cannot have explained it. As the hon. Minister was not here when I referred to it a moment ago, I am going to bring it to his notice now. I mean to call his attention to the fact that the map put upon the Table of the House is false. There are in it counties wrongly indicated. There are parishes shown as belonging to one county while they belong to another, and it is from this false and erroneous map that the Government want us to vote this Bill. I will ask the hon. Minister if it is not true that this map is false.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) This is certainly not true.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) It seems as if the hon. Minister had never studied this question. It will be with this denial as it was with his remarks about his county. I am going to prove to him that this map is false. I am going to proceed by order. We will take the County of Laprairie. I think that the Minister of Public Works, before belying me in this House, would do better to study his own measure as he should. By the Bill which he has fathered, the hon. Minister declares that the electoral district of Laprairie will be composed of the villages of Laprairie and Sault St. Louis, and of the parishes of Laprairie, St. Constant, St. Isidore, St. Jacques-le-Mineur, St. Phillippe, St. Michel Archange, St. Joachim de Chateauguay and Ste. Philomène. Now I am going to show him that Sherrington is put on the map as going to belong to County of Laprairie. The hon. Minister, perhaps, does not know that.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) I know nothing of it.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Then why do you give me the lie?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is time to call the hon. gentleman to order. I am not responsible for this map, and if any error has been made, it seems that the hon. member should be polite enough to indicate what those errors are, and we will see that they are corrected.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) That is precisely what I am doing now.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Yes, but it is quite a different thing to say that there is an error and to say that it is a Minister who has made it.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) That is not what he said at all. The hon. member said that the map was false, and the hon. Minister answered that that was not true.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) He attributed it to me.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I said that I would show that the map is false, and while I was showing it, the hon. Minister, very politely—oh, he is very polite!—said I was not telling the truth. Although I am but a young member, having had but one year of experience in this House, the hon. Minister should have the decency at least to find out if what I say is true or false, before giving me the lie. I am going to continue pointing out the errors contained in this map, and I hope to succeed in convincing the Government and their friends, that they must put off the second reading of this bill, or give us a map which is not a network of misrepresentations. The parish of St. Edouard is indicated as in Laprairie. Now the Bill puts this parish in Chateauguay. I denounce this to the Minister of Public Works, and I believe that he will admit with me, that we have been deceived by the employés who have prepared the map. The parish of St. Cyprien according to the bill is in the County of Chateauguay. According to the map we find it in the County of St. John. The parish of Notre Dame de Bonsecours is included by the Bill in the County of Rouville. However the map furnished to the House, shows it in Chambly. There are also grave errors in connection with the County of St. Hyacinthe. Moreover the boundaries of the parishes are not given correctly. And I find these errors in almost every county. After this I hope the Minister of Public Works will withdraw the accusation which he made against me, and that he will admit that I was right in saying that the Government had not put before the House a map which showed accurately the changes proposed by the Bill.

Mr. BÉCHARD. My constituency being affected by this Bill, I wish to make a few remarks with regard to it. The scheme propounded is an admirable one, and I cannot help admiring the inventive genius which has given it birth. Indeed the great Machiavelli himself, that great master in trickery, could hardly have done better; but before I proceed to speak upon the measure itself, I must express my regrets that it should have been brought before Parliament at so late a period of the session. We have been here now more than three months, which is the usual duration of a session, and yet this is the first time we are called upon to discuss this important measure. I notice that during the session the Government have presented to Parliament three or four very important measures, but with the exception of the criminal code, about one-half of which has been discussed, this is the first of these important measures we have begun to consider. I know that the occupation of Ministers of the Crown are numerous and important, but, really, I think their measures should be prepared during the recess. They are here at the seat of Government the whole year, with the exception of a few weeks during which they take a reasonable holiday, and I think the rest of the time ought to be sufficient to allow them to see to the different

acts of administration required in the different departments, and to prepare at least the important measures which they intend to submit to Parliament the coming session. For at least six weeks from the beginning of the session we were here without seeing any of those important measures to which I have alluded, and I repeat it is to be regretted that we should have to examine a measure of so great importance as this at a time when this House ought to be prorogued. Now, Sir, this measure is needed, in so far as the provinces are concerned where the increase of population entitles them by law to an increased representation, and it is also needed in so far as the provinces are concerned where the decrease of population subjects them to a reduction of representation; but in so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned I fail to see its necessity. In that province, as we all know, the number of representatives cannot be changed. Under the British North America Act it is fixed at 65, and must remain at that figure. Therefore, I cannot see the urgent necessity of changing the limits of its constituencies. If the Government had contemplated a general reform in the limits of constituencies in the Province of Quebec, I could understand there being some reason for that, because we know that there are in that province constituencies which have a population far exceeding the unit required for each county, while there are others in which the population is far below the requisite unit. But by this Bill I see that the object of the Government is mainly to give an increased representation to the city of Montreal. Well, my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, has given a very good reason why the representation of that city should not be increased, for it cannot be increased excepting at the expense of the rural districts. He has truly said that the city of Montreal is represented in this House, not only by the three members which it elects but also by nearly ten other gentlemen who reside in that city, and have been elected by rural districts. Suppose that some of the interests of the people of Montreal or its suburbs were discussed in this House, does any one believe that each one of those gentlemen residing in Montreal, and having seats in this House for rural districts, would not be prepared to defend the interests of the population of that city where they reside and have their interests? If we had adopted the principle that no man should represent a constituency who did not reside in it, I could conceive there being stronger reasons to increase the representation of Montreal on account of its large population; but, as matters stand to-day, there is no reason or necessity for creating new electoral divisions in that city, because it is practically well represented, not only by the members it returns, but also by those other gentlemen who reside and have their interests there and are returned by rural districts. Besides, in a large city, where the population is concentrated, it is a very easy matter, during an election, for a candidate to meet his constituents, within a couple of hours' notice, and give them his views, whilst in the rural districts candidates are obliged to travel long distances in order to visit the different localities in their constituencies. Sir, in a city like Montreal the people, being concentrated, have more means to receive education and information, they have easier access to the newspapers and all the other sources of information concerning their interests than have the people in rural districts; and I hold that the higher the degree of education in a community, the smaller its need for representation in Parliament. Now, I come to the County of Hochelaga which is composed for the most part of the suburban population of Montreal, and I say that population is as well represented by the gentlemen residing in Montreal and representing other districts as is the population of the city. The County of Ottawa could have been left alone as well as other constituencies in the Province of Quebec which have a very large population, and the limits of which are not at all disturbed by this Bill. Look at the Counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay with a population of 38,281, Drummond and Arthabaska with a population of 43,923, the County of Beauce with over 33,000 souls, and there are other counties with a population far exceeding the ratio required to form a constituency. It is true that the County of Ottawa has perhaps the largest population of all the rural districts in the Province of Quebec, but I think it could have been left alone as well as other counties which, though having a less population, have yet a population far too large to have only one representative in this House. But the hon. the Minister of Public Works told us that he was inclined to accept propositions or suggestions if they were reasonable. I will avail myself on this occasion of those good dispositions on his part and will take the liberty of making a few suggestions. Admit that the County of Ottawa, on account of its very large population, should have an increase of one representative in this House, the hon. Minister could have very easily adjusted this matter, he could have very easily settled that question by simply uniting the two constituencies of Vaudreuil and Soulanges. These two counties united would have a population of only 20,411, which is still within the unit required. Why has not the hon. gentleman done this? I would not like to make a malign insinuation, but I venture to think that, if these two counties were represented in this House by Liberals, the union would have certainly taken place. The hon. gentleman, instead of doing that, has determined to provide for four new constituencies in the Province of Quebec, but, as the number of representatives in Quebec can neither be increased nor decreased, he can provide for these four new constituencies only by some changes and by the suppression of four other constituencies. The hon. Minister has thought proper to cross the St. Lawrence River in order to effect his object, and to go to the southern portion of the province which has always been considered as the Liberal stronghold. He went first to the County of Napierville, and dismembered it, throwing one part into the County of Chateauguay and the other part into the County of Laprairie. Why did not the hon. Minister simply unite the counties of Napierville and Laprairie together without dismembering the County of Napierville? Those two counties united would have had a population of 21,001 souls, which is still within the proportion required by law to constitute a county. If he had done that, since he was determined to find four new constituencies in the Province of Quebec, perhaps there would not be much reason for discontent. There is some affinity existing between the different constituencies of old municipalities. The electors are accustomed to fight their

electoral battles together, and to throw one part of a county on the one side and another part on the other side, with municipalities with whom they have previously had hardly any relations, seems a harsh proceeding. When the hon. gentleman spoke on the introduction of the Bill, he said, in regard to the County of Napierville, that the reason for its suppression was that, this county having the smallest population of all the counties adjacent to it, it was chosen to be suppressed. I regret that the Minister has not thought proper to be logical and apply the same rule with regard to Chambly and Verchères. Chambly has a smaller population than Verchères, and, on the grounds alleged in reference to Napierville, the hon. gentleman should have suppressed Chambly and preserved Verchères. In this case the hon. gentleman could have avoided destroying the old County of Verchères, which has been represeneed by so great a politician as the late Sir George E. Cartier, the hon. gentleman's former leader, one of his political idols, and a county which is so well represented in this House by my hon. friend the present incumbent of the seat, a man who is loved and respected by every one who knows him, and who has been a Minister of the Crown. I think it was a harsh thing to do, to expose that old veteran in politics to be deprived of that constituency in the next Parliament. I am sure that my hon. friend, if he desires to continue in public life, could easily find a county in the Province of Quebec where he could be elected, but I am sure also he would refuse to take the place of any of his friends. Sir, these two counties could have been easily united, and, if they were united, their population would only amount to 23,961. It is a little beyond the unit, only 1,000, but this could have been easily settled by taking one or two parishes from the County of Chambly and throwing them into the County of Laprairie. By this plan the hon. gentleman would have avoided creating the discontent which he has caused in those constituencies which have been dismembered. He would have united them, it is true, with the neighbouring counties, but at least he would have kept together the old municipalities which had hitherto constituted those counties. I repeat, it seems cruel to have dismembered and quartered the County of Verchères, for in effect it has been divided into four parts, one going to Chambly, one going to Richelieu, another going to St. Hyacinthe —I do not know for what reason—and another parish going to Rouville. The county of my hon. friend has been quartered. Really this is too cruel a treatment for an old and patriotic county. My hon. friend could have well avoided that extreme measure. Now if he had united Soulanges and Vaudreuil, Napierville and Laprairie, Verchères and Chambly, along with the union he has made of Three Rivers and St. Maurice, he would have completed his scheme without creating so much discontent and without suppressing entirely whole constituencies. But he has chosen the latter course, and has created thereby much discontent, not only among his opponents, but among his own political friends. The hon. gentleman has thought fit to unite Iberville and St. John's. Iberville is the constituency which I have had the honour to represent in this House for nearly 25 years. It is true that the population of Iberville has decreased considerably; in St. John's it is about the same as it was ten or twenty years ago. In Iberville, I find that in 1871 the population was 15,450; in 1881 it was 14,459; in 1891 the population has fallen to 11,930. It has been decimated by emigration. It is within the last decade that that noble constituency has suffered the greatest loss in population. Sir, the policy which has increased the population of Montreal, which has attracted people there, has had quite an opposite effect in the rural districts. While the policy of the Government has increased the population of Montreal and of other manufacturing cities, it has had the effect of reducing the population in the rural districts, and driving it out to a foreign country. Now, according to the hon. gentleman's scheme, the union of the Counties of Iberville and St. John's will give a population of 21,396. I had expected at first that the parish of Lacolle would remain in the County of St. John's, but the explanation given by the Minister this afternoon shows that the plan is in conformity with the map which has been prepared, as I see that Lacolle will be annexed to the County of Missisquoi. Whether the people of Lacolle will be satisfied with this arrangement I cannot tell, but I know very well that people living in other parts of the district are not satisfied. I can tell the hon. gentlemen that even some of their most influential friends in the County of St. John's are totally disgusted with this arrangement. Now, Sir, permit me to read a short article published by the *News and Eastern Townships Advocate* of St. John's. This is a Conservative paper, and has always been a staunch supporter of the Conservative Government. This number of the paper has been sent to me with an article marked in ink so as to attract my attention, probably with the expectation that I would make use of the article during this debate. Here is what it says with regard to the union of the two counties:

"The Redistribution Bill involves a burning question which will soon engage the attention of Parliament. The representation of the Province of Quebec is fixed at 65, and this is the basis of representation in other provinces. But in this province itself changes are demanded, because of the abnormal growth of some constituencies, and the dwindling down of others. Montreal, for instance, with its 200,000 population, has only three members, while Laval, in contradistinction, with 9,000, and other counties with 12,000 and 14,000, each elects its member. No doubt this inequality should be remedied, but why all eyes should be turned to St. John's as the first victim, is what we fail to understand. St. John's is neither the smallest nor the most insignificant county in the province. It is the centre of a prosperous agricultural district, and its capital town is the headquarters of a large and growing commerce, far in excess of such counties as Verchères, Laprairie, Laval, Yamaska, Bagot or Napierville. The latter county might be divided up between St. John's, Chambly and Laprairie, but to hitch St. John's and Iberville together would be the height of absurdity. St. John's and Iberville are both important and distinctive counties, and are separated by a broad navigable river, and the proposition to unite them for electoral purposes cannot be defended on political or geographical lines."

Now, in addition to this, I can tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that a few days ago I had an opportunity of meeting some of the best and most influential friends of this Government in St. John's, and they told me that they disliked exceedingly the present arrangement so far as their county was concerned. I can well understand that. The Conservative party in the County of St. John's have always been unsuccessful in political struggles. That county has been represented for the last thirty-eight years without interruption by my venerable friend from St. John's (Mr. Bourassa). His great popularity has always pre-

vented his opponents from being victorious over him, but I have no doubt that those Conservatives in that constituency who have political aspirations are only waiting the moment when my hon. friend shall retire from public life to try their chances again, as they hope that, he having disappeared, their chances will be greater. But by the union of St. John's and Iberville they can make no stand. They will have to encounter, besides the majority of 200 or 300 Liberals in St. John's, the regular majority of at least 500 in Iberville. Therefore, by this new arrangement a constituency is created which will give the Liberal party a majority of between 700 and 800. It is true that the Bill has the effect of suppressing one Liberal in that part of the province, but it will also have the effect of discouraging the friends of the Government in those two constituencies, and notably in St. John's. The Conservatives could not hope to carry Iberville, because in other years on more than one occasion their candidates have lost their deposits when they attempted to defeat the Liberal candidates. But when the present member for St. John's, he who has represented that constituency so long and so worthily in Parliament, has disappeared from public life, Conservatives there might have some hope for success in the struggle, provided a strong Conservative candidate can be brought out. But this arrangement will completely discourage them. They know they cannot make a very serious struggle, and I can well understand their discontent and disappointment. In Iberville we should have far preferred to remain as we are; but as we are Liberals there, I do not suppose that our voice will have much influence with the majority in this House, or that we will be able to change the proposal of the Government with regard to the union of the two counties. But if the Conservatives in that part of the country, in St. John's and Iberville, are discontented with the projected arrangement, of course hon. gentlemen opposite will well understand that the Liberals are far from being satisfied. They have strong reasons as a political party to be dissatisfied, because it deprives the party of one representative in this House. I could not complain much of a new arrangement if the system had been carried out through all the Province of Quebec. I know there are constituencies in that province which are far from having the requisite number of population to entitle them to a representative in this House, but if it had been a general reform, a general rearrangement of the different counties, other arrangements might have been made regarding my county and St. John's, which would have been more acceptable than those now proposed. But the Minister of Public Works, having found the four constituencies which he needed in Quebec in order to give increased representation in Montreal, Hochelaga and Ottawa, I ask why was he not satisfied to rest there? The hon. Minister insisted on this point, that the Government had no intention to be unfair and unjust to their political opponents. I shall be happy to think the hon. gentleman was in earnest, but I ask what reason was there to interfere with the limits of the County of Rouville? What reason was there to interfere with the limits of the County of Bagot? What reason was there to take one parish from Joliette and put it in the County of Montcalm? What reason was there to take one parish from Berthier and throw it into the County of L'Assomption? If the hon. gentleman did not want to be unfair to his political opponents, I ask him for what reason he interfered with the limits of these old constituencies? He had provided his four constituencies by the union of St. John's and Iberville, of Three Rivers and St. Maurice, by the suppression of Napierville, and also the suppression of Verchères and why was he not satisfied? Inasmuch as this Bill does not interfere with a large number of the counties of Quebec, and inasmuch as this measure is not a general measure of redistribution from one end of the province to the other, why does the hon. gentleman interfere with these counties to which I have just alluded and disturb their limits? In Rouville the friends of the Government are as discontented as they are in St. John's. I live in the immediate vicinity of Rouville, I vote there at election time, I know the people, and I am well aware that some of them are enraged with this Bill. This county has been for many years a Conservative county. The Government have in that constituency devoted friends who have worked and struggled for years in support of the Conservative party, and they now declare that they have not been considered. There was a gentleman who was highly respected, and he deserves it, in the ranks of the Conservative party, Mr. Gigault. He carried the county. The county had been Liberal for some years, it turned Conservative, and it has become Liberal again during the last few years. Mr. Gigault was for years the representative of the county in this House and the leader of the Conservative party in Rouville. I venture to say that if Mr. Gigault was still in a position to be a candidate at the next election, if he had not accepted an office under the Local Government at Quebec and still resided among his old constituents, the county would not have been touched and the present limits of the constituency would not have been interfered with. But, although Mr. Gigault has gone out of political life, all the Conservatives in the county are surely not dead. There were Conservatives there before Mr. Gigault, men who worked for the party during more years than did Mr. Gigault, and the Government have cast into insignificance their political aspirations. I know men there Conservatives who had been elected representatives of that county in the Canadian Parliament before Confederation, and since Confederation in the Provincial Parliament. What aspirations for parliamentary honours can these men entertain when they find their strongest Conservative municipalities thrown into the County of Chambly, where they are hardly known? The parish of St. Mary and the parish of Ste. Angèle, with also the parish of Richelieu, Conservative strongholds, are thrown into the County of Chambly. Ste. Marie de Monnoir is the shire town of the County of Rouville, and it is thrown into the County of Chambly. Poor County of Rouville, it has been beheaded. It appears to me that those who prepared this Bill thought that after Mr. Gigault had retired, there were no Conservatives remaining there who were worthy of being noticed. It seems that those Conservatives who remain in Rouville and have legitimate aspirations for parliamentary honours do not deserve the consideration, even the attention, of this Government. It is a poor compliment paid to faithful friends and a poor reward

for their long services. I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that I do not see the reason why the Minister of Public Works, having provided his four constituencies, which he says he needs to give increased representation to some parts of the Province of Quebec, has chosen to interfere with the old limits of Rouville. I cannot see any better reason for his interference with the County of Bagot. My hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Dupont), whom I very highly respect, and with whom personally, I have very friendly relations, is quite able to hold his position in the county as it is to-day. It is true that at the last election he had a very hard battle to fight; probably the hardest he ever encountered, and that his majority was reduced, but that was not due to his personal unpopularity, but rather to the sound policy preached by his opponents and which the people wished to adopt. What is the reason, I ask, which induced the Minister of Public Works to interfere with the Counties of L'Assomption, Berthier and St. Hyacinthe? I cannot find a reason for it, but I will take the liberty of expressing my opinion, and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will not take offence at what I say. I venture to state that the only reason for this interference is the wish on the part of the Government to secure a political advantage over their opponents. There can be no other reason. There is not an honest man in this House—a man having any conscience, who will pretend to deny that this reason is not as I have stated. What have this Government to fear in their strong position in this House? They have a majority of over sixty. They pretend that their policy has been supported by the people for years and years, and they contend that it will continue to be supported, although they are no more blind to the fact than we are that our people are leaving our country by thousands and tens of thousands, and are taking up their abode in a foreign country. However, the Government will not admit that this is the result of their fiscal policy. They pretend that their policy is the soundest which can be maintained for the prosperity of this country, and if such is their conviction, what have they to fear? They have under their control all the elements which tend to cause them to succeed over their opponents. They have the control over the electoral lists, and the revising barristers are their friends. I do not mean to insinuate anything wrong in the conduct of all those revising barristers. I know, Sir, that in my constituency the revising officer is a most honourable man, and who would not willingly consent to do what he would consider to be a fraud. But I do not believe they are all like him. Others might not be quite so scrupulous. At all events the revising barristers have been chosen from amongst their own friends and they have nothing to fear from that quarter. The Government have the control of the printing of the voters' lists here in the city of Ottawa. They have at their command the prestige of patronage which is always so attractive in times of elections to a considerable number of electors who are always expecting to succeed in getting something profitable from the party in power. They have at their command the large subscriptions made in their favour by the manufacturers of this country, the few and happy monopolists which their fiscal policy has created, and by the large contractors of public works and by jobbers of all kinds. They have those moneys at their disposal, while we in the cold region of Opposition, the region of poverty in the time of election as hon. gentlemen know, have to contend against all that power. What need have the Government to fear in the face of all this, and why should they by this Bill take an unjust and unfair precaution to secure a party advantage? This measure has been introduced to the House by the Minister of Justice, but I do not believe that he was the author of it. I would be much surprised if he were, after the opinion which has been formed of him in this House. I would be much surprised if he were the author of this Bill, and if he knew what are the natural limits of the constituencies which are affected by it. If he were the author of this Bill I believe that he would be more properly called the Minister of "Injustice" than the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Public Works, as I understand, assumed the responsibility of this measure, but perhaps the information which I have received is not far from the truth, and that is that this Bill has been prepared by gentlemen representing the Province of Quebec in the other Chamber of this Parliament, and who, perhaps, are not very scrupulous as to giving fair-play or justice. I believe, Sir, that this method of the Government trying to secure a political advantage in the apportionment of the constituencies should be disregarded. We must not forget that the present limits of these constituencies were made about 40 years ago by men who created these counties by giving them what were, at the time, the most natural limits, and without any regard to party politics at all. This noble example should have been followed to-day. The present attempt of securing a party advantage in apportioning the electoral districts is altogether unfair and unjust, and it may provoke reprisals which will be regretted in the future. The power of governing the country is the property of no man and of no party. If I conceive correctly the theory of representative government it rests upon the free expression of the will of the people; and any man or any political party that resorts to means which have the effect of stifling the expression of the free will even of the slightest portion of the people, violates the principles which lie at the very foundation of our representative institutions. By such attempts to secure political advantage, you discourage and disgust many honest and moderate men with politics. You discourage the hopes of young men full of talent, but deprived in most cases of the means which seem to be requisite in this country to fight a hard battle, and you inculcate in the young generation notions of a subversive character. A measure of this kind diminishes the authority which our constitutional system should exercise over the minds of the people. Instead of provoking in the young generation the love of their hearts and the admiration of their minds for our representative system, it tends to bring them to regard it with indifference, if not with utter contempt. For these reasons I support the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 1st June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of James Nicol Grieve, Esq., for the Electoral District of North Riding of the County of Perth.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

JAMES NICOL GRIEVE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of North Perth: introduced by the Hon. Mr. Laurier and Mr. Paterson (Brant).

MANITOBA AND ASSINIBOIA GRAND JUNCTION RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. DAVIN moved that Bill (No. 88), to incorporate the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company, be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. DAVIN moved that as no petition has been presented to this House for the said Bill, it be referred, under the 54th Rule, to the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman give some explanation of this Bill?

Mr. DAVIN. The Bill provides for an extension of the charter of the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company, so as to allow them to enter Winnipeg. Last year the Bill was passed enabling a railway to be run from Regina to a point in Manitoba, and now it is desired to extend that so that it can run into Winnipeg.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION LANDS.

Order called for introduction of Bill to amend the Dominion Lands Act,—

Mr. DAVIN. When I put this notice on the Paper, the Government measure bearing the same name had been dropped. I immediately put this Bill on the Paper, but I subsequently learned that the Government Bill had been dropped in error, and contrary to the wishes of any member of the Government. It had been mistaken for another Bill, and was dropped. The provisions of this Bill are embodied in the measure that the Government has introduced and which passed its first reading last week; therefore I wish no longer to press this Bill.

ROUTE OF THE *RIMOUSKI*.

Mr. FRASER asked, Do the Government intend to make any changes in the route of the *Rimouski* in the Counties of Inverness, Guysborough and Richmond, during the present season? If so, what will they be?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman's question relates to the route for the steamer *Rimouski*. I am informed that the arrangement made is that the route should be, until further notice: Port Mulgrave to Guysborough, once a week; Port Mulgrave to Arichat and Canso, twice a week; Port Mulgrave to Port Hood, twice a week.

DEEPENING THE STE. SAULT MARIE CANAL.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. MULOCK) asked, 1. Who was the lowest tenderer for the contract for deepening and forming the upper entrance to the Sault Ste. Marie Canal? 2. What was the estimated amount of such tender? 3. To whom was such contract let? 4. What was the estimated amount of such contract price?

Mr. HAGGART. The lowest tenderer for the upper section of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal was $231,049. The contract was awarded to W. A. Allan and S. H. Fleming, the amount of the contract price being $325,926. The lowest tenderer, Mr. Nicholson, wrote to the department positively refusing to do the work for which he had tendered, unless he was awarded both sections, and his tender for the other section was a great deal higher than tenders sent in by other parties.

LEASE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND MESSRS. McCARTHY, OF SOREL.

Mr. BRUNEAU (Translation) asked, 1. Whether there is any lease between the Government of Canada and Messrs. John and Daniel McCarthy, of Sorel, for the land now occupied by the Government at St. Joseph de Sorel? 2. What is the rental? 3. What is the term of the lease? 4. Is it the intention of the Government to renew the lease? If not, why not?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I have the honour to state that there is a lease between the Government and Messrs. McCarthy, of Sorel, for the grounds and shops occupied by the Government at St. Joseph de Sorel. The rental is $1,600 per year. The lease will expire on 4th August next. It is not probable that the Government will require the grounds after the 4th August, the date on which the lease will expire.

HULL POST OFFICE.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to issue an order to have the Hull Post Office open on Sundays between the hours of 12 and 1 o'clock?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Only one application has been made to the department. As no serious inconvenience appears to result from keeping the Hull Post Office closed on Sunday, and as no representations on the subject, except the one already mentioned, has been made to the department by the citizens, there does not seem to be any good reason why the postmaster should be called upon to keep that office open for the time mentioned.

OUTWARD-BOUND MAILS.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Whether the Post Office Department despatches a mail train from

Point Lévis on Sunday afternoon, to connect with the outward-bound mail steamer at Rimouski? Does the Post Office Department despatch a European mail from Quebec by the outward-bound mail steamer on Sunday?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. A mail train leaves Lévis on Sunday afternoon for Rimouski, conveying the European mails which leave Toronto by train on Saturday evening and reach Montreal and Quebec on Sunday. A European mail is despatched from Quebec by the outward-bound mail steamer on Sunday.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM REPORTS.

Mr. FRÉMONT. Before the Orders of the Day were called yesterday, I brought before the attention of the Government the fact that a certain report respecting the Experimental Farm asked by an Order of the House, had not been brought down. I regretted that the Minister of Agriculture was not present in the House at that moment. I have since had the pleasure of meeting the Minister, and he has expressed a desire to reply to the remarks I made, and to give the reasons why the report has not yet been brought down. It is only fair that I should give this opportunity to the Minister to reply to the remarks I made.

Mr. CARLING. As I was not in the House yesterday afternoon when the hon. gentleman made his remarks, I shall feel very much obliged to him if he will repeat what he stated on that occasion yesterday.

Mr. FRÉMONT. My remarks were to the effect that by an Order of the House passed in March last——

Mr. SPEAKER. I draw the attention of the House, as I did last session, to the inconvenience of opening up a discussion at this stage of the proceedings. Of course the hon. member has the right to put any question to the Government, but he has no right to discuss the question.

ELECTION STATISTICS.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). In reply to an enquiry made yesterday by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) as to the votes polled at the last general election, a return was prepared last session, and if it has not already been furnished to members, it can be obtained at the distribution office.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The statistics are not furnished as fully as the Order of the House requires. The return in question was from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the information contained therein is not so full as that required by the Order of the House.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will look up the Order granted last session, and I will see it is fully complied with.

RAILWAY STATISTICS.

Mr. McMULLEN. I call the attention of the Government to the fact that no railway statistics have been submitted for this year, or for last year. I should like to know why the ordinary statements of railway statistics have not been furnished to Parliament. Is it because the returns were not made to the department in time to be printed for the use of the House? When may we expect these statistics to be presented to the House, and what progress has been made in regard to their preparation?

Mr. HAGGART. I will make enquiries in regard to the matter.

WRITS FOR BYE-ELECTIONS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg to again remind the Government that we have not yet had laid before us the report showing the reasons for the delay between the issue of the Speaker's warrant and the issue of the writs at the bye-elections. I think that a return was moved for early in March, but it has not yet been brought down.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will bring down the information at once. A partial return was made to the House from one department, and part of the information had to be obtained from the Printing Department, namely, statistics as to when the returns were received there and when they were printed. The hon. gentleman will find there was really no delay. So far as the return is concerned, I will have it brought down at once.

REDISTRIBUTION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir John Thompson: "That Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, be read a second time;" and the motion of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, one must be well impressed with the importance of one's duty, and fully decided to do this duty, to take the floor during this debate. But the Liberal party, always faithful, always ready to defend the rights of the people, will not falter in its task, and notwithstanding the overpowering heat of the day, we will continue to fight the Conservative party, which despair drives behind its last entrenchments. Since the beginning of this debate, a singular fact must have struck those who followed it: I mean the strange attitude of the members of the Right. It is evident, from the silence which they have kept until now, that they are obeying strict orders from the Government. Hence the silence of these gentlemen, and their muteness in the face of our just and sober-minded arraignment of their policy. We must not forget the rumour which has been abroad for the last few days and which seems to be well enough founded, if I may judge by what has taken place, namely, that these gentlemen have pledged themselves to the Government to vote this measure and vote it too without even saying a word in its defence. It is whispered that the Government exacted from their friends, a formal and written pledge to vote for this measure at all costs. The truth of this seems to be shown by the debate of last night, and by the strange attitude of these gentlemen, who should have taken the floor and endeavoured to attenuate the disastrous effects which will be the outcome of this measure. This Bill was introduced at a very late period of the session, and that with the object of preventing the Opposition from discussing the measure in all

its bearings, as it is their duty to do. Although the Minister of Public Works has said that the Bill was presented within the two weeks which followed the reception of the statistics on which it was based—I mean the data of the last census—I could not be convinced, for I remember that as early as last year we debated over the figures of that census, and it was known then that the country, instead of progressing, had gone back. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, if the Government have no other reason than this to give us in justification of their delay in presenting this Bill, they cannot expect to meet approval. It seems to be evident that if this Bill has been so long delayed, it was because of the hope that the eagerness for the prorogation of the House would cause it to be hastily adopted. It seems to me that a measure of this importance should have been one of the first to be introduced in the session. Had it been submitted to us, say during the first five or six weeks of the session, while we had next to nothing to do, we could have discussed it without haste or fatigue. We could have come to an understanding, and put upon the Statute-book an equitable enactment, which would have given satisfaction to the public. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that this measure does not affect me personally. It has, doubtless, been thought that there was nothing to do that could change the verdict of my electors, and that it was better not to attempt anything in that direction. It is true that all means have already been tried to defeat me. The money from the Quebec Harbour works could not insure the success of the Conservative candidate in Montmagny. The Franchise Bill has also been tried. But all these attempts have convinced our opponents that we had better be left alone. If I speak, therefore, it is not from a personal interest, but to protest against the iniquity committed by the Government to the detriment of our friends in the region of Montreal. If the Government could with impunity present and cause to be adopted a Bill the object of which be to deprive the popular voice from free expression; if the Government could with the approbation of public opinion take one county from its opponents by means of such a measure, they might as well propose at once a Bill to declare that their friends are elected for ten years or permanently. These gentlemen know very well that if they had come to fight us squarely before the people, they know very well, I say, that if they had not employed corruption, as they always did, they would never have reached power, or if they had accidentally reached it once they would not have kept it long. We have been told—it is the Minister of Public Works who has used the argument—that while the Liberals have a majority of the representatives for one province, this majority only represent a minority of votes. This is true to a certain extent. But if you deduct the majority given by the city of Montreal and by Hochelaga from the total Conservative vote of the province, you will see, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals have then a majority of 3,336. Therefore, aside of the centre which comprises Montreal and Hochelaga, the province gives us a majority. We have with us the farmers, while the Government have a majority in the workingmen's centres, which are ruled by the influence of the combines. The combines control the workingmen, and the Government is under the control of the combines. It is, therefore, easy to explain the majority boasted of by the Minister of Public Works. In the fact that I have just pointed out to the House I find the most formal condemnation possible of the policy of the Government. Moreover, this Bill itself will show that the country, instead of having prospered, has marched to ruin. Indeed from 215 members that we are to-day, we are to be reduced to 213 in the future, because the population, instead of increasing, has decreased. How is it that with mines of inexhaustible richness, a most excellent soil, an immense network of railways and superb water routes; in a word, with resources of all kinds, how is it that the country has not prospered, and that to our mortification we find that the population is decreasing. How is it that in the County of Montmagny, for instance, where the land is so beautiful, and where we have so many advantages, the population, instead of increasing, has decreased by 4,156, through the departure of those who have gone to earn their bread in the United States? If the policy of the Government was so favourable to our interests, would we have such a state of things? The Conservatives boast of their election successes. What means have they used to attain and keep themselves in power, no true and honest programme? I am going to show them, Mr. Speaker. When the Conservatives invented the National Policy, and we were opposing it as a policy of disguised taxation, the late Prime Minister telegraphed to his friends that it was not true. Nevertheless who can deny to-day that we were right then? In 1882 again, in order to maintain themselves in power, the Conservatives made a gerrymandering of the Province of Ontario, and succeeded in a certain measure in controlling districts represented until then by Liberals. Thanks to that iniquitous measure, the Government were enabled to come back with a majority. In 1887, have these gentlemen gone to the electors with a frank and honest policy? No, Mr. Speaker, they again resorted to a course condemned by honest people. They took the control of the voters lists, and they intrusted their preparation in every county to their most fanatical partisan. He was told: Prepare the voters lists, but do not forget that we want to carry the elections. In spite of that the Liberal party again made a most creditable showing. Thanks to the public contractors, and the voters lists prepared by their friends, the Government were able to secure a small majority. In 1891, the Conservatives convinced that the gerrymandering of 1882 and the voters lists of 1887, would not be sufficient again to secure them a majority, resorted to one of their old tactics. We had adopted the platform of reciprocity with the United States. The Conservative party, this party so strong, so powerful, stole our policy and with the help of money from the Quebec Harbour works, and of subscriptions from the Lake St. John Railway Company and others, they succeeded in coming back to the House with a majority of fifteen. I have mentioned the subscriptions of the railway companies, it is true these are denied, but such denials are not worth much. You still hear in the pockets of these gentlemen the jingle of the rolls of gold coming from those subscriptions. These denials are not worth more than those which were made last year under oath by an ex-Minister, who swore he had received money from no one for his election and those of his political friends, while to-day the proof is before us, that his hands had been full of such money.

More than that. Let us open the newspapers and we find autograph letters of members of the House, of ex-Ministers, which contradict the sworn evidence given by them before a committee of this House. Is it surprising that with all the great manufacturers at their back, with all these shiftings of policies, these changes of political colours and garments at every election, the Conservative party have succeeded in keeping themselves at the helm of affairs? To-day again for the purpose of keeping themselves in power, they resort to this Redistribution Bill, this most iniquituous measure. As the leader of the Opposition was saying, Montreal has really thirteen representatives on the floor of this House. Montreal is enough represented here. Any increase of representation for it will be to the detriment of the rural districts. Let us take, if you wish, a house in Montreal containing ten families, that is to say about sixty persons. Have those sixty persons more interest in the administration of public affairs than a single farmer's family who own a hundred or two hundred acres in the country? Assuredly not. By means of protection established in the interest of the towns, taxes are exacted from the agricultural classes for the benefit of a few manufacturers, who in return subscribe largely to the election fund by which the Conservative party is kept in power. The Minister of Public Works said in his speech yesterday, I am tired of the boasting of honesty by the Liberal party. It is quite possible that the purity of the Liberal party, that the fact that the Liberals can show clean hands to the electors, is as annoying to the hon. Minister, as the spectre of Conservative corruption. The Liberal party has not, as he and his friends have, millions at its disposal for the election of its candidates. We have only our principles by which to carry our elections, but we are not afraid of showing our colours to the electors. Now, if an equitable redistribution of electoral colleges had been contemplated the Government could have followed the example set in England by Mr. Gladstone. Of a hundred counties which had to be done away with, Mr. Gladstone threw out fifty Liberal, forty-six Conservative and four doubtful. That is to say, he pruned off more freely from his party than from the Conservative. There is the example of a true Liberal mind, animated by a spirit of justice. There is the example of a man who does not shrink from showing himself before the country on the simple merits of his political principles. Is another example wanted of an equitable redistribution? Let us find it in our own country. It is Mr. Mercier who will give it to us. What did Mr. Mercier do? He had to increase by eight the number of representatives of Quebec. It was on the eve of the general elections in his province. Did he improve this circumstance to remove from the Liberal counties the Conservative parties which could endanger his Liberal friends at the elections? No, Mr. Speaker, he did nothing of the kind. He simply separated Richmond from Wolfe; he separated Drummond from Arthabaska; he did the same with Chicoutimi and Saguenay. He did not try to juggle the electorate. He made no attempt to make for himself a factious majority by altering the county boundaries. Well, I invite the Government to follow his example, and do the same. The Minister of Public Works, with accents of frankness, has made a statement for which I will feel grateful when he proves to me by acts that he was sincere in making it. He invited us to advise the Government, to make suggestions or amendments to this Bill, assuring us that he would receive them with pleasure. The first advice that I would have to give him would be to leave the province of Quebec as it is. I do not see why the limits of the counties should be changed, since under the constitution the number of the members cannot be. There is no reason for such a change, except for the object of insuring success for a certain number of Conservatives. For the Province of Ontario either, there is no reason for this measure, since there is no increase of representation to provide for in that province, the population not having increased, owing to the policy of the Government which drives away the inhabitants from the country. As to my own county, it was not altered because there were nothing but Liberals to add to it, and I have already enough. The policy of the Government is thoroughly detested below Quebec, and instead of a few counties which the Government succeeded in carrying, at the last elections, they will not get one in the future. I do not see why the House is asked to take up its time discussing changes so useless, if not absolutely bad. Let the counties be left as they are. In the other provinces, from what I am told, the proposed changes are not as bad as they are here. The Minister of Public Works therefore, should take my advice, and give up that part of the Bill which refers to the province of Quebec.

Now, should that advice not be accepted, let us see what amendments could be made to the Bill. The Minister of Public Works said that without increasing the representation of the province, he wanted to redistribute it in fairness and reason, and for that purpose, it was necessary to provide for four displacements of representation. This can be easily done without displacing the boundaries of the counties. He only has to unite Soulanges and Vaudreuil, St. Jean and Iberville, Verchères and Chambly, St. Maurice and Three Rivers. This would give the four seats required, and would take from both parties in the same proportion. On the other hand, it will be wholly the Conservatives that will gain by the new seats, for in all probability, it will be friends of the Government that Montreal and Hochelaga will return. The great manufacturers of that city are interested in having the policy of the Government maintained, and they will do all in their power to have it so. The Government have supporters in the two new members from Montreal and that of Hochelaga. Perhaps they will also succeed in carrying the new division of Ottawa, although I have every reason to believe that my hon. friend the present member for that county, with his devotion to his party, and his zeal for the good cause, would not hesitate to go and carry this new division. At all events the Government are certain of a gain of two at least by this arrangement which we are ready to accept. We give them three assured seats, and perhaps a fourth one; surely this proves that we are not grasping. We might still improve on that perhaps by uniting Rimouski and Temiscouata, and making three ridings out of that territory. Jacques Cartier and Laval could also be united, and Drummond and Arthabaska given two seats. I know that the hon. member for the latter is capable of continuing to represent worthily the interests of this large divi-

sion. But as he told us last night, Drummond and Arthabaska have a population which entitles them to another representative. From a political point of view the party changes should be the same, since as it is, the county is represented in Quebec by a Conservative, and at Ottawa by a Liberal. If justice and good faith were to be considered, there would be no hesitation in accepting the suggestion which I am giving now. With these changes the measure before us would be equitable, fair and reasonable. By the measure, such as proposed, the Government strike our friends and save their own. They strike one of the veterans of our politics, my hon. friend for St. Jean (Mr. Bourassa). This venerable member entered public life with the creation of his county, and he will disappear from amongst us with its disappearance from the map of our province. His opponents have never been able to dislodge him from the stronghold which he always held for his party, notwithstanding the money and corruption employed to defeat him. My hon. friend will have the honour of dying under the folds of an ever-victorious flag. The political death is also planned of the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) who caused the late great chief of the Conservative party to bite the dust in a memorable campaign, and later treated to the same fate the hon. Minister of Customs. I will conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by reasserting that this measure is an iniquitous one, and we may not have to look far into the future to see just retribution overtake its authors. Already the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) has quoted us the wailings of a Conservative poet over their fate. And where elegy finds a place the tombstone is in sight. I do not intend to tax the attention of the House any longer. However, I wish to answer a remark which was made here. The hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) alluded to it last night. The Minister of Public Works, as well as of the Conservative members of this House, and certain newspapers of their party, such as the Hamilton *Spectator* and the Montreal *Gazette* have said, "It is true that we are not tender to you, but you ought to be glad, for we might treat you much worse." This is very much like saying to a traveller who has been waylaid in the woods and robbed of his purse, "You should be very glad, for your life might be taken as well." Well, we are robbed of our political possessions when robbed of our electors. Many of us even have our lives taken, since our counties are wiped out. We ask for no favours, Mr. Speaker, we are not in the habit of bending the knee to any one. But we may well say that this Bill is an iniquity when it is condemned by the independent press of the country. This measure, we hope, will soon receive its condemnation at the hand of the electors, as well as all the other bad measures of the Government. Their majority is sufficient to perpetrate this iniquity. But when we reproach the hon. gentlemen of the Right with remaining silent, with not defending the measure, when we say to them: Are you afraid, should you try to defend the measure, that your conscience might speak and in spite of you condemn it instead? We are answered as by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjaridns) last night, "We do not speak, we will answer you by our vote." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the last, the supreme argument of the gentlemen of the Right—the vote. But it is neither an intelligent nor an honest argument, it is not the argument of a member who is sure to be approved in his county. It is such an argument as the veriest imbecile can give as well as the most intelligent man. I say then—when I hear the hon. member for Hochelaga say that they will answer by their votes—that is cowardice, since they refuse to defend this measure, and only find courage for raising their hats when the vote is taken. I will conclude by saying that I have always understood that responsible government rests upon the free expression of the electors vote. We, the Liberals, cling to the principle of the responsible government. History is full of the struggles which the Liberal party of this country has gone through in its behalf. But we abhor government resting on, and upheld by such violence as the Franchise Bill and the one before the House. Responsible government, as I have just said, rests on the expression, the free, frank and honest expression of the people's will. Let us be condemned or absolved by the electorate, we will fain submit. But never shall we bow down before such iniquitous measures as I have just denounced.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition, when moving an amendment yesterday to refer this measure to a select committee, expressed his hope that both parties in this House might agree to submit a Redistribution Bill which might be gratifying to every one. I think, Mr. Speaker, that since the inception of this debate, his political friends have shown to him, with the utmost evidence, that it is impossible to agree and frame a measure which might be gratifying to every one. The hon. gentleman, when stating his view that should this measure be referred to a select committee composed of members of both sides of this House, we could arrive to the making of a measure acceptable to both parties, was stating a wrong view and one impossible to carry out. One might as well search after the philosopher's stone which man with a disordered brain and middling capacity have been pursuing without avail and which, for centuries, they have been trying to find out without ever succeeding. I do not intend to say that the hon. leader of the Opposition is a man with a disordered brain or a middling capacity, or that his friends must be considered as such, but I say that the mode suggested does not bear discussion. These gentlemen, by trying to refer this measure to a select committee, want to foment discord among the deputation and among the people by an unwholesome agitation. It is not a question, Mr. Speaker, as to gratifying every one; I consider that to be an impossibility; it is a question as to doing justice to the majority of the voters of this country, and I think that once justice will be done to the majority, this House will not have to fear any criticism from the public sentiment. What is to be done, Mr. Speaker, to reach the object in view, that is to say, to do justice to the majority in this country? We must by all means adjust the counties so that the majority could send here a majority of the representatives, and the existing state of things does not answer so desirable a purpose. Owing to the electoral districts as they now stand, the Liberal party, with a minority of the popular vote, have a majority of the members of this House, as shown by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. The hon. member

for Montmagny stated that Mr. Mercier, when doing justice to certain too large counties, did not touch the very limits of the counties. True, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mercier did not touch the limits of the counties, and that for a good reason, those limits being such that the Liberal party enjoy so much advantage that they cannot wish for more. Mr. Mercier and his friends felt that they ought not to change in any way these limits, and that it was a good deal better to establish new electoral districts. But the great obstacle which the Government had to contend with here, was to readjust the counties so as to do justice to the majority. If we are to judge of the exigencies of our hon. friends of the Opposition side by their speeches, we must admit, Mr. Speaker, that it is impossible to agree with them in the redistribution of the counties of the Province of Quebec, according to a sound and fair principle. What do these hon. gentlemen ask for? We have heard the jeering member for Drummond and Arthabaska submitting to the Government that they should unite the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil and divide, as far as the federal representation is concerned, the Counties of Drummond and Arthabaska. On the other hand, we have heard the eloquent speech of my hon. and sympathetic friend, the member for Iberville, in which he, too, advised the Government, and his piece of advice is that his county should not be made one with that of St. Johns. Another hon. member told us that we should not dismember the County of Verchères on account of the member who represents that electoral district being an old warrior. So that, Mr. Speaker, should the Government be willing to abide by these advices, they would remove, section after section, the whole of their Bill from the first to the last line. These hon. gentlemen remind me of what the Hon. Thomas D'Arcy McGee said once: They are like these ambitious bowmen who are never satisfied till they have made a bull's eye.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Aimed at the black and killed the white.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side admit that the Conservative party have a majority of the popular vote, and still they contend, as did the hon. member for Montmagny, that they have in their favour that popular majority after having performed the delicate operation of cutting off the immense Conservative majorities given in the city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga. In order to make for themselves a popular majority, they are compelled to cut off the majorities given in the most wealthy centres of the Government, in those districts where the labouring classes and the manufacturers are the most prosperous, and where the farmers find the best market that is to be found on the American continent for the sale of their products. The hon. member for Montmagny wants to remove Montreal and Hochelaga from the electoral map of the province; that is what he is aiming at. Exorbitant as this contention be, I must say that it is only by way of exception that his party had a majority in the remainder of the province at the last general elections, and that up to that time the Liberal party had always been in the lowest minority, as well in the rural parts of the province as in the towns. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has as yet submitted to the Government no argument worth anything, why they should either drop their Redistribution Bill or accept important amendments. Their grievances, as far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, may be summed up as follows:—They say: "The present limits of the counties are perfect, we want them to stand as they are." Why do they want them to stand as they are? It is because, with a minority of votes in the province, they can have a majority of representatives in this House. It is through this that at the last federal elections they returned a majority of eleven of their party here, whilst the Conservative party should have been entitled to that majority. It is no wonder for me, in the present circumstance, that the liberal party should stick to the rights of the minorities. It is no wonder for me that they should assume to be the advocates of the rights of the minorities, for if they ever ruled the country, it was only through a minority of the votes or through more or less suspicious combinations that they succeeded. They urge as an obstacle in the way of the present redistribution that certain electoral constituencies are cut in two by rivers, or again that certain places have no business relations with other places that are annexed to them. But what, I should like to ask, have commercial and municipal relations to do with the political readjustment of the counties? Do these hon. gentlemen wish to mix up politics with commercial affairs? Many a time before the people and the commercial corporations, we have heard the leading men amongst the liberals proclaiming as a maxim that politics were not to be mixed up with business. Should a county be cut in two by a river, the electors will not be compelled to cross the river in order to go and cast their votes; they will cast them as they did in the past. The important thing to do—is that the readjustment be made so that the majority of the electors can send here a majority of representatives, in order that their rights might be recognized. The hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side have come to dote upon the geographical symmetry of the counties as soon as they found out that by fairly redistributing the counties of the Province of Quebec, the interests of the majority would predominate. According to the theory of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), whom I now see laughing, the *statu quo* should be preserved. I will just show him that the preserving of the *statu quo* would mean a crying injustice to the majority of the electors of the Province of Quebec. The Liberals in this House were incensed yesterday at the hon. the Minister of Public Works saying that the present division had given undue advantages to the Liberal party at the last elections in the Province of Quebec. They clamoured against such a statement, for they said: We never had an opportunity of changing the electoral constituencies in the Province of Quebec; these constituencies were settled prior to the union and we never had anything to do with the adjustment of the electoral constituencies. My hon. friend must know that this state of things can no longer stand, and that if the Government are willing to do justice to the majority, they must at once set themselves to a new redistribution, since the imperfection pointed out by the hon. the Minister of Public Works has been evidenced. My hon. friends on the other side must understand that if they are not guilty of the past redistribu-

tion, they are guilty of opposing justice being done to the majority. One of these hon. gentlemen made a relation of the redistribution of electoral constituencies in the States of New England. I cannot see what interest this relation may have to the Conservative party; for we are not looking to the United States for examples in point of electoral system; we are trying to frame properly and so as to meet the requirements of our own country, a system of adjustment that will be fair to our people. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur), in a fit of passion, feigned rather than real, for I am sure no man is better gratified than he, in as much as he will have to represent a liberal stronghold, in a fit of feigned passion, through which he disguised his pleasure, exclaimed that this was an iniquitous measure brought up by an impudent government.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) You must be gratified, since you will have a Conservative stronghold.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Since I am gratified, I am not complaining of the measure which makes me feel so; why does not the hon. member for Rouville do as I do? Why is he not open enough to speak out his whole mind? It is because that might injure his friends. The hon. leader of the Opposition and his friends stated that Mr. Gladstone, when redistributing the seats in the English Parliament, did not proceed as this Government did, but brought his measure before a select committee, composed of members of both sides of the House. They forgot to tell us that Mr. Gladstone had given no notice of his measure to the members of the Opposition, but had forced it through the House of Commons, just as he did with all the other ministerial measures. It was only when in the House of Lords, where he stood in a minority, and when hemmed in, so to speak, in what the English people call a dead-lock, that he agreed to a select committee, composed of his political friends and opponents and allowed his measure to be altered by that committee. As I stated a moment ago, the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House pretend to be scandalized and take all to themselves the title of advocates of the rights of the minority. They are not the sole supporters of the rights of minorities, we are as devoted as they are to the vindication of those rights, but we do not feel that the minority should dictate to the majority, for that would be the upsetting of the parliamentary system which we now enjoy. If my hon. friends of the Opposition only had a political platform, they would not trouble themselves with any endeavour to rule the majority, when they are only a minority. The hon member for Montmagny took another vengeance of the protective system which has so much injured his party. He again repeated that if his county was depopulating it was due to the protective policy of the Government. If I take into account these speeches, I fear they are not foreign to this depopulation; for he pictures in such gloomy language the condition of our country and in such glowing language that of the United States that his electors must be tempted to go there and try to better their fortunes. Do these people who desert their country to go and settle in the United States, go there with a view to engage in farming operations or to work in the factories? Now, should you, as I contend—and no man can reasonably deny that the French-Canadians who leave for the United States do so with the intent of finding some work in the factories of that country—shut our manufactures by a policy of free trade, you would see the Canadians leaving us in greater numbers to go and settle in the United States. As a result of this exodus, our rural districts would lose more of their population than before, for our farmers would have no more markets where to sell their products. Therefore, should this evil policy ever come to prevail, our people would leave us in still greater numbers on their way to the United States. I was rather surprised to hear the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) stating that Montreal was controlled by monopolies, that the electors of that great city were unworthy of the use of their voting power, that they had not sufficient independence to do so, that they had no opinion. It was paying a poor compliment to the people of Montreal and the hon. member thereby expressed a poor opinion of his fellow citizens. I was surprised to hear him paying the same compliment to the new Ottawa district. I do not know whether the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) was much flattered by the language of his colleague from Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) when he contended that that part of the Ottawa County was a *quantité négligeable* whenever a Conservative Government held the reins of power in Quebec. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) stated that the electors of the Ottawa County were too much in need of the Government to cast an honest and independent vote. They urge, moreover, against us that the city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga have too many representatives and that the representation of the rural districts is cut down for the benefit of the towns. Behold here the policy of the members of the Opposition: to promote jealousies between city and country people; to try and make them believe that they have conflicting interests when it is plain that the interests of the workmen, of the traders and of the farmers are alike; when the rural districts are furthering the prosperity of the towns by supplying them with their products, just as the towns are helping the rural districts by selling to them trade articles. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) charged the Government with cowardice as he alleged that by annexing a Conservative parish to the County of Chambly, they made it a Conservative county, and that they did likewise by taking from the county of Berthier and adding to that of L'Assomption. At the local elections the Conservatives had a majority of 278 votes in that county. The hon. gentleman ought to understand, unless he be willing to prefer false and wanton charges and to slander those of his colleagues who occupy seats on the Treasury benches, that hon. gentleman, I say, ought to have understood and accepted the explanations offered by the hon. the Minister of Public Works which were so much to the point. The hon. Minister stated that the population of the County of L'Assomption being less than that of the neighbouring counties, it was proper to annex to it the parish of Lavaltrie. The same thing may be said of Montcalm whose population is far less than that of Joliette. And the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who can but boast in this House and be defeated by the electors, when they appear before these, rise here and state that they are not afraid of the Conservative party; they are known to be gallant, when far from the battle-

field. Prior to each general election, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was heard saying to his Conservative colleagues in this House: Give us general elections, and you will see what will happen; you will be defeated by the Liberal party as never you were before. The Liberals are intelligent men, I admit they are.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) You are very kind.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) But when before the people they have nothing to offer them as a substitute for the protective system, and the people, wiser than they, are unwilling to burn their house previous to the Liberal party offering them at least a shelter. My hon. friend from Rouville contends that the Bill of redistribution is grounded on no principle, for, says he, if it was gounded on the principle of population, for instance, the redistribution would have been general and the Government would have dealt with the Quebec district. I must say that the Bill is defective in one respect. I submit that the Government should have made a general redistribution of the whole Province of Quebec in order to do justice not only to a section but to the whole Province; and I will show that through the keeping of the old distribution in the Quebec district the Liberals still enjoy undue advantages. I trust, however, that the Government, during this debate, will do justice to our friends of the Quebec district, since the hon. the Minister of Public Works promised to accept any amendment likely to improve his measure. I hope now to show that the hon. gentlemen on this side wrongly complain of this Bill. We will not take their life after having taken their purse, as stated by the hon. member for Montmagny, for I think they hold nearly as much to their purse as to their life. As regards even the Montreal district, this Bill does not do full justice to the Conservative party. I only accept this measure as an improvement on the old division of the counties of the province: I am not so much exacting as my hon. friends on this side, but I trust that should it be shown to the Government that injustices are wrought to the Quebec district by the keeping of the existing divisions, they will be willing to remedy that. I contend that by exposing a province to be ruled by a political party which stands in a minority in such a province, an injustice is wrought which calls for an immediate redress. Such is the case in the Province of Quebec; and yet, see how the Liberals wince against the half measure of justice the Government grant to the Conservatives of that province. After laying before the House the figures showing that our friends, the Liberals, have always been in a minority in the Province of Quebec, I shall have shown that when they were called to the management of public affairs, either in Quebec or here, it was only through coalition with some portions of the Conservative party, by making them promises which they never kept, or through the existing division of the counties which enabled them to have a majority not of the popular votes, but of representatives in this House. Let me give the history of that party as far back as 1878. At that time a *coup d'état* was done by a liberal Governor. Thanks to that *coup d'état* the Joly Government came into power, where it kept itself for 18 or 20 months, although not supported by a popular majority. I am not the only one to say so; Mr. Speaker, you shall hear the same statement forthcoming from the very mouth of a liberal, for I am not looking for authorities in my own party; it was said by Mr. Barthe, one of the editors of the newspaper *L'Electeur*, of Quebec. In 1890, this gentleman gave a lecture, in Montreal, to an audience composed of his political friends, and here is what he told them. The subject-matter of that lecture was the *scrutin de liste* and he was reviewing, in support of his theory, the various elections that took place, in the Province of Quebec, for a number of years. Mr. Barthe said:

"I now come to a point specially interesting to the Conservatives. Should there be any, amongst those who do me the honour to listen to me, who were Conservatives in 1878 and are still so, I warn them to open their ears."

I myself warn my hon. friends, the Liberals, to open their ears and listen to what one of their political friends said:

"It will be shown to them that the change, of which I am presently the humble advocate, is not a Liberal contrivance, as they might be led to suppose, and that our opponents are as much interested in calling for it with all the might of their wishes. Moreover, that succession of facts which I am now stating calls for a higher consideration than that from a party standpoint; they are good things to know, for they are true and truth can never be too much widespread.

"There never were, amongst us, closer elections throughout the province than those of 1878. The contest was general: there were only five unanimous elections, 60 counties were called upon to vote and gave a total of 137,023 votes, of which 69,696 were Conservative and 67,327 Liberal. However, 30 Conservatives and 30 Liberals were elected in these 60 counties. Therefore, when I say that our electoral system is fraught with injustice, I am saying what is true for the Conservatives as well as for the Liberals, since our opponents had a hard experience of it. In 1878, a popular majority of 2,369 votes gave them a tie instead of a majority, in the Legislative Assembly. It was owing to the unanimous elections that they were one vote behind, they had two of them and the Liberals three."

So, Mr. Speaker, in 1878, with a minority of the popular vote, the Liberal party ruled the Province of Quebec, although our party was supported by a majority of the electors. The Liberal party had the support of a majority of the representatives and that was enough. To what was that due? Simply to the wrong distribution of the counties to which we are now called upon by the Government to remedy. What were the results for the Province of Quebec of the coming into power of the Joly Government in 1878? The representatives of the Province of Quebec are now aware that from that day dates the decline of our province. Had it not been for the coming into power of that Government the troubles we experienced would not have happened. I repeat it is from that day that dates the financial decline of the Province of Quebec. And the result was that once the door open, Mr. Mercier in his turn came into power in 1887, through the support of a portion of the Conservative party who are now disabused as regards their reckoning of the Liberals. Now, you see, Mr. Speaker, the deplorable result of that wrong distribution of the counties, a distribution inconsistent with the rules of justice since it enables a minority to rule the majority. It was through it that we had as rulers men who allowed themselves to be swayed by boodlers, thus causing the ruin of the Province of Quebec. It will, perhaps, take several years to come to undo the wrong that has been done, irrespective of the sacrifices the people will no doubt have to task themselves with. Such

was the result of a wrong distribution of the electoral seats, a distribution which is not doing justice to the majority. Let us now come to the federal elections of 1882, what do we find? In 1882, and I remind the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) of that fact, his party was not helped by Mr. Mercier since this gentleman was not into power, and if, in 1887, the Liberal party happened to get a slight majority in the rural districts, it was due to the alliance of the National Conservatives with the Liberals, of those National Conservatives who were deceived and were promised a policy which was never carried out. If, in 1887, the Liberal party succeeded in getting a very small gain, they owed it to the assistance of Mr. Mercier and the activity of Mr. L. P. Pelletier. In 1882, the Liberal party were not into power in Quebec, power which they regret so much having lost. What was the result of the elections held during that year? We had a majority in 53 counties, forming a popular majority of 23,193 votes. The Liberals had a majority in 12 counties, forming a popular majority of only 2,258 votes. What, I enquire from my hon. friend the member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) was the Liberal majority in the rural districts? Suppose we divide the Liberal majority by the number of members returned, we find that instead of having 12 members, the Liberal party should have had 5 only. However, 12 of them came here and sat in this House and voted against a policy which had received the support of a great majority of the popular vote. Let us now come down to 1887, and we will use the figures voted by Mr. Barthe. I did not take the trouble to ascertain them, but he owns that our party had a popular majority. 79,176 electors voted for the Conservative policy, whilst the Liberal party only had 79,108 votes. We retained a majority of the votes notwithstanding the alliance of the Conservative Nationals with the Liberals. Let us now come to 1891. The hon. the Minister of Public Works gave yesterday a correct statement of the votes polled in 1891. He has shown that we should have had 38 members, whilst it is the Liberal party that had them. Let us now come to the elections held, in 1892, in the Province of Quebec subsequent to the falling down of the Mercier Government. According to the figures I have gathered, of 63 elections where there was a contest, the Liberal party won 20 and the Conservatives the balance. Under the number of votes cast and the majorities received by the candidates of both parties, the Liberal party are entitled to 11 members only, including the independent members. If we consider the total majorities received by the candidates of both parties, we find that they average 306 votes for each member, which would give 9 Liberals and 54 Conservatives. Under this estimate, the Liberal party would be represented by 11 members in the Quebec Legislature, while they have now 20. Under these circumstances, it is not to be wondered at that the leader of the Opposition and his friends should make any shift to try and keep the existing system. The hon. members on this side pointed out to this House some editorials published in certain so-called independent newspapers, urging us at the same time to accept their opinion, which is adverse to this Bill and goes to say that its sole object is to favour a political party; that from this day forth the hon. the Minister of Justice is no longer entitled to that enviable character for equity and justice which these independent newspapers were pleased to possess him with. When this so-called independent press contended that the Minister of Justice had fallen from his pedestal the very day he brought up this measure, these newspapers were allowing themselves to be guilty towards him of a denial of justice, for through this Bill the hon. Minister is going to do a tardy justice to the electorate. But this redistribution ought to go further. Should the Government be willing to accept amendments that will complete their measure, they would, perhaps, not suit our friends the Liberals; they will certainly not please these so-called independent newspapers, such as the *Mail* and the *Star*, which never miss an opportunity of slandering some one, but they will have only done their duty. This Bill is certainly a measure which will have for its effect to assure the reign of liberty in our country. I know, Mr. Speaker, that several of my colleagues in this House see with regret the time coming when they will have to part with electors with whom they were up to now in constant relations; who, for more than thirty years, have fought the political battles at their side. More than any one else, I understand the feeling of regret with which we see our political friends finding their way into another electoral constituency, my own county being affected by this Bill. I myself have political friends devoted to me and to the Conservative party who will be withdrawn from my electoral constituency should this Bill pass as it now stands. I regret the gallant co-operation of these soldiers of the Conservative party; but this leads me to believe that my hon. friend from Rouville, who is now so much pleased, will not be so when he will have to fight against them. He will then understand that there are men devoted to their country in the parishes of St. Pie and St. Dominique. He will not be as cheerful as he is now when he will have to meet these gentlemen during an election contest. Mr. Speaker, when public interest calls for sacrifices such as these, we must not hesitate, and it behooves a true citizen to make them cheerfully. If I see with regret a certain number of my electors leaving the County of Bagot to be annexed to that of Rouville, I still hope that they will continue to fight as they did in the past, the good battles, and I expect from my political friends living in the parishes which happen to be annexed to the County of Bagot the devotion which those of St. Pie and St. Dominique never measured to me.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Speak of your political opponents in those parishes.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I hope that the citizens of the parishes which will henceforth form part of the County of Rouville, will gallantly fight the good battles and that they will continue to support with all their might the sound policy. Notwithstanding the endeavours of the hon. leader of the Opposition to sow the tare of division in the parishes which happen to be withdrawn from one county and annexed to another by this measure, I hope that these endeavours will be unavailing. If the hon. leader of the Opposition has no policy to offer to his political friends and to the people of this country, he will hardly succeed in rallying a majority around him. I will now draw to a close these remarks which were more protracted than I

intended, inasmuch as I allowed myself to be led away by the multiplicity of subjects discussed by the speakers who preceded me. The fact is I had to answer to several speeches made on this side of the House, and the tone of which, as regards several of them, went outside the parliamentary courtesies. I cannot apply that remark to my hon. friend the member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) who spoke with that courtesy to which he is used.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have listened with pleasure to the remarks of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont). At moments he spoke with real eloquence. His joy animated his welcome to the Conservative parishes which will in the future be part of his county. It also permeated the would-be touching adieux he made to the Liberal parishes which in the future will vote with the County of Rouville. His words were more intended to be affecting than they were sincere. In his speech he touched upon several subjects which have little to do with the Bill before us. Often he wandered from the path of discussion to gather here and there flowers on his way. He told us that the speeches from my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) were the cause of the emigration of the electors of Montmagny to the United States. In that case how would it do for the Government to pay the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) to go to Montmagny to fight the evil effects of the speeches of its representative? He might even be sent into most of the counties of the Province of Quebec and try his hand at encouraging our people to remain in the country. But the speeches he has made up to this time, I must say, are hardly calculated to prevent the emigration of our countrymen. Should the speech which he made to-night be distributed in his county it would hardly do much good. The hon. member undertook the defence of the city of Montreal, which has, however, thirteen or fourteen representatives in this House able to speak in its behalf. It is strange, to say the least, to see him make himself the champion of the interests of Montreal, when they are entirely in opposition to those of the rural counties. All his speech rests on an argument which had already been used by the Minister of Public Works. He told us that the Liberals were in a minority in the province although in majority in the House. This is a *bonâ fide* argument, the most serious to be found in his speech. I have not verified the figures which he gave us, but I trust enough in his honesty to believe his word. Only I will say in answer to this argument, that, at the last general elections, the Liberal organization was such, as to direct our efforts especially upon the doubtful counties, which we, for the most part, carried. We made those elections in the Province of Quebec *in forma pauperis;* and consequently we had to neglect the Conservative strongholds, which we only went through the form of contesting. These are the divisions which rolled up the majority spoken of by the hon. member. In that lies the explanation of the seeming anomaly pointed out by him. I must congratulate him for having had the courage to undertake the defence of this measure. We were beginning to believe that not a single member on the right would have the pluck to do so. I congratulate him, for he is the most valiant of the crew. But he knows the reward of courage, as he has already received it. Much could be said of that courage, as well as of that of his chief, the Minister of Public Works. It is easy for these gentlemen to challenge us to meet them in election campaigns, when they shape the counties at their own sweet will. My intention is not to attack especially the Minister of Public Works, nor the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont). The Minister of Public Works has assumed the responsibility of the measure, and claims its paternity. He is not the originator of the main idea of this Bill, which is to keep in power, by fair means or foul. This idea is as old as the party itself. What has been the guiding idea of these gentlemen during the fourteen years that I have occupied a seat in this House? To keep themselves in power by any means. This measure is in idea the exact and faithful copy of that which was presented in 1882, and by which the counties were manipulated in the Province of Ontario with the object of building up a majority. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) told us that we had been beaten by immense majorities, it is true, Mr. Speaker, for they had done so much blowing over the construction of the Canadian Pacific, that they succeeded in deceiving a large proportion of the electorate. It must not be forgotten either that we had gone out of power at the end of a terrible crisis, which was sent by Providence, and not due, as was said, to bad government by the party. The subsidence of the crisis has given a revival of popularity to the Conservative party, which claimed for its policy the credit of the new impetus experienced in commercial affairs in Canada. Notwithstanding that, so little courage had this party that they did not dare to go to the electors, without taking advantage of a remanipulation of counties in Ontario which would secure them ten or twelve more seats. But they had reckoned without their host, for the feeling of irritation in Ontario was so strong that the people defeated them in several of the districts which they had counted on securing. At the elections of 1887 the Conservative party imagined another means by which still to over-reach the popular confidence which they had lost. They took in hand the making of the voters' lists, by officers, partisans of the Government, and completely under their control. At every election since 1878, such means have been resorted to to carry the elections. In 1891 the Government again controlled the elections by the appointment of returning officers. The influence exercised by these officers is well known. They themselves appoint the deputy returning officers who preside over the summing up of the votes. At the next coming election the Government will have for themselves the benefit of the measure which they are presenting to-day. I oppose this Bill for two reasons. The first is, that it does not deal justly with the minority in this House; the second is, that it does not render justice to the electors. The majority of this House, however powerful it may be, has certainly not the right to oppress the minority. On the contrary, it owes it a certain deference which it refuses to-day. Let a member belong to the majority or to the minority in the House he always represents here the majority of the electors of his county. Consequently all denial of justice by the majority towards a member or political party in the House, is a denial of justice towards the electors. If the majority had shown

ordinary fairness or even courtesy, it would never have presented this Bill without consulting the minority in some way. There was a very easy way to do so. It was to do for this measure what has been done with the Bill of the hon. member for Bellechase. The question could have been submitted to a committee composed of the principal members on both sides of the House, for them to settle upon a principle whereon to base the measure. I understand that the Executive could not forego the right to divide the Province of Quebec, but this division should have been made according to a principle determined in advance, which should serve as a basis to all future redistributions. Not only has the Opposition not been consulted, but it is a known fact that each of the members of the right has been free to build up for himself his own county. Each has been allowed to reinforce his county, if too weak, in order to make the election sure. The manner in which this Bill has been prepared explains the shocking outrages that have been denounced by the member for Rouville and the other hon. members who have spoken before me. It explains why the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil remain as they were, with a population of less than ten thousand souls in each. The present representatives of those counties, who are friends of the Government, have used all their strength to oppose any change which would affect them. It explains also the changes made in Bagot, where Liberal parishes have been taken away and replaced by Conservative parishes, although this county had the required population, and there was consequently no necessity of altering it. As I said before, I oppose this Bill because it is not just to the electors. Loyalty to the rights of the electorate is the fundamental basis of British institutions. There has been much said in praise of the English parliamentary system. I am one of its admirers. But its superiority over all other forms of government, rests on one essential: that it be in the hands of a wise people, like British people. As soon as the working of constitutional principles is trusted to a law which does not respect the rights of the electors, the rights of the people, this system, excellent in itself, may become worse than Cæsarism. Can it be said that the rights of the electors are respected in this country, when the Government in a general election seize upon the electors' lists; when in another general election they appoint the returning officers at their will; and when they can in the most unjust and arbitrary manner, manipulate the electoral divisions, so as to build up majorities for themselves? Every member occupying a seat here has been elected on a certain political ticket. He represents a certain number of electors, who have a right to judge him, that is to say, who constitute a kind of jury to pronounce whether he has well or ill fulfilled his trust. The moment you change the boundaries of counties on such a large scale as you propose to do to-day—affecting twenty or twenty-five counties in a single province—how will you expect that the electors can exercise their privilege, if those whom they have sent here cease to represent them? Let us take for example the hon. member for Rouville. In spite of all his zeal he might now occasionally indulge in some little negligence in the House without being brought to book. On the other hand, my hon. friend from Bagot may be calculating, perhaps, to indulge in some himself, since he takes the trouble of building himself up a safe majority of 300. There are, again, other members, such as the members for Verchères, St. John and Three Rivers, whose doom is already sealed. These members may be models of virtue, as my old friend of St. John (Mr. Bourassa), or again, the member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion). They cannot return to their jury to be judged, since their counties are to be struck off by the present measure. The Minister of Public Works showed himself, in his speech of yesterday, an excellent heart indeed, in spite of the bad measure he fathered. He gave us some consolation. He told us we might hope for some sudden change of public opinion such as has taken place in the Province of Quebec in the last ten years. I must say, that in the *rôle* of consoler, my hon. friend is truly sublime. But if we take things as they are we must admit that the effective changes in public opinion are slow to come about, and that it will take a long while for the Liberal party to regain what it is going to lose. The gerrymandering which took place in the Province of Ontario in 1882 inflicted upon us wounds that have not yet healed over. Let us hope that the wounds which are dealt us to-day may heal sooner, considering that of late years public opinion in the Province of Quebec has been, at last, more partial to the Liberal party. Within a few years, Mr. Speaker, the political struggles seem to have taken the Province of Quebec for their special ground. In 1882 the gerrymandering was done in Ontario, because the chief of the Liberal party then belonged to that province. It seemed that the Conservative party had resolved to ruin him in his province. The war that was then waged against Mr. Blake is now directed against the present leader of the Opposition. It has been clamoured everywhere that the Province of Quebec was the most corrupt of the whole Dominion, and that there the most money was wanted for the elections. The reason is easy to find. It is because fiercer war was waged there. Notwithstanding the desperation of this war, the Conservative party finds to-day that we are gaining ground from one election to another, and they resolved to stop our progress by brutal force, if necessary, by wiping out the counties that we have gained. I hope the Conservative party may not consummate that injustice, and that the people may energetically condemn it if it is perpetrated. I hope that public sentiment will be strong enough to baffle our opponents in the course. I hope that in the counties thus juggled with, the people will not give their support to the ministerial candidates, and that the majority of those counties will remain faithful to us as in the past. I hope that the people will condemn the invasion thus made upon their municipal rights, for this interference is pregnant with dangerous consequences. The House must know that our population is steadfastly attached to its municipal organization. We have a provincial autonomy. Enough has been said about it to show our attachment to it. The same obtains for the municipal autonomy. There are interests to be cared for which are of the whole country. And to these the people of the province attach the highest value. It frequently happens that men are chosen to represent their fellow-citizens in Parliament simply on the ground of their success in management of municipal affairs. I hope that the Conservative party will perceive that it is a mistake to dismember counties as they

are doing, and that they will retrace their steps. If not, I hope that the people of the country will avenge the outrage of which the Liberal party is to-day the victim, and that they will give us in the future as generous a support as in the past.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). Mr. Speaker, since this debate was resumed this afternoon, all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House have taunted us with not having had the courage to come to the rescue of the hon. Minister of Public Works, who declared yesterday that he was more particularly responsible for the measure now before the House. I may tell my hon. friends opposite that they are entirely mistaken in thinking this. It is true that yesterday we allowed them the whole time, but this was for the very good and simple reason that the Bill we are now discussing is so good and so fair, that we consider it requires no defence on our part. Moreover, we could not see how it could be fairly or reasonably criticised, and of course in order that we might answer the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite we had to wait to know what they had to say. Now, we have heard them speaking for several hours, we know a little of their grievances, and hon. gentlemen opposite will find that there are many on this side of the House able and ready to defend the action of the Government in this matter. On this subject, as on any other, I will speak my mind openly, and there will be no misunderstanding whatever about what I mean and as to what are my opinions. Let me at the outset of my remarks declare that I entirely approve of the principle of the measure before the House, and I believe that I will be able to give good reasons to show that it is a just measure ; reasons which may not convince hon. gentlemen opposite, but which I feel sure will convince sensible and reasonable men not swayed, as they are, by party prejudices. So thoroughly do I approve of the principle of the Bill that my only regret is that the Government has not thought fit to give a larger application to the principle.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. You only partially approve of it, then ?

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). I speak with sincerity and honesty, because it is better that our opinions should be well known in this House and in the country, and I repeat that I am in favour of the principle of the Bill, but that, for my part, I would have preferred a larger and a broader application of that principle. Why, Sir, would I have preferred a larger application of the principle ? Here is my answer : I ask any reasonable man, and I hope there are a large number of them amongst our friends opposite, if they can for a few moments try and disengage their minds from party bias, party prejudices and party aspirations. What are the facts ? The present limits of the constituencies in the Province of Quebec were fixed in the year 1851, which is 41 years ago. The measure now before the House will take effect only at the next general elections, and, in the ordinary course of events, if there is no ministerial crisis—and it is not likely there will be—the next general election will be held in 1895, so that the present limits of the constituencies in the Province of Quebec will have then lasted 44 years. Now, I appeal to the good sense of my hon. friends opposite, and I ask if it is not a fact that, during the last 41 years, there has been a complete change, not only with regard to the population, but also with regard to the commercial, agricultural and industrial interests of the several counties? I was strongly of the opinion, and I have expressed that opinion on every available occasion during the last year—the Parliament of Canada being in duty bound by the British North America Act to have a new Bill redistributing the representation between the different provinces—I was strongly of opinion, I say, that the time had arrived when a general measure of redistribution for the Province of Quebec should be laid before this Parliament and made the law of the land. This is my opinion, and it has been the more strongly confirmed by what I have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite. Before I answer the different arguments made by members on the other side, I will first give to the House the reasons why I thought that the time had arrived for this general measure of redistribution, and I will also have the courage—notwithstanding the taunt that has been made by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) and the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette)—to defend this Bill and to say that it is a just measure. It is a fair measure, it is a reasonable measure, but I am sorry to say that it only partially corrects the very grave injustice under which the Province of Quebec has been labouring for 30 years past. This I am able to prove. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not speak as a party man here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear. Oh, no.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). No, I do not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They cannot understand that.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). The hon. Minister of Justice has truly remarked that, perhaps, hon. gentlemen opposite cannot understand that a member can speak in this House, not as a party man, but as a citizen and as a member of Parliament understanding his duty and decided to do his duty. I repeat, Sir, that I do not speak as a party man, but I want to speak as a sensible and a reasonable man, and I also appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite not to consider this question from a party point of view. That, unfortunately, is not the spirit which has actuated them during this debate, and which is likely to actuate them to its close ; but I ask them now to come to the consideration of the question without any party bias or prejudice. Let us go into a few figures bearing on this subject. I have said that the present limits of the counties of the Province of Quebec were settled in 1851, and at that time, everything considered, it was thought a pretty fair measure. Since that, however, the province has developed, and, of course, that progress, commercially, agriculturally and industrially, has not been felt in an equal degree by all parts of the province. The population of the city of Montreal, by the census of 1851, was 57,715. The County of Hochelaga, which is now only an extension of the city of Montreal, had only a few thousand inhabitants. I suppose that in the County of Hochelaga and the city of Montreal together the population, all told, was between 65,000 and 68,000. In 1891, the city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga had a combined population of 263,706. The average yearly increase is from 8,000 to 10,000. So that to-day, at the moment I speak, there are within the

limits of the four electoral divisions of Montreal and Hochelaga at least 275,000 people. That is the increase with regard to the population. At the same time the commercial and industrial interests of Montreal have multiplied more than ten-fold, and capital has increased by tens of millions and tens of millions. And now, Mr. Speaker, where is the reasonable man who will pretend to say that the great commercial city of Montreal to-day should be left with the same representation which was allotted to it 41 years ago? I do not think any one in the House will take such a completely nonsensical position as that.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited).—(Mr. Dickey.)

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Buckingham and Lièvre River Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 87) respecting the Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Railway Company.—(Mr. Beausoleil.)

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). When you left the Chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, after a few preliminary remarks I intended to show the reasons which, I think, make it imperative upon the Government and, I may add, the Parliament of Canada, to adopt the measure for the redistribution of the limits of counties in the Province of Quebec and elsewhere which is now submitted to the House. Before going into the figures, I will summarize in a very few words the principles I have laid down, and which I think should guide us in this matter. I said first that I entirely approve of the principle of the Bill, and I added, speaking openly my mind, that I was of opinion that, under the circumstances and all things considered, it would have been better to have made a larger application of this principle. I called the attention of the House seriously to this very important point, certainly one of the most important to be considered in this debate: that the present limits of the counties in the Province of Quebec have been so arranged and so decided upon in 1851, that is 41 years ago. I called the attention of the House to this point, that since that time Canada has wonderfully developed, that the Province of Quebec has developed a great deal, that the increase of population and of wealth has not been going on equally in the different sections of the province, so that the basis upon which the limitation of counties took place in 1851 has been altogether altered. It has been gradually altered ever since 1851, and gradually and rapidly the consequence has been that politically the electors of the Province of Quebec have really suffered an ever-increasing injustice and unfairness for the last 30 years. I added that, having given what I consider full consideration to the question, I personally, not at all looking at the question from any party point of view, wanted to impress this very strongly on the minds of my hon. friends opposite, though I do not know whether or not I will succeed in convincing them that I am not speaking as a party man, but I honestly and sincerely do so, and I ask my friends to believe that I do so. As, according to the law of the land, our constitution, the British North America Act, given us by the Imperial Parliament, the sovereign authority in Canada as in England, the Government of Canada was in duty bound to propose to the House to adopt a measure redistributing the representation of the several provinces, I think it was a good, and fair, and just opportunity to make a general redistribution of the limits of the counties in the Province of Quebec on such a basis as would guarantee to that province, that for at least 20 or 30 years it would not be necessary to disturb those limits. This is my point of view, and I will say that I consider that the general redistribution of seats should take place as seldom as possible, but, when necessity makes it an imperative duty on Parliament to do so, Parliament should face its duty with courage, not minding party prejudices or fanaticism, and should so fix the limits of counties that it would not be necessary to alter them every 10 years. I was convinced, and I am still convinced, that it would have been easy to frame such a general measure for the Province of Quebec which would have given complete justice to both parties, which would have given justice to the electoral body of the province as a whole, which would have given justice to the entire Dominion, and so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, the constitution fixing at 65 the number of its representatives, this basis should have been made so broad and well defined that it should have taken at least thirty years before it would have been again necessary to alter those limits. Of course, with further development of population and wealth, with further consequent displacements of political power in the different constituencies, I understand that it would have been necessary later on to reconsider those limits in any case, but my object would have been to so frame this basis as to postpone for as long a time as possible the reconsideration of this question. The Bill, as I have said, does not go so far. I sincerely regret it. I speak with sincerity, but though the Bill is not as broad as I would have liked it to be, I still think it is my duty to defend and support it, and the principle upon which it is based, expressing the hope that during this debate, hon. gentlemen opposite having insisted, after the kind words spoken to them by the Minister of Public Works, that the Government should consider their suggestions, we may also on this side of the House ask that the Government may consider some of our suggestions and wishes, and perhaps, some amendments may be made to the Bill. At all events, on this motion for the second reading, and the amendment to it which are before the House, all we have to do so far is to consider the measure as a whole, and to consider the principle of the Bill, and we will later on investigate the details of the Bill in committee. Before going into the figures which I will ask the kind permission of the House to submit, I will express my views in a few words with regard to the principle which is embodied in the Bill, and which I think should be applied in the country when the question of distribution of seats has to be considered. I will say openly and frankly that I am in favour of as general as possible an application of the principle of representation by population, but I do not con-

sider that as an absolute principle, that the limits of the counties should be set down solely in consideration of the principle of population, that we should frame a measure giving so many representatives to a province or of the whole Dominion simply based on the division of the total population. I am not in favour of an absolute application of the principle, because there are many other important considerations to be looked after which I am just going to mention, and, moreover, it is impossible to make a complete application of the principle of population. Why? Because in all countries in the world, and especially in a large and new country like Canada, the population increasing over a vast extent of territory, if you were to simply divide the population of Canada by the number of representatives required, the House would be composed of so many members each representing, say, 23,000 people. Well and good. You would declare by law that every representative sitting in the House of Commons should represent a population of 23,000. But the very next day after you have passed the law, that basis would be displaced by the movement of population, and day after day you would see some constituencies, perhaps, decreasing in population and running below the standard, and others rising and going far beyond the standard. So I consider that it is impossible to make a complete application of the principle. I say, moreover, that we must not only look at the question of population. In a homogeneous country, where the population is all of the same race and creed, it would be easier to apply the principle, but I find a great difficulty in applying the principle in a mixed community like that of Canada, where you have a variety of religious creeds, and where you have, and perhaps will have for all time to come, or at least for many centuries, a variety of races. And it becomes imperative upon the Parliament of Canada, in fixing the limits of the constituencies, to take into consideration the past traditions of the creeds and races in this country; because if you applied the principle of population to the extreme limit, you might go so far as to do a serious injustice to some creed or race. Another important consideration not to be forgotten is this. We have to take into consideration the geographical conditions of the country. Our friends opposite—and I will have to consider this point in reply to some of their arguments—have tried to make a great point against one of the clauses of the Bill which provides for the union of two counties which are divided by a very narrow river. For my part, I will say at once that I do not see any serious objection against this provision; but I admit that upon the whole, in a large country like Canada, with so vast an extent of territory, you have to consider somewhat the geographical question. We have large rivers; I am proud to say that we have, if not the largest, at least the finest river in the whole world—the St. Lawrence. We have large lakes in the old Provinces of Canada, and also in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Some sections of the country are divided by mountain ranges. Of course, all these things have to be taken into consideration. Moreover, you must not forget that we cannot apply the principle of population rigorously, because in several of the counties we have a sparse population over a large extent of territory; and of course you are bound to consider not only the number of the population in those counties, but also the extent of the territory of those counties. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a further exception to the rule of applying the principle of population. It is my opinion that representative government means, not representation by population altogether, not representation according to the number of heads, but it also means representation of interests. In fixing the limits of counties we have to consider, besides population, the varied interests of the country; first, the agricultural interest, and secondly the interests of capital, of manufactures, of commerce, of finance and the fishing and mining interests; all these different interests have to be taken into consideration in our system of parliamentary government. The first protection given to these varied interests is provided by the Franchise Act itself, by the determination of what the franchise shall be. But this protection must also be completed by a well defined system governing the limits of counties. It is after all those considerations, however favourably I may view the application of the principle of population where there are no causes to interfere with it, that I have come to the conclusion that it is our duty as a Parliament to take into consideration all these other points. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will give you a case exactly in point. I will go into the city where I have the honour and the happiness to reside, to find a case in point where you cannot apply the principle of representation by population. Take the city of Quebec. The population of the city of Quebec is a little over 63,000. As our average is a little less than 23,000 as a basis of representation, this would give about three members, the present number, as the representation to which Quebec is entitled. On that basis three members should represent 69,000, which is but little more that the population of the city of Quebec. Now look at the divisions of that city. You have over 36,000 of population in Quebec East, which constituency is so worthily represented in this House by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. In Quebec Centre, you have a population, if I remember rightly, of a little over 17,000; and in Quebec West you have a population of only 9,000 and a few hundred; so that the population of Quebec West is only about one-fourth the population of Quebec East. Now, taking the circumstances of that city into consideration, can we alter, as far as Quebec West is concerned, the representation of that constituency? I answer no. Why? Because when the present divisions of Quebec were settled 41 years ago, the circumstances which determined those limits apply as strongly to-day as they did then. The division of Quebec West at that time was composed by a large majority of English-speaking electors. It so happens that in the city of Quebec a very large percentage of the capital, of the commerce, of the banking, and of the industrial interests, are in the hands of, and controlled by, the English-speaking minority. The English-speaking minority in Quebec West is composed of English, a few Scotch, and a larger number of Irish. Now, although the relative numbers of the races have changed, it is still our duty so to define the limits of the constituencies of Quebec so that the English-speaking minority, and, I may say, the English interest, controlling the capital and commerce of Quebec to so large a degree, should be represented in this House at least by one member out of the three. I desire to submit for the

consideration of the House a fair proposition. What would be the consequence if Parliament altered the division of Quebec West? It could be easily done, and perhaps I may be, later on, reproached for the words I am about to utter, but since I entered public life I have come to the conclusion that, in view of all considerations, first as an elector and then as a member of Parliament and politician, the only course to follow is the straight one, without fear of consequences. Whatever reproach may subsequently be cast at me I care not, and it will not prevent the utterance of my views, for I never feared to face prejudice. We could alter the limits of Quebec West so that the English-speaking minority would be swamped by the French-Canadian vote—and it could be very easily done. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) would not agree to such a change, because his sense of justice would prevent him concurring in such an act, but he would have only to approve of the transfer of one-third of Quebec East to Quebec West and the thing is done, for there would be three French-Canadian votes to one English vote, and then no longer would any English-speaking member be elected by Quebec West. This we cannot do, because it would be unfair and unjust, and it would deprive the English-speaking minority of a seat in the city of Quebec, which is their due representation in this House, and against such a proposal I would fight myself, because I desire to render justice to the English-speaking minority in the city of Quebec, as I wish to render justice to them in the province, and as I hope that we, the French-Canadian minority in the Dominion, will receive fair-play and justice from the English-speaking majority in this country. Under the arrangement existing for the last fifteen years the equilibrium between the various interests has not been maintained, but it has been gradually breaking down, so much so that to-day a glaring injustice prevails, and it is this injustice which I wish Parliament to correct. The Bill now under consideration corrects, in a large degree, this injustice, and for that reason I give it my approval. I wish the Bill to go further and remedy the whole injustice. I hope it may be amended so as to grant our province a larger share of justice than it now secures, but, at all events, if we cannot arrive at a fair understanding to so amend the Bill, I, for my part, taking into consideration the very important fact that a large part of the injustice is corrected, will support the Bill to the end with all my energy and to the best of my knowledge, and I will do so not as a party man but as a citizen of Canada and as a responsible member of the Parliament of this Dominion. Quotations of figures do not afford very good entertainment, but I desire to present a few statistics to the House, and I hope hon. members will bear with me in doing so. I wish to support the views which I honestly entertain, and although I do not wish to impose my views on any one, it is my duty to express them and to take the responsibility of them, and then I consider I shall have done my duty. The leader of the Opposition will, perhaps, allow me, although I am a much younger member of the House than himself, to reply to some of the arguments he addressed to the House yesterday. If I understood the hon. gentleman rightly, he first laid down the principle that, according to the British North America Act, the Government were only bound to rearrange the representation in provinces where a decrease or increase of representation was a necessity. I differ with the hon. gentleman on that point; and why? It is true that the number of representatives of the Province of Quebec is limited by the constitution to 65. It is also true that the result of the last census of 1891, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, is to leave that province with the same number of representatives as it has possessed during the last ten years, 92 members. Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to score a point against the National Policy in this way. They have stated that the fact that the Province of Ontario has not the right to increase its members shows that the National Policy is a failure, that indeed this is another proof of the failure of that policy. Of course we cannot all see through the same spectacles, and my political convictions and training have not accustomed me to look at the policy of the country through the spectacles of hon. gentlemen opposite. So it is in this case. I cannot see that the fact that the Province of Ontario cannot claim an increase of representation shows the failure of the National Policy. In my humble opinion, it shows this: that the representation of Ontario being based upon the representation of Quebec, and the Province of Quebec having, owing to the National Policy, especially observable in the great centre of population, Montreal, increased relatively in larger proportion than in former decades, it so happens that Ontario is not entitled to a further increase of representation. But it does not show that the National Policy has been a failure. The leader of the Opposition laid down as his first principle that no changes should be made in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I differ from him on this point. The law makes it obligatory for the Government to change the representation of the provinces which have to suffer a decrease of representation, and of the provinces which are entitled to an increase. The British North America Act has no provision to make it obligatory on Parliament to alter the existing limits of counties in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, but the fact of the changes which I have indicated having taken place during the last forty years, has made it the duty of the Government and the duty of Parliament to make a redistribution of seats. My remarks apply more particularly to the Province of Quebec, but I will have a few words also to say with regard to the Province of Ontario, because my hon. friends from Ontario on both sides of the House, of course, recognize the right of every member of Parliament, from whichever province he comes, to consider this question from the standpoint of his duty to the whole Dominion, and not exclusively in relation to the particular district or province from which he may come. I trust the leader of the Opposition will allow me to dissent from the opinion he has expressed, that we should not increase the representation of the urban population and decrease the representation of the rural population. I contend that our duty as a Parliament is to provide that both the urban and rural population shall be proportionately, adequately and fairly represented. If I rightly understood the leader of the Opposition, he is of opinion that under the present system of representation the rural and urban population

are now fairly and adequately represented. I do not think so. Although I have the honour to represent a rural county, and have no personal interest in the matter, but only the good of my country at heart, altogether outside of any party consideration, I maintain that if there is an injustice existing to-day, it is an injustice existing against the urban population. If my recollection of the recent past is correct, the hon. the leader of the Opposition is in complete contradiction of himself on this question. Two or three years ago, when I had the honour to have a seat in the Quebec Legislature, there was a law proposed by the Mercier Government which was not exactly to redistribute the seats, but to increase the number of representatives, and one of the principal objects of the Bill was to give increased representation to the large city of Montreal and also to the city of Quebec. I believe that the hon. leader of the Opposition has been a staunch friend of the Mercier Government ever since. During the elections of 1890 he supported the Mercier Government with all his political influence, and with all his talent and eloquence. He paid me the very high honour, and he will remember the fact, of coming down to the county where I was fighting the battle for my party, or rather for my province and my country at the time. The hon. gentleman came there to support with his eloquence my opponent, the Hon. Charles Langelier. If I am not mistaken, I had something to say on the platform that day condemning the measure of the Mercier Government increasing the representation, but the hon. leader of the Opposition never condemned this policy of the Mercier Government, but approved of it as of everything else they did then.

Mr. CARROLL. Did the Mercier Government limit the rural constituencies ?

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). They did not decrease the rural constituencies, but they increased the total representation, and I will explain that matter just now. I wish first to point to what I consider the inconsistency of the leader of the Opposition, who at that time approved of the increase in the representation of the larger cities, but who, to my very great surprise, now declares that he is altogether against increasing the representation of the larger cities. In the Quebec Legislature I voted against this Bill of the Mercier Government, because it provided for the increase of the number of members, but if the Mercier Government had proposed a measure not increasing the number of members from 65 to 73, and so altering the limits, I would have considered the question with more approbation. I expressed then the opinion, which I repeat here to-day, with regard to the increasing of the representation of the larger cities, and I say that I consider that the Provincial Legislature being charged more particularly by the British North America Act with the protection of agricultural interests; if there was a point to be made against the increase of the representation of the large cities, it was to be made in the Local Legislature, where I thought, and where I think still, that the rural population should have a larger representation proportionately, because the Local Governments are more particularly responsible for the protection of the great national industry of agriculture. But if there was a Parliament in which an increased representation should be given to the large cities, it was the Dominion Parliament. That is the opinion I expressed in Quebec, and which I repeat here to-night; and why ? Because it is true that under our federal system the Local Legislatures have been wisely authorized to supervise and protect specially the agricultural interests; and the Parliament of Canada particularly charged with the superintendence and protection of the commercial, the industrial and the banking interests of the Dominion; and as these large interests are naturally concentrated in the large cities, I think it is only right, fair and just that those cities should have as large a representation as possible for the protection of those great interests. That is the stand I took in the Province of Quebec in discussing the Bill of the Mercier Government, and I think I am quite consistent in advocating the same principle in this House to-night. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will cite a few figures. I have already mentioned that the city of Quebec, according to its population, is entitled to three members. The city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga, by a strict application of the same principle of representation by population, would be entitled to 14 members four years hence, at the next general elections. But I say that considering the varied interests I have mentioned, 14 members for the city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga would be too many. The average would be against the rural population. But what does the Bill provide ? It provides that the city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga, instead of having 14 members, the number they would be entitled to, should be granted only seven, or half the number to which they would be entitled according to the strict rule of population. So far as we can learn, the city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga are very well satisfied with the arrangement; they do not ask for more; and are we who represent the rural constituencies going to deny them this small increase in representation ? I say no, because that would be unjust. Looking at the question solely from the point of view of population—and hon. gentlemen opposite will admit, if they are sincere, that there are two sides of the question—I ask in the name of what justice, what common sense, what fairness, my hon. friend the member for Montreal East (Mr. Lépine) should have imposed upon him the duty of representing in this House to-day at least 100,000 souls, whilst on the other side of the House, and even on this side, there are scores of members like myself representing 9,000, 10,000, 11,000, 12,000 or 13,000 ? In the name of what justice, I ask, is our hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) to have imposed upon him the responsible duty of representing in this House to-day 85,000 people, when scores of members, I repeat, like myself, represent only about 12,000 or 13,000 ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No business here.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). How no business here ? I do not understand the objection of the hon. member. The citizens of Montreal and Hochelaga do not ask for an average representation by population; they ask only half the number; and are we going to deny them this measure of justice ? For my part I am not willing to do so, though I represent a county in the district of Quebec. Now, Mr. Speaker, my purpose and desire is not at all

to consider this question from a party point of view; and if I do so now for a moment, it is only to answer the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, to show how far they are wrong when they contend that the Bill now before the House is unjust to them as a political party. Now, if there is any unfairness in the Bill with reference to political parties, I affirm that it is against the Conservative party, and I will prove it. I ask the House to bear with me while I give a few figures, which are very important ones. Looking at the question from the point of view of political parties, we have the division of Montreal East represented in this House by my hon. friend, Mr. Lépine. According to the census of last year Montreal East had a population of 92,079 and 18,730 electors; and to-day 100,000 people at least are represented in this House by one Conservative member. Now let us look for a moment at the other side of the shield, and what do we find? We find that the County of Chambly, represented here by my good friend, Mr. Préfontaine, had a population, according to the census of 1891, of 11,704, and 3,006 electors. The County of Verchères, represented by my esteemed friend Mr. Geoffrion, had a population of 12,257 and 2,695 electors. The County of Rouville, represented by my kind and amiable friend, Mr. Brodeur, has a population of 16,019 and 3,631 electors. The County of St. John, represented by our old and esteemed friend, Mr. Bourassa, has a population of 12,282 and 2,725 electors. Iberville, represented by my esteemed friend, Mr. Béchard, had a population of 11,895 and 2,544 electors. Napierville, represented by Mr. Monet, had 10,102 of a population and 2,047 electors. Chateauguay had 13,865 people and 3,482 electors. What is the result? Those seven counties had a total population in 1891 of 88,124. Now, I know that my hon. friends opposite are too intelligent and reasonable to deny the proposition I am about to make. I would ask them, in the name of common fairness and justice, looking at the question only from a political point of view, whether it is right that a population of 92,079 should have a representation of only one member, a Conservative, while a population of 88,124, or 3,955 less, has a representation of seven members. There, Sir, you have unfairness and injustice, and, though it is not for this object it has been introduced, this Bill will remedy this injustice to some extent. Let me take the case of Hochelaga, represented by my namesake in this House. The population of Hochelaga in 1891 was 81,011. The population of Rouville, St. John, Iberville, Napierville, Chambly and Verchères amounts to 74,259, or 6,752 less than that of the County of Hochelaga; yet those counties are represented in this House by six Liberal members, while the County of Hochelaga, with its 81,011 population, has only one representative. And this injustice is becoming increased to such an extent, that we must remedy it at once, or we will fail in our duty towards the Province of Quebec, towards the constituencies mentioned, and towards the Dominion at large. We would be recreant to our trust, if we allowed ourselves to be influenced by the prejudices which hon. gentlemen opposite will raise against us, and fail to have the courage to pass this measure. If you add the two constituencies of Montreal East and Hochelaga together, you have a total population of 173,090 and of 33,323 electors. Let us then look at the other side of the shield. I have given you the population of seven Liberal constituencies in the Province of Quebec. To these I will add the population of the following counties:—Huntingdon, 14,385 and 3,766 electors; L'Assomption, 13,744 and about 3,000 electors; Maskinongé 17,830 and 3,229 electors; Quebec Centre, 17,649 and 2,558 electors; Berthier, 19,839 and 4,161 electors, giving a total population of 171,571, or 1,519 less than the combined population of Montreal East and Hochelaga. And these two Conservative divisions are represented by only two members, while the twelve counties mentioned, with a smaller population, are represented by twelve Liberal members—two against twelve. Where, then, is the unfairness? Is it not under the present system? And is it not our duty to pass this Bill and correct this discrepancy? If I call the attention of the House to these figures, it is because I feel it necessary to do so in order to correct the false argument of hon. gentlemen opposite, who should have taken the trouble to look at the figures before describing this measure, which will render justice to the electorate as a whole, as one framed to destroy the aspirations of hon. gentlemen opposite and benefit this side. Of course the figures I have given are those of the census of 1891, according to which the two counties of Hochelaga and Montreal East had a larger population then by 1,519 than the twelve counties I have mentioned combined. But we know very well that while to-day these constituencies show no increase of population, the population of Montreal and Hochelaga has at least increased since last year by 10,000 people, so that the difference is at least 11,000 instead of 1,519. I must ask the indulgence of the House, while I go on to another point of comparison. The three divisions of Montreal had in 1891, the following population: Montreal Centre, 28,122; Montreal East, 92,079; Montreal West, 62,494; or a total of 182,695. Add Hochelaga County, which is only an extension of Montreal, minus a few thousand of rural population, and you have for these four divisions a total population of 263,706; and these four divisions are represented by four Conservative members, who were elected in 1891 by a total majority of nearly 5,000. Let us once more look at the other side of the shield. Add to the population of the twelve mentioned Liberal counties, 171,571, the following counties: Argenteuil, 15,163; Dorchester, 19,042; Stanstead, 18,072; Montmagny, 14,724; Quebec County, 19,504, and we have a total population for these seventeen Liberal constituencies, of 258,076, while that of the four Conservative divisions of Montreal and Hochelaga amounts to 263,706, so that we have four Conservative members representing a population of 263,706 against seventeen Liberal members representing a population of 258,076. Once more I call the attention of hon. members to the fact that the figures given for the population of Montreal and Hochelaga are those of 1891. The total is 263,706, but I have no doubt, and the gentlemen from those counties will bear me out, that to-day the population of those four divisions is at least 275,000. So you have to-day a difference of population of 17,000 in favour of the four Conservative divisions of Montreal, and yet you have only four Conservative members against seventeen Liberal members, as I have pointed out. If any one should complain, is it not the Conservative members, the

friends of the Government? Hon. gentlemen opposite have no right to complain. They have profited by this unfairness and injustice for twenty years, and they will profit by it for four years more. Is that not sufficient, and are we in duty bound here, as Conservative members, to be so lenient, to be so courteous, are we bound to be so stupid, I will say, as to allow these gentlemen to have the advantage of this unfairness for another ten years? If we were to do this, they would be the first in the country to laugh at us, and we do not want to be laughed at.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? How is he going to remedy the difference between the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil, which have two representatives with a population of only 20,415, and the Counties of Drummond and Arthabaska that have only one member, with a population of 43,127? What are we going to do with that?

Mr. CURRAN. They are suburbs of Montreal.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) has spoken. Does he want to speak again?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. No; I simply put a question to the hon. member.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). If my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) will have a little patience, I am coming to that point later on. Now, I want to call the attention of the House to this. To-day, in considering this Bill, in voting and passing this measure, we are not legislating for the present, but we will be legislating for the next ten years, counting four years hence. The *status quo* will be maintained until the next general election, as provided by the British North America Act. I have already shown the extraordinary discrepancy which exists now between the Conservative divisions of Montreal and Hochelaga and seventeen Liberal divisions which I have enumerated, but what will be the discrepancy four years hence if this Parliament runs its full term? We know that these Liberal constituencies will barely do more than hold their own, but with my faith in the future of the great city of Montreal, I have no doubt that four or five years hence the combined divisions of Montreal and Hochelaga will have a population of at least 310,000, so that then, if you look from the point of view of political parties and their relative strength and their relative representation in this House, supposing that every one of these divisions should persevere in its present political views, four years hence the four divisions of Montreal and Hochelaga, under the present system, would be represented by only four Conservative members, though having a larger population than twenty constituencies in the Province of Quebec returning Liberal members. Will you tell me, if we allowed the system to go on longer, we would not be doing a glaring injustice, not only in regard to representation by population, not only in regard to the representation of the various interests I have spoken of, but also in regard to the proper, the fair, the just representation of the political feelings of the population? Those who would profit by it would be my hon. friends opposite, and I understand, so far as it goes, the outcry they make. I understand that they are a little afraid of the consequences. But what of it? Can it be helped? Why will they not admit that this is only a half measure, that it is only correcting half the injustice; but, as we are satisfied with it, let them bear the other half and be content with it also. I go a little further, and I say that the present alterations will remain for ten years. In due course of time, if we have no very serious crisis in our political history for the next decade, the general election of 1901 will take place under the Bill as now framed, and then, if you were to have left Montreal and Hochelaga as they are now, there is no doubt in my mind that the great city of Montreal and suburbs will have a total population of at least 375,000.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). More than that.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). Yes, more than that I am sure. Then they would have a right to only four members, while they would have a population equal to the population of 25 constituencies returning Liberals to this House. Would this be reasonable or fair? The unfairness would be altogether against the Conservative party, and I may say that I am convinced that ten years hence the population of Montreal will be at least 375,000. My hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) said "more," and I am sure he is right. I might repeat the opinion expressed to me by a man who is certainly the most qualified in the Dominion of Canada to express an opinion as to the future population of the city of Montreal, Mr. Van Horne, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who in an interesting conversation I had with him—and the interest of the conversation lay altogether in what he told me—said that if the citizens of Montreal were true to themselves, if the citizens of the Province of Quebec were true to themselves, if the citizens of Canada were true to themselves, he had not the slightest doubt that the population of Montreal could be increased in the next twenty years to about a million people. I wish it to be well understood that if I have considered it my duty to go into figures at such length, it is only for the purpose of giving a peremptory answer to the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite; but not at all from a party point of view, because I insist that I do not want to consider the question from a party point of view. Now, the leader of the Opposition having expressed the opinion that the representation of the great cities should not be increased, I ask this House, I ask the Province of Quebec, I ask the Dominion of Canada, if they approve of the kind of fairness and justice which the leader of the Opposition would mete out to those large cities? I repeat that I desire to look at this question, not from a party point of view, but in view of the varied interests of commerce, of finance, of industry, of manufactures and of agriculture; and by giving to the city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga an increased representation, which is only one-half the number to which they would be entitled according to population, we are giving to that section of the Dominion a fair and just representation, aside from the representation of the agricultural interests, which are already sufficiently provided. The leader of the Opposition says that so far as Montreal is concerned, its interests are practically sufficiently represented already, because a number of gentlemen residing in Montreal represent rural constituencies. There is

something in that argument, I admit, and it is for this reason that we give Montreal only one-half the number of members to which she would be entitled on the basis of population. At all events, this measure will diminish the inconvenience now suffered by those gentlemen residing in Montreal who represent rural constituencies, because some of them, no doubt, will be able to get seats hereafter in the city itself. My hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) remarks to me that if we were to apply the principle enunciated by the leader of the Opposition, we would consider that the city of Ottawa is represented by about fifteen members, because there are thirteen members of this House living in Ottawa, who represent other constituencies. For all these reasons, I consider it is an imperative duty for me to support this measure; and I will go further and ask the Government to take into serious consideration the question of applying the principle of the Bill to the whole Province of Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. To the County of L'Islet?

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). No, that is not my point of view at all, because I will say honestly that I am representing to-day a county of a little over 13,000 of population. It is a pretty close county. Since I have been in political life I have been accustomed to run close constituencies, but I have generally succeeded in inducing the electors to elect me. I was defeated only once, when the leader of the Opposition came down to fight against me in favour of his friend, which it was his perfect right to do.

Mr. LAURIER. You were elected.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). I was elected the next time.

Mr. LAURIER. Then I went twice.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). Yes, the hon. gentleman came twice, and I will tell you the result. The first time he came it was in the local election of 1890. I had a very hard fight. I had to fight against a prospective Minister in the Mercier Government, and the Mercier Government considered me very obnoxious to them, and they called upon my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition to come down and fight against me, and he came. I cordially welcomed him to my county. We had a large meeting at St. John, on the Island of Orleans; at least 4,000 people attended from Quebec and the surrounding parishes; we had one of the largest meetings I ever saw. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition spoke at length, and as usual with great eloquence, but I am bound to say that with all his eloquence and his exertions against me, I would still have been elected if my opponent had not been backed by over $16,000 of boodle. Just two days after my defeat in the local election, I was called upon by the electors of the same county to run as candidate for the House of Commons in Montmorency, in 1890. At first I refused, but at last I yielded to the solicitations of my friends, together with those of a large number of the political friends of the leader of the Opposition. He has a good memory; he knows how hard it was for him to get his own friends to decide to fight against me on that occasion. He thought, of course, that as he believed he had been largely instrumental in my defeat in the local election, he could defeat me again in the bye-election five weeks later on. But this time he was unfortunate, and the memory of the event must be sorrowful to him. He drove down in a fine carriage to Chateau Richer, expecting to go back triumphantly, but instead it was I who went back triumphantly as the elected member for Montmorency. Now, so far as I am concerned, having, as I said, the honour to represent a county of only about 13,000 of a population, from my point of view, I would not press for an increased population. If there were a larger population I would have much more work in running a campaign. We would have to hold as many meetings as there are parishes, and we would have about double the trouble we have now. The last time, I went down at the call of my friends in the county who, for the fourth time, called upon me to run as a candidate. I went down, and perhaps my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has a sad remembrance of the fact that, after a hard fight, I succeeded in redeeming the constituency of L'Islet which had remained against us for nineteen years. There is in this political history of mine this satisfactory point, that Mr. P. B. Casgrain, against whom I fought last year, as soon as the scandalous conduct of Mr. Mercier and his associates became known, left the party with which he was associated in Quebec politics, and we went down and fought the battle together.

Some hon. MEMBERS. And he was beaten.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). As a matter of fact he was not beaten. It was a point decided by law; but I know that if it had not been for the negligence of a few returning officers as regards placing their initials to the ballots, Mr. Casgrain would have been elected. At all events it is a matter of local concern, and I need not enlarge upon it. We have already heard so much, and I am satisfied as the debate proceeds we shall hear still more, from hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to this question, which they discussed from their party standpoint and nothing else. We cannot expect them to consider the question outside of party considerations. All those who are acquainted with the political history of the Province of Quebec must fail to understand how hon. gentlemen opposite can make the claim which they have submitted to this House, that Quebec is a Liberal province. I can affirm that Quebec is a Conservative province. The feelings of the people are Conservative, and when I say Conservative I do not mean the people are in favour of any reactionary or arbitrary principle, but they are in favour of true conservatism, which I hold to be also true liberalism, because true conservatism is nothing else than the harmonious working of free political institutions according to sound principles of morals and public order. The feelings of Quebec are Conservative, and if hon. gentlemen opposite succeeded, during a few years, in securing a little party advantage, it has been only under very peculiar circumstances, which are well known. Looking at the history of the province from a political point of view, and I will not go back further than Confederation, is it not a fact that in 1867, in the great struggle which occurred after the adoption of the system of Confederation, the Province of Quebec returned a very large majority of Conservatives to the House of Commons? Is it not a fact also that in 1872 that province returned to this House a large Conservative majority? Is it not a fact that, notwithstanding the

discouraging circumstances of the political struggle of 1874, the Conservative party held its own in Quebec, and very soon afterwards redeemed a great part of its former majority in the bye-elections between 1874 and 1878? Is it not a fact that the returns of the general elections show that in 1878 hon. gentlemen opposite were almost swept from the province, which returned a Conservative majority of 35? Is it not a fact that in 1882 we secured about the same majority; and in vain did the leader of the Opposition shoulder his Saskatchewan musket after the North-West Rebellion, and in vain did he and Mr. Mercier and his' other friends, after the political excitement of 1885 and '86, appeal to the people of Quebec in 1887, for the province under those very difficult and trying circumstances again returned a majority of Conservatives, which majority was greatly increased during the bye-elections. At the last election hon. gentlemen opposite boasted of the greatest triumph they had secured during the last 25 years. They obtained a majority of a few votes in this House. But, as has been shown, the Liberal members from the Province of Quebec actually represented the minority of the electors. Since then, and I call the attention of the House and the country to this fact, on account of the scandalous disclosures that have been made, we are placed in possession of the causes of this partial success of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Which scandals?

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). The scandals connected with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway and the other scandals, which were not unknown to many hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. DELISLE. The St. John Railway Company subsidy.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). If the hon. gentleman wishes to address the House he can do so by and by.

Mr. DESLISLE. Certainly.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). The bye-elections have already commenced to return our party to its former position. We have not lost a single seat, but we have won two seats. What has occurred since? This House and the Province of Quebec have had the proud satisfaction of observing three hon. members who supported the hon. gentlemen opposite last session take the patriotic stand of supporting this Government, thus altering the relative position of parties in this House by six, and they have adopted this course because they understood what were the real feelings of the province; and I have only to call attention to the speech of the hon. member for Bellechase (Mr. Amyot) in which he explained the reasons why he separated himself from hon. gentlemen opposite and returned to his former allegiance to the Conservative party, for which he had fought so many noble battles. If I travel beyond the Province of Quebec and call attention to the results of the bye-elections in Ontario, they will appear surprising. Speaking of Ontario, I desire to say a word in regard to Toronto. I consider that instead of one, two more members should have been given to Toronto, on the principle I have enunciated with regard to Montreal. I need not enlarge, but I only mention this because I want the same principle to be applied all over the Dominion. In answering once more to the howls of hon. gentlemen opposite, I may say that from a knowledge of the past history of the Province of Quebec and of the feelings of the people, I have no hesitation in affirming that in a regular political fight hon. gentlemen opposite cannot rely on more than 20 constituencies, and we have a safe majority of 25. We can challenge hon. gentlemen opposite and say that if an election occurred to-morrow the Conservatives could return to this House their regular majority of at least 25. I quite understand why the leader of the Opposition and his friends are fighting so hard against this Bill, and I will make them a proposition. Will they accept the principle of representation by population being applied to the whole Province of Quebec as far as possible? I can tell them that under the present Bill, they can carry 20 constituencies, but if the province were divided according to population they could not carry more than 12 or 15, and I speak of what I know. I know the past record of the leader of the Opposition, and I have no doubt that on principle he is in favour of representation by population as far as it can be applied, but if he does not speak in favour of that now, it is because he knows well what would be the political consequences for his party in the Province of Quebec if that principle were adopted. I repeat that under the present limits of the constituencies which exist for 41 years the injustice is against the Conservative party, and the injustice will remain largely against the Conservative party under the present Bill, but it will be modified. If hon. gentlemen opposite do not accept of a larger measure it is because they understand very well what would be the consequence of that for them, and so they wish to maintain as far as possible the existing injustice to the Conservatives. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has been altogether mistaken in the precedent he has quoted in reference to the course followed by the Right Hon. Mr. Gladstone in the matter of the Redistribution Bill in England. The real facts of that case are these: Several years ago when Mr. Gladstone was Prime Minister of England he decided on an Electoral Franchise Bill increasing the number of electors by over 2,000,000. This Bill was to be followed by the redistribution of the seats in the United Kingdom. Mr. Gladstone carried his Bill through the Imperial House of Commons, but when it came to the House of Lords where the Liberals were in the minority, the lords would not pass the Franchise Bill until the Gladstone Government would say what was to be their Redistribution Bill. Mr. Gladstone would not make known his policy with regard to the Redistribution Bill, and the consequence was that the Franchise Bill was thrown out by the House of Lords.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was postponed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was defeated.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). It was practically defeated, and it dropped by prorogation. Mr. Gladstone had only two alternatives open to him, either to bow to the wish of the House of Lords to let Parliament know what was his policy about redistribution, or to take the extreme measure of advising Her Majesty to create a sufficient number of new peers to swamp the majority against his Franchise Bill in the House of Lords. Mr. Gladstone recoiled from the danger of the precedent of creating such a large number of peers, and

he waited until the next session to reintroduce the Franchise Bill, and then he came to the arrangement mentioned by the leader of the Opposition with regard to the Redistribution Bill which settled the difficulty. The difficulty arose out of the conflict between the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and it was settled, not at all as the leader of the Opposition wished this House to understand because of the kind disposition of Mr. Gladstone, and out of a spirit of fairness to his opponents in asking them to meet him half way in order to lay down the basis of the Redistribution Bill. These are historical facts, and I will not accuse my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition of having misstated them intentionally. It was my duty, however, to show what were the real facts connected with the precedent he quoted to the House. I am decidedly opposed to the amendment of the hon. gentleman, and if the Government of Canada were to accept such an amendment it would be an act of weakness, and it would be contrary to their duty, because under the British North America Act the duty is imposed on the advisers of the Crown to submit to this House a Bill for the redistribution of seats between the provinces. They are bound to do so on their ministerial responsibility, and they stake their existence as a Government upon the measure which they ask this House to accept. If Parliament does not accept the Bill they propose, they have to bow to its decision and either to resign or appeal to the people. This is the true constitutional doctrine, and I am too much a partisan of responsible government not to ask the Government to stand by their measure, to stand by their responsibility, and to allow this House and the country to judge of the measure by which they propose to settle this important question. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have taken up so much of the time of the House, but I wished to explain my views as frankly, as honestly and as sincerely as a man can. I trust that I have said nothing offensive to my hon. friends opposite. This is a very important question, and I hope that after due consideration from the Parliament of Canada, it will be so settled that for the next ten years and more we will have a fair, a just, and a more adequate representation of the population and the varied interests of the Dominion of Canada in the House of Commons.

Mr. MONET (Translation). I beg the pardon of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) for undertaking to answer his speech instead of leaving the task to some orator more able and more worthy. Besides, the task will be as disagreeable for me as for him, for the hon. member for L'Islet repeatedly asserted that what he would say would be sensible and not at all dictated by party spirit, inferring by that that whoever did not share his opinion, whoever, either before or after his speech, differed from him, either were lacking in sense or were partisans. If the hon. member remembers having been young, he will know that it is very embarrassing, very intimidating to be treated as a fool before even having open the mouth to speak. I knew that the hon. member for L'Islet, as a protectionist was inclined to favour monopolizing; but I had no idea that he aspired to the monopoly of common sense, intelligence, wisdom and independence. His speech furnished him an occasion of treating us to his autobiography. It was an expensive treat, but a very useless one, for we already knew his political history; we knew the *rôle* he played in Quebec, we had followed the political events, and I do not know that since he is in Ottawa he has much altered his course in the matter of independence. He went to a great deal of labour to make a two or three hours' speech to show that there was no need of speaking in favour of a measure which commended itself by so much justice, fairness and common sense. That is something more than independent zeal in a member. The hon. member, in order to explain to what degree his intelligence overtowers that of those who would answer him, told us that the reason why the Government side did not think proper to debate the measure was because it was so clear and so just. However, he showed us that he did not believe the first word of his own speech, since he inflicted upon us an oration of two hours and a half on top of that from the hon. member for Bagot, who surely would have justified the Bill, had it been justifiable. Who are those who, until now, have thought fit to defend the Government on this measure? First, the Minister of Public Works, who says he is the father of the Bill. His evidence is interested, for it is known that every father likes to pass off his child for a fine specimen of humanity, however misshapen it might be. Who spoke after him? The hon. member for Bagot. And if this Bill is not his child, it should surely be his god-child. At all events, the member for Bagot will take much comfort in it, for it is to build him a Conservative stronghold. As to the member for L'Islet, he has not had his measure of favour in the Bill, and his speech was overshadowed with disappointment and spite. Every now and again he would say, I approve the measure before the House, but I wish it more complete. And why? Because there is a wee bit of a County of L'Islet, and that bit of a County of L'Islet, which has not always been faithful to the Conservative party, should, in order to become a safe harbour for the present hon. member, be gerrymandered by the annexation of a few Conservative parishes, which would make victories forever sure. We have not heard many speeches from the other side of the House, but all were in favour of the measure. I have only heard one recrimination, not in the course of this debate, but on the occasion of the discussion concerning the Postmaster General. This recrimination came from the member for St. Maurice (Mr. Desaulniers) who then called the Bill a political massacre. I do not know what is the matter with him, he has become mute now and does not open his mouth in defence of his county, which is threatened with destruction, and I suppose that he will fall in behind the others. Really, the position of the Conservatives who are interfered with by this Bill, the conduct of those who are to vote their own humiliation, their own ruin, reminds me of those ancient victims of the Roman circus who were made to say on their way to death, "Cæsar, we who are going to die, greet thee." Well, we Liberals have not as much self-abnegation as the Conservatives, and if it is true that we are marching to our political death, the bow we shall make to the Government will certainly not be as profound—I was going to say as low—as those of the members for St. Maurice and L'Islet. At the second reading of a Bill, it is the practice to discuss its principles rather than its details, but the leader

of the Opposition asks that this Bill be referred to a committee composed of members from both sides of the House. Now to prove that this is more just according to constitutional principles than the position taken by the Conservative party, it seems to me that it is not out of place to enter into the details of the Bill, and show that it is not as good as it would be, were it the result of an understanding between the two parties. Besides, the hon. members for Bagot and L'Islet have done so, and I will follow them on that ground. I must do the hon. member for L'Islet this justice. He has not put in all the time of his speech in giving his autobiography, he has also expounded the principles on which this Bill should rest. This Bill should be the outcome of the due consideration, first, of the figures of the population, secondly, of the commercial interests, and finally, of the geographical position of the counties. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that after the few figures and the few examples of redistribution which I am going to put before the House, the hon. member will see that the Bill is completely, or at least very largely in conflict with the very principles which he would like to see preside at the framing of such a Bill. The standard figure of population, taken as a unit of representation, is 22,800. Well, out of sixty-five counties, forty-four are under this figure, and twenty-one are over it. Of the forty-four counties having less than the standard of population, only three have been affected by this Bill. They are Jacques Cartier, Laval and Richelieu. If it has been the intention to follow the principle of representation by population, the aim has been missed; the principle has not been carried out. As to the twenty-one divisions the population of which is above the standard, how many are there, Mr. Speaker, of which the population has been reduced? There are four; two in Montreal, one in Hochelaga and one in Ottawa. So that out of twenty-one electoral districts having a right to this grand measure of justice, to this measure represented to us almost as one of humanity, four only will be benefited, and the great majority of these counties will be allowed to continue their existence under this crying injustice. The evil will continue to obtain, and this measure of justice so grand, so necessary, so pressing, will be dealt to four districts only out of twenty-one. Why so, Mr. Speaker? Because these other districts are partly represented by Liberals, and if they were touched, there would be some risk of affecting the Government. From all this I am quite justified in saying, that this principle is completely wanting in the measure. I will not speak of the commercial interests. It is known that Montreal alone represents the greatest sum of such interests. But on another hand, there is no denying the argument which has already been brought forth during this debate, namely, that among the members here representing the Province of Quebec, thirteen reside in the city of Montreal itself, and that it counts amongst its citizens, seven senators who all take part in public legislation and can, as they do when occasion offers, take the interests of the city of Montreal. Among the members representing the rural counties, there are even aldermen of the city of Montreal. Thus, the hon. members for Berthier and Chambly are also members of the municipal council of that city. Can it be said that if the commercial interests of that city were threatened, these hon. gentlemen would not be standard-bearers of the cause of Montreal, and can it be said that they would not do all in their power to promote it? Therefore, I can justly say that that city is as well represented as it should be, and I would not be surprised if after the adoption of this Bill, the rural counties should in the future refuse to accept as candidates any coming from the cities. The thing has already been mooted in the County of Napierville. At the last provincial elections there we had a Montreal candidate, and it was said: Let us have for the country candidates from the country. You Montrealers want to centralize everything in Montreal. The consequence is that the young professional men, who intend to devote themselves to politics, will have to stay at home, and that the country will have to do without representatives who could render real services. If we were to rest the representation on the figure of the population there are seventeen counties which would be entitled to a larger representation. I am going to name them, so as to show that if nothing is done for those counties, it is that the majority in them is Liberal, at least such is the reason for most of them. Terrebonne, represented by the Minister of Customs, has a population of 25,128; Shefford, 26,263; Temiscouata, 25,698; Portneuf, 25,813; Lévis, 25,995; Gaspé, 26,875; Nicolet, 28,735; Champlain, 29,267; Richmond and Wolfe, 31,347; Rimouski, 33,430; Beauce, 37,222. Here is a figure imposing enough, and this county should have attracted the attention of the Minister of Public Works. Why has he not granted an additional representative to that county? Why has he not at leart lightened for the present member the weight of the population of this county? I do not advocate a gerrymandering, but you ought to have applied the principle in the name of which you defend this measure. If there is a county which has attracted the attention of the Government, it is surely Beauce. Chicoutimi and Saguenay have a population of 38,281; Drummond and Arthabaska, 43,923; the city of Quebec, 63,090; Ottawa, 64,056; Hochelaga, 80,998; Montreal, 182,695. Now we are told by way of consolation that the County of Ottawa is to have a new representative. This county is represented by a Liberal, but the effect of the new division will certainly be to make our party lose it. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly an occasion to say with the Latin poet, *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*—"I fear the Greeks, even when they bring me presents." In fact, if such a bizarre line of division was adopted for this county, it was in order that this new electoral division should be secured. The Minister of Public Works has owned as much by saying, that perhaps this division is not in accordance with justice now, but that it will be in ten years from now, If there is a Redistribution Bill every ten years, why not make this one in accordance with the present requirements of justice? It seems to me evident that the Government have taken their measures, that a Conservative should come out of this new division, and that is the reason why an additional representative has been allowed to the County of Ottawa. It has also been said that the division of Three Rivers is added to the County of St. Maurice, and that thereby the Government will lose a Conservative supporter. This sacrifice is not altogether a piece of self-denial on the part of our opponents. I believe that in making it the future has been fore-

seen, and they saw that Three Rivers could very well slip out of their hands. The disclosures of the *Globe* have no doubt revealed but little to the Conservatives. But they have much enlightened us, who did not know what had happened. Our opponents knew long before we did the substance of those disclosures. They knew they would be made one day or another, and it was better to take precautions in advance. Under the circumstances, be it the present member of this division, or another candidate who may stand an election in Three Rivers, it will be a comfort to him to get the benefit of the Conservative majority of St. Maurice to keep a Liberal out. This is not a gratuitous supposition. The fact is that there can only be two reasons for this union. If it be not a party motive which dictated this step, it must have been taken in consideration of the population. If this last reason is to be credited for this change, why did it not obtain as well in the matter of the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil? These two counties, if united, would only have an aggregate population of 20,400. The Counties of Three Rivers and St. Maurice have a united population of 21,000, Soulanges and Vaudreuil, which should also be united, are left apart, and why? The reason is that while in the case of Three Rivers and St. Maurice it is expected that Three Rivers will be lost, the Government are certain of keeping Soulanges and Vaudreuil, which they hold now. My hon. friend for L'Islet, who boasts of being so fair, so honest, has not spoken of Soulanges and Vaudreuil. And when my hon. friend from Montmagny asked him about these two counties, he told him that he would answer him later on. The member for L'Islet, who can make a two-hour speech, however, made no answer. The question still remains unanswered. No one could rise after him and defend intelligently this act of partiality in favour of Soulanges and Vaudreuil. If we now pass on to the details of the Bill, we find them still more revolting than the *ensemble*. The hon. member for L'Islet has shown but little care for the details. He has not spoken to us about St. Hyacinthe, the Liberal stronghold to-day, where my hon. friend was elected by a majority of 496, and which will probably return a Conservative at the next general elections. Was it with a view to equalizing the population that the Government remodelled St. Hyacinthe? Certainly not, for the population is barely raised by an insignificant figure. The intention was to change a Liberal majority into a Conservative majority. Instead of adding purely and simply some parishes to St. Hyacinthe, they detached from it Liberal parishes which they annexed to their counties and added Conservative instead. The same thing was done in Bagot. I do not wonder that the member for this county has made on this question his greatest speech yet. He could well afford to be eloquent. Forsooth, this Bill is building him a Conservative stronghold. I will not say, as the hon. member for Rouville did, that the member for Bagot is a marvellous equilibrist, but I will say that he must be strong at chess or checkers, since that in those games the value of the pieces depends upon their position on the board. He took Liberal parishes from his county and put them in the County of Rouville. In exchange he took in two Conservative parishes. It was a simple transposition. It was not a matter of increasing the population, since it decreased it by forty. It is less than that of St. Hyacinthe. Why this partisanship? The hon. member for Bagot is in his seat, can he explain it? These details are revolting. They prove the partisan spirit which moved the Government in the framing of this Bill, and the cynicism of those who defend it. The hon. member for L'Islet told us that the city of Quebec could not suffer from the present Bill. The city counts 63,000 souls, divided into three ridings. Two of these ridings have a population of more than 26,000 each, and the third—represented here by a Conservative—has only 9,000. The reason given by the member for L'Islet is that the riding of Quebec West, which has only 9,000 souls, is partly composed of Irish and Scotch, and that there exists an understanding by which an Englishman is to be returned there. I do not wish to reproach him with his eminently courteous attitude towards the Scotch, Irish or English of our province, but I will take the same position and will ask him a question. He said: If a clause of this Bill should provide for a new delimitation of Quebec West, so as to frustrate the English population of its right to an English representative, I would oppose this Bill. Well, I am going to point out an identical case in my district. The County of Chateauguay, represented here by my friend Mr. Brown, is one where nearly half of the population is English while the rest is French-Canadian. There was an understanding reached by the electors of this county, under which an English member would be returned to one of the Parliaments, and a French member to the other. Now, to-day, by the transposition of four French parishes from Napierville into this county, the English minority is swamped. This is certainly an injustice to the English minority, according to the hon. member for L'Islet, and he must oppose this Bill with all his strength as he bound himself to do should there be in it any clause frustrating the rights of the English minority. As I said in the beginning, it is only Liberals who have protested against this Bill in this House. Outside, there is the independent press who also opposed it. The *Star*, an important paper, said that the Bill was so odious that the Governor General should prevent its passage. The *News*, from which the hon. member from Iberville read an extract in his speech last night, says in substance the same thing. But the protestations of the press will not be sufficient to stop the Government in the course they are pursuing. And I fully think that this Bill having met with no condemnation from the Conservative party, will pass as it is. I myself went to the parish of St. Michel Archange, which is thrown into Laprairie, and enquired from the electors if they were glad of the change. They answered that they were. They will always carry their elections now, they told me, while before they were always sure to lose. Here is certainly the principle which presided over the creation of this Bill. The mother sense of the people owns it up more ingenuously than the Minister of Public Works, but it is none the less true. They added that this would render elections less frequent; there would not be so much discussion, so much opposition. The Liberals, in the counties where they have been hived, would henceforth return their men by acclamation, and it would be the same with the Conservatives in the counties made safe

for them. Is this a desirable result? Is opposition less useful in the counties than in the House? Is not light born of discussion, from the meeting of ideas? Is not truth better brought out through contradictory debates? Now, if as a result of this juggling of counties there is no more discussion, I say it will be a deplorable state of things, which will for ever discourage young men and make them shun politics. The precedent which is established to-day holds, perhaps, terrible retaliations against the Conservative party. The precedent can be repeated every ten years. Who is the imbecile—I have no hesitation in using the word—who in the future will leave his practice to enter politics when he knows that on a given day the party in power will disturb the boundaries of his county and send him back to private life? The hon. members ought to have thought of this before to-day. I then enter a protest against this Bill in the name of my county and in the name of the youth of the country, for it seems to me I have yet a right to speak in its name. I would like to have had preserved the name of Napierville, which has its historical souvenirs, especially in the light of popular liberties. There is there a little corner of land that was bathed with the blood of the patriots of 1837 and 1838. This county has also been represented by our late illustrious chief, Sir Antoine Aimé Dorion, and it seems to me that it would not have been improper if this county, marked by such events and by such men, should have seen its name kept by the side of that of Chateauguay. I also like to see the name of Chateauguay preserved, for it recalls one of the finest *faits d'armes* in the history of Canada. It is there that the French-Canadians fought for the English Crown. I do not know whether those who thus fought were Conservatives or Liberals; at all events they showed themselves loyal to the British Empire by saving one of its finest colonies from the hands of the Americans. I would like to see the name of Napierville added to that of Chateauguay, but what I would like above all is that there be no change at all.

Mr. LEDUC. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, although the county I represent is not affected by this measure, I think it my duty, however, to address the House for the purpose of protesting against the brutal force which is used in the effecting of an Act such as the one it is proposed to effect, the results of which will be disastrous, in the first place for the Opposition, which they are trying to render powerless, and also for the people whom they are trying to silence so as to prevent them from deciding on the action of those who have in hand the key of the public treasury. These gentlemen are afraid to lose these little enjoyments, so sweet when one is in power, but which are so much regretted when one is taken to the cold shades of the Opposition. For my part I consider, and I have no hesitation in saying, that this measure, with which shall ever be connected the name of the hon. the Minister of Justice, not to his honour, is a breach, if not of the letter, at least of the spirit of the constitution. It has solely for its object the winning of a party advantage, not the wish to do justice to the electorate. Under the constitution of our country, the representation of the various provinces of the Dominion must be proportioned to their population in connection with that of the Province of Quebec. It follows that should that proportion no longer exist, as regards one of the provinces, after the taking of the census, a redistribution is becoming necessary in that province, but as regards the Province of Quebec, which is used as a basis, any increase or decrease in the number of its members being precluded, it does not follow that, after the taking of each census, there should be a redistribution of the electoral seats. The same thing may be said of the other provinces when their population has undergone no change with respect to that of the Province of Quebec. However, although a redistribution is not necessary as regards the Province of Quebec, we are willing to admit that the principle of a just proportion could be applied as well to the representation of the counties as to that of the provinces, and for my part, I would have been the first to congratulate the hon. the Minister of Justice, should he have submitted to us a measure readjusting the population of the various counties and removing the existing disproportions. But we are unable to congratulate him when, through a glance on this Bill, we find that this disproportion will continue to exist as well after as before its adoption. But, say the hon. gentlemen on the other side, there was a grand matter of justice that required to be settled. The city of Montreal was entitled to an increase in the number of its members. At first sight the granting of this increase was seen fair, but if it is considered that twelve members at least representing rural districts are living in Montreal and have thereby interests closely connected with those of that great city, one must admit the unwiseness of dismembering the rural counties to the benefit of that city. Be that as it may for the sake of argument, we will admit that such an increase is proper, well, then, I will ask the hon. gentleman on the opposite: Is that increase granted to Montreal and to the County of Hochelaga calculated to warrant and render necessary all the intended changes in the district of Montreal? Should the hon. the Minister of Justice have acted *bonâ fide*, should he have cared only to do justice to whom justice was to be done, he could have found a plainer way to remove in the district of Montreal the three counties which it is intended to annex to the island of that name. It seems to me that the uniting of the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil, Three Rivers and St. Maurice, St. John's and Iberville would have offered a very acceptable scheme and one which should have been highly satisfactory to both parties. The Opposition should have had nothing to say, for the choice would have been equal on both sides as there were united two Liberal counties, two Conservative counties and two very doubtful counties. But, Mr. Speaker, that would not satiate our friends on the other side; it was too tempting a circumstance; it was a too easy thing to take an advantage on their opponents. It was simply a question of gaining ground on the Liberal party, and the Minister of Justice has shown himself to be a good weather prophet in this circumstance. He found out that the protection policy preached for a dozen of years was losing ground in the rural district; he dreaded to see, at any moment, the people in their wrath coming and pulling down the governmental structure built at much expense, and he became aware that, should he again attempt to get over the electoral storm on board this old vessel which had nearly sunk during her last trip, he had

to examine, carefully search for the dangerous rocks and try to find out a shorter way to reach shore, and so, in his great wisdom, he devised this marvellous scheme for the dividing, the parcelling out of the counties, so as to enable the hon. gentlemen on the other side to again man this old vessel, which was leaking on all sides, with the prospects of a successful trip. I think, Mr. Speaker, that a single glance at the Bill is sufficient to make any one feel satisfied that the Government simply consulted the interests of their party. They began by framing for themselves three nice counties in the island of Montreal. They contend that it is only fair that the representation of the city of Montreal should be increased. That city is sufficiently represented. I gave the reason why. Montreal is a manufacturing centre, and the Government know that in manufacturing centres the protective system is in favour. They, therefore, estimated that these three new counties in the island of Montreal would be an addition to the Conservative party. Three counties to the south of Montreal must be removed, as they are not willing to accept the ministerial policy. Now is the time for the hon. gentlemen opposite who represent neighbouring counties to divide the spoils between themselves. Now is the time for them to supply themselves a little so as to agreeably spend the winter. As there were many exigencies in the dividing of the spoils, the man of genius who framed this Bill said to them: Should we not find enough in these three counties to satisfy ourselves, we will look elsewhere. I cannot conclude my remarks without throwing a glance at some of the counties that were favoured by this dividing of the spoils. And first of all, here is Laprairie. This county, which had once the misfortune to be wanting in its loyalty to the party, which for several years belonged to the Liberal party, was taken away from them by the present member, at the last general election, I do not know by what coincidence; and since then the Government were seen caring in every way for the hon. member who gave them that county. Some time ago there was a protracted debate in this House with respect to an expensive post office which is being erected there. The Government now grant to this member 150 votes so that he may protect himself in future elections. The Government have also thrown a covetous eye on the County of Chambly. The result of the last local election led them to believe that that county was rife for becoming a loyal county. Finding that that county was represented here by a Liberal member, a formidable opponent in political contests, they took the means to transfer to Chambly a large Conservative vote. Through all that, the Government did not forget the enormous services rendered by the member for Bagot. His services were worthy of a reward, and so the Government, in their kindness, said to him: You have so well served us for a good many years that we cannot do otherwise than invite you to a seat at our table, in order that you may taste the succulent things that are served. Some years ago, it is true, in a difficult circumstance, you happened to commit a slight error, but since you have shown yourself to be weak and humble in your heart, and we are going to give you a worldly kingdom. Therefore, 200 Conservative votes were transferred to the County of Bagot. They could not forgive the County of St. Hyacinthe for always returning Liberal members since the Union. St. Hyacinthe is a manufacturing centre and they feared that, should it be allowed to remain Liberal, it might be used elsewhere as a model object in the course of discussion. They feared it might be cited as an example and the neighbouring counties told: See, here is a manufacturing centre where the protective policy should be promoted, and still proprietors and masters favour the principles of the Liberal party. They wanted St. Hyacinthe to be punished for its audacity in continuing to claim markets for its products. And that is why means were taken to politically make away with the member for that county. The County of Joliette is also, under the circumstances, worthy of our attention. At the last elections, they succeeded in inducing it to return a Conservative member by pledging themselves to build a short railway, and as the Government seem to hesitate to carry out their promises as regards the railway, they thought proper, the present member having been returned with a majority of about sixty votes only, to remove from that county a parish which gave a Liberal majority of two hundred votes. Through this readjustment, should the railway promised not be built, the member for that county will be in a position to secure at any rate his re-election. But, say these gentlemen, it is true that in those counties we have certain party advantages, but on the other hand there is a compensation, for we are annexing the County of St. Maurice to Three Rivers, which is removing a Conservative. But Three Rivers gives a large Liberal vote and the return of a member of the Opposition there, at the next general elections, was amongst the possibilities. The Government were themselves in doubt as to their future success in that riding, and therefore I think it is a very poor compensation for the gains which the Conservatives are making at our expense. And then, we find by the letters published in the Toronto *Globe* that elections were enormously expensive in Three Rivers. By uniting St. Maurice and Three Rivers, the Government saved their own money. They will thus be able to apply the greater part of the money which was spent in this riding to the winning over of three or four neighbouring counties. I only referred so far to this measure from the standpoint of the Province of Quebec, but it seems to me that we, French-Canadians, ought to throw a glance at the Province of Ontario. I was much pleased to hear the hon. member for L'Islet stating that for his part, he would oppose any change that might result in an interference with rights of the minority in Quebec West riding, that he would oppose any measure likely to deal improperly with the English minority in that riding. Russell County has a French-Canadian population worthy of our protection. Russell has a population of 30,000 and Prescott about 27,000. By this measure the Government decide to take all the French population of Russell and to put it in the County of Prescott for the purpose of hiving all the French influence in Ontario in a single electoral riding. Under the rule laid down by the hon. member for L'Islet, if it should be wrong to change the limits of Quebec West which has only a population of 9,000 souls, because it might interfere with the rights of the English minority, how much worse it would be to change the limits of two counties which have more than the required popula-

tion, when such a change would consummate a gross injustice against the French minority. It seems to me we have a right to rely on the assistance of the gentlemen opposite for the removal of this clause. Unfortunately after all the iniquities they committed themselves to since the beginning of this session, we are much in doubt as to their willingness to let their chain fall in order to come and help us in the changing of the rights of our Ontario compatriots. We hope, however, that the hon. member for L'Islet at least, after the statement he made, will lend us a helping hand to obtain the removal of the most iniquitous clause of this Bill.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to say one word on the merits of the general question now before the House, but only to refer to the amendment which is supposed to be under discussion, and to point out one or two reasons why I think that amendment ought not to prevail. No subject could be discussed here of much greater importance than that of the representation of the people in this Parliament, and I am somewhat surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite should waste so much ammunition in skirmishing over an amendment which is historically inaccurate and logically incorrect, for which the hon. leader of the Opposition himself has shown no foundation in the speech he has made in its support. The hon. gentleman, having told us that we ought to accept his amendment because it is based on the practice of the British Parliament, ought to have given us all the circumstances connected with the events of 1884 and 1885 to which he alluded. What he has told us is simply that a conference was held between the leaders of the different parties. That, however, was the least part of the whole business. What this House should consider, if they regard this as a precedent at all, is the fact that a basis was laid down for the proceedings which took place. But neither the hon. gentleman, in his resolution or in his speech, nor any one of his supporters who followed him in this debate for so many hours, has made a single proposal as to the basis on which the conference he proposes should act; and surely it is just as well that we should discuss the subject in the House as to send it to five men representing the two parties and meeting together without any proposition before them, or any basis on which they could possibly arrive at any better conclusion. The most important fact in the events of 1884 and 1885 was not the conference between the leaders of the different parties, but the instructions given to the commissioners by whom the arrangement was ultimately carried out. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I see, looks dissent; but I say that the really important part of those events, and what this House might fairly take into consideration as a basis of action in this matter, were the instructions given to those commissioners as the basis of representation; but the hon. gentleman, so far from adopting that principle, has repudiated it, because he says he will not have commissioners at all. He says that we should follow British practice, and when he attempts to embody it in a resolution, he repudiates what took place in British practice. His resolution is historically inaccurate; it means nothing; and if carried into effect, it can do nothing; and neither the hon. gentleman nor any of his supporters, so far as I could follow, have touched the real basis of the question. They have pointed out little defects in the details of the measure; but not one has pointed out its real defects; it is a mere waste of time and obstruction for hon. gentlemen to carry on a long debate on a motion which means nothing and says nothing, and which, if carried into effect, could do nothing. If the hon. gentleman was honest in his professed desire to induce us to vote on a resolution based on British practice, he should not have left out the main feature of that practice, he should not have repudiated it in his speech. He should not profess to give us a resolution based on British practice, and leave out of it everything that makes it of any value whatever. The hon. gentleman, in laying this important proposition before us, is surely not going to confine himself to pointing out whether one county or another is fairly dealt with in the Province of Quebec or the Province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman is the leader of a great party, and he should surely give us some idea of the basis on which he proposes that we should deal with the question. Surely he does not wish this House to be misled by what I must, with all respect, call a mere catch-penny resolution, professedly based on British precedent when there is no British precedent about it. As the hon. member from L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) has pointed out, the conference which took place in England was a mere political accident; it was simply the result of the political circumstances of the time; and the hon. leader of the Opposition is hardly dealing honestly with this House by asking us to vote for a motion which he wishes established as a precedent, when in reality he knocks away the principal support on which such a resolution should be based. If he had told us the instructions which had been given to the commissioners, he would have given us something valuable—something which would have formed the real basis of a Bill for the representation of the people in this Parliament. But he has failed to do so. I say, therefore, that this resolution is a meaningless one. More than that, it is a misleading one. It is an attempt to place the members of this House in the position of voting against a British precedent when in reality there is no British precedent at all, neither in the terms of the resolution itself nor in the arguments by which it is supported. I have no intention of entering into a discussion of the measure, but I am somewhat disappointed that in the many speeches we have had, none of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have said one word in support of the amendment moved by their leader, nor advanced anything to show us why this Bill is really objectionable, except in some unimportant details.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up the time of the House at any great length; but I desire to refer to one case at least which, I think, will prove conclusively that a question of this kind should not be settled by one political party, but should be disposed of in some other way; and I think the amendment before the House, proposing that the basis for the readjustment should be arrived at by reference to a committee of members from both sides of the House, is a very fair proposition. The case to which I will refer shows very clearly that into this proposed redistribution politics and partisanship have entered, and that the rights of the people have not been fairly

considered. The particular case to which I refer is that of the county which I have the honour to represent —the County of Russell. To the Government it appears that there is a mountain which must be disposed of, and, by removing the mountain from the County of Russell and placing it in the County of Prescott, that matters are improved, but they are not improved at all. The mountain still exists, but it is in Prescott instead of in Russell. At the taking of the last census, the population of Russell was 31,643, and that of Prescott 24,173, and the proposition made in the Bill before the House is that the township of Clarence and the village of Rockland, containing a population of 6,244, shall be taken from Russell and given to Prescott. The effect of this would be that the population of Prescott would be 30,417 and that of Russell 25,399. I think the case is so plain as to require no argument at all to show conclusively that this is done for one purpose, and one purpose alone, and that purpose is to legislate myself out of Parliament. The statement was made after the bye-election in 1888 by my opponent, that if they could not beat me in any other way they would beat me by placing the township of Clarence in the County of Prescott. I thought that was simply talk, and never believed such an iniquity would be perpetrated by any political party. I heard the statement several times since, but did not believe it, for, I must say frankly, I had more confidence in the gentlemen who occupy seats on the other side than to believe they would do this ; and I believe still that there is too much honour among a large number of them to permit of such an injustice being done to an opponent. Now, I will just give the House the position of a few of the counties immediately adjacent to the County of Russell. The County of Glengarry has a population of 24,476, very near the unit. The adjoining County of Dundas has a population of 20,132, while the County of Prescott has a population of 25,000. It was not to be thought of for a moment that one of the townships of Russell should be added to the County of Dundas ; and why ? For the simple reason that the County of Dundas would then be a Liberal county. That is the reason, and no other. The County of Stormont, adjoining the County of Dundas, has a population of 27,158. There is no suggestion that an adjustment shall take place between the County of Dundas and the County of Stormont, for the simple reason that these two counties are represented by two Conservatives. Now, we will take North Leeds and Grenville, which also touch the south-west portion of the County of Russell. The population of North Leeds is 13,523, and that of South Grenville 12,931, while Brockville has a population of 15,855. Thus there are three counties in immediate succession southward from the County of Russell having a smaller population, yet the adjustment is made by giving to Prescott, which is already larger than the unit, a township belonging to the County of Russell. And let me here say that I understand that the statement has been made that the township of Clarence is really in the County of Prescott. I desire to state that such is not the case. The township of Clarence is one of the townships of the municipality of Russell. It is true that Prescott and Russell are united for municipal purposes, but the counties are separate and distinct in every other way.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Have they one county council ?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes. I will just refer to a few other counties in the more western part of the province, to show that redistribution is not the purpose of this Bill. The County of Kent has a population of 31,433. The population of South Essex is 24,022, and of North Essex 31,523. The discrepancy between the two ridings of Essex is as nearly as possible the same as the discrepancy between the Counties of Prescott and Russell, but it did not occur to those framing this Bill that it was necessary at all to adjust those two ridings. And why ? Because no political effect could take place by so doing. East Simcoe has a population of 35,801, North Simcoe 28,206, and South Simcoe 20,827, and again in this instance redistribution was not thought of, simply because it would have no political effect. I will just give you one more instance, and that is the case of the city of Ottawa. Ottawa has a population of 37,281. Rideau ward of that city is a portion of the County of Russell for electoral purposes and has a population of 1,673, and while I am not suggesting for one moment that the County of Russell should be disturbed in any way, yet if justice and fair-play were sought, the simple giving of the village of New Edinburgh to the city, to which it properly belongs, would be a better adjustment than what has been suggested. I will not take up the time of the House longer, but I will say this, and I will say it frankly, that I do not believe for one moment that this portion of the Bill before the House ever originated with the Government. I believe it originated with a few ambitious gentlemen living in the County of Russell, who desire to represent that county, and after having had two or three hard fights they have come to the conclusion that it is a very difficult task. I will say frankly that to me it is a very great sacrifice to be in this House. It is a very great injury to the business of which I am one of the proprietors and the manager. My desire is not to be here, because the sacrifice is one too great for me to make ; but, Mr. Speaker, if it is suggested that I shall be legislated out of the House in the manner proposed, I will leave it to the balance of the County of Russell to say whether I shall be returned or not. And while there are Conservatives, and many Conservatives, in the County of Russell, yet they are men who will not for one moment endure such an iniquity as that proposed. If the Government performs such an iniquity, as far as I am concerned I will leave it to the people of Russell to say whether they will endorse such a measure, and I believe in my heart that they will do nothing of the kind. I do not stand up here to say for a moment that I control a single vote except my own, but I have confidence in the people of Russell, and, while not ignoring for a moment the township which gave me birth, the township in which my property is, and the township which I heartily love, at the same time, if the great injustice is done that township by placing it in another county, I firmly believe that the balance of the County of Russell will resent the suggested iniquity. In the course of the introduction of this Bill, the leader of the Government in this House gave two reasons for the proposed change, the first being readjustment, and the next that it would be more in harmony with

the feeling of the people of Clarence to compose a part of the County of Prescott than to remain as they are to-day. Let me say that, while the township of Clarence is composed of a French population and an English population, at the same time no such idea has ever crept into the mind of a single man living in that township. The very best feeling exists among all classes and all creeds in the county, and, if this injustice is done, a very great feeling of resentment will be entertained among the very people who are supposed to be pleased by making such a change. So far as that is concerned, I hope I may be pardoned for saying that it seems that some excuse had to be given, and it was thought that that would be a very good excuse, but it will not be so accepted by the people of the constituency.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 2nd June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Fisheries.—(Mr. Tupper.)

CUSTOMS OFFICER EDMOND TRUDELLE.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether there is in the Custom House at Quebec an official named Edmond Trudelle? How many years has he been there, and what is his salary? Are the Government satisfied as to his services? What has been the amount of his expenses in making the several seizures of liquor effected by him, and has the amount of the said expenses been repaid to the Government out of the moneys derived from such seizures? What are the articles seized by him since 1st May, 1890?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is such an officer as Edmond Trudelle in the Custom House at Quebec. He has been appointed, I think, for about 15 years, as the Civil Service list will show. If the Government were not satisfied with his services he would not be in the service. His expenses in the seizure on the date mentioned is between $390 and $400. He has effected over 25 seizures. These expenses will be paid out of the proceeds of the seizures, as is done in every case. If a motion is made the articles seized by him will be given to the House, but they cover three or four pages of foolscap and would be too long to read in an answer to a question. With the exception of 186 barrels of whiskey which he seized the others are all small seizures.

EXPORT OF APPLES.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) asked, 1. Is the Government aware that apples are being exported from Canada in barrels of different sizes, and not in compliance with section 18 of the Weights and Measures Act, to the injury of certain portions of the Dominion, the apple trade of which complies with the Act? 2. If so, has the Government instituted any proceedings to enforce the law? 3. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation prohibiting the exportation from Canada of apples except in barrels of the statutory dimensions? 4. Does the Government intend to bring apples within the purview of the Inspection Act, making the barrels as well as the apples subject to such official inspection?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. The Government has received information, through the hon. member for Annapolis, that apples are packed and exported in barrels not in accordance with the law. 2. No proceedings have been instituted. 3. The present law provides that apples shall only be put up in barrels of certain dimensions. 4. It is the intention to add apples to the schedule of articles in the Inspection Act subject to inspection, and it will be the duty of the inspector to see that the barrel is in accordance with the Act.

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP POST OFFICE—CLAIMS FROM THE WORKMEN.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (translation) asked, 1. Whether the Government are aware that several workmen who have worked on the post office building at Rivière du Loup, have not been paid as yet? 2. Whether the Government are themselves going to pay these workmen, or to see that they are paid?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The Government received several claims from the sub-contractors and other persons, for work done and material furnished for the Fraservile Post Office. The department is examining these claims previous to settlement with the contractor. I cannot say at present which of these claims will be paid.

COMMISSIONS ON CUSTOMS SEIZURES.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the statement made in the Montreal *Herald* of the 26th instant is true, to the effect that "Various rumours are flying as to the action of the Government concerning the Commissioner's recommendation that Parliament should look into the immense sums paid one official for his commission on seizures. In regard to this the statement is made that sometime since, two check clerks, one named Russell, were engaged for three weeks, not in checking entries for the Dominion Appraiser, but in special work for the late Accountant. For these three weeks they drew their Civil Service salary, but did not do their regular work, which was left undone. They received extra pay from the then Accountant, for the work they did to enable him to make seizures, and it was not until the Board of Appraisers took cognizance of the matter that the regular entries were attended to." If so, has any action been taken in the matter?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have noticed no rumours applying to the case mentioned, and, not having seen them, I have taken no cognizance of the matter.

VISIT OF MINISTERS TO WASHINGTON.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that there is a statement in the press that two members of the Government left yesterday for Washington on important public business. I would ask the leader of the House to state if this is true, and what is the nature of the business of his colleagues on the other side of the line?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The statement is correct. I noticed in this morning's *Citizen* an explanation of the visit, and that statement is substantially correct also.

RETURN—ROYAL COMMISSIONS.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House to a return which was brought down yesterday by the Secretary of State. It was a return showing the number of Royal Commissions issued in each and every year since Confederation, and by whom issued, together with the subjects enquired into, and the cost of each commission and the total cost of all. For one commission appointed 19th August, 1876, the cost is set down at $150,069.56. I see by the Public Accounts for that year that the total cost of that commission was $13,632.12. I think that this return should be inspected again by the department, because it shows that ten or fifteen times the amount was spent on that commission which the Public Accounts show to have been spent.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What was the subject of the commission?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The management of the Indian lands in British Columbia.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will call the attention of the Secretary of State to the matter and see which is correct, but I would suppose at the moment that the larger figure must be erroneous.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Sir John Thompson: "That Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, be read the second time;" and the motion of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to continue the debate on the lines of minute criticism of the different sections of the Bill, the second reading of which is now proposed to the House. Rather I would invite the attention of the House more especially to the alternative proposition contained in the amendment of my hon. leader, and the discussion of that proposition does not necessarily, I take it, involve the discussion of the minute details of the Bill itself, although, of course, such discussion would be perfectly in order. For my purpose I propose to confine my remarks almost entirely to the amendment, and as its purport and meaning appear to have been very much misunderstood by some gentlemen opposite, particularly by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) who spoke last night, I invite the attention of the House for a moment to its wording. The resolution proposed:

"That the said Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be referred to a conference or committee, to be composed of both political parties, to agree upon the lines or principles on which a Redistribution Bill should be drawn."

My hon. friend did not suggest whether it was prudent or not to leave the details of a Redistribution Bill to a committee; that was a matter to be considered hereafter. He merely proposed that the lines or principles which should govern in drawing a Bill of that kind should be determined by a committee of this House. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) last night expressed his regret that my hon. friend had declined to delegate to a commission of judges the powers which he asks in this resolution that Parliament should itself exercise. I have no hesitation in saying that a little reflection will convince the hon. gentleman that it would be highly improper and also highly unconstitutional to refer it to a commission of judges or anybody else to determine the principles and the lines on which a Bill should be drawn. That duty is one which under the British North America Act devolves on this Parliament, and that duty this Parliament cannot delegate—not should not, but cannot delegate—to any commission of judges or to anybody else, and I have no hesitation in saying that if the hon. gentleman gives the matter a moment's reflection, he will see that that criticism of his on the resolution was entirely unjust and unfounded. Now, I beg to submit to the House that the resolution now before it is inherently sound and fair—that it is a proposition which has for its authority a very high British constitutional precedent, and one which follows strictly the legal lines of the constitution; and it will be necessary for this House, if the view which I take of the British North America Act is correct, to adopt either this resolution or a similar one, and to determine for itself, either by this committee or by one better suited to the purpose, the lines and principles on which the Bill should be drawn. I shall have this afternoon to challenge the right of this House, after having fixed the lines and principles on which the Bill shall be drawn, to apply those lines and principles itself. I think it will be found by an examination of the constitution, that that is not the duty of the House. After it has fixed the lines and determined the principles on which the redistribution shall take place, and has determined the time when the redistribution shall come into effect, then its duty is to refer the mechanical application of those principles to a commission or other authority outside of this House. Upon the first proposition which I submit I wish to say a word or two. I say that this resolution, apart from precedents and constitutional law altogether, is inherently sound and fair, and should commend itself to the better judgment of hon. gentlemen on both sides. Sir, the machinery to have themselves fairly represented in Parliament is vital to the people of the country; there is no mistake about that. Our laws may be good or may be bad; but if the people have the machinery by which they can elect men fairly to represent them, then they have the repeal of bad laws or the enactment of good laws in their own hands, and have nothing to complain of. I for one, Sir, am a great stickler for administrative re-

sponsibility. I believe in the Administration taking the responsibility of introducing to Parliament all measures affecting the well-being of the people. But when you are rebuilding as it were the foundation stones upon which our whole constitutional system rests, it may not be compulsory, but it is eminently desirable, that in doing so you should legislate on lines which approve themselves to both historical parties in the state. Experience has shown to us that if the dominant party for the time being, when legislating on a matter affecting the very foundations of representative government, ignore the existence of their opponents and say, we will arbitrarily proceed to decide in this way or that way, the result has been and may be again almost to annihilate one of those parties; and when the party which is excluded for the time being happens by a combination of accidents to be returned to power, that party will be, perforce, driven to adopt the same unjust and unfair system, and will introduce another Redistribution Bill, not founded on justice or on the lines of the constitution, and intended to give the people a fair means of representation, but intended to promote the interests of the dominant party alone. Now, I submit that this is not what this House should desire, or what the well-being of the state should demand. We should, I say, insist, when we are rebuilding the foundations of our representative institutions, that those foundations shall be based on just and equitable principles. I think that will be conceded by all parties; and what is the proposition of my hon. friend? Is it fair or just? He says: Let us appoint a committee of this House, composed as such committees always are, of a majority of Government supporters, let that committee sit down together and discuss this matter, and agree if possible—not on what the details should be, not that this township or that should be taken out of one division and placed in another—nothing of the kind: but agree on the principles on which the Redistribution Bill should be based; and after they have agreed, let them submit their agreement to the House of Commons and the Senate, and let that agreement be passed into law. After you have agreed that certain lines or principles shall be adopted, which shall be just to the people, and give a fair representation to all parties in the state, the application of those principles to the different constituencies is a matter of detail; and I will invite the House to consider what the constitution provides as to how those principles shall be applied. I say, secondly, that the proposition which my hon. friend has asked this House to endorse is one having a very high historical precedent. The hon. gentleman who spoke last night referred to the events of 1884, when Mr. Gladstone introduced his Franchise Bill conferring upon two millions of people in Great Britain the franchise which they had not before. After being introduced I believe that Bill passed the House of Commons, but not the House of Lords, and it was held over until the following session, when it was again passed in the House of Commons and then went to the House of Lords; and what took place? Negotiations were entered upon between the leaders of the two respective parties to see whether it was possible to agree upon a basis on which a Redistribution Bill could be introduced. Now, I do not want to give my own statement of the facts in connection with that transaction. It is desirable that there should be no dispute as to what the precedent is, whatever it may be; I am not going to weaken my case by overstating it, nor is it necessary that I should do so. I shall place the facts before the House, and then I shall appeal to them whether that British precedent is not one in every way applicable to our case, having very beneficial results in its train, and one which the Parliament of Canada should follow as closely as possible. I would call the attention of the House to the facts as detailed in the *Annual Register* of 1884, a book of no mean authority; and before reading it I will premise that at the time of which I am about to speak, the Franchise Bill had passed the House of Commons and was in the House of Lords, and the Redistribution Bill was about being introduced into the Commons. It was contended by the Conservative party in England that it would be unjust to ask them to pass that Franchise Bill until they thoroughly understood what the Redistribution Bill was to be. They said: If you get us to pass this Bill, you may not introduce the Redistribution Bill at all, or you may introduce such a one as we will not accept; and, having passed the Franchise Bill, you will go to the country and have the benefit of the new franchise applied to the old constituencies. That was a reasonable objection on the face, and the record goes on to say:

"When therefore, on the day before (17th November) that appointed for the second reading of the Franchise Bill, Lord Granville rose to make a proposal on the part of the Government, it was at once understood that a means had been found of solving the difficulty which had hitherto barred the way to a complete understanding."

Lord Granville went on to state:

"Without sacrificing their object, the Government could not come to any understanding unless they received an assurance that the Franchise Bill should pass at an early date, during that session; but if they received that assurance, they would be prepared to make the main provisions of a Redistribution Bill, or even a draft of a Bill drawn in accordance with the plan already sketched by Mr. Gladstone, the subject of friendly communications."

Mr. Gladstone, on the same day, in the House of Commons, made a similar statement, adding that:

"On receiving an adequate assurance that the Franchise Bill would be passed in the course of that session, the Government would be willing to make the main provisions of their Redistribution Bill the subject of friendly communication, and would undertake to move its second reading simultaneously with the committee or some subsequent stage of the Franchise Bill in the Lords."

The *Register*, continuing its account, says:

"The process by which this understanding was arrived at was fully described by the *Times*, according to which journal the Government received an assurance that the Conservative leaders would, prior to the second reading of the Franchise Bill, intimate their willingness to discuss the Redistribution Bill with the Government."

Mr. DAVIN. Is that November the 18th?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This was November 17th. On the 18th, the following day, Lord Salisbury made the following statement in the House of Lords, on the motion to read the Bill a second time:—

"The progress of the negotiations was further explained by Lord Salisbury, who, referring to what had passed on the previous day, said that at first he was not altogether satisfied with Earl Granville's remarks. He drew from them—no doubt inaccurately—the conclusion that previously to any communication or consultation between the two sides on the Redistribution Bill, the Opposition should undertake that the Franchise Bill should be passed into law before the close of the year. He need not dwell on the objections to such an arrangement, as by it the Opposition would be parting with their liberty, and might

afterwards find that, through no fault of theirs and no fault of the Government the end they had in view could not be gained. He had spoken to some friends in the other House, and finding that they had not understood Mr. Gladstone as he had understood the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, he requested his relative, Mr. Balfour, to enter into communication with the Government. The result was a statement by the Marquess of Hartington that the Government would receive in trust a communication from the Opposition that they would go into consultation on the Redistribution Bill and would not ask for the assurance as to the passing of the Franchise Bill as a preliminary to such a consultation. It was impossible to exaggerate the importance of that explanation. The Opposition could now enter into communication with the Government on the subject of the Redistribution Bill. If they came to an agreement as to that Bill, they were to give an assurance that the Franchise Bill should pass. If they did not, they would be just where they were at present. But he did not think that there was a likelihood of no agreement being come to, because the Opposition would reciprocate the spirit of trust in which the Government would receive their request for communications."

Here was the great leader of a great party, not asking that the matter should be discussed and decided across the floor of the House, but that friendly communication should take place between both leaders before the terms of the Redistribution Bill should be agreed to. And why? In order that something like fair-play and justice, and not party advantage, should be secured. Then the *Register* continues the account, as my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, gave it, and he was accused of not telling the whole story:

"During the next fortnight the process of arrangement was steadily pursued. Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote attended the meetings of the Cabinet and conducted negotiations with the specially elected delegates of that body."

That is the very proposition, or one very closely akin to it, which my hon friend has embodied in his resolution:

"Naturally there were rumours of misunderstandings more or less serious, but as time wore on, from the public utterances of those in a position to know the whole facts, that the basis of the compromise was never in jeopardy and that the ultimate decision on all questions of detail would have to be left to Parliament. The Government, throughout the preliminary negotiations, showed no desire to extort any direct pledge from the Opposition as to the passing of the Franchise Bill, until the Opposition leaders had satisfied themselves that the Redistribution Bill would be drawn upon lines of which they could approve."

That is plain enough, and now let us look at the concluding part of the record:

"At length, says the *Register*, after a week's adjournment both Houses reassembled, and Mr. Gladstone, in a very brief speech, altogether without rhetorical display and sympathetic enthusiasm, presented to the House of Commons the result of the negotiations, and moved for leave to bring in a Bill dealing with the most crucial party rights and susceptibilities which had been settled outside the arena of parliamentary conflict. Taking the scheme as published in the *Standard* as a fair expression of the views of the Cabinet, when a desperate struggle seemed inevitable, it appeared that the Bill, as unfolded by Mr. Gladstone, had been broadened and rendered a more permanent measure under the influence of Lord Salisbury."

Then follows the leading provisions of the Bill, the details of which would not be interesting to the House and are not applicable to the present discussion. The *Register* winds up its account as follows:—

"In conclusion Mr. Gladstone announced that a boundary commission had been appointed, consisting of Sir J. Lambert, Mr. Pelham, Sir F. Sandford, Mr. J. J. Henley, Colonel Owen Jones, and Major H. Tulloch, which was already at work and would complete its labours in a couple of months."

There is the whole story. Certain principles on which the Redistribution Bill should be based were proposed by Mr. Gladstone. He invited his great opponent to a conference, they sat in conference from day to day with their lieutenants on both sides, Lord Salisbury broadened the measure to suit the interests of his party and what he conceived to be the wants and requirements of the country, and eventually the Bill, which threatened at one time to involve a dead-lock, was presented to the House as the joint product of both political parties of the state, and passed into law. The principles which were to be the guiding principles of the Bill were agreed to by the joint committee of both parties, and a commission, consisting of the names I have read was appointed to apply the principles agreed to between the two parties so that both should have fair-play. The application of the principles was almost mechanical; the great question was, what principles should be applied; and my hon. friend has asked, not whether you are going to take a township from one county and put it somewhere else, not whether you are going to gerrymander this district or the other, but that the leaders of both sides should come together and see if they can agree on fair and just principles on which to frame a bill, and then present their conclusions to the House for its adoption, and if necessary, as I think it is, have an authority outside the House to apply those principles to the country at large. I submit, therefore, that the proposal before the House of the leader of the Opposition is inherently sound and fair. I submit, also, that it is following in the lines of the great historic precedent set by the two great leaders of the two great parties in Britain to-day; I submit, further, that the precedent so set has been followed by the best results in English politics; and lastly I submit that the course the Government is taking to-day, following the precedent of 1882, which produced in Canada the very bitterest consequences, which intensified party feeling and almost annihilated in one of the great provinces one of our political parties, will be equally productive of evil fruits; whereas if we adopt the more statesman-like and fair proposal of my hon. friend and give both parties their share in the adjustment of the foundation stones on which government has to rest, we will be doing what is in the interest of the whole country. More than that, I invite the attention of the House to this proposition, that the Bill before us is, in my humble opinion at least, directly opposed to the constitutional provisions of the British North America Act. I invite the attention of the House to that Act. On reading the section to which I refer, it will be seen that the framers of the Act never intended that the redistribution of seats should be entrusted to the dominant party for the time being. They foresaw what might result and they provided that, while the House of Commons and the Senate together, acting as the Parliament of Canada, with the concurrence of His Excellency, should agree upon the lines of the redistribution, after they had agreed upon the principles upon which the distribution should take place, the application of that distribution should be relegated to a third party, to some one outside of them.

Mr. WALLACE. How did they do this in Ontario?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not sufficiently conversant with the facts to say what they did in Ontario. If one province or another has done

wrongly, does the hon. gentleman suggest that we should follow their example? I understand that he says a wrong was done there and therefore a wrong should be done here. I ask the House to take a higher view of their responsibilities, and I say that the Imperial Parliament determined, in passing the law, that not only should the lines and principles be laid down, but that at every decennial census you should make a change in these lines and principles to suit the changed conditions of the country. The Act does not say that the Parliament shall lay down what for all time shall be the lines and principles to be followed, but that Parliament, after every decennial census, shall lay down those lines and principles. Let me call the attention of the House to the section on which I base my argument. When the Quebec resolutions were passed, this was not in the resolutions. The resolutions provided that the Legislatures of each province should, after each decennial census, readjust its own boundaries. Rightly or wrongly, and I think rightly, the Imperial Parliament thought the basis on which redistribution should take place should be left to the Parliament of Canada instead of to the Local Legislatures, and they inserted the following paragraph :—

"On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, and in such a manner and at such a time as the Parliament of Canada, from time to time, provides."

So that the Parliament of Canada have to provide three things. They have to provide an authority that shall deal with the readjustment on the principles they have laid down. They have to provide the principles which shall guide the redistribution, and they have to decide the time when the readjustment is to go into operation. Parliament is not to do that itself. It is expressly stated that the redistribution shall be made by such authority as Parliament itself shall provide. It is true that we have the control of the manner in which the redistribution shall take place and can lay down the rules. You can say if it shall be based absolutely on population, or you can adopt any principle which is fair and just in your opinion, but you cannot take a different line and an unfair one, you cannot take a district here and a district there, and cut and carve them in order to meet party exigencies. If you choose to legislate outside the lines of legislation which the Imperial Parliament has imposed you will be going beyond your powers. I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen to the result of this. I do not care whether the mechanical work is referred to a committee of this House or to an outside authority. They will be bound by the lines which you lay down. Those lines which you lay down should be a matter of which you are perfectly seized, and should secure the people against arbitrary action on the part of one or the other party, and should prevent the dominant majority so legislating that their opponents shall be practically annihilated. We saw a case the other day when the Wisconsin Legislature tried to carry a Gerrymander Bill against the will of the minority. But there was a written constitution, and the courts held that they could not legislate outside the lines of the constitution, and that such legislation was *ultra vires*. You have no more right to cut and carve up my district than the Provincial Legislature of Prince Edward Island has. You have a right to determine that the readjustment shall be based on a principle which may be applied to the whole country, but to take three townships from King's and put them into Queen's, and to take three from Queen's and to put them into another county is not according to the rule under which redistribution should take place. The limitation has been placed upon your powers by the Imperial Parliament in language so clear that it cannot be misunderstood. If you are to go on in the way you are now going on, you are forcing the Liberal party to take the same course against you if they should come into power. In that case, they must gerrymander. Do you imagine that you are to remain in power for ever by passing these gerrymanders? You must lay down your principles, you must appoint your authority, you must fix your time, and when the authority to whom you have referred the application of the principles carries them out, then Parliament enacts them into law. Now, Sir, it is said by some that there must be an inherent power in Parliament to do this. I deny it. This Parliament is the creation of an Imperial statute, it is bound by the limitations expressed in the statute, it has no power to legislate in defiance of or beyond or inconsistent with any of the limitations in that statute. This Parliament attempted once to do that. This Parliament, in 1873, I think, passed what is called the Oaths Act, authorizing committees of this House to administer oaths. Objections of a constitutional character were raised to the passage of that Act. It was referred to the Crown law officers in England, and the Crown law officers gave an opinion that the Act was *ultra vires* because it was inconsistent with one of the limitations of the British North America Act. They did not go any further. They only said this Act was *ultra vires* because it was inconsistent with the limitations of section so and so. Then, in 1869 or 1870, the Province of Ontario attempted to legislate with reference to the powers of the Ontario Legislature, attempted to legislate in the direction of giving that Legislature all the powers which the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain had. That Act was referred to the Crown law officers in England, and they gave an opinion that the Act was *ultra vires* because it was inconsistent with the provisions of section 92 of the British North America Act. What is the underlying principle of both those opinions? That the British North America Act has laid down certain principles which are to govern, and certain limitations which are to control the legislation of this Parliament. We can, within the boundaries of those limitations, legislate when, where, and how we please, but if we overstep those limitations, or legislate in any manner inconsistent with those limitations, our legislation is *ultra vires*. Now apply that reasoning to this case. You have no authority arbitrarily to cut and carve as you please. The law does not give it to you, a limitation has been placed upon your power. It does not say you "may" do so and so, but you "shall." The imperative is used, and you "shall" do so not once for all, but from time to time, after each decennial census you shall readjust, by such authority, and in such manner, and over such time, as Parliament provides. There is no limita-

tion upon the lines which you may prescribe as the guide of the authority you may appoint. But you must lay down lines; you cannot act arbitrarily; you cannot say that *a* shall be placed in *b*, that *b* shall be placed in *c*, or that *c* shall be divided into two parts. Your principle must be applicable to all the provinces. It must ensure that justice shall be done to all parts of each province, it must carry out the spirit and the intent of the British North America Act. I invite the hon. gentleman's attention to this. My hon. friend's motion is based exactly upon that section of the constitution. He says: Let us come together now and agree upon these lines, and when we have agreed upon the lines, and upon the manner, then let us legislate and enact the law, and when we have carried the principles into law, let us appoint the authorities who are to apply the principles to the condition of the country, and carry them out. I say that in principle, and from historic precedents, and by the legal construction of the British North America Act, this proposition of the leader of the Opposition is one which I think must commend itself to the minds, at any rate, of the legal members of the House. I cannot see, based as it is upon justice and equity, how it can fail to commend itself not only to the sense of fair-play, but to the common sense of all the members of the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not desire to give a silent vote on this question. I think it is one of too much importance for me to record my vote without entering my verbal protest against this measure. It is not the first Bill of this character that has been introduced in the House since I have been a member. In 1871 a Redistribution of Seats Bill was brought before the House. It was then passed and carried into effect. Ten years after that time, another Bill of a similar character was passed in this House. That Bill changed, in the Province of Ontario, some 55 seats. The provisions of that Bill, although ostensibly made for the purpose of equalizing population, were carried out more particularly for the purpose of gaining strength to the party who proposed the Bill. Up to the present time no effort has been made to touch the Province of Quebec. By the provisions of the British North America Act it would appear as if no changes were contemplated by the authors of Confederation with reference to that province. It is true that when the leader of the Conservative party in Quebec was in the House, Sir George E. Cartier, he spared the Province of Quebec. He was a gentleman that was supposed to be true to the interests of the Province of Quebec, he was supposed to be true to the traditions of that province, and he allowed the constituencies to remain as the British North America Act decided they should remain. During his time in the House no change was made or contemplated, I presume. While he lived the province was allowed to remain as it then was. Neither did Sir John A. Macdonald introduce any change in his Act in reference to the Province of Quebec. He allowed the constituencies to remain as they were after Confederation. Sir George E. Cartier has passed away, Sir John A. Macdonald has passed away, and a short time afterwards we find that those who have come after them and who control the Province of Quebec, without respecting the traditions, or the wishes, or the aspirations of that province, without being guided by the illustrious name of Sir George E. Cartier, nor controlled by the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald—no sooner have those leaders departed from the scene, than we see those who succeed them in that province and in this House, cut, and mutilate, and transform the counties in that province in such a manner as to render them scarcely recognizable by the people living in that province. The changes proposed are great, the changes proposed are nefarious. It would look more like the work of a brigand than the work of a statesman, so far as the Act applies to the Province of Quebec. The object of the Act is said to be equalization, but the Act has failed to carry out, in almost a single county, the principle of equalization. Then, leaving the Province of Quebec and coming to the Province of Ontario, we find a change has been made in the County of Russell. Justification cannot be given for that change. It is true the Minister of Justice told us when he introduced this Bill that there were a large number of French people in the township of Clarence and they would be more at home and more in harmony with their friends in the County of Prescott, and hence they were placed there. It did look to me as if the Minister of Justice was trying to "hive" the French, as if he had not as much confidence in the French when they were allowed to mingle with other people in the counties to which they geographically belong. The Minister of Railways says the change was done merely for purposes of equalization. The County of Prescott had 25,000 people according to the last census; the County of Russell had 31,000. The equalization the Government effect is to give Prescott a population of 31,000 and Russell a population of 25,000. That is what the Minister of Railways told the deputation was the only object the Government had in view when they proposed this change by the Bill. I do not wonder the deputation was surprised when the hon. gentleman made that statement to them; I felt surprised, because in equalizing the population different changes from that proposed were necessary. If there had been a desire to secure equalization it could have been very easily accomplished by adding to Ottawa that portion of Ottawa which now lies in Russell and which belongs to the city, and this would have affected materially the equalization of the population in those counties. Taking six or seven counties in Ontario, it will be seen that they are very far below the unit of population. Leeds and Grenville has a population of 13,523, North Leeds has a population of 22,451, Lennox 14,902. Frontenac 13,445, Grenville South 12,931, Brockville 15,855, or in all those six counties a population of only 93,107. When the principle which was enunciated by the Government, that this change was made in the County of Russell for the purpose of securing equalization, is calmly considered, is it not surprising that the Government should make that admission when so close at hand were six counties where the unit of population was not reached by a single one of them, and where the population of the six gave an average of only 15,000 people to each member? I wonder very much that the Minister of Railways stated that this change was made for the purpose of equalization, when he had those six examples lying to the west in a range of counties along the river. It appears to me very strange indeed that this reason should be assigned when there were

those instances where equalization might have been carried out. Why were changes not made in those six counties? Why was it desirable to equalize the population in the counties of Prescott and Russell, and undesirable to disturb those six counties I have named? Need I tell this House the reason; is it necessary when it is so apparent? Those counties I have named are represented in this House by supporters of the Government. They could not add to or take from those counties without imperilling the political existence of those members, and when the Government were framing this Bill, which they profess is so fair and so straightforward, with a view to equalizing the population, it was wonderful how anxious they were to equalize the population in the Counties of Prescott and Russell and to allow the population to remain without being disturbed in those other counties. Then going westward to the city of London, I find the Government have left two wards belonging to the city out in the county and have taken one town that belongs to the county and added it to the city. The two wards they left out gave a Reform majority, and the ward they took in gave a Conservative majority.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman is not stating the actual facts. The two wards did not give a Reform majority.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did London East not give a Reform majority?

Mr. CARLING. No, it gave a Conservative majority.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What did London South do?

Mr. CARLING. It gave a Conservative majority.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Where have you left them?

Mr. CARLING. Where they were.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Where were they?

Mr. CARLING. In the county.

Mr. LANDERKIN. London South, I am told by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), gave 100 Reform majority.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman who contested South Middlesex last time informed me that the portion of the riding which is now London South gave 31 Conservative majority.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. CARLING. I had it from the gentleman who ran at the last election, and he is my authority.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for South Middlesex can tell you better.

Mr. CARLING. I do not know that he can.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In order to settle the matter, I will refer to the book.

Mr. ROOME. London South is divided into several polling divisions, and not into municipalities, and therefore you cannot find the return in the book.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I cannot find it just now, but I was informed as I said, and the Minister has made his statement of the matter. Am I not correct in stating that the municipality of London West is taken into the city by the Bill?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understand that gives a Conservative majority.

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What justification can there be, except a political justification, for leaving wards out of the city that belong to the city, and taking wards into the city that belong to the county?

Mr. CARLING. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to answer?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes.

Mr. CARLING. I may state to the hon. gentleman that London East has a population of nearly 6,000 people, and the County of East Middlesex has a population of something over 19,000, and London 28,000; but by taking London West, with a population of 1,900, from East Middlesex and adding it to the city, it nearly equalizes the populations of East Middlesex and the city of London.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is very desirable the population should be equalized there, because the city of London has only one member, and the present population of London is in the neighbourhood of 22,281. That is up to the unit of population now.

Mr. CARLING. East Middlesex has 26,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the three other Middlesexes, how much are they?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say for North Middlesex, but I think South Middlesex has between 16,000 and 19,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. My statement hardly agrees with the statement of the hon. Minister, and that is, that London South gave Mr. Armstrong 93 majority.

Mr. CARLING. I have it from the gentleman who contested the riding with Mr. Armstrong, that in that particular locality which now is London South, taken from Westminster township, that it gave him a majority of 31.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friend will see that is impossible, because Mr. Armstrong had a majority in every polling division of the whole township, including London South, except one.

Mr. CARLING. I have the information from Mr. Chisholm, who contested the riding with Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have the return here of the vote cast for Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Chisholm, and I see in every division except one, Mr. Armstrong had a majority. I will just read the returns. Poll No. 17, Armstrong 106, Chisholm 45; No. 18, Armstrong 116, Chisholm 36; No. 19, Armstrong 116, Chisholm 78; No. 20, Armstrong 171, Chisholm 114; No. 21, Armstrong 44, Chisholm 37; No. 22, Armstrong 69, Chisholm 44; No. 23, Armstrong 48, Chisholm 58. This is the first instance where he got a majority in all these divisions. Poll No. 24, Armstrong 84, Chisholm 61; No. 25, Armstrong 117, Chisholm 21; No. 26, Armstrong 84, Chisholm 89. All the majorities that he got were five in that place and ten in the other, and Mr. Armstrong must have had in that township I should say two or three hundred majority. That township includes London South.

Mr. CARLING. The boundaries of London South were divided a year or a year and a half ago into

the city, and what is stated to me by Mr. Chisholm according to the boundaries that were divided by the city and by the township, is, that there was actually a majority of 31 inside of the village of London South. You are speaking of the township of Westminster.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am speaking of the village of London South, which is in Westminster. I have read the returns of all the wards in Westminster, and it does not bear out the statement that the hon. Minister says Mr. Chisholm made to him. It establishes the correctness of the statement I have made, that these parts that were favourable to the Reform candidate were left out and the one that was unfavourable to him was put in the city. It shows that the statement I made is correct, that this was not done so much for equalization as to increase the vote that favours my hon. friend.

Mr. CARLING. I may say that if London South had been taken from South Middlesex and added to the city, South Middlesex would have a population of 14,000, and London a population of something like 26,000 or 27,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How can the Minister reconcile that to the fact that Leeds and Grenville have a population of only 13,000? If this is going to be defended on the ground of equalization the hon. gentleman had better get some other argument.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman refers to what was done in London, and I am explaining exactly how the matter stands.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You have explained how the matter does not exactly stand, and I am explaining how the matter does stand, and I am borne out by the blue-books.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sure the House must see how inconvenient it is to carry on this cross-fire of conversation from one side of the House to the other. I would suggest that the hon. member be permitted to conclude his speech.

Mr. LANDERKIN. According to the blue-book we find that changes were made there which will perhaps render it not necessary to take into consideration the votes of the appealed men, and that these changes are calculated to strengthen the Minister of Agriculture. It is very gratifying to the Minister of Agriculture to be so much appreciated by his colleagues that they have to strengthen him when he his getting weak. It is very good policy on their part, particularly as they have no other gentleman on that side of the House to take the Minister's place. It must, however, be very mortifying to some hon. gentlemen opposite to know that there is no other gentleman amongst them who understands so much about agriculture as my hon. friend the present Minister, and if he cannot hold his seat without having London South added, why give him London South. If he has to have London East thrown out, let it be thrown out; anything so long as the interests of agriculture in this country are not to be neglected. But it appears to me that my hon. friend's agricultural pursuits have been pointed in the direction of the cultivation of votes there, rather than of agricultural products. This Bill will indicate that that is what has been done, and that is what has been the result of the changes that have been made in the city of London. If you look at Bruce you will see the change that was made there in order to equalize. Port Elgin is left where it geographically belongs, and if you look at Port Elgin you will find that by it being taken from North Bruce and added to West Bruce, it makes the same difference between the two ridings as exist at the present time. West Bruce has a population of 20,710; add Port Elgin, with a population of 1,659, to that, and you give West Bruce a population of 22,377. In North Bruce, which has a population of 22,531, you take from it the population of Port Elgin which makes it 20,872, or just exactly the same size as West Bruce is now. It appears that Port Elgin gave a majority against my hon. friend who represents that county, and the consequence has been that Port Elgin has been shifted and vanished. Had the Government wanted to do what was right in the matter, and if they had added the township of Saugeen to North Bruce and allowed Port Elgin to go to West Bruce, there would have been a division on geographical lines, and it would have preserved the equalization of the population. But what is the use of telling us that this Bill is introduced for the purpose of equalizing the population? What is the burning necessity for an equalization of population? The necessity is rather for an increase in the vote that supports the Government. It is a sad thing that in this age of the world a Government can take a township from one riding and put it into another and expect the people there to vote as they are told. That is something which makes a Redistribution Bill in this House a very painful thing to those who love this country, who have lived here all their lives, to think that people can be pitchforked from one riding to another, and cheerfully and passively obey the masters who so use them to serve their political ends. If you examine this Bill from one end to the other, you cannot defend it on the ground of equalization. That need not be attempted, because it cannot be done. It has not been introduced for the purpose of equalization; it has been introduced for the purpose of keeping the Government party in power. The very conception of an Act like this, to perpetuate any party in power, is beneath the dignity of British institutions; it is subversive of our rights and destructive of our liberties, and should not be permitted in a British House of Commons under the old flag of England. We sometimes hear hon. gentlemen say that they love the old flag, and the next moment they will support a cowardly measure to trail the old flag through the mire. Britons are not cowards, and a party who profess to uphold the old flag should not resort to any cowardly measures to keep themselves in power. We should have fair-play in this Parliament, and any party that holds power should do so by the will of the people, and not by carrying through this House an unmanly and un-British measure. They should not one day glory in the British institutions, and the next day introduce a measure contrary to all British precedents, for the purpose of keeping themselves in power. I think the Government should consider whether it would not be in the interest of this country, in the interest of political morality, and in the interest of everything that the people should hold dear, that they should abandon this measure and adopt the British method of arranging the constituencies. I think it is time that the Government should adopt very differ-

ent tactics. It must be painful to the Government to think that after all the glamour they have thrown around their policy, they are afraid to go before the people on the merits of the policy which they have been carrying out for the last few years. Everywhere and every day we have seen the Government, having lost confidence in their policy, striving to carry through this House measures calculated to give them the place which they have forfeited in the confidence of the people of this country. I hope the Government will reconsider this matter and withdraw this Bill, and decide upon taking a British course. Because you have the power you think you can cut up the constituencies just as you like, and you think you will get the people to vote for you and keep you in power wherever you chose to put them. Is it not a spectacle, indeed, to find men who profess to love the old flag and to be British in their institutions, introducing a measure to deprive of their seats in this House those who do not see as they do? Let the Government be honest, and let them say that they have introduced this measure for the purpose of keeping themselves in power. I would like them very much better if they did that than I do when they are trying to bolster up the measure by professing that it is for the purpose of equalizing the representation. When they do that it strikes me that there is a little hypocrisy in them. There are some members of the Government who do not make professions of any kind, and I think I like them better than the others. We are going to gerrymander you in order to keep ourselves in power; we are ashamed of our legislation, and we know that we shall be defeated in the country unless we adopt some means to keep ourselves in power; we know that by the old gerrymander we hold ten seats in Ontario; we have ten members by the throat who are obliged to support us; if they do not, we will gerrymander them back; and now we are going to make an effort to get ten or twelve seats more. That is the position of the Government, and if they would come down and say that that is the avowed object in introducing this measure, I would give them a great deal more credit and a great deal more support than I usually accord to them. I would like very much if the Government would follow British models. I would like the suggestion made by the hon. leader of the Opposition to be carried out by the Government. I would like the Government to say: We are British in our instincts and we are going to follow British models; we have discarded the system that we copied from the United States; we can stand up on the platform and say we are British, we have abandoned the Yankee methods which have kept us in power for the last twenty years. Let the Government say: We are going to follow British institutions after this; and when they shout, Hurrah for the old flag, let them mean it. Let them be true to British institutions; and if they should be, we will have no more Gerrymander Bills. I believe the Government would have almost as good a chance to keep themselves in office if they would only act honestly in their other legislation, but there is the trouble. One thing brings on another. If you secure power by dishonest means, you have to act dishonestly after you get in. You cannot introduce a policy dishonest in its inception, which will not lead to dishonesty afterwards. If we are to have an honest Government, let us have it at once. The time has come when the people must clamour for legislation; and mark my words, if you have honesty in the Administration you will have its consequences felt throughout the country. If we have seen what we all deplore very much, the slow growth and progress of the Dominion in the last ten years, if we see hundreds of thousands of our best citizens driven away from the country, very much of that is due to the corrupt practices of the Government in the past ten years. Let the Government reverse their course, let them withdraw this Bill and have it rearranged on a proper basis, and have it carried through on that basis, and then there will be some hope that the future of the country will be less cloudy than it has been in the past. The first thing the Government know, they will have to introduce a Bill to readjust the seats in the House. They are under great difficulty at present with reference to the redistribution of seats in the House. A seat became vacant the other day, and I understand that rival claims were made for it on that side. I believe there has been a regular battle of the Boyne over that seat, and I do not know whether the forces of William or James carried the day. I do not know whether the sons of William stand by their motto "No surrender;" but we all know that in a few days, in all probability, the Minister of Justice will have to put another clause in this Bill to readjust the seats in the House in order to keep in harmony some of his followers who were gerrymandered into the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was in hopes that before there should be occasion for me to address the House, something more would have been said by our hon. friends opposite on what may be considered the principle of the Bill, or at any rate, the principle on which it should be dealt with, so that whatever one had to say at this stage of the debate on questions of principle might be said. I have been somewhat disappointed to find that the discussion, which has been very extended, has been mainly on the details of the measure, and indeed has been such a discussion as is rarely heard on the second reading of a Bill, but is generally reserved for consideration by the committee of the whole. I propose this afternoon not to ask the attention of the House to the details of the Bill, because I am perfectly aware that should the Bill be read the second time and be referred to the committee of the whole House, every point to which attention has been drawn in this debate will be urged again in committee, where the answer can, perhaps, be given more effectively and its application be better observed than at this stage when many of the details are confused with the general debate. I propose, therefore, with the permission of the House, merely to consider those points which particularly are applicable to the second reading of the Bill, and shall have further opportunity of dealing with the others at another stage. I repeat what I said when I had the honour to introduce the Bill, and what was received then, I observed, in a very sceptical way by the leader of the Opposition, and what was denounced by him when I moved the second reading, namely, that this Bill was introduced in the discharge of our duty in connection with the taking of the census, which calls for a change in the representation of the

various provinces; that it was not introduced, or pressed with any design to secure a party advantage, and I affirm that in the most distinct manner notwithstanding the denial which has been given to it by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and notwithstanding the challenges which have been made as to the various details of the measure. As my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) pointed out to the House yesterday, if we had chosen to pursue even the principle of readjustment by population, we could have made, with regard to each of the provinces, a measure in which the application of the principle would have been far wider than it is, and which would have secured to us eminent party advantages. We have been guided, Sir, by the principle almost exclusively—and where we have acted on any other principle that will be explained when we come to the details—that we should only interfere with the representation in those districts where additional representation for increased population had to be provided. As for example in the city of Montreal and in Hochelaga, where the growth of population has been immense since the last redistribution affecting those constituencies, additional representation has, in our opinion, to be provided to give the increased population fair representation in this House. We have, therefore, dealt with the constituencies in the district of Montreal, and have left, for the present at least undealt with other districts in the Province of Quebec, in which the application of the principle of readjustment by population would have given this Government a very great numerical advantage in the representation. And so as regards the Province of Ontario. I think there is some force in the observations of the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, as regards representation in the large centres of population. I agree, and the Bill is framed upon that principle, that cities, especially metropolitan cities, as Montreal and Toronto may be considered, are not entitled to the full measure of representation which their population would seem to indicate, not only because, as the leader of the Opposition has said, these cities are in natural course represented, in addition to those members whom they send here, by other members elected by other constituencies but whose residences are there, whose interests are to a great extent there, and whose knowledge of those cities is as intimate as that of their immediate representatives, but for this further reason that the public, in great centres like these, is more alive to political questions, and political feeling there is more vigorous and more likely to receive prompt expression than in rural districts. But, nevertheless, the claims of these cities are not to be entirely ignored. The principle is not to be recognized that they are entitled to no representation, because there are living in them representatives of other constituencies. In the argument made by the leader of the Opposition in that direction, I agree in so far as to admit that there should be a reduction of the representation that population would give, but not that the representation of those cities, if their growth is as rapid as the growth of Montreal and Toronto has been, should be entirely ignored and not increased, while the representation of rural constituencies is maintained at its former status, notwithstanding their population may have declined. Proceeding upon that principle, we have recognized the fact that Montreal, Toronto and Hochelaga are entitled to

further representation, and it was necessary to provide for this, and we have provided for it without departing from the principle of population, and on no principle which secures a political advantage to us other than the political advantage which will accrue from having large bodies of people receiving their proper representation in this House. The Bill, therefore, coming before the House in that way, is met by an amendment which seems to me to be an extraordinary one to proceed from gentlemen who claim that we should act upon precedents, and above all from gentlemen who claim to believe in British precedents. We have it proposed in a vague way, for I understand the resolution as a very vague one, that the Bill shall not be read the second time now but shall be referred to a conference or a committee to be composed of both political parties, to agree upon the lines and principles upon which a Redistribution Bill should be drawn. I have never heard, and certainly we have not heard in this debate, a precedent for Parliament declining to legislate until two political parties have agreed as to what the line of legislation should be. We have not heard in this debate of any case in parliamentary procedure in which a Bill was made subject to agreement between two political parties. I have never heard of a resolution the meaning and intent of which was that there should be no recognition of any independence in Parliament, but that the two political parties, whether they include the vast majority of the members of the House, or whether, standing outside of them, there is a large independent body of gentlemen, should undertake to dictate what should be the line of a Redistribution Bill, and that the responsibility should be the responsibility of two political parties and not the responsibility of an Administration before Parliament. Let me call the attention of the House likewise to the fact that this is the first instance—I think I may claim it to be the first instance, for I have been able to find no precedent for it—when before the second reading, a Bill has been reached it has been proposed to refer it to a Select Committee to draft it over again. The practice of referring a Bill after the second reading either to a Committee of the Whole or to a select committee is familiar. But this is a refusal to read the Bill a second time and a proposal to refer it to a committee to be reframed. There has been a strong claim made on the part of the leader of the Opposition on the ground of British precedent—not to refuse to read the Bill a second time and refer it first to a select committee or conference, because he could not find that that course had been taken in any Legislature in the world—but he claimed that a precedent was found for a conference between the two parties in regard to a Redistribution Bill. I say that the hon. gentleman did not state the argument to the House in the way which was justified by the so-called precedent. He spoke of it as a recognized principle in British practice that a Redistribution Bill should not be dealt with unless after a conference of the political parties. We had that elaborated by a reference to the fact that we need not despair of arriving at a fair measure of redistribution, and that we need not even refer it to a special commission of judges, because in the history of the British Parliament there was a principle established which illustrated the free play of British

institutions and the magnificent operation of the British system of fair-play. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) this afternoon asserted that this was as sacred a business as the relaying of the foundation stones of the constitution, and this work was never to be touched by the sacrilegious hands of politicians from one side of the House, but should be done by both sides in common, although in a conference there must be a majority from one side, and that majority must eventually prevail. When we look at what the precedent which has been referred to is, the House will see that I am justified in saying that there is no precedent in British history which establishes that there ought to be a political conference as to the lines on which a Redistribution Bill should be framed or submitted to Parliament. The precedent my hon. friends have referred to is one of many in British history, where attempts have been made to get out of a dead-lock between parties or between the two Houses. The subject of distribution has been often dealt with there. My hon. friends know that the Redistribution Bill which has been referred to as having been passed in 1885, was not the first one passed there. When was that sacred principle established? Was it violated in preceding measures for the redistribution of the seats in the House of Commons? No, Sir, but, in the course of redistribution measures, through a long series of years, a time occurred within the last seven years, when the Government found themselves utterly unable to pass a measure without the assent of their opponents, Mr. Gladstone, who commanded a large majority in the House of Commons, who had passed through that House, as my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) stated last night, a measure for the enfranchisement of 2,000,000 of electors, but found when that measure went to the House of Lords, that Lord Salisbury held the pass by reason of the great majority he had in the House of Lords, and, when that measure came there, the House of Lords adopted this resolution:

"That this House, while prepared to concur in a well considered and complete scheme for the extension of the franchise, does not think it right to assent to the second reading of a Bill having for its object a fundamental change in the constitution of the electoral body of the United Kingdom, but which is not accompanied by provisions for so apportioning the right to return members as to ensure a true and fair representation of the people, or by any security in the proposals of the Government that the present Bill shall not come into operation except as part of an entire scheme."

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) last night challenged the statement of my hon. friend from L'Islet that the House of Lords had defeated the Bill, but that resolution put an end to it as decidedly as would the six months' hoist, because prorogation followed and the Bill was lost. Afterwards there were great popular demonstrations in favour of the extension of the franchise, and in favour of curbing the action of the House of Lords by the creation of a number of new peers. Happily Mr. Gladstone hesitated before taking that step, and preferred to ask a conference with the opponents without whose help he not only could not pass the redistribution measure, but could not pass his Bill for the enfranchisement of the two millions of new voters. Having had a conference to remove the difficulties of the dead-lock, the result was a scheme for redistribution which he proposed to his opponents. He made the concessions which they demanded and those conferences occurred, not in the progress of the Redistribution Bill, but for the purpose of securing, as far as he could, the passing of his Franchise Bill. So far as he was concerned he had not submitted, and did not propose to submit, to his opponents the consideration of the principles on which Redistribution should be based, as adopting a new practice in British legislation, as adopting the principle that the relaying of the foundation stones should not be undertaken by political hands, but for the purpose of getting the promise of his opponents to allow the passage of his Bill for the extension of the franchise. The stipulations that were exacted from him were stipulations that he was obliged to concede in order to secure not only the passage of his redistribution Bill, but primarily the Bill for the extension of the franchise. Now, hon. gentlemen who have discussed this question must surely have realized that before a political conference such as my hon. friend suggests, or even a committee, can do its work efficiently, some principle must be laid down to guide these authorities, to indicate the will of the House to the conference, or to the select committee. My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) took that point well last night, but I must go a step farther than he did. I am unable to agree with him that the Opposition have not put forward a principle as a basis upon which the conference or the committee must proceed to act. I must admit that the leader of the Opposition has stated a principle, and he has stated that principle, I presume, for the purpose of indicating how he thinks the conference or the committee should proceed to act, and he has stated that principle for the purpose of inducing the House to assent to the political conference before the Bill shall proceed. But the hon. gentleman's principle is one that we can never agree to in this House; I think that the House on reflection cannot agree to it, and if I can show, as I think I can within the next five minutes, that this principle is one that cannot be accepted by Parliament, and ought not to be agreed to, the foundation of his argument in favour of the conference or in favour of the committee falls away. The principle which the hon. gentleman laid down as the one which must guide the deliberations of the conference or the committee, is this: that the equilibrium between the two parties in the country existing at the present time, must be maintained. Sir, I say that no more false principle can lie at the basis of any measure for redistribution, or any measure for the extension of the franchise. What political party in this country has a vested right in the equilibrium of parties? If it be a fact that in one province a great majority of the voters stand on one side and a large majority of the representatives on the other, what right has my hon. friend to claim that the equilibrium shall not be disturbed? What right has he to say that the force and weight, and representation of political parties as they are now ranged, facing each other, shall override all other rights to representation on the part of the people? I should say that whenever a Redistribution Bill is brought forward, and whenever such a Bill is discussed by a political conference, the first object the members should set before them ought to be that the distribution should be fair, that it should interfere as little as possible with the existing lines, and should not interfere with these except where some serious occasion

calls for it, but that when a serious occasion does call for it, the change should be carried out without regard to the effect on either political party, or on the equilibrium of the parties. Therefore, Sir, I am quite unable to agree with the hon. gentleman that there should be a conference for the purpose of carrying out that principle, or that the Bill should be based upon any principle of that character. The hon. gentleman has reminded us, and I admit it, that there has been a good deal said in the press against the Bill. I regret, of course, that we are not able to secure the co-operation and the approval of the independent press, as I am sorry to act without the approval of any section of the press of the country. It is much more agreeable to act in concert with that strong exponent of public opinion, and that strong influence in moulding public opinion; but since the Bill was read the first time in the House, after making a careful study of the comments which have been made upon it by the press from which the hon. gentleman read extracts, I have been much encouraged to go forward with this Bill by finding that, strongly as it has been discussed from many quarters, I have yet to find a statement in any one of those journals of what it is that is wrong, or what it is that is defective in this Bill. You can find in a number of those journals general expression of disapproval, general expression of a suspicion that the Government was seeking a political advantage, but I only find, even in the partisan press opposed to us—with the exception of such comments as have been made upon details like the case of Clarence, which, as I said before, we will discuss by and by—I only find these general expressions of disapproval which I have mentioned. Take the question of the distribution in the Province of Quebec; I only find, even in the partisan press opposed to us, one statement of complaint as to an injustice, and that was a statement which was as grossly false as any caricature could be. But if you will take the general run of the papers which my hon. friend has read from, those of them which are entitled to the respect of the House, you will find that while there is a characterization of the measure as one calculated to strengthen the Government, there is nothing to indicate that there has been a careful study of the Bill, nor is there any attempt to point out what is said to be defective. Now, I propose to say a word or two with regard to the argument which was presented this afterdoon by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). In 1872 the House passed, under precisely the same circumstances, a Redistribution Bill; in 1882 we passed another Act, and that Bill was as keenly fought as any measure was ever fought in this House, and fought by men as of great intellect as any men who sit in this House now. I presume that the views which gentlemen on both side of the House have taken upon this subject for a quarter of a century, and upon which they have agreed for a quarter of a century, may safely guide the House in its decision this afternoon, as to whether this Bill may be read a second time or not. But if we had not the precedents of 1872 and 1882, and the consensus of opinion on those occasions, in my humble judgment the effect and meaning of the constitution giving us the fullest control over this subject, are abundantly clear. I shall not undertake to state in any dogmatic way, as I am sometimes accused of doing, what the law is or what it is not; but I beg the House to assume at the outset that in making the argument which I am about to make, I am putting it forward simply as my own views of the meaning of the constitution, leaving other hon. members to form their own opinion as to whether I am right or not. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that it is incorrect to speak of the inherent powers of this Parliament, because this Parliament is the creation of statute. But, Sir, we have a clause in our constitution which gives us the equivalent of the inherent powers possessed by other assemblies. When this Parliament was created, unlike other creations of statutes, it was not given a limited and narrow authority which had to be drawn from the statute itself, but in lieu of the inherent power possessed by other Parliaments, we have section 91 of the Act, which says that this Parliament may make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada, in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the provinces. I only state this as a reminder for those members of the House who are not versed in legal matters, that this section plainly gives to this Parliament all powers in relation to the government of Canada, "for the peace, order and good government of Canada," which are not given expressly to the Legislatures, and that while, as regards the Legislatures, we must look to this Act to find their powers, we have all the powers given to us except those given to the other bodies. That clearly includes the power of dealing with the representation of the country in this House, and the corollary as regards the provincial constitutions is the gift of power to Provincial Legislatures to alter their constitution, under which those Legislatures have sometimes abolished one Chamber, and sometimes increased and sometimes decreased the number of members who sat in one Chamber or the other. The hon. gentleman's argument at the outset would present this anomaly in the constitution: that while a Provincial Legislature may deal with that subject, can redistribute, can increase and can diminish, this Parliament has not that power, notwithstanding there is express authority given to the Provincial Legislature, and all other authority. But there are other indications in the constitution itself which seem to me to recognize plainly that that is our power, that it was always intended to be our power. For example, section 40 provides how the electoral districts of the country shall be at the coming into force of the Act, not for the purpose of making them perpetual, but with these important words at the beginning: "until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides." What is the meaning and significance of the expression: "until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides." I must admit these words mean until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, in accordance with this Act, because we get all our power from this Act, and I say the expression means until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides in pursuance of its authority to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada. The hon. gentleman's argument gives a more restricted meaning to the expression. Are we to put the more restricted or a wider meaning on the term: "until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides"? Does it mean that

the power is restricted by section 51, or does it mean "until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides" in pursuance of its undoubted authority under the general provisions of the Act? We have that expression occurring elsewhere, as for example, in section 41:

"Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces at the union relative to the following matters or any of them, namely, the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected,"—

and so on, shall continue in force, and also the laws relating to the trial of controverted elections. Then it follows from the hon. gentleman's argument that the phrase, "until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides," in section 40 has one meaning and in section 41 it has another meaning. The laws relating to the conduct of elections and the trial of controverted elections may be changed from year to year, from session to session, by this Parliament, but the hon. gentleman thinks that legislation can take place only once in every ten years in regard to the distribution of seats, although that is not expressly stated. Then, again, in section 47 there is another example of the use of the words "until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides," for the case of the absence of the Speaker from the Chair for forty-eight consecutive hours, provision is made for the adjournment of the House; but there can be no dispute whatever that the Parliament of Canada may at any time provide another measure with respect to that subject. When we come to section 51, on which the hon. gentleman based his argument, we come to a section which, I contend, is not a section framed for the purpose of conferring power upon this Parliament to redistribute the seats, but a section compelling Parliament to do it after the completion of each decennial census. Section 51 is not an enabling section, because we had the ability before; it is not a disabling section, because certainly, before we are to conclude that it takes away from us powers which are given to us by section 91, we must find express words that do so. If by section 91 of the Act we have all powers given to us in relation to passing laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada, we are not to interpret the Act or any part of it as taking away any fraction of that power unless we find words which can receive no other interpretation. But the obvious interpretation of section 51 is that it shall be the plain duty of this Parliament at the end of every decennial census to readjust the representation, and then it goes on to say "by such authority, in such manner and for such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time shall provide." If my view of section 51 is correct, that it is not a section under which we derive our general or specific power over this subject, then all ambiguity is removed, and it simply enables us to do that work which is enjoined on us and made compulsory by that section at the close of every decennial census, by some other authority, if we please, as for example, by the Provincial Legislatures or otherwise. But the hon. gentleman, in order to give effect to the paraphrase which he made of the section, as to settling a principle not permitting a majority to take advantage of a minority, and all that class of expressions which he used, gave, as his own argument implied, a very vague and obscure meaning of the words relating to "such authority, and in such a manner and for such time as Parliament shall establish." I repeat very shortly what I have said on the construction of section 51. I contend we had the power before section 51 and outside of it altogether; that we are not to interpret section 51 as taking away from the general power or making any repugnance in the Act, and that, above all, the section is not to receive that construction unless that construction is plain and necessary. But if it were intended by the Parliament that passed this statute that, although we should have the power to increase the number of members of this House—and that is another point against the hon. gentleman's argument, that there is power given to increase the numbers of the House from time to time, provided the proportion of representation is not disturbed as laid down by the Act—the question of redistribution is something we are prohibited from doing, there is not in the whole Act from beginning to end a single negative provision as regards the right of this Parliament to do that work. But the construction of the whole Act, unless the hon. gentleman is to read into that section which applies solely to the decennial census, unless the hon. gentleman is to read into that section negative words which are not there, comes to this: That while this Parliament may redistribute at the term of every Parliament, or from year to year even, yet when it comes to the decennial term we have not the power to redistribute the seats at all. Then to go one step further, we should reach this absurdity, that while this year in consequence of the decennial census having taken place, the redistribution must be made by some other authority than ourselves, yet next year in the exercise of our general powers, we could repeal their work and redistribute over again according to our own will. It seems to me, Sir, that the many wise and learned men who have considered this subject in past years, and who have struggled here over the principles and the details of redistribution Bills, have not been so blind as not to see a defect like that in their work, if such a defect existed. The construction which I have ventured to put upon the Act with very great confidence indeed, is the construction it has received in times past, and it appears to me that it is the construction that the House ought to act upon, and which eventually will be sustained as the sound and proper construction, and as the only construction which is consistent with the general powers which have been given to the House over this subject. Mr. Speaker, I trust that my reasons for refraining from discussing in detail the objections which have been taken to this Bill will not be misunderstood by the House. We neither undervalue them nor are we unable to meet them, but we think we have not reached that stage in the progress of this Bill when it is suitable or convenient to discuss these matters. At any rate we are confident that when the details shall be reached, we shall have occasion, and be obliged to meet then the arguments which hon. gentlemen have put forth with so much force as regards some of the provisions of the measure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose, no more than it has been that of the hon. leader of the House, to enter into a discussion of the details of the measure now before us, but I shall endeavour to point out the grounds upon which I think the motion of my hon. friend ought

to be supported, and I shall endeavour to point out the grounds upon which I think the House should proceed in determining what ought to be the principles governing the redistribution of the seats in Parliament. I shall point out also the reasons why the constitution placed upon this House the restrictions to which my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) has referred this afternoon. I shall not at this moment enter into a discussion of that legal question further than to say, that if I rightly understood the Minister of Justice he admits that so far as section 51 of the British North America Act is concerned, it has been rightly interpreted by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies)——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I beg your pardon.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood the hon. gentleman to say that there was power in this House derived from the provisions of the British North America Act to legislate upon the subject of the redistribution of seats outside of that section, and that it was open to Parliament to exercise these general powers which it possessed from other portions of the Act, or it might proceed under the provisions of this section to which I refer. If I misunderstood the hon. gentleman I will give way at this moment, if he will correct my misapprehension.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was totally unable to agree with the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) as to his construction of the Act. I contended that our powers over this subject were amply provided for by other sections, and that the function of section 51 was to make it obligatory upon this Parliament to redistribute at the decennial period; and to make it plain even though, perhaps, legislation upon that subject was not necessary, that we might delegate our authority in that regard. I am quite aware, of course, that the expression "delegation" may be inapplicable and that the word has been improperly used as to any measure by which Parliament deputes some other authority with regard to details and all that. It has been said likewise that no express words are necessary to confer that power. In this the express words with regard to the other authority are inserted, but not inserted in the clause from which we derive our powers over this subject, and only in section 51 as indicating generally in what way we may proceed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Minister contends that this 51st section delegates to the Parliament of Canada the power to proceed to the work of the redistribution of seats through other instrumentalities than the two Houses of Parliament and the assent of the Crown. The hon. Minister knows well that it has been again and again decided that under our constitutional system, in all the English colonies to the extent of the authority they are entrusted with, they have sovereign powers and are capable of delegating, in consequence of these sovereign powers, the exercise of any one of the powers with which they are entrusted; and under that construction it is clear that this section of the British North America Act would be altogether unnecessary. But, Sir, as I said at the outset, I am not going to argue this question at the present moment. I purpose looking at some of the features of the Bill, and at some of the principles which I think ought to govern any Act of redistribution. I agree with what the hon. Minister has said, that Parliament ought not to consider simply what will be the effect of a proper system of redistribution of seats upon this or that party. I admit that at the outset. I have never contended for any such proposition; but what I think has been a marked feature of this discussion on the ministerial side, both in the speech made by the Minister of Public Works and the speech made by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), has been this—that the principal object of the Bill, at all events so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, has been to rectify a wrong that has hitherto been done to the Conservative party. It was contended by these hon. gentlemen that a wrong was done at the time the Act of Confederation was adopted, a wrong was done again in 1872, a wrong was done in 1882, in that changes had not been made that ought to have been made then, and the hon. member says,—we did not touch the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil because these are simply suburbs of Montreal, and they have returned Conservative representatives, and in that way they, to some extent, compensate us for the inadequate representation that has been given to the city of Montreal. The hon. member said that the Liberal majority in the Province of Quebec was only 10,463, that the Conservative majority was 14,333, and that one duty that devolved upon Parliament in the redistribution, was to see that the party having the larger majority in the province should have the larger majority in the House, and so the Government specially set to work in the preparation of this Bill, to accomplish the object which the hon. gentleman said he had in view.

Mr. OUIMET. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will show that I am not misrepresenting the hon. gentleman. Then, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) told us last night that he proposed to do this work so effectually that for the next quarter of a century it would not be necessary to do it again. While I admit that to secure special representation for this party or that is not the primary object of a representation Bill, I contend that it is no portion of the Bill to make provision that those who at the time are by an unjust distribution put in a minority shall have assigned to them for the next ten years the privilege of simply voting for defeated candidates. That is what the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for L'Islet informed the House was the privilege which they proposed to accord to the Opposition under what they regarded as a British constitution. I maintain that the redistribution ought to proceed on certain lines in conformity with certain principles. It may not secure to each party in every locality representation according to its exact strength; but it gives to the party that is unduly represented in one place an under-representation somewhere else. If you act on some uniform and settled rule, regardless of party, then you have the principle of compensation that Mr. Bright referred to as always operating to correct those theoretical defects which may be pointed out in any practical measure which can be submitted to Parliament; and the objection I make to the speeches which those two hon. gentlemen addressed to the House is that they took certain

localities which seemed to favour the representation which they contended for, and they omitted altogether those compensating localities which operated in the opposite direction. Now, I complain that this is a measure for packing the House of Commons. It is not a measure for securing fair representation; and if the hon. Minister of Justice adheres to the declaration which he has made today, and is prepared to secure a fair representation to the people of Canada, then I venture to say that the defects of this measure will be made so clear to his mind that it will be utterly impossible for him to continue to give it his support. We are not asking that there shall be, as the hon. member for L'Islet said, unfair representation given to the Reform party in this House; we are not asking that if we are in a minority in the country we shall be given a majority of the seats; we are simply asking that there shall be such a plan of representation adopted that the preponderating political opinion of the country may possess a prevailing influence in Parliament; beyond that we are not asking the House to go. We are opposing this measure simply because it does undertake to accomplish in the interests of the Administration and of those who support them, that object which the hon. Minister of Justice has said ought never to be the aim of a measure of this character. The advocates of this measure have again and again asserted that the changes made in the electoral districts in the Province of Quebec were changes by which the electoral districts were made more equal. Sir, that is a matter of no consequence. In my opinion it is a matter of no importance at all to establish numerical equality in the populations of the different districts. What we say is this: that hon. gentlemen, while professedly aiming at that, have undertaken to secure an entirely different object. Take the district in the Province of Quebec which has been so mutilated and carved and changed, where hon. gentlemen admit the majority of the electoral vote is markedly in favour of those who sit on this side of the House; and yet that district has been cut and carved in such a way that with the vote that was given at the last general election hon. gentlemen opposite would secure three out of four seats where they have at the present time, I believe, but one seat out of five.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What district is that?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am speaking of that part of the Montreal district in which important changes have been made in the boundaries of constituencies. I am pointing out that what the hon. Minister of Justice says ought not to receive paramount consideration, is the one thing that has been carefully considered by the gentlemen who have been entrusted with the distribution of the seats in the Province of Quebec. Therefore I say that that cannot be a properly considered scheme or a just scheme which undertakes to impose disabilities upon the proper expression of the public opinion, and which prevents public opinion having its due weight in the representation of the people in Parliament. While I am in favour of a general scheme of representation, one which is not merely applicable to the country at the present moment, but which will be applicable to this country for all time, I am opposed altogether to the division of the people of this country in a Redistribution Bill into privileged and non-privileged classes. I am opposed to putting the Liberal party in this country in the position in which the slaves were put by the constitution of the United States prior to the abolition of slavery, when five negroes were counted equal to three white men. That is a principle which I do not want to see applied under a British constitutional system to the representation of a party in Parliament. I am under the impression that, man for man, the members of the Liberal party, and the voters of this country who adhere to Liberal views, are not inferior to those who belong to the other side. I am not claiming superiority for them, I am simply claiming equality, and I say this measure bears upon its face the evidence that it has been carefully considered in the interests of one party, that it has been framed to promote unduly the interests of that party, and with that object alone. Everything else is a mere pretext intended to conceal as far as possible the deformity of the measure. When the Minister of Justice says that the strength of parties ought not to be considered in the matter of redistribution, but that you ought to work on a general plan, I accept that proposition. But what is the general plan put forward in this case? Is there a preservation of county boundaries? Is there a creation of ridings? Where a county has a larger number than should be represented by one member, is there a correction of this by a division into ridings? That was the plan agreed upon by both sides of the House in 1872, but that has not been followed in this measure. Is this an attempt to equalize the electoral districts? Not at all. Why, you have the County of Ottawa with 64,000, a county sufficiently populous to have three members. But two are given to it. I admit that territory ought to be taken into consideration in the division of a county as well as numbers. It may not have the same weight, but it ought to have some weight. The County of Ottawa is a very large county containing 64,000. How do you deal with it? You create one riding of 17,000 people and another of 47,000, a number so large that it is more than sufficient for two representatives. Why are three members not given to Ottawa? Why was not this southern section of Ottawa divided into two constituencies? Why have you not two constituencies of 23,500 each instead of one constituency of 47,000? The hon. gentleman says: Oh, you would then give the Reform party additional representation. That is the trouble. Why were not Soulanges and Vaudreuil united? Together they are 20,000, not the unit of one constituency; but each returns a supporter of the other side; and so at every step, when you undertake to analyse the Bill, you see what is the principle which governs the conduct of those who prepared this measure of redistribution. Then the hon. gentleman said he would not consider the details. He referred to the case of Clarence which was taken off the County of Russell and put into the County of Prescott. Why was that done? What idea entered into the minds of those who prepared this measure to convince them that it was necessary to take the township of Clarence out of the County of Russell and put it into the County of Prescott? The hon. gentleman saw that Prescott had a large Liberal majority; he saw that at the last general election the return of a Liberal for Russell depended upon the township of Clarence. Now, the township of Clarence gave at the last election a Liberal

majority of 495, and that township is taken off the County of Russell to which it belongs and is put into the County of Prescott. Did the equalization of population require this? Upon what principle was it done? What are the motives which actuated those who made this change? If you assume that they were ready to hopelessly abandon Prescott and to try and secure Russell for the Conservative party, you have the explanation; and if you throw away this explanation, you have none at all. There is no hypothesis on which this change can be accounted for except the one I have mentioned. Then let us look at the constituency of London. Now, there are two wards in London not included in the city by this Bill. They ought to be included, and I shall discuss that feature of the Bill in a few moments. London South contains a majority of 100 Liberals, and London East is slightly Conservative, but it largely depends upon the personal strength of the two candidates as to whether you will have a Liberal or Conservative majority in that ward. What is done? Both of these wards have been left out of the city, and the village of London West, which polled last winter 231 Conservatives and 78 Liberals, giving a majority of 153 to the Conservative party, is taken into the city of London.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the history of that?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman asks the history. If it is necessary, I will go into the discussion further, but I wish to call attention to this fact, that the city of London contains two wards which are left out for representation purposes, and that the village of London West, where there was a Conservative majority of 153, is taken out of East Middlesex, from which it can be well spared without destroying the Conservative character of that constituency, and is put into the city to make the seat of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture secure. Is there any room to doubt the ground upon which this division has taken place? Is there any room to doubt the ground upon which those who prepared that portion of the Bill relating to the Province of Ontario, proceeded? Well, in the face of such facts as these, it is rather extraordinary that the leader of the House should stand up here and tell us that political consideration ought to be left out of view in the preparation of the Redistribution Bill. I call his attention to the fact that no Bill could more widely depart from the principles he has enunciated than the Bill he has submitted to this House.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When the House rose at six o'clock, I was pointing out that the rule laid down by the Minister of Justice as one which ought to be observed in the preparation of a measure of this sort was one which was systematically disregarded in this measure, and I referred to the proceeding in the County of Russell, and to the proceeding in the city of London in the Province of Ontario. Now, if we draw a meridian line at Toronto, we will find that east of that line the Province of Ontario is in a very considerable degree over-represented, and that Toronto and the western division of the province has not adequate representation. It is also a fact worthy to be borne in mind that the western portion of the province is largely represented in this House by Reformers, and the eastern portion of the Province of Ontario is largely represented by supporters of the Administration. Now, in the readjustment of the representation in the Province of Ontario, the proper course, whatever system might have been adopted, would have been to have withdrawn representation from that section of the province which is over-represented and to have conferred the representation obtained in this way upon those sections of the province that are inadequately represented. But that is not done by this Bill. The provisions of this Bill take away from that portion of the province west of the city of Toronto for the purpose of supplying representation to the city of Toronto and the Algoma district. I am not contending that the Algoma district, or the section of Algoma upon which it is proposed to confer another representative, is not entitled to it. I think it is. I am not contending that the city of Toronto is not entitled to another representative. I think it is. But these representatives ought to have been provided by a union of constituencies in that section of the province that is at the present time more than adequately represented. The Government, by this Bill, have gone into the Niagara district and taken away two of its representatives. They have altered the representation by what they have done there. The complaints which we made against the Bill of 1882, which was vicious in the method of distribution, which was grossly unjust in what it aimed at by its provisions, have not been corrected by this Bill, but those mischiefs have rather been intensified by its provisions. If you look at the present division and at the vote that was given in that province in the recent elections, you will find that Welland has a Reform majority now of 447, and under the new arrangement will have a majority of 376. Lincoln and Niagara have a Reform majority of 48. They will have under this proposed system a Reform majority of 670. Haldimand and Monck have a Conservative majority of 78, and under this arrangement they will have 325. South Wentworth, whose representative here now was returned by a majority of one, will under this arrangement give a majority of 131. The majority in South Norfolk was 412, by the new arrangement it will be 459. In North Brant there was a Reform majority of 1,116, and under the new arrangement it will be 1,466. Two counties disappear, one Conservative and one Reform, it is said, but any one who will look at these figures will see that the opportunity of carrying any one of these border counties in which the Reformers had very nearly half the vote, and in which the public opinion is moving in the direction of the Reform policy is altogether taken away from that party. The attempt is to give to each of these constituencies a fixed political character, and this arrangement is made to the advantage of the Administration. This fact must be borne in mind. You have wiped out two constituencies in which you say you have dealt equally with the two parties, one being Reform and the other Conservative, but when you say that will not be the character of the representation you create; you give to Toronto an additional representative and you give to a new district which will be largely under

the control of the Administration or under the influence of the Government, which must necessarily be very great there, an additional representative also. What the Government should have done was to look to the sparsely-populated section to the east, to have united those constituencies which are altogether below the unit, and to have left the west with at least the representation it now possesses. Why was that not done? Simply because in this arrangement, as in the case of the city of London, as in the case of North Bruce, as in the case of the County of Russell, there is an attempt to legislate with a view to the general election, to legislate a party into power whether that party can command a majority of the electors or not, and to legislate their political opponents out of office whether they can command a majority of the electors or whether they fail to do so. And this is not confined to the Province of Ontario. The same principle, as I previously stated, applies to the Province of Quebec, and the Minister of Public Works declared that this was the object they had in view, and the hon. gentleman referred again and again with particularity to the political complexion of every one of those parishes that were transferred from one constituency to another. All the manipulations which were had were manipulations had with a special view to the interests of party. Let me read an extract or two from the speech of the hon. gentleman, so that the House may see that I am not misrepresenting his statement when he came to the defence of this measure:

"Now, coming to Chambly, we have added to it parishes in which large Liberal majorities have existed for a great many years. Of course, it was only fair that we should balance that gain of our hon. friends by adding some of our own."

And so the hon. gentleman intimates frankly that the object was to take away the representation from certain constituencies that were Liberal, to hive the Liberals in certain parishes by putting them in other constituencies where they could do no harm, and that this representation which was taken away from a particular district of Quebec was to be given to another district of Quebec of a wholly different political complexion, and that for the purpose, as the hon. gentleman said, of giving to them a representation in Parliament in proportion to their strength. Then, again, he said:

"We have done this, not with a view of depriving these gentlemen of their majorities, but to make the situation at the next election as fair to them as we could expect them to be for us, and I hope the result of the next elections will show this."

And so the hon. gentleman figured in the preparation of this Bill with a view to the next election. He took into consideration the exact strength of the two parties in each parish, and he combined them in such a way as to convert a district of Quebec in which the Liberal party have all along had a majority into a district in which, in spite of that majority, his friends will be able to send to the support of the Administration a much larger delegation than they have ever been able to send in the past. That is the argument of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman, in undertaking to show how it was necessary to even up these things in that district, because its population was not up to the unit of representation, overlooked the fact that the Counties of Drummond and Arthabaska, that returns a Liberal to this House, and returned a Liberal in the last Parliament, has 44,000 of a population, a population as large as that which is required for the return of two members to this House; and that another hon. gentleman sitting in this House on the Liberal side represents a population of 64,000, a population large enough to return three representatives to Parliament. Now, the hon. gentleman ought to have taken these into consideration as well as the population of Montreal. But the hon. gentleman does not do that, and he undertakes to compensate the party for what he considers their large population in Montreal by keeping two counties side by side that are together entitled to one representative in place of two, and to keep two Liberal counties, that according to their population are entitled to five representatives, with three hereafter, that have up to this time had but two. Wherever we look we find the hon. gentleman has in this Bill proceeded upon precisely the same lines. I understand from the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) that whereas by the last vote the Liberal party had a majority in the Island, hon. gentlemen have divided the Island by this Bill into five constituencies in such a way that that vote would give to the Government three supporters out of five. Well, I am not going to discuss this matter further than simply to mention these facts, and to point out the uniform character of this measure. From the Pacific through to the Atlantic Ocean it bears exactly the same features. Wherever you go this mark is upon it; and while the Minister of Justice says that we ought not to consider the strength of parties in the present House when we are preparing a measure of this sort, every provision of the Bill, every alteration in the present constituencies of the country, shows that that has been the paramount consideration of the members of the Administration who prepared this measure. Sir, it has been well said by Dougald Stewart in his lectures on philosophy, that if a number of boys were standing under an apple tree, and a stranger were passing by, and one of them were to hit him with an apple, he might plead it was an accident, that it was not a matter of design; but if every one of the score of boys that were standing there, succeeded in hitting him, it would be very difficult to persuade the stranger that they did not intend to do what actually did happen. Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman were to succeed in pointing out that there was but one feature of this measure of the character which I have indicated, he might persuade the country that that was a mere accident, that it was not designed to give to the Government, or to the supporters of the Government, any advantage in the preparation of this measure. But when every provision of the measure, when every locality referred to in this measure, when every constituency created, or altered, or modified by this measure bears upon its face features indicating that the Government are to derive an advantage from it, supposing public opinion to remain what it is now, there can be no two opinions on the subject that what is contained in the measure is not a matter of accident, it is a matter of design. Now, Sir, there are certain principles which, it seems to me, ought to be considered in the preparation of a measure of this sort. We ought to bear in mind that our system of Government is not like that of the neighbouring republic; it is in form, and it ought to be in spirit

and in practice, the English parliamentary system. The English constitution is a somewhat delicate machine; it is not an artificial contrivance. A great deal of it is a matter of growth, and its characteristics are characteristics found in our constitution no less than that of the mother country. We have not only legal rules governing our conduct under the constitution, but we have also conventions, and these conventions are not less important, are not less necessary, to the proper working of the governmental and parliamentary machine, than the legal provisions. Now, under the English system there never has been an attempt to carve the constituencies out into equal electoral districts; there never has been any contention that Parliament is composed of two parties each of which represents a series of political propositions determined upon beforehand in convention, and which members have been elected to try and carry into effect. Each party may have a policy, but there are a hundred things that Parliament is called upon to do outside of mere party questions. There are a great many vital forces operating upon Parliament which are necessary to its healthy action, and any attempt to destroy them, any attempt to get rid of them will change the character of our constitution, and will necessarily change its character for the worse. We never vote in this country on abstract propositions. There are a hundred things influencing the conduct of the electors besides the more prominent questions upon which parties are divided. Why, the personal popularity of the candidate, his long experience, his ability, are all taken into consideration by the electors, and it not infrequently happens that the man who receives the majority of votes may be one with whose views on important public questions the majority of his constituents do not entirely agree; but in spite of those differences of opinion they nevertheless support him. So that the fitness of the man, and his relations to his constituents and his relations to the constituency, are matters that are always taken into consideration. Now, these are some of the numerous and important influences that operate upon Parliament, and upon the constitution of Parliament, under our representative system, and these have little or no place under the constitutional system found in the neighbouring republic. Sir, one of the advantages that grows out of the permanency of this constitution, is that you frequently have a very considerable number of men who remain for a long time in public life; you do not have a new man with every election. You have at a general election no doubt very many changes, but these changes after all do not produce the mistakes and blunders that would certainly take place in the conduct of public affairs if you had on every occasion nearly the whole representation of the people in Parliament composed of men without parliamentary experience. You have sitting in Parliament under the English system leading public men for half a century. They acquire great personal influence, their experience entitles them to possess that influence, and they exercise it, however much you may disagree with their policy on the questions that are for the hour before the House, on the whole in the public interest and for the benefit of the nation. I should like to see in this country as far as our circumstances will permit, this feature of the English system preserved. I believe it is one of the most important features of that system, and the representation in the Executive, important as it is, is not more important, not more advantageous than that continuity in public life which the English parliamentary system affords. When you undertake to change constituencies every ten years, and you cut and carve them up and disarrange the boundaries, you destroy this feature of personal and historic continuity which is to be found in public life under the English parliamentary system. But you do more than that. You destroy the historic continuity that exists between a constituency and its representatives in the past. I have no doubt whatever, and I think every one who has given any attention to the English parliamentary system will say, that able men, men of great ability and of large parliamentary experience who have represented a constituency, although they may be dead and gone, do not cease to exercise a healthy and invigorating influence on the constituency after they have departed. The constituency has a certain pride in its historic past that tends not a little to secure to it a better representation than it would possess under other circumstances. If you look at the American system you will find that the degeneracy in public life in a large degree dates from the period when obliteration of the municipal boundaries began and measures were introduced for creating equal electoral districts. I leave out of sight altogether the frauds which have been committed under that system, and the fact that frequently the minority have secured a majority of the representatives by the character of the divisions. No matter how fair those divisions are made, the effect of that system is to destroy anything like continuity in public life. Take, for instance, the municipality in which the representative resides. It may be taken out of the community with whom he has been in contact all his public life, and it may be placed in an adjoining constituency, where some local parties will possess a greater degree of influence than he himself possesses, and so he is superseded. He ceases longer to be a representative, and just as he was superseded by another, so that other, with the next change in the boundaries of the constituency, is himself put out of the Legislature and a new man is introduced in his place. In my opinion it is of very great importance that you should preserve municipal boundaries. The people in a county act together as jurymen, they are brought into contact with each other in the administration of justice and in their municipal government, and in their agricultural associations. There are a hundred ways in which they intermingle and become personally associated with each other. Every man knows who is the strongest, most prominent and most able man in the county in which he lives, and so the men best qualified to come to the front are the men who for the most part do so. But if you take one township from one constituency and put it into another constituency for electoral purposes, the men who belong to that township meet with those with whom they never meet except when there is a federal election, and I want to know what chance a man living in such a municipality has of being nominated for Parliament as against some one in that section in which the majority of the municipalities are found.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is that not an argument against all change?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly it is not. If constituencies always remained equal, there would be a reason against changing them, but if you divide a county that is entitled to two representatives into ridings, still the men who act together are those who were together for all other purposes. Each section possesses all the qualities possessed by the whole constituency before; it is not in the position of a constituency made up of fragments of various municipalities. It stands in a wholly different position, and you have in that arrangement the opportunity of preserving county boundaries, of distinguishing, where the population is adequate, between the urban and rural populations, a basis for distribution that is the proper one, one founded on sound, political considerations, one which recognizes the social organization of the community, and it does not appear as a mere mechanical contrivance, as has been the case since 1882. And you have further this feature, that, whenever a census is taken, every man in the country who is capable of reading knows which portions of the Dominion will be entitled to additional representation. This is a plan upon which representation may be fairly carried out, this is a plan by which you preserve the continuity of the constituency, this is a plan which places it out of the power of the Administration, if it is not already put out of their power by the provisions of the constitution, to alter and change the constituencies to the advantage of one party or to the detriment of the other party. There is another point which is important, and it is that there should be single constituencies. It is not proper to have two constituencies united into one. In the first place, it is extremely inconvenient. In the case of a bye-election in this city, why should a candidate be called upon to ask the suffrages practically of two constituencies in order to obtain a seat in Parliament? The same may be said of Pictou, Halifax and Hamilton, as well as of Ottawa. All these constituencies ought to be divided, and in no case should there be two representatives for the same constituency. If you have a division you increase the opportunity to each party of electing its candidate. Let us suppose in this instance one party had a majority of 20 or 50 in the whole city. If we divided the city, the majority may be found in one constituency. It might be found that the party who had a majority of 50 in the whole city, had a majority of 100 in one-half the city, and was in the minority of 50 in the other half. Is it not better and fairer, when parties are equally divided, that they each should have an opportunity of returning one, than that a majority of one should have an opportunity of returning two? We ask in this matter that the plan of representation should be a matter of conference between the two sides of the House. That is a reasonable proposition, and that is the plan which was adopted in England in 1884. There has been an attempt made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to show how this fact came about, but there is no denying the fact itself. Some hon. gentlemen have said that it was because the House of Lords refused to let the Representation Bill go through. The House of Lords opposed the Representation Bill, and they postponed it, but Lord Salisbury said in a speech, and I am using his own words: We did not defeat the Bill, we did not vote against the second reading of the Bill. We postponed its consideration, we had not yet determined whether we should support or oppose it, nor could we, until we knew whether the Government were to give us a fair Redistribution Bill or not. Lord Salisbury had a majority in the House of Lords, but it was not necessary to create new peers to carry that measure through. The Government never for a moment considered the propriety of that course. There was considerable talk of revolutionary changes in the constitution of the House of Lords, there were strong remonstrances made against the powers of an hereditary peerage, but the Government knew right well that if they chose to dissolve Parliament they would carry the country by an overwhelming majority, and that if they carried the country the resistance of the House of Lords would cease. That was said over and over again, and I am sure my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) who can call to mind the discussions which took place in England at that time, will remember well that there was no doubt whatever that if there was an appeal to the constituent body the Franchise Bill would be carried. It was rather with a view of saving the House of Lords than of carrying the Redistribution Bill that the Government gave their consent to the moderate plan of conferring with the other side and agreeing upon a basis of distribution. So far as we can know there was no indication or intention to depart widely from the position which the Government ultimately agreed to in the conference with their opponents, but there is the fact that a conference took place, that the party which had a majority of 120 in the English House of Commons agreed to a conference with their political opponents, and submitted a measure which their political opponents accepted as reasonable. Did the Imperial Government say what the Minister of Justice said here to-day: We are responsible for the legislation and we will not allow the minority to have a voice in this matter, we will not enter into a discussion with them. That was not the position taken in England. The discussion took place, the basis of agreement was arrived at, and that basis of agreement was arrived at outside of Parliament and not by discussion upon the floor of the House. The measure was submitted to Parliament after the leaders of the two parties had agreed to it. The hon. Minister of Justice said to-day that there is no precedent for the course which my hon. friend is proposing in this resolution. I maintain that the proceedings of the Government in England in 1884 was a precedent in point. The English Government entered into a conference with their political opponents on the character of a measure which they were to submit to Parliament, and to assume the responsibility for, and that was done prior to the submission of the Bill to Parliament for discussion. Why, Sir, it is not an unusual thing, even in this country, to take that course upon a measure which the Government themselves had declared their opinion to Parliament upon. Take, for instance, the Insolvency Act. Some years ago, the Prime Minister of the day, Sir John A. Macdonald, said that we ought to have an insolvency law, and he asked to have a conference between the various parties upon the subject, some of whom were favourable and some opposed to that measure. The Government did not assume the responsibility of bringing down the Bill, but they asked that the feelings and opinions of interested parties should be ascertained, and the present Prime Minister, I believe, was chairman of

that committee. They made a report to the House and that subject was dealt with by the House, the Government assuming the responsibility of supporting the measure as a Government measure. It was not prepared by the Government, it was not introduced by the Government, it was made the subject of conference, it was discussed and considered, and it was submitted to Parliament by the Administration. Now, my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) has introduced to the consideration of Parliament the provisions of the British North America Act which in his opinion and in mine, are inconsistent with the legislation now proposed. I think that he is entirely right in his contention that the Government has no authority to propose a measure of this sort, and that Parliament has not the right to legislate upon this subject in this way. The Minister of Justice has pointed out that this question is one upon which the House has already acted. He says that in 1872, and again in 1882, Parliament legislated upon the subject. Well, all I have to say is that the provisions of the law were not brought before this House then. The question was not made the subject of discussion. The particular provisions of section 51 were not considered, and I do not think that we are in the slightest degree bound by the want of attention on the part of Parliament on two previous occasions. In the case of the Queen *vs.* the Inhabitants of Houghton, which is reported, I think, in the first volume of Ellis and Blackburn, Lord Campbell said that Parliament may mistake the character of a measure, and that in the preamble of a Bill, it may recite as law that which is not law at all, and the mere recitation of a mistaken view of the law will not make it law. And so, in this case, Parliament, acting on a mistaken construction of that provision of the Act, will not make that mistaken view of the law a correct view, will not give them a power which they did not possess in 1882. We are just as free to consider the question of the jurisdiction of Parliament over this subject as we were in 1872. The hon. Minister of Justice says that the Local Legislatures have this power, and that it is unreasonable to suppose that this Parliament would be placed in a less favourable position. Well, Sir, I do not take that view. In looking at the articles of Confederation which were adopted prior to the Union, I find that by the 23rd article it was agreed that the Legislature of each province should divide such province into a certain number of constituencies and define the boundaries of those constituencies. That seemed to be the plan. There was some distrust as to the use which Parliament might make of its power; and if the hon. gentleman will look at the discussions which took place on Confederation, he will find the view expressed that you might hive the French; you might divide the Province of Quebec in such a way that the English-speaking section would have a majority of the representatives on the floor of this House. You might, from jealousy of the rapid growth of a particular province, so divide its constituencies as to prevent an adequate expression of its opinion in consequence of its increased population. To guard against such contingencies, it was proposed in the first instance, that the Legislatures of the different provinces should divide the provinces into constituencies for the Dominion Parliament. That, however, was abandoned before the delegates went to England; and when the British North America Act was framed for the purpose of carrying into effect the articles of Confederation—the Quebec resolutions which were agreed upon—this 51st section was substituted for them. What does it say? It says:

"On the completion of the census in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides."

That is clear. It does not say that there is an additional way or that the Parliament of Canada may do so-and-so; it does not say that there is an implied or expressed power in the Parliament of Canada to act in some other way. It provides this specific way, and I contend, and I shall endeavour to establish, that this is the only way provided by the constitution for altering the representation in this House. There is power to do what? For this House to readjust, by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, the representation in Parliament. You may create an authority, and you may give it instructions. You cannot give it discretionary power, because the Act says it must act in such a manner as you point out. You must point out some plan; you must devise some scheme; you must say that there must be equal electoral districts, or that the county boundaries shall be respected. Because you are bound to provide some plan, and you are bound to provide an authority for the purpose of carrying that plan into effect. Now, the hon. Minister of Justice referred to the 40th section of this Act. What does the 40th section say? It says:

"Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall have such and such a number of representatives."

"Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides"—provides how? In what way? Arbitrarily? No, Sir, provides in the way pointed out in section 51. It is authorized to provide in that way; it is not authorized to provide in any other way. Now, there is no rule of constitutional authority better settled than this, that you cannot set up an implied power as against an expressed one; you cannot, as a matter of inference or implication, maintain that there exists a power that will in effect vary or nullify or render useless an expressed power. An implied power has its origin in necessity, and springs from some power expressed. That is stated over and over again in the authorities. Now, Sir, there is not in this Parliament any inherent power, the hon. Minister admits, because this Government and Parliament are wholly the creation of a statute. At the same time there exists under a certain statute, just as there exists under the common law, certain implied powers. They are powers by implication—powers the existence of which are to be established in a particular way; they are to be established by showing that they are necessary to the proper exercise of the granted power. Unless you can show that you must fail. Now, I will take one case, which has been decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the case of Doyle *vs.* Falconer, in which the Legislature of one of the colonies maintained that it had the inherent power to arrest and punish for contempt. Let me read a

portion of the judgment of the Privy Council given by Sir James Colville in that case. I might refer to others which are stronger, but the Reports containing them are not in the library here. He says:

"It may be said that the dignity of an assembly exercising supreme legislative authority in a colony, however small, and the importance of its functions, require more efficient protection than that which has just been indicated; that it is unseemly or inconvenient to subject the proceedings of such a body to examination by the local tribunals; and that it is but reasonable to concede to it a power which belongs to every inferior court of record. On the other hand, it may be urged, with at least equal force, that the power contended for is of a high and peculiar character: that it is derogation of the liberty of the subject and carries with the anomaly of making those who exercise it judges in their own cause, and judges from whom there is no appeal; and that it may be safely entrusted to magistrates, who would all be personally responsible for any abuse of it to some higher authority, it might be very dangerous in the hands of a body which, from its very constitution, is practically irresponsible. Their Lordships, however, are not at liberty to deal with considerations of this kind. There may or may not be good reasons for giving by express grant to such an assembly as this, privileges beyond those which are legally and essentially incident to it."

He says further:

"That extraordinary privileges of this kind, when regularly acquired, will be duly recognized here, is shown by the recent case of Dill *vs.* Murphy. But their Lordships, sitting as a court of justice, have to consider not what privileges the House of Assembly of Dominica ought to have but what by law it has. In order to establish that the particular power claimed is one of those privileges, the appellants must show that it is essential to the existence of the assembly, an incident *sine quo res ipsa esse non potest*. Their Lordships are of opinion that it is not such an incident."

That is the rule. It is the rule that the power must be a necessary incident to the exercise of the power which is granted. There is a power granted here. We are entitled to have a House of Commons: it has to be elected every 5 years, if not sooner dissolved. It is based upon population as between the provinces. Then there must be a redistribution of seats. If there were no provision for a redistribution of seats, certainly the power would be here, and be here upon the principle that we have a grant of powers, and this is a necessary incident to carry that grant into effect; but when the constitution itself does prescribe the rule by which that grant is to be exercised, when it prescribes how that power is to be carried into effect, when it tells you that there is to be a redistribution of seats by a tribunal created by you, and acting under instructions from you, in which you prescribe the manner and the time it must be followed, and all the more because by it we have protection against the very abuses we complain of in this Bill. There is a special provision in the law for the exercise of this power, and I deny altogether that it is or can be implied in the grant which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. It has been said by a very high authority in the United States as well as in the United Kingdom that you cannot claim as an incident of an express grant what is an express grant already in some other way. I will refer to two cases in the United States decided by Chief Justice Marshall where this rule is laid down. In the one—McCulloch *vs.* Maryland—he says this:

"Take for example the power to establish post offices and post roads."

That is the power granted, there is nothing further said in the constitution with regard to the authority of Congress on that subject beyond what is contained in those words. Chief Justice Marshall says:

"This power is executed by the single act of making the establishment. But from this has been inferred the power and duty of carrying the mail bag along the post road, from one post office to another. And from this implied power has again been inferred the right to punish those who steal letters from the post office or rob the mail. It may be said, with some plausibility, that the right to carry the mail, and to punish those who rob it, is not indispensably necessary to the establishment of a post office and post road. This right is indeed essential to the beneficial exercise of the power, but not indispensably necessary to its existence. So of the punishment of the crimes of stealing or falsifying the record or process of a court of the United States or of perjury in such court. To punish these offences is certainly conducive to the due administration of justice. But courts may exist, and may decide the causes brought before them, though such crimes escape punishment."

And so he points out that whatever is necessary to the due exercise of a power is an implied power, is an incident to the power so granted; and so in another case, the case of Anderson against Dunn, which was a case of privilege raised in Congress, Chief Justice Marshall says:

"It is true that such a power, if it exists, must be derived from implication, and the genius and spirit of our institutions are hostile to the exercise of implied powers. Had the faculties of men been competent to the framing of a system of Government which would have left nothing to implication, it cannot be doubted that the effort would have been made by the framers of the constitution. What is the fact? There is not in the whole of that admirable instrument a grant of powers which does not draw after it others, not expressed, but vital to their exercise, not substantive and independent, indeed, but auxiliary and subordinate."

Now, that is the rule. Is this power of legislating, as the hon. Minister proposes in this case, vital to the exercise of this power of distribution? Why, the very section which I have read shows that it is not. Parliament may give to Quebec more than 65 members, there is no provision that it may give less, yet the hon. gentleman, if his argument were a good argument, would, notwithstanding that provision, imply that this Parliament might increase or diminish the representation at Quebec. If the power is implied, it is a power that may be exercised independent of these sections, but I say that the power here is an expressed grant, and you cannot set up as incidental to any other power a power in opposition to the grant. The grant is that:

"On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and on each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority and in such a manner and at such a time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides."

That is the way in which you are to exercise this power. There is the express provision, these are the directions given, and this Parliament is required to act in consonance with these directions and in conformity with this grant. It has no right to go outside of the grant. If the contention of the Minister were a sound one, notwithstanding the grant was given to create courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada, the Parliament of Canada might constitute itself into a court and undertake the administration of justice. I say that the Parliament of Canada cannot do so. All the provisions of the Act show that the administration of justice is to be vested in another tribunal. It is provided in this constitution that representation in the Parliament of Canada of the provinces can only be based upon population. I say, looking at this last provision, that it is for the purpose of

protecting each particular province against the effects of a possible combination hostile to it, and that which protects the provinces also gives protection to the political party. I do not know that party matters were kept in sight at all in this provision. I suppose what was aimed at was the protection of the provinces against injustice, against oppression by the abuse of the power of redistributing the seats; and to prevent that abuse, you are called upon to constitute an authority, but that authority is not entrusted with any discretion. You are to give that authority instructions to act in the manner and at the time you decided. That is the provision of the law; and I think it is perfectly clear that it is in the public interest, as it is in the interest of good government for all time to come that this power should not be exercised by the Parliament of Canada otherwise than in the way marked out by the British North America Act, and I have no doubt that this Parliament has no other power and no other way of redistributing seats than in the way pointed out by the Act. It has the power to alter and make revision in accordance with the provisions of the law and in that way alone; and if Parliament gives effect to that view of the constitution, which I believe is the correct view, then the country will be protected against those abuses which occurred in the Redistribution Bill of 1882, and which are to be intensified in the Bill now before the House.

Mr. DAVIN. I shall trouble the House but a very brief time while I explain the vote I intend to give on the motion and amendment that are now before the House. The Bill is an agreeable disappointment to me and to a great many others, and I think, if they would confess it, is also an agreeable disappointment to the hon. gentlemen who have criticised it for two or three days past. I think there has been in the minds of gentlemen outside of this House, in the minds of publicists and in the minds of hon. members of this House on both sides, a great misconception as to the character of the Bill. The Bill has been criticised very acutely and with great vehemence at times, but so far—and this applies to the speech of the leader of the Opposition as well as to the speeches of those who came after him—the criticism has been mainly of that character, as the Minister of Justice pointed out, which might more properly be made in committee. That remark has this exception, although it is probably hardly an exception. The main argument which has been used against the Bill, until the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) spoke this afternoon, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) who spoke just now, is not that it does not lay down principles of action, principles that both sides of the House could agree to, but hon. gentlemen have assailed it because they said it gave an undue advantage to the Conservative party. That is the main ground of assault by one member after another. But I had the pleasure of listening to the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) last evening, and he showed that in regard to the Province of Quebec, which is the only Province about which there was any serious apprehension, so far from this measure being an undesirable one, instead of its being a harsh measure so far as the Liberal party are concerned, if the principle which has been attributed to the Government of trying to make a party advantage out of this Bill had been acted on, the redistribution might have been carried to the Quebec district, and the result would have been very much more serious so far as the Liberal party is concerned. Now, Sir, I entirely hold that we should approach a measure like this dealing with the redistribution of seats at each decennial census without regard to party one way or the other. I hold that we ought to have fixed principles of action, and I only wish that we could have done what was done in England, that we could have principles laid down to guide, the authority if you like, which some contend is contemplated by the 51st section of the British North America Act, to have principles to guide such an authority as were contained in the instructions given to the Boundary Commissioners in England in 1884, and let those persons, without regard to party one way or the other, decide what are the bounds of the electoral districts. I have before me the report of the Boundary Commission, and the directions given to them are such as would certainly commend themselves to any fair-minded man. In the first place the commissioners were:

"To examine the surveys maps of the Ordnance Department and determine from them and other documents in the possession of that department and of the Local Government Board, and from other available information, the boundaries to be assigned to the several divisions of each county to be divided. In forming the divisions care must be taken in all those cases where there are populous localities of an urban character to include them in one and the same division, unless this cannot be done without producing grave inconvenience, and involving boundaries of a very irregular and objectionable character. Subject to this important rule, each division should be as compact as possible with respect to geographical position, and should be based upon well-known existing areas, such as petty sessional divisions, or other areas consisting of an aggregate of parishes."

Now, in 1882, I happened to fight in the County of Norfolk I think for two months against the hon. member who sits here for North Norfolk, and I remember that I did not like the Bill that had been passed in that year by my own party, and I would never deal with it, and the persons who would call out, when I concluded my speech, "What about the Gerrymander Bill?" Were not the Reformers but the Conservatives in that riding, and some of them were very angry. For instance, some were brought in from Oxford to the County of Norfolk, and what occurred? We squeezed the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in that portion of the county which was supposed to be his stronghold. His majority was brought down there, but where we expected a very large vote we got a very small one because the men who had been brought in from their old associations were angry and refused to vote for the Conservative party. So it does not always follow that a party will gain from a gerrymander. When I went to see whether this principle of compactness had been complied with in Quebec—and I got one of my hon. friends from Quebec to go over the map with me—I was well pleased to observe that the principle of compactness had been maintained. I had before my mind at the time the distorted and monstrous constituencies which were carved out of Ontario by Mr. Mowat.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen say "oh." They do not like to hear that, but they can make night hideous here for a week denouncing the provisions of this Bill which I say is an agreeable disappointment to those of us who expected a Bill like

that of 1882, and find instead that we have a moderate Bill and one that, although it may not go on all fours with the principles I should like to see obtain with regard to these redistribution measures, still can be substantially regarded as bearing out the promise made by the Minister of Justice. The directions to the boundary commissioners go on:

"Each division will be named from some important town or place within it, preference being given to any merged borough or boroughs, or when it consists wholly or mainly of some well known area, from that area. When the divisions have thus been provisionally determined, public notice must be given of their contents by advertisement in one or more local newspapers, and a day and place appointed for the attendance of one of the members of the commission or an assistant commissioner at some principal town in the county to hear any objections to the proposed constitution of the divisions and receive proposals for their alteration."

That, I think, is a very just arrangement, and I am calling attention to all this now, not because I am pressing its adoption on the Government, for that is now too late, but in the hope that some arrangement may be made in the future so that we may come to such a fixed arrangement that henceforth the people of the country may always know what they may expect, and on what lines the Government will proceed. Similar principles are laid down in regard to boroughs. Now, let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that I listened with great attention and much political edification to the admirable speech made last night—not the briefest speech I ever heard in my life, but still the admirable speech made by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins). He went over the whole subject, and he showed that he was master of it, and it was a most instructive speech. Nevertheless my hon. friend laid down some principles that I certainly do not agree with. He argued, for instance, that where you have a population in a town or a city, and you have a number of counties, say 20 counties—I remember that was one of the cases he took—and these 20 counties will aggregate the same population as a city or a town, he seemed to argue that the town should have nearly the same representation as these 20 constituencies. Sir, it has never been the principle in the English constitution to represent heads, nor is it, as he contended, a principle in the history of English political life, to represent interests; the real principle is the representation of communities. I have a great deal of sympathy with what fell from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that we ought to try and preserve as much as possible the arrangement of the county bounds, the historical county feeling in the people. I hold that is an important thing, and as I say, I found in 1882, in Norfolk, the greatest possible irritation amongst the Conservatives that had been brought from Oxford into Norfolk, because they had been taken from their old associations, removed from their moorings, from amongst their old friends, and they resented it in the manner I have described. Now the illustrious man whom we all mourn in this House, laid down, in 1872, principles that I am sorry were not adhered to in 1882. I believe the result would have been practically the same. It is only the other day that that great man sat amongst us, and I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen, whether they were accustomed to hear him here, or only know him as a great name, will not be unwilling to hear the principles that he laid down in 1872:

"With respect to rural constituencies, the desire of the Government has been to preserve the representations for counties and sub-divisions of counties as much as possible. It is considered objectionable to make representation a mere geographical term. It is desired, as much as possible, to keep the representation within the county, so that each county that is a municipality in Ontario should be represented, and, if it becomes large enough, to divide it into ridings. That principle is carried out in the suggestion I am about to make."

And he goes on to show in detail the importance of having men grow up in their counties, become members of the county council, engage in its municipal affairs, become attached to their county, become known to the people of that county, and, by and by, if they aspire to Parliament, if they aspire to serve their country in a larger sphere, their fellow-countymen will know who they are and will be ready to give them their support. Now, there is an hon. friend of mine in this House who has taken the trouble to go over the bounds of the constituencies as they were when we came into Confederation, and he can show, as I hope he will be heard in this debate, that if there had been no tampering whatever with the bounds of the constituencies, so far as the political result goes, it would be very much as it is. Now, Sir, at the risk of hearing "oh" again cried out over here, I say, when one party does a wrong, another party is apt to follow in its wake; and in effect the hon. member for Queen's almost threatens something like that to-night, although I think without any reason. I think this Bill is, on the whole, a moderate measure. I expected the attack on this measure would be full of force and storm; I expected to hear the roar of cannon and the thundering of catapults; but instead of that I have only heard comparatively mild criticisms, and the reason is that the measure does not invite the sort of attack that we expected to hear, and which would only be forcible and effective if the measure had been such as the papers and the people, Conservative and Liberal throughout the country have been led to believe it was. But, Sir, if Mr. Mowat—it is a horrible thing to think of—if Mr. Mowat had not gerrymandered, he would probably not be Sir Oliver Mowat to-day; and to quote the language of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)—for it is not my language—I would not stoop to anything so cruel as that—if Mr. Mowat had not become a political assassin, he would never have worn a star. But, Sir, can you blame men from Ontario, can you blame members from Ontario, for what they did in 1882, and the way they felt at that time? My hon. friend the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has got several maps of constituencies made by Mr. Mowat, now Sir Oliver, and if these were sent to the World's Exposition and there exhibited, I will venture to say that the people would flock around them like bees around a sugar barrel, to see the curious, and complex, and distorted lines of those gerrymandered constituencies in Ontario.

An hon. MEMBER. Name them?

Mr. DAVIN. They are too numerous to name. Now, I will only briefly deal with the argument that there is an English precedent. I think that the hon. member for L'Islet and the hon. and learned Minister of Justice have settled that. But what can there be of reason in the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) saying there is an English precedent for this? Has any man ever risen up in the Eng-

lish Parliament to refer a Redistribution Bill to a select committee as he proposes? All that was done, as the Minister of Justice explained here to-night, was to get rid of a dead-lock. There was a conference between the leaders on both sides, and there was a joint agreement. But what did Mr. Goschen say about that joint agreement? What did other hon. members say about it? They said: We hope the fact that there is a joint agreement between leading members on each side of the House, is not going to destroy the independence of members of Parliament when they go into committee on this most important measure. So I say here, that if the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Government and one or two others from each side, were to meet together and come to an agreement, it would be open to this House, and properly so, to repudiate that agreement if they liked, because on this House must rest the responsibility of dealing with this measure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I suppose my hon. friend agrees with me, but I do not see how, if he agrees with that position, he can maintain the highly technical argument that he went into with regard to the 51st clause. Now, I will speak with great diffidence about the 51st clause because, after the argument made by the Minister of Justice, by a great lawyer, it would be an impertinence on my part if I were to try to deal with that question again. But as my hon. friend has made an argument about it, and as I think there are perhaps some points that may properly be dwelt on, I will, with the indulgence of the House, say a few words about section 51. I want to point out one thing about it. You had in 1872 and 1882 this same kind of question in Parliament, and you had sitting where the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) sits now the most distinguished man his party has produced and one of the greatest lawyers in Canada, Edward Blake. You will read his speeches in 1872 and 1882 in vain to find him taking a point about this section 51. Considering the legal acumen of Mr. Blake, that from the character of his mind to take a point of this sort was exactly the thing he would be most apt to do, I think the people of Canada will come to the conclusion that when he sat there and never thought of raising it, although it has now been raised by able men, by lawyers too, but still not Edward Blake, that fact will have some influence with the great Liberal party throughout Canada, and will probably mollify the indignation of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen). The hon. member lays down the proposition that you cannot set up an implied power against an express power. With deference to the hon. member I would say, although I am not so skilled in interpreting statutes as he is, still I know something about the English language, that we are not dealing with implied power. Take section 40 to which the hon. and learned gentleman referred. It says: "Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and so on." That is not an implied power, it is an express power given to Parliament. Again in section 41 we finds the words: "Until Parliament otherwise provides, all the laws in force in the several provinces at the time of the union relative to the following matters, &c."

Again, as the Minister of Justice pointed out, in section 47 the same words are used, and I say it again with deference, because my life during recent years has been devoted to politics and literature and my legal studies may be rusty, but I understand the English language, that we are not dealing with an implied power, but with an express power. Again, with great deference to the hon. member for Bothwell, I never heard in my life, and I have been attending Parliaments for twenty-five years, an analogy drawn between a Parliament and a man entrusted with power by a legal instrument. I confess, and I say it unwillingly, that when the hon. member for Bothwell read those cases, I did not think they were very much in point. Let me read section 51:

"On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules."

I ask the hon. member for Bothwell what is his authority? Hon. gentlemen of the Opposition have provided us with the authority—it is the committee referred to by the leader of the Opposition, a committee of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. DAVIN. I thought it was. Have you changed your mind?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No. Does the hon. gentleman want me to answer him?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The object of the committee or conference is to determine the manner in which we shall deal with this subject. To determine on the policy is the object of the committee, and then the House will create an authority to carry that policy into effect.

Mr. DAVIN. I think it will be admitted that those hon. gentlemen have only come to the light of reason very recently, because when the leader of the Opposition moved his amendment to refer this matter to a select committee, he had no idea then whatever of any authority, or we should have had that point in the hon. gentleman's speech. The authority clearly in their minds was that of a committee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all.

Mr. DAVIN. Cannot the Committee of the Whole do all that a committee of five, six or ten men can do? What is to prevent hon. members in Committee of the Whole proposing before members of the House, who constitute the proper party to deal with this matter, the rules on which, in their opinion, the Bill should deal with this subject? When the different clauses come up, they can do so. Reverting to section 51, I shall be very glad, even for my legal instruction, to have it pointed out by some subsequent speaker how my reasoning is at fault. What is to prevent the Committee of the Whole being the authority to deal with this matter?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The House of Commons is not Parliament; it is Parliament that creates the authority.

Mr. DAVIN. Suppose a certain number of members of this House were appointed a committee, would they have any power or virtue that the

whole of the House in committee does not possess? For my part I will say—and again I almost scruple to presume to give an opinion like this—that the fact that we have the power to create an authority presupposes a power in ourselves that we can exercise, and, I contend (I may be out in my interpretation and reasoning, but if I have any memory of what were formerly considered to be true principles I think it is a correct position which I occupy) that this House having the power to create an authority can itself do what the authority it might create could do. I cannot understand how in the ordinary affairs of life action between attorney and client, a man or body that has power to create an authority, to do anything, cannot himself or itself do it. The hon. the Minister of Public Works made a speech which struck me as a very forcible piece of debating, and at the close of his speech he said:

"I am not prepared to say that this Bill is not open to criticism. I am not prepared to say that something else should not have been done, and I believe that if fair amendments be proposed, we would be disposed to take them into consideration and perhaps accept them if they were really fair and reasonable. I say that frankly, but I hold that it is unfair on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite not to give us the credit of having acted on principles of justice in order to avoid throwing the country into agitation, and in order to make the changes in the fairest manner possible."

Now, Sir, when the Minister who tells you that he was practically in charge of the Quebec portion of this Bill makes a statement like that it ought to be frankly received, and when as we find from the splendid speech made last night by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) and from the speech made by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), that possibly looking at the spirit that might prevail in strict partisans either Conservative or Liberal, the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches may say with Warren Hastings, when he talked about what he had done: "If you had known my opportunities you would have been amazed by my moderation."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That was Clive.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, I am glad to be corrected by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Since I have been in this House, my hon. friend has tried to correct me again and again, but he was always wrong, so that I am glad he is right for once. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hold that when the Minister of Public Works makes a statement like that, the hon. gentlemen ought to be ready at once to go into Committee of the Whole, and to give up denouncing this Bill in language and criticism that would only apply appropriately to what is done in committee. For my part they may be perfectly certain, and I know it is true of other gentlemen who support the Government, that if they make fair and reasonable proposals, we will be ready to consider their proposals, not from a partisan point of view, but from a point of view having regard to the general good feeling and advantage of the country. I should like very much if we could devise some means of avoiding, at each decennial census, the possibility of what took place in 1882. I should even like to avoid what is taking place at this time, namely, that when the Government have prepared a measure against which so little can be said of a reasonable character, yet that throughout the country there should be a widespread impression that something very wrong had been done. It is a bad thing that throughout this country people should think that a Government composed of men whom they should honour would proceed to create a measure, actuated not by principles of justice, which are the only principles that can properly underlie legislation and give it sanction, but actuated solely and wholly by party motives. We do not know how this Bill is to emerge from committee, but I have no doubt the Government will meet the Opposition in the spirit of the words of the Minister of Public Works. I say, regarding the measure broadly, that the country is at the present minute under a misconception of its character; and, having looked at the measure and having heard the statements concerning it, I rejoice to find that it is probably a measure more fair, more just, less leaning towards party, less interfering with the proper bounds of constituencies, and less antagonistic to those principles which should guide a redistribution than any measure that would come from any other Government having a party character. I believe that the people of this country, when they understand the Bill thoroughly, will come to that conclusion too. Why, Sir, I should astonish this House if I were to repeat what an hon. member of the Liberal party said here in my hearing, as to what would happen if they were to get into office before the decennial census came. Then, he said, there would be such a gerrymander that a Conservative success would never be in sight again. Hon. gentlemen in the Opposition cannot dare to say that that is a wrong imputation levelled at them, and for this reason: High as one after another of them stands; supreme the niche as one after another occupies in the temple of the Liberal party; there is a niche above it all where Saint Oliver Mowat reposes. He is the great politician, he is the embodiment of all that is virtuous in Presbyterian humanity, but yet this immaculate Grit gave such a gerrymander as was never perpetrated by any man aspiring to the rank of a statesman. You could hardly believe he would do it. It reminds me of a story the old Puritan tells. He relates that when Elisha met the great Israelitish captain, he looked at him steadfastly in the face and wept, and the great Israelitish captain said: Why doth my lord weep? And Elisha answered: Because I foresee what evil you will bring on this people. You will rip up their mothers, you will destroy their children, you will dash them to the flags. You will destroy the country, and he gave a fearful description of the devastation he would bring on Israel. The captain said: Is thy servant a dog that I should do this thing? But the old Puritan says the dog did it after all. So, Sir, except by experience we never could have known what Sir Oliver Mowat would have done:—but the dog did it after all. I say that when this moderate measure is understood by the country, all the attacks we have had in the Liberal press and here, too, will act as boomerangs on the Liberal party, and when these gentlemen assume tones of virtuous indignation we cannot but remember that the very best and choicest specimen of virtue amongst the whole lot did perpetrate the gerrymander of Ontario.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It would be impossible for me to follow the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat in all his wild ramblings for the last half

hour. I assume that the speech which he has delivered to-night is similar to the speech which he was to have delivered in the city of Stratford, but which for some unfortunate reason, over which he had no control, was never delivered. I believe that the hon. gentleman was sent out that night to a place called St. Bridget's school-house, and although the meeting had been advertised for two or three weeks and it was announced that the great orator of Assiniboia would be there to deliver one of his powerful addresses, yet only three persons attended altogether, and so the public were saved the infliction of the speech he intended to deliver.

Mr. DAVIN Yes, but I spoke at Bornholm and I raised the Conservative majority there.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I believe that our Conservative friends in Stratford say that if Davin had never come up there at all they would have had a chance to carry that county, but the moment he came there he killed their chances for ever, and they do not want the Conservative party ever to send him back to Stratford again, or anywhere in North Perth. The hon. gentleman started out fairly in his speech. I thought he was going to support the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, but it is characteristic of his speeches that you never know where they are going to end, because he will start out in one way and then he will cut across the line to the other side, and then he will be back again to where he started, and when he comes to vote it is ten chances to one, that his vote will be in contradiction to what he is talking about. That has been his course in the House. You never can tell, by listening to a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman, how his vote is going to be recorded. I suppose it is just as the whim takes him at the time. He started out by saying that he would have been glad if this matter had been left to commissioners, as was done in the case of the boundary award, in order that a fair and equitable arrangement might be arrived at. That I think is just in the line of the amendment before the House, and it seems to me that is a fair way of dealing with the subject. But the hon. gentleman after a while got off the track again, and got back to his old line, and then he devoted a good deal of his time to abusing Sir Oliver Mowat and his gerrymander in Ontario. Now, it does not matter much to this House whether Sir Oliver Mowat gerrymandered the counties or not; that is no justification for our doing something equally bad. But the hon. gentleman, when asked to mention one solitary instance in which Sir Oliver Mowat gerrymandered in Ontario, was unable to do so, and he cannot do it. It is easy for hon. gentlemen to get up here and make assertions that the Province of Ontario was gerrymandered and the constituencies contorted in every possible direction; but when you pin them down to the facts and challenge them to name a case, they are silent as dumb dogs.

An hon. MEMBER. What about Toronto?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think that in the Province of Ontario one single instance can be mentioned in which county lines have been disturbed. It is true, some of the constituencies have a very irregular shape; but that could not be avoided because, as any hon. gentleman who looks at the map will see, the constituencies as they were laid out at Confederation were in a very irregular shape, and it would be quite impossible to so arrange those counties as to put them into a regular or compact shape. The only case in which county lines may have been interfered with was where an incorporated town lay on the boundary between two counties, in which case the incorporated town was placed in one county or the other. I think the only exception to that was the village of Stouffville, in the County of York, which was allowed to remain as it was before, divided between two counties. That was done because the people of that village petitioned to the Local Legislature asking that it should be done; and I believe that when the next redistribution of seats takes place that anomaly will be done away with, and the whole village will be placed in one county or the other. But I do not think any man can show where the redistribution of seats in the Province of Ontario was not made on a fair and well-defined plan. As a matter of fact, when the general election took place in 1883, after the redistribution of seats, a majority of the constituencies which had been redistributed returned Conservatives to the Local Legislature, showing that the distribution as it was carried out was more favourable to the Conservative party than to the Reform party. Under these circumstances, I think it is very unfair for the hon. member for Assiniboia or any body else in this House to get up and fling out broadcast mean, contemptible and unworthy statements against a man who has held the confidence of the people of Ontario so long as Sir Oliver Mowat has done; and it would be well for the hon. member to emulate the christian statesman of the Province of Ontario. If his actions were patterned after those of that christian statesman, it would be better for him and for this country. The hon. gentleman has also stated that after listening to the able speech delivered by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) he was convinced that this measure was not as bad as it was said to be. Well, the hon. gentleman's paper at all events has denounced this Redistribution Bill in no unmeasured terms. He has denounced it and advised the Government, in the interest of justice, to withdraw the Bill, holding that it was an unfair measure, and that it ought not to receive the sanction of this House. But to-night he has received new light on the subject.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not say that. Where did I say it should be withdrawn?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I presume that the hon. gentleman will not go back on the organ which represents his views. I believe the Regina *Leader*, which receives some $6,000 or $7,000 a year in subsidies from the Dominion Government, is the hon. gentleman's organ, and it speaks pretty plainly on this question. I will read an extract from this paper, published on 23rd May.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Oh, that is a week ago.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, it shows what the hon. gentleman's views then were. He says:

"The Redistribution Bill in its present shape is encountering some hostilities in other quarters than the Opposition. British Columbia is not satisfied, a protest has gone up from Lincoln, the Conservatives of Quebec district are asking for concessions, and the Maritime Provinces are showing more or less discontent. With a little modification, the Bill might be a very good one, but we hope the Government will consider the advice contained in the *Leader* of the 16th inst, where we said: The true course is to drop the Bill and pass an Act creating an impartial tribunal which shall on well-understood principles redis-

tribute the seats after every census. The Government is strong, as we pointed it out then, but its strength is a reason which on several grounds should impel it to take a course that will commend itself to the justice of the country."

Mr. DAVIN. I understand the hon. gentleman to attribute that to me. I never suggested it, I never wrote it, I never saw it in manuscript, and had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is an editorial in your own organ, and I would advise you, if the organ does not reflect your views on this question, to repudiate it. It is awkward for an hon. member to have an organ and to have that organ calling on the Government to drop the Bill, declaring that the Bill is an unfair one, and that the matter should be referred to an impartial tribunal, and then have the hon. member himself get up and advocate another cause. But as I have said, you can never tell where this gentleman is. He has been on two or three sides to-night. He started out by saying he was sorry that the matter had not been left to a commission, and he wound up by saying, with reference to the Gerrymander Bill of 1882 and his experience in Norfolk, that he wished the same state of affairs could be avoided which existed in 1882. He saw the effects of that Bill in 1882; and I tell you, Sir, there was not a man in the Province of Ontario who would not blush for shame to attempt to defend that iniquitous measure. It was such a measure that I do not wonder the honest electors showed their resentment in many instances by returning the men whom it was designed to crush. The hon. gentleman wound up, as I have said, after being on two or three sides, with the wish that this state of affairs which existed in 1882 might be avoided, and that a system could be devised which would be fair and just to the whole country. That is just what the leader of the Opposition is proposing by this amendment. No fairer system could be proposed than that the leaders of the two political parties should meet together and discuss the measure. We have many precedents for this. When this House meets for the first time, we strike our committees and see that in every committee both sides are represented, and how much fairer would it not be for the two political parties to meet together and decide upon the terms and conditions and procedure to be adopted in redistributing the seats. By such means, neither party would be given the advantage, and neither party should have the advantage. We ought to have a fair, honest, practical measure which would give a proper representation to both parties, according to their numbers. That is one reason why I believe this measure should be referred to a committee of both political parties. No man can say this is a fair measure. There is no justification for it at all. In the first place I do not think there should be any redistribution of seats in Ontario or Quebec, because neither is entitled to any extra members. So far as the other provinces are concerned, it is necessary there should be redistribution, but I think it would have been better had the measure been confined to those provinces. So far as Ontario and Quebec are concerned and some of the other provinces, I submit that this measure is a most unjust one; and for that reason I support the amendment to refer it to both political parties, in order that some scheme may be devised by which a more just measure may be brought about. No one looking at the Bill can fail to admit that it was conceived in iniquity; no one can fail to admit that its sole purpose is to legislate into this House a number of Conservative members who cannot get their seats in any other way and to keep out a lot of Reform members who cannot be kept out in any other way. A measure designed for that purpose is not in the interests of the country, and should be opposed by every true lover of his country and by every man who has a spark of honour or manliness about him. Take the cases that have been referred to. Is there any possible justification for this iniquitous measure which proposes to take a township from the County of Russell and give it to Prescott? There is no possible justification for it. There are many cases to show the unfairness of this measure, but I will only recite the following. I take eight counties in the Province of Ontario represented by Conservatives and eight in the Province of Ontario represented by Reformers, and what is the result? These are the Conservative counties:

	Population.
Lennox	14,902
Brockville	15,855
Prince Edward	18,892
Frontenac	13,445
Grenville South	12,931
Leeds and Grenville	13,523
Northumberland West	14,947
Peterborough West	15,808

Now, you will see that in these eight counties represented by Conservative members, the total population is only 120,313, or an average of 15,038. These eight counties return eight members on the Conservative side, and their average population is 7,962 less than the unit. Now take eight counties in Ontario which return Reformers:

	Population.
North Essex	31,532
South Essex	24,032
Kent	31,434
Bothwell	25,595
North Oxford	26,131
North York	26,909
North Waterloo	25,325
South Waterloo	25,148

Those eight counties return eight Reformers to this House. Their total population is 216,087 souls, and an average, of 27,011 each. So that we have, on the one hand, eight Conservatives, each representing only 15,038 souls, and eight Reformers each representing 27,011 souls, and in this Redistribution Bill there is no provision made for changing the state of affairs at all. It is therefore a most unjust measure, which should not go to the second reading, but be referred to a committee to see if some modification cannot be made of this injustice. We might go further and take other counties which have been interfered with in the Province of Ontario. What is the reason that they have taken the County of North Wentworth and wiped it out by amalgamating it with another county and allow Grenville South with 12,031 to remain as it is? simply because South Grenville returns to this House a supporter of this Administration while the other county returns an opponent of this Administration. They have interfered with the boundaries of counties in the Niagara district and have jumped from Niagara district to the extreme eastern section of Ontario, allowing all these little counties to remain, such as Lennox, Brockville, Prince Edward, Frontenac, South Grenville, Leeds and Grenville and West Peterborough. Then they jump all the way to the County of Russell and

think, by taking a township from that county and adding it to Prescott, they will defeat the hon. member who now represents Russell. So far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, I do not think the measure is a fair one at all, and it ought not to go to the second reading. We know that, although the Conservatives have nearly three-fourths of the representatives here from that province, the Reformers hold a majority of the popular vote outside of Toronto. That is not fair or just. Take the County of Middlesex, for example, which returns four members to this House. The popular vote of that county would give a majority of 600 to the Reformers, and yet out of the four members three are Conservatives and only one is a Reformer, because the province has been gerrymandered out of all shape and reason in order to legislate into this House members who could never get here in any other way. That is very unfair and is not in the interest of the province or of the Dominion. Then take the Province of Quebec, and, though I do not know that as well as I do Ontario, I can see that the same injustice exists there as exists in Ontario, and I wonder that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) who has just come into the House, did not look up this matter a little more, because I am sure, with his great ability and his love of fair-play, if he had carefully studied and examined this matter for himself instead of taking the hearsay of some one else for it, he would have adhered to the just and fair decision he came to a few days ago, when he demanded that this Bill should be withdrawn and referred to a just tribunal.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order. I never made a statement of the sort.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think the best thing the hon. gentleman can do is to refer the difference between himself and his editor to a tribunal. You know the old saying: A house divided against itself will go to the wall. In the Province of Quebec, I find that a very great injustice exists. I will take seven counties that return Conservatives to this House, and seven counties that return Reformers. Take the seven counties that return Conservatives: Quebec West, with a population of 9,241; Vaudreuil, 10,803; Soulanges, 9,608; Brome, 14,709; Montcalm, 12,131; Montmorency, 12,309; L'Islet, 13,822, or a total population of 82,623, an average of 11,803, which is only about half of what the unit should be which amounts to about 22,900. Now take the seven counties which are represented by Reformers: We have Quebec East with a population of 36,200; Ottawa North, 32,000; Ottawa South, 32,000—although that is not the population as given under the new Bill, but represents the total population of 64,000; Drummond and Arthabaska, 43,923; Beauce, 36,222; Lévis, 25,995; Nicolet, 28,735; or a total in those seven counties of 235,075 against 82,623 in the seven counties that return Conservatives. The average in the Liberal counties is 33,582, and in the Conservative constituencies 11,803. The seven Liberal counties have about three times as much population as the seven counties which return Conservatives. I submit to you that there can be no justification for allowing such a state of affairs as that to exist. It is manifestly unjust to the whole Dominion, and especially to those counties where there is such a large proportion of the people represented by so few. In referring this matter now to a commission or to a committee of the leaders of both sides of the House, this anomaly would be removed, and we would arrive at a fair basis which would be just to both sides of the House. I think that the amendment is one which should commend itself to every fair and honourable man in this House. I am sure no one can desire that an injustice should be done. The Conservatives have a large majority in this House and they should be not only just but generous, and I think it is a cowardly thing on their part now to try and gerrymander the province and the counties so that they will have the advantage at the next election. If there is any manliness about them, any fairness or honour about them, they will not perpetrate a scheme like this, which will tend to deprive a large number of the people of this Dominion of their just representation in this House. Surely if the Government cannot stand upon its merits and appeal to the people upon its acts and the measures it has carried in this House for four or five years past, if these acts and measures do not commend themselves to the good feeling of the people, that Government ought to go to the wall and give place to one that will pass measures which will commend themselves to the people. Now, the history of the two political parties in this country has not, in my humble opinion, been to the credit of the present Government and the party. I say that the Conservative party to-day are only carrying out the policy and system they have pursued for many long years. We know that to the gerrymander of 1882, eight or ten hon. members of this House owe their seats, and through the Franchise Bill, the appointment of returning officers, with the aid and influence of the Red Parlour and the reptile fund, they have succeeded in retaining their hold on this country. I was surprised at the member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) last night, when he tried to impress upon this House that the Province of Quebec was a Conservative province. He said that in 1887, and during all the bye-elections in that province until the general election of 1891, the Conservative party had always been able to carry a majority of the members from that province. Why, Sir, in face of the revelations that are being made from day to day in one of the public journals of this country, is it a wonder that the Conservatives got a majority from the Province of Quebec? In my opinion the wonder is, not that they secured a majority in that province, but that we ever elected a single man in the Province of Quebec, and in my opinion it speaks volumes for the honour and integrity of the people of the Province of Quebec in that they withstood the corruption, and the bribery, and the boodle, and all the influences that were brought to bear upon them to induce them to vote against their consciences. We have from day to day, in one of the leading organs of this country, the most scandalous exposures of the way in which bribery and corruption were carried on in the Province of Quebec during the election of 1887. I may say that although an hon. member of this House has been charged with perjury by one of the leading organs of the country, charged openly and above board with perjury, one of the gravest crimes with which a man can be charged in this country, yet that hon. gentleman is obliged to sit day after day in his seat and dare not say one word, dare not get up and bring an action against that paper. And

there is the hon. Postmaster General whose signature is coming out every day, "Please pay to so and so $500 for legal expenses in such and such a county." And yet a few weeks ago when charges were made against him, although he said there was not a word of truth in them, he was not bold enough, he was not manly enough, to go before a committe in which his own friends would have a great majority——

An hon. MEMBER. Question; question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am on the question. You don't like that, perhaps, but during this discussion you may hear more of it than you desire. I say that the majority which hon. gentlemen opposite have secured from the Province of Quebec, is largely owing to the fact that enormous sums of money have been spent in every election I believe, at all events, in one that we know of, to return supporters of those gentlemen. We know that not only in the Province of Quebec but in the Province of Ontario likewise the same system is carried on. Why, what was stated by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) last year? When he asked for a committee to investigate certain charges he stated that not only the present Minister of Railways was in the soup, but another hon. gentleman who stands high at the bar in the city of Toronto, was also implicated to a very great extent. And, Sir, although that hon. gentleman pretends to be a very honourable man, and has often expressed himself eloquently here upon various questions, yet when the vote was taken, he quietly got up and without saying one word he voted down that resolution, because he felt convinced in his own mind that the accusations would be sustained and the charges proved against him. Sir, I wonder that the hon. member for L'Islet last night should have dared to make the statement he did. I think that he ought rather to be ashamed of such a statement as that the Province of Quebec was a Conservative province. Sir, I believe that if the electors of this Dominion could poll their votes without any influence, without any Gerrymander Bills, without any bribery, or any boodle, or any restrictions being placed upon them by the Franchise Bill, nine-tenths of the representatives in this Chamber would be on this side of the House. I think sufficiently has been said by gentlemen on this side of the House to induce the House to support the amendment which has been proposed, and very little has been said against it. We all expected that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would have given us his views upon that question. A legal point was raised with reference to the British North America Act; I am not sufficiently posted on that point to enter upon a discussion, but I could not help but notice the peculiar manner in which the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) took upon that question. There is one beauty about him, and that is that he is never afraid to tackle any question. Let it be a legal point, or a philosophical point, or a constitutional point, or matrimonial point, or anything else, the hon. gentleman is always ready to stand in the breach. But, while professing a certain measure of independence, he always lands on one side. Now, the member for Assiniboia took the point that, because clause 51 was not objected to by the Hon. Mr. Blake, whom we all admit is one of the brightest and ablest minds in the Dominion, therefore there was nothing in it. But I do not understand that in 1872, or 1882, that point ever came up, and it is just possible that the Hon. Mr. Blake never gave his attention to that particular point. But it does not matter whether he did or not. It is right and proper for us now to raise the point and discuss it, and I certainly expected that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson), and the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), who is well known to be one of the greatest constitutional lawyers in the Dominion, and whose views upon this subject would be of great weight and of great assistance to us, would have spoken. When a legal point comes up we look to these legal minds to enlighten us, and I hope before the debate closes we shall have the pleasure of hearing those hon. gentlemen give their views upon this particular point. I consider it is a very important one, and one that should receive the attention of the House. If it is true, as is contended by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), that we have no right to pass this Bill, that in fact the Bills passed in 1872 and 1882 were illegal, it is high time the point was settled before we go further. Under these circumstances it is the bounden duty of the House to adopt the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, which is one that will commend itself to the people of the whole country. It is in these words:

"That all the words after 'That' in the said motion be omitted, and the following be inserted instead thereof:—'That Bill No. 76, an Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons, be referred to a conference or committee to be composed of both political parties to agree upon the lines or principles on which a redistribution Bill should be drawn.'"

That is a fair proposition, and is one that ought to commend itself to every one. It does not propose any advantage to either side. It is simply that a conference, a committee composed of both political parties, should agree on the principles upon which a Redistribution Bill should be brought in. There are many principles to be considered. In my opinion, county lines should not be interfered with. Again, it is questionable whether we should give every 23,000 people a representative. Some people hold that the cities of Toronto and Montreal should not be represented so fully as the rural districts. I quite agree with that view. Take, for instance, Montreal, although it has a very large population, there are no less than thirteen members of this House who live there. It is true they represent counties outside the city, but at the same time they have an interest in the city and will watch that the interests, rights and privileges of Montreal are not injuriously affected, and therefore I think that if Montreal had been allowed to remain as at present, with three members, this would have been the proper course. When we take counties 40, 60, 100 or 200 miles long by 40, 60 or probably 100 wide, they should be represented by members, although their population may not be up to the required standard. For these reasons, and for other reasons that have been advanced, I think it is highly proper that this Bill should be referred to a committee which should decide the lines and principles that should be adopted, and I believe, if they do so, the advice tendered by the Regina *Leader* will be acted upon,

that this Bill will be withdrawn, and one will be presented to the House that will deal fairly, honestly and justly with the people of this Dominion.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House for more than a few moments, as I have no intention of making a speech on this question, but I wish to say a word with respect to a statement I made in my place the day before yesterday, and which was contradicted by hon. gentlemen opposite. I stated:

"When he refers to precedents in England, when he refers to Mr. Gladstone's generosity in consulting with Lord Salisbury about his Redistribution Bill, does my hon. friend recollect that Mr. Gladstone was compelled to do so, that the House of Lords refused to pass his Franchise Bill until he had disclosed something about the Redistribution Bill?"

I was interrupted by cries of "no, no," and I asked who says "no." The hon. member for Bothwell said, "I said no." I then said:

"Then I say my hon. friend is, as usual, entirely mistaken as to the facts. I say it is a matter of notorious history."

In regard to that statement I wish to quote a passage from the Imperial *Hansard*, which I think will make it sufficiently clear that what I said was correct. When the hon. member with great gravity calls attention to the manner in which they were in the habit of dealing with questions of this kind in England, and asserts that Mr. Gladstone, the leader of the Liberal party, had in a spirit of generosity approached his opponents and consulted them with respect to the Redistribution Bill, I wish to invite his attention to what the facts were. Mr. Gladstone introduced the Franchise Bill, which enfranchised 2,000,000 of voters, there then being about 3,000,000 voters in England; so he added 2,000,000 voters to 3,000,000 already existing. He did not accompany that Franchise Bill with a Redistribution Bill, as had been the invariable custom in England previously. When he introduced his Bill in the House of Commons, exception was taken to the fact that a Redistribution Bill was not introduced, and it was stated that it was impossible to deal with the Franchise Bill without knowing what the Redistribution Bill was to be. Mr. Gladstone refused to introduce a Redistribution Bill, alleging there was not time for it. The majority at the back of the Government forced the Franchise Bill through the House of Commons. It came up to the House of Lords, and Lord Cairns moved an amendment, to which reference has been made to-day by the leader of the House, to the effect that the Franchise Bill should not be passed by the House of Lords until a Redistribution Bill was before them, and he pointed out, in the course of his remarks, what the result would be if a Franchise Bill were passed first without any reference to a Redistribution Bill. He said:

"A Redistribution Bill may be brought in. It is not likely to please everybody; and suppose it does not satisfy those who are not supporters of the Government, what will be the consequence? Was there ever before an engine of this kind put into the hands of a Government? The parties say: 'We do not like this Redistribution Bill.' The Government say: 'You must either take it or leave it; if you do not take it you leave the election to the new electors without any redistribution at all.' Is that a course which it is fair to take towards Parliament—to call upon Parliament to legislate under duress."

This was the generosity of Mr. Gladstone. Lord Cairns had previously pointed out what the result would be in case a Redistribution Bill were not brought in before the elections took place, and he said that at the time of the introduction of the previous Reform Bill Lord Beaconsfield, then Mr. Disraeli, had made this calculation, that there would be 1,750,000 county voters returning 187 members and 1,250,000 borough voters returning 297 members. So that would be the effect of holding elections without the introduction of a Redistribution Bill. Lord Cadogan, in referring to the matter at a later period, said that, briefly, the principles which were then enunciated (that is by the House of Lords when supporting Lord Cairns's resolution) were that redistribution must accompany extension of the franchise, and no Franchise Bill could otherwise be passed; and, further on repeats that their lordships had decided they would not allow the Franchise Bill to pass until they knew the provisions of the Redistribution Bill and what the effect would be at the general elections. He goes on to quote a passage from the great leader of the great Liberal party, and I wish to call the attention of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition to what Lord Cadogan quoted from Mr. Gladstone:

"The right hon. gentleman in addressing his supporters last week said: 'The passing of a Redistribution Bill is impossible this session. And there is no mode, I venture to tell you, in which a majority in the House of Commons though you be—you can carry a Redistribution Bill through the House of Commons unless the House of Commons and the Conservative party in that House has a motive for allowing its progress.' The object of this was to show that unless the Prime Minister had these two millions newly enfranchised, but undistributed voters to hold in terrorism over the heads of members of the House of Commons, he would find it impossible to pass a Redistribution Bill. It was therefore acknowledged by the Prime Minister that the withholding of redistribution was not done to expedite reform generally, but as a deliberate plan to enable him to force Parliament to accept whatever Redistribution Bill it may be his pleasure to present."

Lord Salisbury, in referring to the matter and in referring to the reasons which induced the House of Lords to refuse to pass the Franchise Bill without the Redistribution Bill, said:

"The Conservative party would be in the position that they would be obliged to accept the Redistribution Bill whatever it might be, because if they did not accept it, the Government would be able to go to the electors on the Franchise Bill without redistribution at all."

Mr. LAURIER. Just as we are.

Mr. McNEILL. We are not speaking of "just as we are" at all. The difference between a thickly populated country such as England, and between a country such as Canada, is enormous, as the hon. gentleman knows. In the counties in England, the meaning of passing a Franchise Bill of this kind was to throw thousands of urban votes upon the rural constituencies. We have nothing of that kind here at all, and moreover that is quite beside the question. The question is: As to whether or not Mr. Gladstone was following a generous policy in regard to this matter, or whether he was forced to do it?

Mr. LAURIER. According to all that, but for the tactics resorted to by Lord Salisbury, the Conservative party in England would be forced to accept whatever redistribution was forced upon them, just as the Liberal party are forced to do here.

Mr. McNEILL. Not by reason of their being forced, as hon. gentlemen are, at all, but

by reason of the duress held over them by the passage of a Franchise Bill which had enfranchised nearly two million voters. The House of Lords continued its opposition and refused to allow the Bill to pass, and eventually when Mr. Gladstone found it was impossible to have his Bill passed in any other way, he proposed the compromise of a consultation with his opponents to which my hon. friend has referred. That is rather a different condition of things, from what my hon. friend in his speech the other day led us to suppose were the facts. But my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) enters into the controversy and he endeavours to give us new light upon the subject to-night, and he tells us that the reason of this consultation was a kindly interest on the part of Mr. Gladstone for the House of Lords, and he says that in point of fact the House of Lords had been opposing the Franchise Bill, and that the people of the country were very much incensed at the House of Lords, and that it was in order to save them from the result of an election in which they would be punished by the country, that this proposal was made. Great as my surprise was yesterday, when I was contradicted when I said that Mr. Gladstone had done this because the House of Lords had refused to pass his Redistribution Bill; if it were possible, my astonishment was greater to-night when I heard my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) make that extraordinary statement.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friend yesterday did not use the word "refused"; he used the word "rejected."

Mr. McNEILL. I have the *Hansard* here. I find that I said: "The House of Lords refused to pass the Franchise Bill until they knew something about the Redistribution Bill." My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), as I told him yesterday, was entirely astray as usual as to his facts. If it is conceivable he is still more astray as to his facts to-night. I am surprised that an hon. gentleman who lays such store by his knowledge with regard to constitutional questions should be so utterly ignorant as to the facts in reference to what was described by Lord Shaftesbury as the greatest constitutional crisis in the history of England since 1832. Lord Shaftesbury said: "That he had remembered and had passed through the crisis in 1832, and that this was even a greater crisis than that." My hon. friend, speaking of a notorious matter of history of that kind, actually tells us that the desire on the part of the Liberal party at that time in England was to save the House of Lords from a general election.

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

Mr. McNEILL. What did he say? He said that it was because the House of Lords had not passed the Franchise Bill, and that it was because the Government did not wish the House of Lords should suffer the consequence, as the country was indignant at the House of Lords. What are the facts? The facts were that the House of Lords had been asking to go to the country. The hon. gentleman shakes his head again. Now, I will give the hon. gentleman chapter and verse for it. Here is what Lord Salisbury said:

"In the presence of such vast proposals we appeal to the people. We have no fear of the humiliation with which we are threatened. We do not shrink from bowing to the opinion of the people, whatever the opinion may be. If it is their judgment that there should be enfranchisement with redistribution, I should be very much surprised, but I should not attempt to dispute their decision. But now that the people have in no real sense been consulted, when they had, at the last general election, no notion of what was coming upon them, I feel that we are bound, as guardians of their interests, to call upon the Government to appeal to the people, and by the result of that appeal we will abide."

The hon. gentleman for Bothwell says the House of Lords did not ask an appeal to the people at all and did not want it. Why, Sir, if he had known anything at all about the matter, he would have known that one of the accusations brought against the House of Lords was, that they were trying to force a general election. The statement was made on every platform that the House of Lords were exceeding their constitutional privileges and dictating to Her Majesty as to when she should dissolve Parliament. The hon. gentleman says that there was a great fear that the House of Lords would be swept away by public opinion. He ought to know that while there were public meetings held in England denunciatory of the conduct of the House of Lords in reference to this matter, which were attended by twenties of thousands of people: yet there were public meetings comprising as many as one hundred thousand people to support the action of the House of Lords. The hon. member for Bothwell dissents. Was there not such a meeting? Was it not stated in the *Times* and other leading journals of England that in the great public grounds at Manchester there were a hundred thousand people supporting the position taken by the House of Lords? And this meeting was addressed by Lord Salisbury. The hon. gentleman shakes his head; he does not remember about that either, I suppose; but nevertheless it is the fact; and when my hon. friend again contradicts me in regard to matters of fact, as he did the other day, I hope he will be a little better informed than he has been on this matter.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier:

That the said Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be referred to a conference or committee to be composed of both political parties to agree upon the lines or principles on which a Redistribution Bill should be drawn.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan.	Geoffrion,
Armstrong,	Godbout,
Bain (Wentworth),	Grieve,
Beausoleil,	Guay,
Béchard,	Innes,
Beith,	Laurier,
Bernier,	Lavergne,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Bowers,	Legris,
Bowman,	Livingston,
Brodeur,	Lowell,
Brown,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bruneau,	McGregor,
Campbell,	McMillan (Huron),
Carroll,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mignault,
Casey,	Mills (Bothwell),
Choquette,	Monet,
Christie,	Paterson (Brant),
Colter,	Perry,
Davies,	Proulx,
Dawson,	Rider,
Desaulniers,	Rinfret,
Devlin,	Rowand,
Edwards,	Sanborn,
Featherston,	Scriver,
Flint,	Semple,
Fraser,	Somerville,
Frémont,	Vaillancourt.—58.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baker,
Barnard,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Boyle,
Burnham,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carignan,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Corby,
Costigan,
Curran,
Daly,
Davin,
Davis,
Denison,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins L'Islet),
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Hearn,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Mackintosh,
Maclean (York),
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McKay,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moncrieff,
Northrup,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Patterson (Huron),
Pope,
Pridham,
Putman,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Simard,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tupper,
Turcotte,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville).—109.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Col. Prior,	Mr. Edgar,
Mr. Foster,	Mr. Gillmor,
Mr. Bowell,	Mr. Lister,
Mr. Taylor,	Mr. Sutherland,
Mr. Montague,	Mr. Mulock,
Mr. Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mr. Préfontaine,
Mr. McDonald (Victoria),	Mr. Fauvel,
Mr. McKeen,	Mr. Borden,
Mr. Craig,	Mr. Forbes,
Mr. Burns,	Mr. Gibson,
Mr. Marshall,	Mr. Landerkin,
Mr. Pelletier,	Mr. Charlton,
Mr. Ives.	Mr. Delisle.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. McCARTHY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. McNEILL.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 3rd June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior, for year ending 30th June, 1891.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Midland Railway of Canada.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 90) to amend the Patent Act and Acts amending the same (from the Senate).—(Mr. Carling.)

DIVORCE BILLS.

Mr. TISDALE moved first reading of Bill (No. 92) for the relief of Hattie Adele Harrison (from the Senate).

Motion agreed to on a division.

Mr. TISDALE moved first reading of B. l(No. 91) for the relief of James Wright (from the Senate).

Motion agreed to on a division.

THE VOTERS' LIST OF 1891.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron) moved second reading of Bill (No. 67) respecting the Voters' lists of 1891.

Mr. LAURIER. This Bill contains only two provisions, one to give validity to what we may presume to be an informality with regard to the printing of the lists, and the other to dispense with the annual revision. I have no opposition to offer to those two provisions; but I would suggest to the hon. gentleman whether, instead of dispensing with the revision of the lists year after year, it would not be more advisable to abolish the Act altogether. Nothing, in my judgment, can better show how utterly wanting in proper results this Act is, than the fact that year after year the Government have to pass this legislation, and dare not put the Act into operation. This Act was passed in the year 1885; we had a revision in 1886, another in 1889, and another in 1891; and as to the other years, the Government did as they are doing now—they asked authority from Parliament not to apply the law. No greater confession that the Act is weak and mischievous could, it seems to me, have been given, and though I will not press the question this year, I hope that next year he will see his way to repeal the Act altogether.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I have only to say, in reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition, as I announced to the House when this measure was introduced, that it is the intention of the Government to introduce such legislation next session as shall tend to a simplification of this Act and a reduction of the expenses in connection with its enforcement.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not propose to object to the second reading of the Bill; but when

it goes into committee I propose moving an amendment to the second clause, to except the city of London from its operation. The hon. gentleman who moves the Bill is aware that there are 250 odd names upon the list of London that every one admits are not there by virtue of any qualification they possess.

Mr. CARLING. That is not so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, I am stating what I believe to be so. Their qualification was enquired into by the revising officer, and he ordered those names to be struck off the list. They were restored to the list by the county judge solely upon the ground, as every one knows who has examined his judgment, that the notice given by the parties complaining was not such a notice as the law required. Therefore, it seems to me that it would be a monstrous thing under the circumstances for this House to interfere with the ordinary operation of the law, and to retain upon the list so large a number of names that ought not to have found a place there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to state to the House that I have been informed that if clause 1 of this Act is passed in its present form, without any qualification, it will undoubtedly affect one or two election cases now before the courts. I am informed that a ground of objection to one or two elections which are now in dispute is that these formalities were not complied with, that the list was not properly returned, and is invalid and illegal. I assume that the hon. Secretary of State has no intention of violently interfering with the ordinary course of the law by promoting *ex post facto* legislation for the purpose of destroying the claim of any suitor now before the courts to annul an election by reason of an infraction of the law, and that he will not object to allow a proviso to be inserted to maintain the rights of all the parties before the courts. I think we should be given to understand, before the second reading takes place, that no such intention lurks under this clause.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I am not aware of any such case, but when we go into committee we will consider the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Bill (No. 89) to amend the Dominion Lands Act and amendments thereto was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of repealing clause 17 is to do away with the absolute provision which exists now that the Territories when surveyed shall be laid out in blocks of four townships each. As a matter of fact, it has been found in many cases impossible, and in nearly all cases exceedingly inconvenient, to comply with that provision, and as a matter of fact strict compliance with it has never been found practicable. It is proposed to strike out that clause, and leave the matter optional.

On section 2,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The only alteration made in that is to enable triangulation surveys now being made on the mountains to be made use of for the purpose of the surveys of the department. In the Rocky Mountains, surveys in the ordinary way are not practicable, and a system of triangulation surveys is now being carried on which will be applied to the lands mentioned in this section.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I can understand how this triangulation shall be carried on in prominent points in a mountain district, but this refers to lands surrendered by the Indians to the late Earl of Selkirk in the Red River and Assiniboia districts. These seem to me to be in the limits of the old section of the country, which was in the hands of the Hudson Bay Company and their factors prior to its acquisition by Canada.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Up to line 23 is the old section in the old Act. This is to allow fractional pieces of land, which are often found after a survey, particularly in this part of the country where the river lots are laid off, to be surveyed so as to be described in the regular way.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that the new part of the section, as it is worded, is governed by what precedes, and that if the intention is to give power to employ this system of survey to the mountainous district far west, the whole section ought to be recast. I have not had an opportunity of examining it very closely, but it strikes me in this way. The first part says:

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent the land upon the Red and Assiniboine Rivers, surrendered by the Indians to the late Earl of Selkirk, from being laid out in such a manner as is necessary,"—

And so on. It seems to me that what follows: "Or to prevent the lands in the mountainous regions"—that is the mountainous regions of the district already referred to—and that is not what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We might add the mountainous regions in the North-West Territories and the railway belt.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is drawn in a very cumbersome way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. "To prevent Dominion lands in the mountainous region and where the ordinary mode of survey is impracticable."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is all one sentence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will show the hon. gentleman what the philosophy of the clause is. The preceding sections in the original Act down to section 20 contain the provisions as to how surveys shall be made and lots laid out, and section 21, which we here remodel, is the one providing for all exceptions. There are, first, the exception for land upon the Red and Assiniboine Rivers surrendered by the Indians to the late Earl of Selkirk; then fractional sections or lands bordering on any river or lake or other watercourse or on a public road; and then as to lands lying in the mountainous districts.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There ought to be some word inserted in line 20: "Upon the Red and Assiniboine Rivers or subdivisions of, or such subdivisions of fractional sections or lands bordering as above, or other lots or wood lots per patent," and

so on. All these expressions would seem to refer to what precedes in this same section, and it seems to me there ought to be words inserted to give it wider scope than any proper construction of the phraseology would give it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We might word it: "To prevent any Dominion lands in the mountainous regions."

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 3,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that this is rather a harsh provision. In the beginning of this section it reads:

"But such pre-emption right, if not exercised and payment made within six months after the settler becomes entitled to claim a patent under his homestead entry, shall be forfeited."

The man may reside upon the property, and at the end of the three years he may have performed all the duties required of him and may have become entitled to his patent, but, if he does not pay for the pre-emption of 160 acres within six months after that, he is to forfeit that pre-emption. That seems to me a great hardship. If the Government secured him as a settler, and he has completed the act of settlement, on the completion of that he is good for the amount of his liability on the pre-emption, and he ought not to be required to make payment within six months under the penalty of forfeiture of the 160 acres.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is a part of the old clause. As a matter of fact, that has not been the practice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It ought not to be the law.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it ought not to be the law, but I know of no case where a pre-emption has been cancelled in accordance with that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The words of the section are: "shall be forfeited." The Minister cannot be discharging his duty, if that be the law and the land is not forfeited under those conditions. The better thing is to make the law conform with justice.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That question has been raised, and the land commissioner has pressed that upon me and upon my predecessor, and I should not object to see that erased. The object of the new portion of the clause is to relieve a settler who has a second homestead and pre-emption from being compelled to build a second dwelling house, which would be a rather foolish regulation to enforce, but the clause imposes upon the settler the burden of performing a little larger cultivation than was required under the old law. As to this section, the clause might be made to read "may be forfeited."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There should be some reasonable time given, because a party who takes a homestead has to put up buildings and performed settlement duties, and got his team, and has done a number of things before he can earn any money from his produce to make this payment. He will hardly earn any money for three years, and it will take four or five years before he will be able to obtain enough to let him live. The Government might charge him interest on the arrears. The rule which prevailed in Ontario many years ago was that the Government charged a reasonable amount of interest on the payments which were in arrear, but the lands were considered a sufficient security for the payment. Here you are putting arbitrary power in the hands of a Minister, because all the settlers may not be on the same footing, and some of the agents may not be of the same character as others, some may be harsher than others, and I think it would be sufficient if the Government provided that payment should be made within five years after the homestead patent has been obtained, and then that interest shall be charged on the payments in arrear. I know of lands in Ontario where the payments were not made for twenty years after they became due, but the lands were not confiscated, because they were considered to be ample security and the Government were fully protected against actual loss. I think the settlers in this case should be dealt with in a similar way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It seems to me that the entire abrogation of the right of forfeiture would be rather a serious step to take. There are certain duties imposed on those who take up lands. One is the payment of money by a certain time, and the Act gives six months grace after that time has expired. I think it should meet all objections to say that the right may be forfeited or shall be liable to forfeiture instead of shall be forfeited, otherwise there are no means of compulsion. The hon. gentleman speaks of entries made under provincial systems under which settlers were allowed to be a long time in arrear, and it is true that some of them paid and some even with interest, but in the meantime the province has a right to put the settler off, and he is there only on sufferance, and that is what we want here. If six months is too short, it may be made longer, but the right of the settler should cease afterwards unless the Minister sees that the reasons he gives are sufficient.

Mr. MASSON. Reference has been made to the practice in Ontario with reference to similar cases, where free grants are given along some of the roads and pre-emption for the adjoining 50 acres. That is the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I understand a longer period, three years, is given. But there always was, even in the ticket that the settler receives setting forth his rights, a notice of forfeiture if he did not comply within the time. I know a case where parties have applied to purchase the pre-empted right where the settler was in arrear, and the practice in Ontario then was to give the pre-emptor notice to pay up within a short time, otherwise his pre-emption right would be forfeited. That, I think, is the practice, but I am speaking from memory. I think the Act provided a term of forfeiture much the same as the section before us. It is only a matter of practice. I think that six months is too short a period, and I would suggest that it be made a year, or six months after notice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There ought to be five years. Take any young man going in from Ontario to the North-West Territories; all that he will earn, not only during the period which he has to acquire a homestead, but for at least as long a period thereafter, is taken in providing himself with the necessary farm outfit. You do not want to take his money from him and cripple him just at a period when it is most important that he

should retain in his possession everything that he can earn beyond what is necessary to enable him to live. If I remember rightly, in nearly all the western states a period of five years is given before the law enforces payment. Now, if we are going to do anything here with regard to pre-emption, you ought to give some time to the settler to put himself in a condition of comparative prosperity before you undertake to call upon him to pay for his pre-emption. But here you make pre-emption payable at the very moment that he has earned his homestead. Now, I say that is a great hardship. I would like to ask the Minister whether he has found it possible in the case of 1 per cent of all the settlers in the North-West Territories to secure compliance with this Act? I do not believe he has. Then why put upon the Statute-book a law which puts the possession of his pre-emption land at the absolute mercy of the department. That is not the condition of things you desire, and it is not a condition of things that suits the settler. No man on land on which he desires to acquire his property, wants to hold his rights to those lands at the sufferance of a Minister of the Crown, or of anybody else: and if you fix a period that he shall pay, not within six months after, but within five years after, you would adopt a very much more reasonable rule. I venture to say that if in the Province of Ontario you take the lands that were sold by the Crown to the settlers, a period of ten years is much more near the average than a period of five years. I would like the Minister to say whether he thinks that settlers who are five years in arrears have in any considerable number paid for those pre-emption lands; and if that be so, judging from experience, you will see that no such rule as you lay down here can be enforced, nor ought you to try to enforce it. Give the settler a chance for his living, and he will make a better and more contented settler, and he will have more heart to promote his own material well-being, than if you undertake to cramp him up in this way.

Mr. DALY. The anomaly in the clause under discussion, it seems to me, is that it is imperative. In no case in my experience has the Government ever enforced this term of payment. The simple fact that the Minister has given time, shows that he was not acting within the true scope of the Act. This Act says that it "shall" be forfeited. That being the law, he would have no right to use that discretion, but that discretion has been used. Now, in the first place, the homesteader must perform his duties within three years, that gives him three years' time for the payment of his pre-emption, and by that time he is in a pretty good condition. The change I would suggest is that the word "shall" be struck out and the word "may" be put in, making it permissive; and instead of saying that payment shall be made within six months after the settler becomes entitled to the claim, say the payment shall be paid within two years. That would give him five years from the date he gets the homestead entry within which he would be able to pay it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The time is too short.

Mr. DALY. There must be a time fixed. If you do not fix a limit he could go on and cultivate the whole 160 acres, and possibly at the end of five years abandon it altogether. Such things have happened. I would suggest that the word "shall" and the words "six months" be struck out, inserting the word "may" for the word "shall" and "two years" instead of "six months."

Mr. McMULLEN. I look upon the whole provision as an exceedingly objectionable provision. In the first place, the time is too short for an actual settler to comply with the terms and pay the money into the department within six months. It is well known that settlers who go into that country usually require all the means they have, and it will take them some time, in the cultivation of the soil, to earn sufficiently to enable them to meet their ordinary wants and then pay the amount that they are required to pay to the Government. Another very objectionable feature is this: it keeps the settler entirely under the thumb of the Department of the Interior. When my hon. friend, who has just addressed the House, goes around to canvass, the probabilities are that a number of these people, when he will approach for their votes, will say: Well, Mr. Daly, my land is in arrears to the Government, the time for paying the money into the department is expired, and I am exceedingly anxious to know whether they are going to urge me or not. My hon. friend can turn round and say: Never mind, I will make it all right for you. That gives him a powerful argument with the settler to secure his support. Now, we do not want semi-landlordism like that in the North-West. We want the settlers in that country to be independent in the exercise of their franchise, at liberty to vote for or against the Government, just as they please. In order to place them in that position you should give them time to pay the amount that they are required to pay. I am quite willing that these words: "shall be forfeited," should be erased and replaced by "shall bear interest at a reasonable rate."

Mr. DEWDNEY. It does bear interest anyway.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then there is no necessity for the word "forfeit," that should be struck out. My hon. friend has referred to the system in Ontario. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Masson) says that in some cases people have been ejected, their rights have been interfered with by others buying. I do not know in my long experience of thirty years, and coming in contact with people for whom I have handled Crown lands, one case where a man's right was sold out over his head and given to another man. I have heard of some cases where timber lands were taken: people occupying those timber lands were taking away valuable timber, and in those cases they were called upon to pay before they were allowed to strip the land of its value. But where the intrinsic value was in the land itself, I have not known of a single case where men were interfered with and for lack of making payments had to leave the land. This provision should be recast, so that the actual settler would be placed in an independent position. He should be simply required to live on the land for six months. After making his entry he should be compelled to erect a house within six months, but the payment for the land should be extended over 5, 6 or 10 years at moderate interest. That is the principle adopted with Ontario, and the Minister of the Interior should apply it to the North-West. There is another feature to which I desire to call attention. Section

b provides that the settler must prove to the satisfaction of the land commissioner or his chief clerk the fact that he has performed those particular duties. I understand we have homestead inspectors in the North-West, who are engaged in examining these lands. Why should a settler be compelled to travel 30 or 50 miles for the purpose of appearing before the land commissioner or his chief clerk, when he might make the necessary proof before a homestead inspector?

Mr. DEWDNEY. When a settler makes application for a patent a homestead inspector is sent, and on his report the local agent of the land office reports whether the settler is entitled to his patent or not. It is the homestead inspector who makes the report.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why, then, does the clause provide that the settler must satisfy the land agent or his chief clerk? It should be sufficient to satisfy "the duly authorized agent of the Government." The other clause with respect to the independence of the settler as to payments to the Government should be so arranged that the payments would be extended for at least five years, with interest, so that the settler should not be placed under the thumb of any Government, because it is unfair to subject him to threats of ejectment, from year to year.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the motives of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) are excellent, and I sympathize with them; but I want to point out to him an inconvenience that would arise from having his suggestion acted on. The hon. member wants to have a man who gets a patent granted five years within which to pay for his pre-emption. Is that so?

Mr. McMULLEN. This clause provides that where a man takes a pre-emption he has six months within which to become a settler.

Mr. DAVIN. No. I thought the hon. gentleman did not exactly understand the matter; and, in fact, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was, I rather think—although I know he thoroughly understands the question—rather mixed, certainly he was so in speaking of settler and pre-emptor in the United States. What happens is this. When a man settles and fulfils the conditions for getting a patent, which takes three years, there is a provision that after six months from that time he shall be bound to pay for this pre-emption or forfeit his right. I understand the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) suggests that the settler should have five years to pay for the pre-emption—that there should be no forfeiture if he did not pay it for five years. That, I understand, is what the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) also desires. I wish to point out what would happen, and what this clause has prevented in the past and is intended to prevent. A man gets a patent for his homestead. It has unfortunately happened both in Manitoba and the North-West, not very frequently, but too frequently for our object in settling that country, that a man enters and gets the patent, and having got the patent removes from the country, and does not cultivate the land, and is not a farmer at all. He has fulfilled the conditions to get a patent, without having any intention of farming, but practically to hold 160 acres for speculative purposes. He secures his entry for a quarter section that he thinks a railway coming along, or a town spreading towards it, or some future contingency happening will make valuable. Take that man; and if you had not such a clause as this, and if five years must elapse before he forfeited his right to the pre-emption if he did not pay, he would simply pay the interest for five years, which he could send to the Department of the Interior, and although a good settler might come in, this man, who was improperly holding the land, contrary to the spirit whatever may be the letter of the Act, could continue to do so. He could pay the interest on the amount, whether $400 or $450 as the case might be, to the Department of the Interior, and although the Minister might see that a great evil was being done so far as that pre-emption was concerned, and very great evil would be done if these cases were numerous, he could laugh at the Minister and claim the right to that pre-emption, and then if his railway came along and the land was made valuable, at the end of the five years he could pay the amount, sell the land and pocket the balance. I may say that this clause has never worked any evil in practice in the North-West, and it is rather late in the day to change it now. Very few people, comparatively, would be affected by it. Pre-emption has for some time been abolished, and the political evil which the hon. member for Wellington fears, I do not think has appeared either in Manitoba or the North-West. What might be done, if the Government wish to meet the views of the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for Wellington would be to enact what has been the practice. What has been the practice is this. If a man secured a patent and became entitled to a pre-emption and he could not pay for it when the time came, he wrote to the Commissioner of Dominion Lands. The commissioner enquired into the circumstances, and if he found the applicant to be a *bonâ fide* settler, working his homestead and determined to pay for the pre-emption, and showing himself to be a man who was likely to pay, he was never disturbed, interest only was demanded from him, and the payment of the price has been postponed from year to year in several cases where the men were unable to pay for their pre-emptions. If it is desirable to meet the wishes of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), an amendment could be made to the effect that the first payment, a fraction of the whole amount, might be required six months after the man obtained his patent, and liability to forfeiture if he did not pay that fraction, and so on, from year to year. You may take an eighth, or any fraction you like as the unit to go on, but provided you have it that the man shall forfeit if he is not paying regularly every year I do not see that any harm would accrue, because practically that is what has been done. There is a kind of irregularity, I grant you, but it is not a very serious one: there is a kind of irregularity in having the practice in the department contrary to the letter of the law. Up to the present, no harm has come of it, but I think it might not be amiss to meet the suggestion of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and provide that if a certain portion of the whole of the pre-emption was not paid then it should be forfeited. I rather think that my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was mixing up the settler and the pre-emptor when he spoke about the man go-

ing in wanting all the money. They do not have all the burden placed upon them, and all they have to do is to pay $10. They enter for 160 acres, they cultivate that for three years, and in very many cases at the end of that three years they have actually made money enough to make the first payment on their pre-emption, and they have done it from year to year. It would never do if you gave them five years to pay, so that within those five years the land never could be forfeited whether they paid any instalment or not. The result might be as I say, that a man would get hold of a pre-emption, and keep it idle for five years, and the hands of the Minister of the Interior would be tied. I shall not certainly object if the Minister of the Interior can see his way to make an amendment providing that at the end of six months a fractional portion of the whole amount due on the pre-emption shall be paid, and if not paid, forfeited, and so on from year to year. That is practically what has been done.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a great deal in what has been said by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and a great number of pre-emptions are to-day in the position which he mentions. I have had petitions from the board of trade of different towns asking that the pre-emptions which are held in the manner indicated might be thrown open for settlement. That has occurred specially in the cases of lands in the immediate vicinity of towns, where they are anxious, of course, to see as much settlement as possible. I am anxious to accede to any proposition which would be an assistance to the settler without doing injury to the Government or to the country. With regard to the discretion given in the Land Act I perfectly agree with what has been said by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen). From my own experience I feel the less discretion the Minister has the better, and I would much sooner see that whatever was done should have finality about it, without leaving a discretion to the Minister, which necessarily places him in a false position. I think that very likely we might agree upon an amendment to this, which will only affect those who have already taken up their pre-emptions, because pre-emptions are done away with, and a great number have voluntarily thrown them up. It depends upon the ambition of the man, of course, whether he throws up his pre-emption or not, but there are some who do wish to retain them, and especially those who have looked upon the property they have resided alongside for several years and have had their stock upon it, and made certain improvements. I shall be glad to accept any suggestion that will place these people in a better condition than they are in to-day. I think, perhaps, we might allow this section to remain over, and consider an amendment which would meet the case before we get into committee again.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think this would be desirable, but I want to say a word before we leave this matter, especially as I suggested that the word "shall" should be turned into "may." I do not think, on second thought, that this would be at all wise, because if it comes to the mere right of forfeiture being vested in the Government, the question remains, what procedure shall be taken to enforce that right. In all probability an action at law would be necessary to establish our right to forfeiture. What I would prefer in that regard is, to say that it shall be forfeited but subject to the right of the Minister to extend the time to a period not exceeding a year. The settler can then show cause and agree to pay interest on the Minister extending it. As regards the question of political influence and all that, I think there is very little in it, because the rights of a settler are pretty strong as regards the forfeiture of land which he is actually in possession of, and the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), after all, puts him equally at the discretion of the department, because it merely extends the time, and says that after five years the settler shall be in that same position which he would be in after six months now. We must be careful, it strikes me, in this matter, because these lands are not taxable by the municipalities until the patent is taken out, and we must not hold out an inducement to people to delay taking up their patents in order to avoid taxes. If you give a man five years to take up his patent of pre-emption, the very class of persons whom my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) refers to, and who are well able to pay, will never pay until the five years period has expired, in order to avoid taxation, and we would give them a means to escape taxation. I think, therefore, that there should be an absolute forfeiture, subject to the right to extend the time in the case of settlers who are needy and who have done all that can reasonably be expected from them. There should be power to extend for a reasonable time, not exceeding a year. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) reminds us that there are no cases in Ontario of actual settlers who have made improvements being sold out in favour of any persons applying over their heads. I do not suppose there are any such cases in any of the provinces, unless it has been done through some inadvertence.

Mr. LAURIER. There are.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I never heard of any in my own province, although there are settlers on land there for sixty years without taking out their titles. The hon. gentleman will admit this, I suppose: that in many cases the Provincial Government is able to collect the arrears, and sometimes the interest, by telling the settler that an application has been made for the title by somebody else. That would not be available to this Government at all unless we are able to tell such settlers: Your right to the property has expired, we have a right to put you off. You have no title to it, and therefore you must pay up or you will be ejected or the land given to some one else. Having that to hold over the occupant the Government can avoid the very disagreeable alternative of selling the property over his head, by compelling him to pay if he is able to pay but unwilling. If you have not that right, if the pre-emptor knows he has five years in which he can hold the Government land and simply pay interest, we shall have no collections made until the end of that five years. The payment of interest is a very difficult thing to enforce, and, generally speaking, the man who falls into arrears with the principal falls into arrears with his interest quite as readily, and the result would be that we should be simply heaping up arrears without any advantage at all. It seems to me from what little I know of it, that there would be no objection to extending the time. This would have the san-

effect as if we made "shall" "may," and would avoid the necessity of having a lawsuit in order to establish the right of forfeiture.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I hardly understand the contention of the Minister that until the patent is issued no taxation can be imposed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the fact.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, that need not be so. In the Province of Ontario, for instance, lands are taxed from the time they are taken possession of by the settlers, and the fact that the title is still in the Crown does not prevent the municipalities imposing taxes. If they can find any personal property on these lands that property will be sold for the taxation, and if they can find no such the interest of the party in the land may be sold, but that sale of the interest of the party does not in any way affect the amount to which the Crown is entitled; and if that be not the rule adopted in the North-West Territories, I see no reason why it should not be. Is it not possible that the hon. Minister may be mistaken?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not only perfectly clear as to that, but we have asserted the right that the lands not patented should be exempt. Otherwise the lands would be torn from the Crown every day by squatters going in and making improvements, and failing to pay the taxes, and the lands then being sold out. In the Province of Ontario we distinctly deny the right of anybody to sell Dominion lands under process.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They could be sold subject to the right of the Crown.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not as to Dominion lands. I presume there is legislation as to provincial lands rendering the settler liable to taxation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is to some extent the rule. For instance, in the Province of Ontario under the municipal law relating to ditches and watercourses, certain lands were drained, and it was found that other lands on either side could not be dealt with without the drain being carried through certain Indian lands, which thus became subject to taxation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. People are sometimes taxed and pay, but I am speaking of the right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am speaking of the right. Where land is sold for taxes, the right of the Crown is not diminished, and the person who buys, buys subject to that right; and if that rule is not applied in the North-West Territories, it seems to me that there is a serious defect in the Government of those Territories and an obstacle put in the way of municipal taxation. Then, with regard to the period, I think six months is too short. If the hon. gentleman fixed it at a year, I think that would be still far too short a period. I am sure that if the hon. Minister obtains information from the Department of the Interior, he will find that although this provision is very stringent, and the time fixed is very short, yet the department has not succeeded in enforcing the law, simply from the fact that the settler who goes in without a considerable sum of money in his possession will be utterly unable in nineteen cases out of twenty to comply with the provisions of the law. If he were to undertake to make the payment it would leave him without resources profitably to cultivate the land of which he is seeking to acquire the homestead. In the case mentioned by the hon. member for West Assiniboia, if a man requires a homestead and holds it for speculative purposes, and deserts it the moment he acquires the title, the pre-emption lands incident to that lot might very well be forfeited by the Government, and held for public sale. You might make a provision of that sort in the public interest; but such a person stands in a wholly different position from the ordinary settler who continues in possession of his homestead, and perhaps wishes to obtain possession for his sons of the pre-emption lot immediately adjoining. I say that the period suggested by one hon. member from Manitoba, two years, would certainly be as short a period as the Government should put upon the Statute-book, with any hope of its being complied with. Even that period I think will be found very short, and I would like the Minister of the Interior to say now, after settlement has been going on in Manitoba and the North-West Territories for twenty years, what percentage of those who hold pre-emption lands have paid for them. Is there 30 per cent at the present time paid, or anything like it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think there is.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that is sufficient to show the House that what I am contending for is well founded; and what advantage does the Government derive from putting on the Statute-book a legal provision which is altogether unenforceable? You should adopt some mean time, and I think five years is as short a period as you could easily enforce in the majority of instances. If you take any shorter period, you impress on the settler's mind the idea that the provision does not mean anything, and that he can wait just as long as he pleases. But if you want a provision which you expect to enforce where there is not reasonable excuse for non-payment, you will fix a very much longer period than has been named by any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. I would like to see on the Statute-book a provision which would give the settler a reasonable opportunity of making the money on his homestead with which to pay for his pre-emption, and if you fix a short period you do not accomplish that object.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). I do not think there is any need of laying this section over. I think that two years, as suggested by the hon. member for Selkirk, is a sufficiently long time. I do not think that the honest and industrious settler would wish any longer time. In my part of the country, there are several cases entirely similar to those mentioned by the hon. member for West Assiniboia. Then, we have in Manitoba, as in other countries, the lazy, shiftless settler, who takes up a homestead and also a pre-emption simply as a speculator, and when he can get the opportunity secures his patent for his homestead and mortgages it, and keeps his pre-emption idle. The industrious settler in the neighbourhood is very anxious to have that pre-emption improved upon, and if it were thrown open to actual settlers who would go upon it and improve it, it would be more in the interest of the industrious settler than to have it left in the hands of a man who will do nothing with it for a number of years. There is another reason why the period should not be more than two years; in fact, I think one year would be

long enough. It is because this section does not refer to future settlers or those going in at the present time, but only to past settlers. There are no pre-emptions now, and the section refers only to those who have in past years taken up pre-emption rights.

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me, in listening to the discussion, that perhaps the interest of the public and the interest of the settler would be secured if the provision were made that the settler should have three years or five years in which to pay, subject to occupation and cultivation of the pre-emption, and make the land liable to taxation. And if you choose, make the condition that interest on instalments should be paid annually. These are matters to be considered. If the settler is a *bonâ fide*, honest, settler, if he has taken his homestead and complied with the conditions of a settler and secured his patent, his right to an extension of time should receive every consideration, as I have no doubt it has in the past, and this provision would meet the case.

Mr. DALY. A good deal of discussion might have been avoided if there had been a proper understanding of the Dominion Lands Act by those who took part in the discussion. The only thing that can be possibly wrong in the section is that the word "shall" is there. In the past the Minister of the Interior used a discretion which the law did not give him. The law provides that if a man does not pay his pre-emption within six months, it shall be forfeited, but the Minister of the Interior has not enforced that law, time has been given to numbers of these men, so that up to the present there are thousands of dollars owing to the Government by men who have not paid for their pre-emption in the six months according to the Act. The number of people who will be affected by the Act, as it stands to-day, is very small indeed. In the first place pre-emptions have been done away with; in the second place, if hon. gentlemen will read the clause they will see it provides that: "Where a settler has had a homestead and pre-emption entry, and has obtained a patent for his homestead in time to entitle him to make a second homestead entry, and has been permitted to make a second homestead entry for the quarter section which was previously his pre-emption, he shall be entitled to a patent under such second homestead entry." So that those who are entitled to a second homestead can second homestead their pre-emption, doing away with any necessity for their paying for it, and the man who has made a homestead entry after the pre-emptions were done away with, can buy 160 acres contiguous to his homestead at $3 an acre. Pre-emptions having been done away with, it seems to me that there are very few people who can be affected.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister says 70 per cent.

Mr. DALY. These men have homesteaded their pre-emptions. They have got over the difficulty of having to pay for them by homesteading them, so that the class affected by this cannot be very many. All that is necessary is to do away with the existing anomaly or else extend the time to a longer period, say even two years, and then let there be finality. Either do that or leave the clause as it is.

Mr. DAVIN. With regard to what my hon. friend from Bothwell suggests as to the municipalities in the North-West collecting the school money from pre-emptions, I should like to point out to him that what this would do would be to make the Department of the Interior a tax collector. Take these school sections and municipalities, and what would happen? Suppose a man owns a section and has it for five years. He is not there, and certain taxes are levied against him. There is the open prairie; how are you going to collect them? They will be filed as liens on his pre-emption, that is if they are to be effective at all in the Department of the Interior, and they cannot be got until five years have passed. What happens? At the end of five years, the man does not think of paying his pre-emption. If he had to buy it, he would have to pay the full amount together with the claims that are accumulated on the part of the school sections or municipalities, if municipalities exist, and which are of record in the Department of the Interior. Very well: the man goes away, but these claims are against the quarter section. In comes a settler and he finds $50 or $60 against a section. He wants to enter for it; and I may tell you this, that those settlers who come in and find they have to pay for a double inspection of cancelled lands will grumble very hard at having to pay the extra $10. Even when there are improvements on a quarter section, such as a settler's shack or other improvement, and the inspector reports them to be worth from $10 to $20, the settler grumbles very much at being called on to pay for them; and this additional tax would be a very inconvenient and vexatious matter to deal with. With reference to the word "shall," I do not see any inconvenience about it, and I will tell you why. The Minister of the Interior has always been, and will always be, in this position: that while he would be able to oust the man if he thought he was trifling with the department, it is within his discretion to sell the 160 acres to any one for the amount the homesteader and pre-emptor would have to pay. So that, although there has been the word "shall" in the Act, the Minister of the Interior in the past has not been breaking the law. All that he has done is this: He has held the lands; there they are: other persons enter, and he has said: We will sell this pre-emption, which we have a right to do to any one for that matter, but we will sell it to this man in preference if he will pay the money, and when there is a probability of his doing it no inconvenience can arise. I agree with the hon. member for Lisgar that this clause, as it is, is a very good clause. I think my hon. friends know that I have never been backward in standing up for the settler, and if I thought he was in any way hampered by this clause you may be certain, Sir, that I would fight very hard against it. On the contrary, I think it is admirably drawn up and thoroughly satisfactory.

Mr. MASSON. Reference has been made to the propriety of taxing the Dominion lands. I will not attempt to advise hon. gentlemen from the North-West and Manitoba, who have had experience of the law as it at present exists, but I know that in Ontario we have always taxed settlers' or locatees' interests in lands from the time of the purchase or location, both as regards our pro-

vincial lands and our Indian lands. The question arose in our courts some time ago as to the legality of the sale of unpatented Indian lands, in the case of Church and Fenton, which went to the Supreme Court, and though the sale of that land was under circumstances that did not exactly decide the point, the court upheld the right to tax and declared in favour of the purchaser under the tax-deed. Doubt being thrown upon it by that case, and the question arising in the Indian Department, an amendment to the Indian Act was made in 1888 or 1889, following almost the language of the Provincial Lands Act, authorizing the Superintendent General to receive the tax-deed from the municipality as the transfer of the locatees' or purchasers' interest in the lands thereby sold. With a slight break of about two years, or less than two years, when the Superintendent General, owing to the doubt that this case had given rise to, held his hand, these deeds have always been acknowledged and received, and the few refused during that period was received under that Act which provided for the receiving of them, notwithstanding the fact that the six months in which they were to be filed, had lapsed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps I expressed myself unfortunately in saying that these lands cannot be taxed. The lands cannot be taxed, but the interest of the settler can be taxed. The land cannot be sold. I have not the slightest doubt that the land cannot be sold in the North-West Territories. There can be no question about it, because the foundation of the title there, under the Torrens system, is the patent. If a purchaser walks in with a tax-deed it cannot be received, because there is no title. The patent is the foundation of the whole matter, and no land can be placed on the register until the registrar finds that there is a title.

On section 5,

Mr. DENISON moved in amendment:

That line 26 be amended by striking out all after the word "for" and adding "periods not exceeding sixty years."

That is following the rule in New Brunswick and, I think, in Nova Scotia also.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose a man gets a lease for twenty years, may he next day go to the office and get an extension?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, it must be after the term. I think the lease should not be longer than twenty years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think twenty years is quite long enough.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; as we want to prevent these people holding the land for purposes of speculation. As to the Park, the provisions under the present Act are very vague, being simply provisions that there may be leases for building purposes, and licenses of occupation for taking minerals, but a license of occupation is too weak an instrument to justify expenditure in the development and equipment of a mine, so that I think it may be wise to give these people twenty years, with a renewable right for forty years more.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would you give it for only one renewal?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the practice elsewhere is to give the lease for twenty years and then to renew it for forty years.

Mr. MASSON.

Mr. LAURIER. Then what happens at the end of sixty years?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Then the property reverts to the Crown.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think twenty years would be enough.

Mr. DENISON. In New Brunswick it is renewable up to eighty years, and I believe that is the case in Nova Scotia. They have had experience there, and it would be difficult to get capitalists to put money into the development of a mine when at the end of twenty years they would be left out in the cold, but if they could then get the lease renewed for a further term of twenty years, and then for other terms of twenty years, not to exceed in the whole eighty years, it would be an inducement to capitalists to come in and develop mines.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the time is long enough. Does this contemplate the power of the Governor in Council to fix the royalties to be paid?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. They are to be fixed in the discretion of the Governor in Council?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is a very important matter, but I suppose we may trust the Governor in Council not to make the conditions so onerous as to prevent development. There is no feature of mining operations more likely to deter miners from going in than the system of royalties. As a member of the Mining Commission of Ontario, I found it was a very doubtful policy, and if a sale in fee-simple could be made it would be better. If sales were made in that way, they might be made with conditions as to development. For instance, in the mineral regions of the United States where claims are made, the claims are staked off and are registered, and certain sums are paid to hold the claim. These claims are held upon certain conditions, which embrace conditions as to development, and unless the development is proceeded with to a certain extent, and in a certain way, and a certain amount expended as provided by law, then these claims revert to the United States Government, and they might here revert to the Crown, if conditions as to development were made. It is worthy of consideration whether a policy of this kind would not be better calculated to develop our mineral resources than the policy contemplated here of charging royalties. I do not express any opinion about it, but I throw out the suggestion for the consideration of the Government. We are now on the threshold of mineral developments in our country, and it is important to lay the foundations of our policy properly and in such a way as to secure the development of these mines and the advancement of the interest of the country.

Mr. DENISON. I would suggest that we put it for a further period not exceeding eighty years. This is an addition of twenty years to his original lease.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that if this is found a profitable business, sufficient to warrant people to invest capital in it, they would not object to the words "twenty years" in the second provision, and if it is found to be in the public interest to have a further extension, there

ought to be no objection to a further extension, possibly forty years in all. That ought to be a sufficiently long period of time.

Mr. DENISON. We want to put our people in a position of being certain about it. Here they would be sure of having it renewed every twenty years up to a period of eighty years; they would know where they were. If you make it only twenty years, a capitalist could not be sure that the Government would not refuse to let him renew. It would stop people putting in extensive machinery to develop the mines.

Mr. TISDALE. The idea is to make it equal to a freehold, but the temporary leases from time to time give the Government a control, so that as these mines are developed in value, the Government can impose conditions in regard to them. To put it for a less time than eighty years altogether, would not be prudent, if these mines increase in value. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that his amendment read: "Renewable in the discretion of the Governor in Council from time to time for further periods not exceeding in the whole sixty years." That would make it plain it was not to be one term of sixty years, and it would give the Government still more control.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is all very well to have a twenty-year period in the first instance. But supposing this proves to be a district extremely wealthy in minerals, and you let for a moderate period of twenty years a section to a party, you will be tied during the whole twenty years with regard to any further applications within that same district, because you could hardly charge a very high rate to one party, and a very low rate to another. When you fix a period of twenty years in the first instance, every subsequent period ought to be for a much shorter time, otherwise the royalty that the country may expect from such a policy might be very seriously restricted. If you said ten years it would be quite long enough.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are two objects to be kept in view: One is not to make the leases so short that capitalists would be afraid to invest liberally; the other is to take care that when a lease expires, we shall have an opportunity to revise the terms of them from time to time. Those who are acquainted with the wishes of capitalists will know better than I as to whether twenty years would be too short a time, but that is the time in the different provinces: they are made renewable I think for a period of twenty years, and all the terms are revisable at the end of that period.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think in the case of a lease made for twenty years, at the expiration of that time the Government and public will be in possession of pretty good information as to the value and richness of the mineral district. I do not think the danger my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) apprehends is likely to occur, in reference to making a renewal of twenty years. As the Minister of Justice says, we must give inducements to capitalists. In many kinds of mining it is likely a lease of ten years would be rather short, it would be so short that capitalists would hardly care to increase their plant and extend their operations. I think the motion of the member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) is all right, as it makes two more terms of twenty years, to cover the period contemplated by the law, or sixty years in all.

On section 6,

Mr. DEWDNEY. At present the control of the highway is vested in the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories. In some sections of the country it is impossible to utilize roads laid out under the present system, especially in broken townships. This section is to give some process by which roads can be opened, closed and repaired in these inaccessible parts. In the mountain country this difficulty is cropping up very frequently, and at present there are no means by which it can be surmounted.

Mr. McMULLEN. Would it not be proper to make a provision to guard the rights of those whose property might be seriously affected by closing up roads? If the value of a man's property depended on public patronage, for example, the Lieutenant Governor might close up the highway and thus destroy the property, and no indemnity is provided for injury that might be sustained by such action.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Lieutenant Governor is not the proper officer to be vested with this authority. In Ontario, the municipal council and the county council have power to close up a road and open another. They may hand over the road closed to the party owning the contiguous property through whose lands the new road may be laid out, and whose lands may be expropriated for road purposes. I can see that, while no difficulty would arise where there are no settlements, and where the title to the property is still vested in the Crown, it is a rather extraordinary and arbitrary provision to give the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories power to close roads and vary their direction, and he could not vary the direction without entering lands of private owners. It is a very large power to vest in an executive officer. In the case of county councils, this power is placed in the hands of parties who have been elected to their positions by those whose property is affected. I can well understand that it may become necessary to vary the direction of the road in consequence of bluffs or watercourses, but the authority should be vested in some local authority deriving its existence from the people whose property is affected. It is going a long way to sell property to the settlers of the country, to part with the title of the Crown, and then for the representative of the Crown to be vested with the power of confiscation, because that is what it means. It is a very extensive power, it is an arbitrary power, and it is one that should not be placed in the hands of Her Majesty's representative.

Mr. DALY. The idea is that where there are no municipalities in the North-West then the power shall be vested in the Lieutenant Governor. Where municipalities exist that power has already been given, by the Lieutenant Governor, to the municipalities. By the ordinances of the North-West the power to close roads is vested in municipalities, but where there are no municipalities then it is necessary to give the power to the Lieutenant Governor which the municipalities otherwise enjoy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not what is stated in the section. It is a proper power to give

to the Government or the Legislature, but not to the Lieutenant Governor.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think any particular object is gained by vesting the power in any particular authority. The object is simply to enable old roads to be closed and new ones made, without saying by what authority, whether by the Department of the Interior spending money there, by the Lieutenant Governor or by any other authority. The first line of the section might, therefore, be omitted: "The Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You have already, by previous legislation, given control over the roads to the North-West Legislature. This should be amended to conform with the provisions of the Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I thought the hon. gentleman's point was that he objected to the authority being vested in the Lieutenant Governor, and that it would be met by leaving it to any competent authority.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The jurisdiction and power should rest with the Assembly,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We might add the word "assembly" after "Lieutenant Governor."

On section 7,

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior to what extent projects for constructing irrigation canals have been entered on in the North-West, and to what extent developments of that kind have been made? It is a matter of very great interest.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Up to the present time almost no operations have taken place and no canals have been built. One or two small ditches have been made in small fields, but no irrigation to any extent has been carried on. It is probably fortunate that such has been the case, because I think that before any of these operations are entered upon the Government ought to be very careful to have a thorough survey as to what operations should be carried on in this respect. There has been, as the hon. gentleman knows, a great deal of difficulty in California and many of the states, because a proper survey of the country for the purpose of irrigation had not been made before the water was taken out of its regular channels. Several applications had been made to proceed with irrigation in the North-West. A very large scheme is in contemplation in southern Alberta which would cover a country of some 150 miles, and the parties who are interested are very anxious to enter upon the work. The hon. gentleman will remember that in the Alberta Railway Bill a provision was incorporated prohibiting them going on with the work, except with the consent of the Governor General in Council. I think myself that the Government should be very careful, before any extensive scheme of irrigation is carried on, to see that a thorough survey of the country should be taken in order to prevent complications in the future.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may say that I am very glad to hear that the Government are awake to the importance of this question. As the Minister of the Interior very correctly says, great difficulties have arisen in California, Utah, Arizona and New Mexico in consequence of the want of forethought, and the promotion of a haphazard system of irrigation which is interfering with private rights, and will probably render it necessary in the future for the Government to incur large expense to rectify mistakes already made. If our Government, as seems to be the case, is awake to the necessity of forethought in this very important matter it will in the end be beneficial to the country.

Committee rose and reported progress.

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bills (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law and (No. 21) for the suppression of obscene literature and to provide for the punishment of certain immoral and criminal practices.

(In the Committee.)

On section 247,

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it intended to make a person liable to imprisonment for life if he removes a fence along a railway line?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If he does it with intent to injure or endanger the safety of any person travelling on the railway. The intent must be proved.

Mr. FLINT. The section is open to this objection, that you are making a crime punishable by imprisonment for life, under clause *b*, which elsewhere is included in minor offences. Why should it be any more serious offence to throw a brick at a person in a railway train than in a carriage?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These special penalties are provided in cases where detection is difficult and serious injury more likely to be inflicted. A brick thrown into the window of a railway carriage is much more likely to do serious harm than a brick thrown into the window of an ordinary carriage or at a person walking, and it is certainly much more difficult to detect the offender; and the speed with which a railway train travels, rendering detection difficult, is a temptation to mischievous persons to throw missiles and inflict perhaps serious injury.

Mr. DICKEY. I took the same view in the committee as the hon. member for Yarmouth takes, that you make a boy who throws a stone at a train liable to imprisonment for life. Would the hon. Minister see any objection to striking out the words "to injure or" and leave the offence punishable by imprisonment for life only where there is intent to endanger the safety of people on the train? There is a great distinction between an act which will endanger the safety of the train itself and the passengers and the mere attack upon a person in a train. No doubt under the English decision in the case of Regina *vs.* Rooke reported in Foster and Finlayson, this would apply to a train standing still at a station. Thus, if after a heated political meeting or anything of that sort, a crowd follows a man, and when he is seated in the train, a stone is thrown at him, the person throwing it is liable to imprisonment for life, while if the party assaulted were standing in the station the person who threw the stone would only be liable for assault.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I see much reason against making the amendment proposed. It would be entirely destructive of the usefulness

of the section, as in every case it would be necessary to show the intention to derail the train, or knock a person off it, or in some other way endanger safety. Every enactment of criminal law provides a heavy punishment for that class of offence, and there is the saving provision that one day's imprisonment shall answer the purposes of the section. No one can suppose that in the case suggested by my hon. friend the maximum would apply; but the question is whether there is not any case possible in this class which would not justify imprisonment for life. I propose that we shall say at line 32 "upon any engine, tender, carriage or truck, used and in motion upon any railway."

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Montreal and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 88) to amend an Act to incorporate the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Davin.)

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law.

(In the Committee.)

On section 275,

Mr. FRASER. Will the hon. gentleman explain sub-section 4?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of sub-section 4 is to keep the enactment within our jurisdiction. In the early words of the clause we speak of marriages in any part of the world. Of course, Canada being a colony, this Parliament can only legislate for offences committed in Canada, and therefore in order to restrain the preceding words, and restrict them to our own jurisdiction, we say:

"4. No person shall be liable to be convicted of bigamy in respect of having gone through a form of marriage in a place not in Canada, unless such person, being a British subject resident in Canada, leaves Canada with intent to go through such form of marriage."

In such case we make it an offence to leave Canada for the purpose of committing that offence in another part of the world, that being the full extent of our power.

Mr. FRASER. Could a citizen of Canada visit a foreign country and go through such form of marriage and return here, and not come within the jurisdiction of Canada for purposes of prosecution?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. Does the Minister say that Parliament would have no power in such a case?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. We are following, in that respect, the decision given with respect to the jurisdiction of the Australian Parliament, that although the words used extended beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the Parliament, the Parliament had no authority and its legislation must be confined to its jurisdiction and interpreted accordingly. While it is morally the same offence to commit bigamy outside our jurisdiction, all we can do is to punish any person who leaves this country for the purpose of committing it.

Mr. FRASER. I have the idea in my mind, although I am not quite sure about it, that in England such cases have been dealt with. Would not an enactment of the English Parliament have effect here?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, but it has not legislated in that manner.

Mr. FRASER. Then, practically, there would be no redress?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There would be no criminal liability.

On section 278,

Mr. FRASER. It appears not to be made an offence for a man to live with a woman who is not married. This appears to be one-sided legislation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not intended to include that class of moral offences. I may state the history of this section. It was inserted the first time three years ago, when an attempt was made to put down offences connected with Mormonism and plural marriages, and after considering the laws of every state in the United States which attempted to deal with that question, we found that that was the best way we could express it, and the section received very careful attention from lawyers on both sides of the House. I am aware that the attention of members has been called to the class of cases mentioned by the hon. member for Guysborough, but we have not introduced that class into this Bill, and it is questionable whether we should make that a crime.

On section 285,

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the length to which this section goes in defining a defamatory libel. I am aware that there are decisions that would justify making "irony" or "insinuations" libellous, but I am inclined to think that very great injustice might sometimes be done if we were to place in the statute this definition of libel. Suppose an ironical article, a skit we will say, is written in a newspaper, and an indictment is laid, and the judge does what I actually have seen a judge do; simply read the law to the jury and says, that is the law; then any jury having this definition of libel placed before it would bring in a verdict against the accused, although from the point of view of practical life, and the efficiency of journalism, the verdict would be an outrageous one. I can easily understand an insinuating article or an ironical article being so written that it would be libellous, and then it would be for the judge to explain the matter to the jury. There are cases where an ironical article has been held to be libellous. For instance, *Grip* which is a powerful and very useful element in our political and social life; *Grip*, every week of his life is guilty of libel within this section.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think he is. *Grip* does not want to insult, and that is the element of the libel. He is ironical but not insulting.

Mr. DAVIN. I am afraid that this section is drawing the loop too closely altogether around the neck of the journalists. In fact, it provides too many loops into which the journalist may intrude his head, and I do not want to have him conduct his very important business——

Mr. FRASER. You are out of journalism now, and you need not care.

Mr. DAVIN. I am in a sense out of it, but if I were wholly out of it there would be the more reason why I should take an interest in that profession to which I did belong.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think there can be no doubt that this is an exact rendering of the present law, and I am sure that the hon. gentleman will realize that it will not be less subject to interpretation, and less subject to proper administration in practice, than the common law is now, notwithstanding that it is embodied in a statute. All these provisions of a statute which merely state the common law are interpreted as making no new law, but as mere statements of the existing law, and are interpreted precisely as if they formed part of the decision of the courts. I think that my hon. friend is mistaken in assuming that the definition makes irony libel. It merely embodies the principle that an ironical statement may be a libel, and so it may. But in order to be so, it must be ironical matter published without legal justification or excuse, and likely to injure the reputation of a person and expose him to hatred, contempt and ridicule. Then, notwithstanding that it may be satirical and likely to create humour, it is libellous. If the hon. gentleman will glance at the other clauses he will find how well the statutory provisions as well as the common law protect *bonâ fide* journalism. For example, there are the various sections about fair reports, and so on, and then we come down to fair discussion under sections 292, 293, 294, 295 and 296. I think all these sections supply what the common law provides.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Chairman, although I did not agree altogether with my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in the application which he gave of the principle which he laid down so far as *Grip* is concerned, because in the production of *Grip* the element of malice is absent, and that is what makes the libel, yet it seems to me that this definition goes altogether too far. I do not dispute the statement made by the Minister of Justice that it may be a fair exposition of what the common law is, but if you take it from the common law and incorporate it in the statute it ceases to be the common law and becomes statutory law, and is deprived of the element of elasticity which is so useful in the common law. I have already impressed the objection on the Minister that many of these definitions had better be left to the common law rather than be incorporated in the Statute-book. In this case if you include irony as the constituent part of libel, I fear that many a man might be perhaps subject to prosecution who had no intention of injuring his neighbour but of simply creating a little merriment at the expense of somebody. That would be an indictable offence, and the line would be very sharply drawn on account of jury this definition. I believe it should be left to the to say whether the defendant intended to wound the feelings or simply to create a little amusement.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Irony is not a libel in itself, but you may commit a libel by irony. You may commit a very serious libel by writing in an ironical way.

Mr. LAURIER. Nothing is libellous here except with regard to the intention in which it is done. Irony becomes a libel if it produces a certain effect.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There may be an ironical suggestion that a man has stolen a leg of lamb. It may be irony, but if it is published with the intention of exposing him to hatred and insult it would be a libel. There is no design in the Act to so draw the mesh that it would catch our friends the journalists. Taking it altogether, I think that so far as journalism is concerned, the law of libel is a very clumsy machine, and is practically a dead letter. These provisions are for the purpose of protecting reputations, not so much against the press, because the press has grown stronger than the law of libel, but for the purpose of protecting them against libels of other kinds.

Mr. FRASER. If the hon. Minister would withdraw the latter part, the irony would be clearer.

Mr. DAVIN. Suppose I were addressing a public meeting, and in reply to some atrocious attacks made on me, I should turn around and say: I do not refer to this man—he is a gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. If the hon. gentleman would say that of some of his opponents, he would be telling the truth.

On section 286,

Mr. DICKEY. There is an innovation here which I suppose is intended, that is, the addition of the words "by the person defamed."

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not a publication now to write a letter.

Mr. DAVIN. Is not this clause intended to meet that form of defamation in which a libeller writes a letter to the person intended to be libelled?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not a libel. It needs publication to make it a libel.

Mr. DAVIN. I should think that that ought to be made libellous.

Mr. McCARTHY. Showing it to anybody else would be libel. For instance, putting it on a post card so that others may see it would constitute publication, but putting it in a sealed envelope and sending it to a person is not publication.

Mr. LAURIER. But showing the libel to the person himself is publication.

Mr. McCARTHY. There must be some other person present.

Mr. WELDON. The essence of the offence is that it is conducive to a breach of the peace, and it should be made libellous.

Mr. DICKEY. I rather incline to the view of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) that it should be made a libel, and I wish to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that it is a change in the common law, so that we may understand what we are doing. It has all the elements of, and should be made a libel.

On section 289,

Mr. FRASER. I suppose that this will cover a statement made of a member of the House of Commons?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is to protect the right of petition.

Mr. FRASER. Suppose there was a gross libel on a member of Parliament or a Minister in the petition?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There must be good faith.

Mr. FRASER. Should any person be allowed to be a judge of good faith in publishing what is defamatory of a member contained in a petition to the House?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is sufficiently protected by the rules of all these bodies restricting the receiving of petitions within reasonable bounds. A petition will not be received if defamatory and not in good faith, but if it be such a petition that a legislative body would receive it, and the subject would have the right to present it, it is protected.

Mr. FRASER. The libel would still be published, and under this clause you would protect the person even if it were not received. Provided it were a very libellous petition, the House would protect itself by not allowing it to be read, but there would be publication as certain parties would see it, yet the party making the libel would be protected by this section.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, that would be a libel and punishable as such. All that would be necessary would be to allege that it was published to somebody else. As it was not received by the legislative body, no harm was done by attempting to publish it there, but if anybody else saw the contents there would be publication.

Mr. FRASER. Therefore if a petition is sent to myself containing a libel upon another member, it would not be considered a libel, and the party would be protected under this section even though I saw it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman himself would not be guilty of publishing the libel by presenting the petition to the House, and that is a necessary protection.

Mr. FRASER. Would the party who put the libel in the petition be protected?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, because it would be a question of publication; and it merely says no one commits the offence by publishing to the Senate or the House of Commons. The same clause is in the English Bill in relation to either House of Parliament: "Defamatory matter contained in a petition to either House or published by order or under the authority of the House."

On section 294,

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest to the Minister that this clause goes very far. There could be no objection in regard to seeking remedy for a public wrong, but it is another matter altogether in regard to a private wrong. By this, power is given to any party who thinks he suffers a private wrong to bring it before the public if he thinks he will thereby obtain a remedy which the offending party would then be disposed to give him. If a man owes a debt and is not willing to pay, the creditor may think that by adopting this means he can force payment. I do not think this should be encouraged.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is quite true as far as the general law of libel is concerned, but we are dealing only with the crime of libel. If a man neglects his private duties, such as the duty of supporting his family, and is criticised severely by the press for that, he has his civil remedy, but he cannot bring the journalist to the bar of justice as a criminal.

Mr. LAURIER. If a wife has a husband who will not support her, by this she can expose her domestic troubles before the public. Surely the hon. gentleman does not believe that public morals will be advanced in that way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman forgets the qualification that the person has a civil remedy, and also that there is a provision:

"If the defamatory matter is believed by him to be true, and is relevant to the remedy or redress sought, and such publishing does not in manner or extent exceed what is reasonably sufficient for the occasion."

Mr. LAURIER. The great objection I see is that this empowers anybody who, rightly or wrongly, has a grievance of a private nature against another to bring it before the public with impunity.

Mr. FRASER. Will not the passage of this go far to make it impossible to succeed in the civil action?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have no jurisdiction in regard to the civil action.

Mr. FRASER. But the very statement will have great effect with a jury.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the common law now.

On section 322,

Mr. FLINT. I know this is the law at present, but it seems to me that it is giving an undue significance to the landlord's property and effects. I think landlords have privileges enough without that. The stealing of any chattel by a tenant from a landlord should be no more serious than stealing from any other person.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Make the penalty four years instead of seven.

Mr. FRASER. By what rule do you make the stealing of $25 worth of property twice as bad as the stealing of $24 worth? Why do you make the punishment so out of proportion in this case to what it is under ordinary circumstances?

Mr. MASSON. It must be borne in mind that this is the same class of case as where the property of a person is put into possession of another for his use and to be returned. The tenant is in the same position as a trustee. He is let into possession of the landlord's property, and for that reason we have to deal with it separately. A banker, or accountant, or agent is dealt with in the same way. This shows that the taking of small things must be treated differently from the taking of things of a higher value than $25.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). All this, it seems to me, might have been dealt with by a single provision instead of by so many.

On section 328,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is a pretty severe punishment for some of the offences mentioned here to imprison one in the penitentiary for five years for the stealing of a newspaper.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is for stealing a newspaper from the mail, and the mails have to be kept sacred by very severe penalties.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). From the mail, I suppose, means from the post office itself.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, everything after it once reaches the post office. These offences are very hard to detect. They are committed very frequently by persons who occupy good positions in society, who have friends and influence, and if we allow magistrates or judges to let them off leniently, we shall have very light sentences imposed. Although a good many of these sentences are reviewed, they are only reduced in cases where there is reason to suppose the offence is the first. But generally these offences have only been detected after a long course of crime; and although the punishment is so severe, the unfortunate fact remains that in the penitentiaries of the country there are many persons who formerly occupied good positions in society, who were convicted of stealing from the mails.

On section 332,

Mr. DICKEY. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he has considered the advisability of striking out the words, "over and above the value of the animal, as part of the punishment?"

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have not personally.

Mr. DICKEY. I raised the question in the committee. It seems to me that the magistrate or other tribunal who tries the criminal charge is not the proper tribunal to settle the value of the animal, and it is difficult to know what effect it will have on the civil action. A man might be fined $10, and also $50 as the value of the dog stolen by him, and the owner of the dog might value it at $200 and sue for that value in a civil court. I suppose this means that the magistrate shall include the value of the animal in the fine. It seems a very unsatisfactory method of punishing.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume there can be no doubt that this provision does not affect the civil remedy. It is altogether a fine; but the object is to have the fine something over the value of the animal, otherwise the person stealing it might make a profit by paying the fine and keeping the animal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose the magistrate were to value the animal at $20, and the owner brought a civil action and were awarded $50, would the magistrate be compelled to modify his judgment?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, there is no review. Of course, for stealing other things the punishment is nearly always imprisonment; but we make the stealing of a dog, bird, beast or other animal punishable by a fine or a month's imprisonment, and therefore we must be careful to see that the fine is something more than the value of the thing taken; and, generally speaking, in my experience, the magistrate applies a nominal value, which he arrives at in a very summary way in order to comply with the provision of the law.

Mr. DICKEY. I have never had occasion to deal with this provision, but I know that in actions for malicious injury to property under the Summary Convictions Act, the valuation of the damages generally makes it very difficult to get a conviction at all.

Mr. FRASER. And sometimes before a Superior Court there may be evidence of an article being very valuable, and it is quite fair to make a man pay a fine, and also the value found by the justice, when he is liable to a subsequent action at civil law, for the real value of the animal. Why not give the justice a greater margin to impose a fine without reference to the value, and leave that to be found by the civil remedy?

On section 333,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When does a person unlawfully kill a pigeon? In shooting at a pigeon match? Where is this defined?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Taking pigeons will be a theft so long as they are in a dove-cot or on their owner's land, but if they are stolen elsewhere, as, for instance, on the highway or on another person's land, they are taken under circumstances which do not amount to theft. This would not refer to pigeon shooting, because that would not be unlawful killing, as the person who gets up the match provides the pigeons and allows them to be killed.

On section 337,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think in these sections, 335 to 337, the punishment is altogether out of proportion to the offence. We ought not to make the law so severe as to turn sympathy in favour of the offender and prevent its being enforced.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are only maximum.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the maximum is altogether too high. I would not put in the power of a judge, who may not have much feeling, to send a boy up for seven years for injury done to a tree in the park. In ninety-nine cases out of one hundred, punishment for three months is more likely to be effective.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to reduce that and make it five years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is too high.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Strike out the third sub-section altogether of section 337.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You may have boys, who have been drinking, who will undertake to dare each other to commit depredations—pull out a shrub or something of that sort. It might never happen again, it possesses no criminal characteristics at all, yet if they fall into the hands of a severe magistrate, especially one who may have some feeling against boys on account of some depredation they may have committed on him, you put it in his power to ruin them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is for the third offence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The punishment in these cases is out of all proportion to the character of the offence.

On section 338,

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think that is an exclusively severe clause. Where I live, saw-logs are constantly drifting on the lake, no one looks after them, and yet if any one picked one of them up, though it might have been floating for three years, he would be liable to seven years in the penitentiary. I think this is a most monstrous provision.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very often on the lakes the rafts break up, and there is a class of men along the shores who pilfer the logs, take them away, and hide them in the woods or take them to saw mills, and the owners find this very hard. These logs are very valuable. A mast is sometimes worth $100 or more, and it is very difficult to guard these pieces of timber. This is substantially the same provision that we have had, and I do not think it is too severe.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Some of these logs are not worth 50 cents. Of course, one can understand under certain circumstances that this would be a criminal act, but it is monstrous to say that if I found a log floating in my place which, perhaps, had been floating for three years and picked it up, I might go to the penitentiary for seven years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I know that very frequently along the shores of Lake Erie rafts go to pieces, and no one thinks of looking up the logs. It would not pay the proprietor to do so. If he finds that a number have gone ashore at some particular point, he may try to sell them to the farmer on whose land they have gone, but otherwise they may lie there until some fisherman is obliged to pile them up and burn them so as to clear his own front and to clear his fishing ground, because these parties would not pay him for the injury he may have sustained. It might be well to protect them for a time, but are they to be protected for four or five years on the front of a man's property, and is he to be liable to the penitentiary if he logs them up and burns them out of the way?

Mr. SPEAKER. Formerly there were a number of small mills along the Ottawa river whose owners made it a business to pick up a sufficient number of logs to supply their mills, and, if they were found in their booms, they set up the pretense that they had floated in there and had come to their possession innocently. This had become such a nuisance and prevailed to such an extent that there seemed to be no way of remedying the evil other than to make the possession of these logs punishable in this way, and, in 1875, as I think my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will remember, the possession of these logs in the booms was made a criminal offence, the onus of proof being thrown upon the party in whose possession they were instead of lying upon the party who owned the logs as it did previously, as to the unlawful manner in which they had come into the possession of the party with whom they were found. While, perhaps, the penalty is a little too severe, I think there should be some penalty.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Suppose we make it three years.

Mr. O'BRIEN. There should be some conditions. Supposing they are found in a boom or in a pond, then it is all right, but any penalty you would enforce in regard to the possession of logs under the circumstances I have mentioned, on the lake by which I live, would be severe, because those logs have no merchantable value whatever.

On section 365,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to severe punishment being imposed on persons who have committed frauds, but still, looking at the various classes of undertakings that might come under this section, I think so long a term as seven years is a terrible punishment to inflict. The scope of this section is wide, and the temper of the judges varies enormously in dealing with this particular class of offences. It appears to me that seven years' imprisonment is a very severe punishment to attach to the issuing of a highly-coloured prospectus, although I am very far from approving of the modes and schemes that a great many promoters have had recourse to. These cases, and this special state of things which has existed in England, have been before the minds of the parties who drew the section, and it is hardly applicable, I think, to any great extent here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to the term being reduced, if it is thought proper; but this has been the law for a good while here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I remember the case where Sir Francis Hincks under the same provision was convicted, but the law was felt to be too severe, and it was believed that he had not been intentionally guilty of fraudulent intent to mislead the public, and he was never brought up for sentence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The conviction was quashed on appeal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was a very peculiar affair. I do not think the conviction was exactly quashed. I think the judges set it aside, but without forcing it. I think it was rather evaded than quashed. No doubt it was felt at the time that it was a very severe punishment which was being inflicted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will make it five years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is, of course, the maximum sentence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 384,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may explain that there is an Imperial statute to this effect, and a request was made by Her Majesty's Government two or three years ago that we should copy the provisions of that statute in order to prevent the secretion and stealing of Her Majesty's stores containing these marks; and that is the purpose of this and the next six sections.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 6th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

C. P. R.—PAYMENTS, P. O. AND MILITIA SERVICES.

Mr. BORDEN (for Mr. FLINT) asked, What was the total amount paid by the Dominion Government last year to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the transportation of mails, militia stores, or other stores?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The amount paid by the Government to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the conveyance of mails was $492,055.15.

Mr. BOWELL. The amount paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by the Minister of Militia and Defence for militia transport for the fiscal year 1890-91 was $19,146.69. This includes transportation of officers and men to and from their annual camps, as well as stores.

Mr. BORDEN (for Mr. FLINT) asked, What amount of subsidy is payable to the Canadian Pacific Steamship Company by the Dominion Government as subsidy or for the conveyance of mails? What amount, if any, is paid to the same company annually by the Imperial Government?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The amount paid by the Government has been as I have stated. We have no official information in the department as to what the Imperial Government pays.

BUTTER AND CHEESE INDUSTRY.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. CHOQUETTE) asked, Whether the Government are aware that Messrs. E. Senécal et Fils, of Montreal, have published a "Manuel de l'Industrie Laitière," which is most highly spoken of by those who are well informed on the subject of the butter and cheese industry, and, if so, is it their intention to purchase copies for distribution amongst the farmers?

Mr. CARLING. The Government is aware of the publication mentioned, and Prof. Robertson, the Dairy Commissioner, has examined the work, and has reported that most of its matter is contained either in the Dairy Commissioner's Reports or in the Dairy Bulletins issued from time to time, and that it is not desirable to purchase copies of a book containing information which has already been published in thousands of copies by order of Parliament.

THE GOVERNMENT STEAMER *QUADRA*.

Mr. CORBOULD asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to hold an enquiry into the cause of the accident to the Government steamer *Quadra*, at Rose Harbour, on the 14th May?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. An enquiry has been ordered.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

MILITARY DISTRICT No. 9.

Mr. FRASER asked, Whether Lieutenant Colonel Worsley, the Deputy Adjutant-General of Military district No. 9, and Lieutenant Colonel Murray, Paymaster and District Storekeeper of the same district, are under suspension? If so, when suspended, by whom, and for what reason? Has any enquiry into such suspension been made? Have the said officers received any pay for any part of the period since they were relieved from duty by suspension? If so, what amount to each, and the period for which pay was granted?

Mr. BOWELL. Lieutenant Colonel Murray was suspended on the 9th May, 1891, by the Minister of Militia and Defence, upon the report of the Major-General commanding the militia of an enquiry held by him into certain charges preferred by Lieutenant Colonel Worsley, as Deputy Adjutant-General, against Lieutenant Colonel Murray, on account of certain irregularities as paymaster of Military District No. 9. Lieutenant Colonel Worsley was suspended on the 9th April, 1891, by the Major-General commanding the militia, as the result of the enquiry held by him into the above charges. An enquiry was held by the Major-General commanding, as stated. The said officers received pay for part of the period since they were relieved from duty by suspension. The amount paid to Lieutenant Colonel Worsley, after his suspension, was $670.60, namely, his salary at $1,700 per annum, continued up to the 31st August, 1891. The amount paid to Lieutenant Colonel Murray, after his suspension, was $280.65, namely, his salary at $900 per annum, continued up to the 31st August, 1891, since which period they have not been paid any sum.

MICHAEL QUINN'S DISMISSAL.

Mr. GUAY (Translation) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence and evidence, and reports respecting and connected with the last enquiry held at Lévis, in the matter of the dismissal of Michael Quinn, employé in the workshops, &c., at Hadlow, in the County of Lévis.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in the course of the month of March, on the 23rd, I had the honour of moving for copies of the evidence given in an enquiry held in the month of February, 1892, in connection with the dismissal of Michael Quinn, an employé on the Intercolonial Railway, in the workshops at Hadlow, Lévis, and for copies of all correspondence with Alfred Drake, chief mechanical engineer, on the same railway, at Hadlow, and with the authorities of the same railway at Moncton, in connection with the dismissal of the said Michael Quinn. When I had the honour of making this motion the Minister of Railways declared that he had no objection to produce the papers, but he added he wanted to say from the start that the dismissal of Mr. Quinn was for drunkenness. On that I remarked to the hon. Minister that the cause of the dismissal was altogether different, that it was unknown to the department, but was very well known in Lévis. Indeed, the hon. Minister, a few moments later, admitted that Mr. Quinn had not been found guilty of drunkenness at the enquiry, but only of having used offensive language to his chief. Mr. Quinn had been employed for twenty-five or twenty-six years, and had always been considered a model employé, a man always

faithful to his duty. However, Mr. Speaker, I was assured that he had not been replaced, and the hon. Minister told me that the friends of Mr. Drake had asked for a new enquiry, hoping to prove this time that Mr. Quinn was under the influence of liquor, and that Drake was not at fault. The second enquiry has taken place since, and the object of the present motion is to obtain the evidence produced at this enquiry. According to the information I was able to procure, the same things were proven as on the first enquiry, namely, that Quinn was not in liquor but that Drake was a recognized drunkard, and a man who gave a very bad example to his men. Since then, Drake has been dismissed for drunkenness. Such is the summing up of the statement which the Minister of Railways and Canals made in answer to a question which I put some time ago. It is on the 25th December last that Mr. Quinn was dismissed, and he has not been reinstated since, although he had always been a trustworthy employé. While this respectable father of a family is still waiting for justice, Drake, the man found guilty of the offence of which he had accused Mr. Quinn, is found in the employ of the Government outside of the Province of Quebec. I think it is Moncton where he is now. The gratification felt at the news of Drake's dismissal as chief of the shops at Hadlow was general in Lévis, in Quebec, and on the whole line of the Intercolonial from Lévis to Rivière du Loup. Indeed here is what *Le Matin* had to say about it, the Conservative newspaper *par excellence*, since it is given as the organ of the would-be honest people's party :

"The papers announce the dismissal of a man by the name of Drake, the foreman of the Intercolonial shops at Hadlow, Lévis, after an investigation into his conduct by the authorities.

"It will be a great relief for the people of that place, who have long been asking for this act of justice. Not only was Drake unworthy of the position he occupied, but he was above all a brutal fanatic who publicly insulted our religion and our race, and who treated the French Canadian employés under him like dogs.

"One of us who would go and behave in that manner in an English province would be kicked out.

"Here the Canadians endured every thing, content with making known their complaints and asking for justice. A poor devil who took a glass of beer was dismissed, while he, besotted with drink, would beat the streets in plain daylight and insult the women of the place. And it took six years to get rid of him. He will probably be called back to New Brunswick, where he may, close under the eyes of his masters, continue his valuable services to the Government. For those fellows are never dismissed. There is a secret thread which keeps them. This is the second man who was sent there from Moncton to play the same game. They were two types absolutely akin. The first remained at the head of the Hadlow shops for nearly fifteen years. It took the members of the county ten years to get rid of him, and it was only in risking his seat that Mr. Belleau succeeded at last. And yet his misbehaviour was notorious and a cause of daily scandal.

"The next day after his dismissal a letter from Mr. Pottinger was already at the Department of Railways recommending the famous Drake to take his place. He came from Moncton to take charge at Hadlow. And yet there was there a man by the name of Langlois, who was a first-class mechanic, sober and industrious. In fact, he was the one who did the work at Hadlow. His chief would content himself with drawing his salary and drinking. All the strongest recommendations were inadequate to obtain for Langlois what belonged to him in justice. Discouraged he left the Intercolonial service and went and offered his services to another road, where they were promptly accepted. Now, here is Drake out in his turn.

"We are going to wait silently for the third specimen who is now to be sent up.

"But true as the sun shines over our heads, if he resembles the others, those who will send him will repent it."

These are words from *Le Matin*, a paper which will not be suspected of favouring my political interests. Unfortunately, after the last investigation, in April, Drake was maintained, at least the Moncton authorities kept him in position after his having been convicted of drunkenness, and after it had been proven by two witnesses—Caron and Samson, two employés of the shops at Hadlow—that he had promised them promotion if they would swear they had perjured themselves at the first enquiry. Notwithstanding these damning revelations, Drake, thanks to the occult influence which protects him, was maintained until the 1st of May. I am not accusing the Minister of Railways, for he does not seem to know about it, and I am pleased to believe that he does not know. Now, do you know what this Drake did, Mr. Speaker? He profited by his being kept in position to dismiss all those who had testified against him at the first enquiry. Unfortunately, the fears expressed by *Le Matin* and other Conservative papers, among which *Le Quotidien*, a newspaper supporting the Government, unfortunately, I say, these fears were realized, and friends of mine, not political friends, but personal friends, wrote to me from Lévis to ask by whom Drake had been replaced. I put a question to the Government to find out whether Drake had been dismissed, and who was to replace him. The hon. Minister answered that Drake had really been dismissed, and that he would be replaced by a competent man. He did not give me the name of the new man. But the fears of *Le Matin* were realized to the letter, Mr. Speaker, and the same paper, a few days later, announced that a man by the name of Bob Stevens had been appointed in Drake's place. This appointment was so unpleasant that a number of Conservative members from the district of Quebec, driven by public opinion, called on the Minister of Railways, or the Postmaster General, who represents more especially the district of Quebec in the Government, to protest against the appointment. They were told that the matter would be attended to, but nothing was done, and the man Bob Stevens is still at his post. I protest in the name of the workingmen of Lévis against the appointment of this person. He may be capable of discharging his duties, but I think the Government could have easily found among their political friends, among the mechanics who work in the Hadlow shops, or in the works or manufactories of Lévis, a man, qualified in every respect to take the place of Drake. In this connection this is what the organ of the Knights of Labour of Lévis, *Le Travailleur*, was saying a few days ago about Drake's dismissal and the appointment of his successor :

"Who is to replace him? This is a question which it is not our province to solve. Shall it be an individual of the same class as the two last who have been forced to recede before public contempt? It would not be surprising after the crying injustice already committed to the detriment of our countrymen in connection with this position.

"We will not carry the national spirit as far as asking that a French-Canadian be appointed to this position, although it belongs to us by right. Besides, should we want that, all our efforts in that direction would be useless, for we know by experience whom we have to deal with.

"But what we want, what we have a right to exact, is that a man from the shops, or at least from Levis, be appointed, let him be French-Canadian, English or Irish. What we want is that he be not an imported one from another province, one of those men whose only qualifica-

tion and recommendation is their hatred of the French Canadians.

"Thank God, there are in Lévis and in Quebec, employés able, sober and intelligent, either English or French, who can fill satisfactorily to all a place of trust at the Hadlow works.

"We want one of these to be appointed.

"Let justice be done."

Mr. Speaker, if it be true that no one has yet been appointed in the place of the man who has just been dismissed, I hope that after the protests which he has received from his own friends, those which are to be found in the press, and those which I now give voice to in the name of the electors of my county, I hope, I say, that the Minister of Railways will accede to the request which is made to him, and that he will admit that it is perfectly reasonable that the chief of the Intercolonial works at Hadlow be chosen among the numerous workmen of Lévis. And this is all the more reasonable since there are among them men eminently qualified to fill such a position. I hope that the Minister of Railways will be good enough to hasten to put before the House the documents asked for by my two motions, for, by the way, I must remark that the return in answer to my first motion, voted in March last, has not yet been brought down. I am surprised that the evidence adduced at the first enquiry has not yet been put before the House, for it does not make a very large file. I hope, once more, that he will kindly lose no time in bringing down the documents moved for, that is to say, the evidence taken both at the first and the last enquiry into this matter.

Mr. HAGGART. There can be no possible objection to bringing down the papers. If I remember rightly the circumstances, this Michael Quinn was employed in one of the workshops at Lévis, and for some alleged insubordination and impertinent remarks to his foreman he was dismissed at the time. He applied afterwards to have a further enquiry, alleging that at the time the foreman spoke to him, the foreman was intoxicated and not in a fit condition to take charge of the works. There was an enquiry ordered into the conduct of the foreman, it was found that the allegations against him were correct, and he was on that account discharged. The simple reason why Quinn has not been re-employed is that there has been a large reduction in the force at the workshops at Point Lévis.

Motion agreed to.

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

Mr. DEVLIN moved:

That, in the opinion of this House of Commons of Canada, the time has arrived when a substantial measure of Home Rule should be granted to Ireland; and this House expresses the hope that at the approaching general election in the United Kingdom, a majority will be returned to Parliament pledged to enact a measure which, while safeguarding the unity and interests of the British Empire, will satisfy the legitimate and national aspirations of the Irish people by granting to them a Parliament with jurisdiction over all matters of a local character.

He said: Before putting this motion in your hands, Mr. Speaker, it may be well that I should offer a few remarks in explanation of the reasons which have induced me to ask the House to concur in it. Since it has appeared upon the Paper, it has been commented upon in many ways, but it is peculiarly gratifying to me to know that if the mover has been severely criticised, if my course has been rather severely censured, the principle involved in the motion has met with generous treatment and respect in nearly every paper which has had articles upon this question. I have no intention of dealing with all the charges made against myself for having introduced this resolution. This is neither the place nor the time to do so; but I may say I have the great satisfaction of knowing that much kind sympathy has been expressed in favour of this resolution. I will ask, however, the House to bear with me an instant while I meet one or two charges which I think it is my duty at once to repel. I have been charged with inconsistency because I thought proper, a few weeks ago, when the hon. member for North Simcoe brought up his motion in this House concerning education and language in the North-West, to vote against that motion, and then thought fit to place the resolution now before the House on the Notice Paper. I cannot see that my course is inconsistent. We do not ask for our people in the North-West any more than we are prepared should be granted to the minority in the country specially mentioned in this motion; and if for that reason I am not a Home Ruler, all I can say is that there are only thirty-three genuine Home Rulers in this House. There can be no danger, at all events, with regard to the rights of the minority in Ireland, inasmuch as a very distinct pledge was given by Mr. Gladstone in the great speech delivered by him at Nottingham some time ago, when he said that this settlement would be carried out provided nothing was done to impair the unity of the Empire, but rather to strengthen and consolidate it, and provided no just claim of the minority would be neglected. This is a pretty strong pledge; and anyway it must be borne in mind that it is highly probable that the rights of the minority in that country will be respected, because the Government which must grant this right to Ireland will be a Protestant Government, and therefore just as likely to look after the interests of the minority as it is possible for hon. members in this House or gentlemen outside to look after the same interests. Again, we are told it is none of our business, and that this is not the place to introduce such a motion. Well, if this argument holds to-day, it must have been good ten years ago, when resolutions similar in spirit were introduced in this House by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. I could quote from the speech delivered by Mr. Gladstone himself a few years ago, in which he answered this very argument:

"If anything is said about America, we are asked 'What do Americans understand about English affairs?' It is impertinent on their part to interfere. True, we English people have been in the habit of interfering with everybody's affairs, but that is a totally different matter, and it is obvious according to their account that they have no business to interfere with ours."

Sir, this is a matter in which, if we have not the right to legislate, we have the right at all events to express an opinion. Parliament, it was said the other day by the hon. member for Central Toronto, had the power to do almost anything and everything. Has Parliament not the power to pass a motion of sympathy, which is all I am asking Parliament by this motion to do? Why, only a few weeks ago the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) introduced a resolution asking us to consent to certain propositions which were certainly far more

disturbing in their relations upon trade and far more reaching than the one now before the Chair. He asked us to give advice to England in the matter of her trade policy, and his motion received considerable support in this House. I do not go as far as the hon. gentleman, but merely ask the House to adopt a motion of sympathy. Again, Mr. Speaker, it is well to remember that Parliament already pronounced in favour of Home Rule on former occasions, I think upon three occasions, and it is desirable, especially at this moment, to deprive the opponents of Home Rule of any pretext for asserting that Canada's views on this subject have changed. If I may be permitted, I would like to call the attention of the House to an event which occurred a few days ago in the city of Montreal, at a meeting of the Grand Orange Lodge of British America. Were it not for the importance of this meeting and for the fact that members of this House were present—men supposed to represent the views of many sections of the community—it might not be necessary to refer at any length to the resolution which was there adopted. That resolution read as follows :—

"That the Grand Lodge of British North America, assembled in the metropolitan city of Montreal, beg leave to express our heartfelt sympathy with our brethren in Great Britain and Ireland in their determination never to surrender the civil and religious liberty of their brethren in Ireland to the tender mercies of an Irish Parliament; and to assure our brethren that all that can be done constitutionally by the Orangemen of Canada will be done to assist them in the coming struggle; and that the secretary be instructed to forward a document setting forth the above views to the Grand Lodge of Ireland."

Attached to this resolution are the signatures of several members of Parliament, and others, James Bennett, Sam Hughes, J. H. Bell, J. M. Morrison and Rev. W. Walsh. Now, after that resolution was adopted the Grand Master responded, at the banquet which took place shortly afterwards, to the toast of the Grand Lodge of British America; and since the sentiments to which he gave utterance will certainly reach the country and people affected by the motion now before the House, this is an additional reason for passing a motion that might perhaps have the tendency of counteracting some of the effects of the views then expressed. The remarks of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) are quoted in the Toronto *Mail* as follows :—

"Grand Master Clarke Wallace, M.P., responded to the next toast, the Grand Lodge of British America. He thanked the Montreal Orangemen for their generous hospitality. This gathering was the more significant when they recalled past events in this city. It showed that things were rapidly changing in Canada. Such a demonstration in this part of Canada contradicted the assertion that Orangeism was not going ahead. Look at the North-West where Louis Riel not so long ago held full sway, and Schultz and Boulton were in danger. Riel to-day filled a felon's grave. Bro. Schultz was the Governor, and Boulton, although he had gone wrong politically occupied a leading position. Mr. Abbott, who had been a brother when he was more active, had become Premier of the Dominion."

Certainly with such names as those I have just mentioned connected with the movement of which I have spoken, and that report going to Ireland, there can be no doubt that harm will result from the passing of the resolution; and especially when we find the name of the Premier of Canada mentioned at their banquet as one of their members. It has been said that the moment is inopportune for presenting a motion of this kind. If it is inopportune now, it was equally inopportune in the year 1882 to have introduced the former resolutions. If the election which is to decide the fate of Home Rule for Ireland were over, certainly it would be inopportune to pass such a resolution. If Ireland had been granted Home Rule, it would be nonsense to introduce a motion of this kind and it would be inopportune. But we are before the election which is to decide this matter, and we still find that the desires of the people of Ireland have been trampled upon, their wishes have not been respected, they are to-day in the same position as they were years ago, still asking and still rapping at the door of the British Parliament for justice. What would we think of the man who had in his power a remedy to keep away death but kept that remedy in his own hand until after death had occurred? Afterwards it would be inopportune; but I hold that this is a highly opportune moment for the Canadian Parliament to express an opinion on this subject. I do not intend to enter at length into the objections which have been put against Home Rule. They have been considered before, and have been satisfactorily dealt with. They were dealt with in the great debate in this House in 1882, and, in the course of debates which afterwards took place, the objections to granting this inestimable blessing, this just right to the people of Ireland have been met time and time again. It must be remembered that there never was a proposition to ameliorate the condition of the masses which did not meet with opposition. There is no difficulty in finding that this proposition has met with opposition, but it is strange that it should have met with stronger and greater objections than any other measure of reform. It is said this will bring about the dismemberment of the Empire. The same argument was used in regard to the position of Canada before 1840. It was said that if responsible government were granted to Canada, it would bring about the dismemberment of the Empire. The people who advocated the granting of responsible government at that time were denounced as traitors, they were proclaimed rebels, and a price was fixed upon the heads of many of them. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to go outside of this House and see a statue which has been erected to the memory of a gentleman who at that time was denounced as a rebel. When Canada was granted what he and his friends had insisted upon having, the people became contented and satisfied, and is there a race in the Empire to-day more loyal to the British flag and more true to the British Empire than these same people who for years were refused responsible government because, it was said, the granting of it would bring about the dismemberment of the Empire? That statue was placed there by this Parliament, it was paid for by the money of this country, and was erected under the authority of the advisers of the Crown to the memory of the man who was once denounced as a traitor, but who, when he saw the country loyal and satisfied, stated, as we are informed, that it would yet be found that the last gun to be fired in behalf of British connection would be by a French-Canadian.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman may laugh. Perhaps he would not be so ready to do that. There is another thing, in regard to which I will simply point to a few figures in the census returns. We are told that the territory and the population of Ireland are insufficient to enable that country to

have self-government. Take our own provinces. We find Manitoba with a population in 1881 of only 62,260, and it was then possessed of responsible government. We find the North-West Territories with a population to-day of about 67,000, and still they have responsible government. We find responsible government in the Province of Quebec, in the Province of Ontario, and wherever we find it we find the people perfectly satisfied, and yet it is said that a people numbering about 5,000,000 should be denied what is given here to a population of 50,000. Mr. Blake, in his great speech in 1882, gave to the House certain figures which were startling as to the falling off in the population of Ireland, and the figures of to-day are even more startling. In the County of Louth in 1855, the population was 128,000, and now it is only 71,000. In the County of Wexford, according to the census returns just issued, the population in 1881 was 123,000, while to-day it is only 111,000. Wicklow shows another terrible decrease in population, and so on with regard to many other counties. If we had similar figures to quote in regard to this country, we would be startled. I do not deny, as I said at the beginning, that there may be opposition to this movement, but I think it is highly desirable that the country which is intimately allied to us by many ties which it is unnecessary to mention here, should at all events be put upon the same footing as we are. The present condition cannot last: it is wrong that it should exist. It brings misery to one religion, and it brings trouble to the other. It gives rise to the deadliest and most irreconcilable feelings, and, Sir, it is a condition that under the free sky of the British Empire should not exist. I have read, and I believe, that when British feelings and aspirations are allowed to go on to their natural development, unchecked by the selfish considerations of interested classes, they always move in the direction of freedom and justice. Sir, there is another point which it is well to refer to here. It is contended that the Protestant minority in the North of Ireland would be oppressed. Let me quote a few remarkable words uttered by Mr. Gladstone a couple of years ago, and which will go far to remove this apprehension:

"There is, I believe, in the great non-conforming body, that same deliberate and warm welcome to the broad principles of justice and humanity, as applied to Ireland as there was when those principles had to be applied, ten years ago, to Bulgaria or Afghanistan. But there has been some holding back here and there on the part of individuals, and, as far as I can learn, that has been due to an apprehension, of all others the most visionary, although not otherwise than respectable in itself, if there were grounds for it. That ground of apprehension is described fairly and properly as a visionary apprehension, and it consists in the idea that if Home Rule should be passed for Ireland, the Protestants would be in danger of persecution. I hope we are not here again shut out with regard to history and experience. The candid observer cannot fail to be struck with this fact, that in the choice of their leaders, both in the last century and since 1829, when they had the power of choosing Roman Catholic leaders and sending them to Parliament, the Irish people have been perfectly impartial as between Roman Catholics and Protestants. We have been told that there have been great cruelties in Ireland at certain epochs of rebellion and conflict. Yes, gentlemen, there have been: but even here, in the case of the Irishman, as considered and compared with that of his oppressor, there is not one of those rebellions in which, to every one act of cruelty on the part of the Irish nation, arising from an insufferable oppression, there have not been ten, twenty, and even fifty such acts committed by those who were beating them down, and who have kept them down. There is this remarkable circumstance, that, in 1798 and 1641, the saddest, perhaps, of these occasions, the leaders of the historical nation did all they could to mitigate the passions of the people, while unfortunately it is well known that officers bearing the British Sovereign's commission, Irish gentry serving in the yeomanry, Irish peers, men of importance and authority, who could have done much to mitigate the cruelty, instead of doing so urged atrocities. There is one little incident which is so touching and so striking that I can not help referring to it. It is not so much known as it ought to be. Our memory goes back to the time of the reign of Queen Mary, to whose name we sometimes apply an epithet more expressive than it is mild. In that reign, as you very well know, the Protestants formed in England a very powerful party, and notwithstanding that they did form a very powerful party, they were subjected to very sanguinary persecutions. In Ireland there was not a natural and spontaneous growth of the Reformation. That is an historical fact, and it is set forth in no better way than in a very interesting volume by a Tory judge, and an ex-chancellor of Ireland, Mr. Ball, who published a book on the Reformation in Ireland. The Reformation in Ireland was imported. The Protestants there were the merest handful of people, unable to cause uneasiness to the Government or to offer the least resistance to their persecutors. Under these circumstances the Irish people themselves were possessed of powers when they were in unison with the religion of the Government that ruled in England. There was not a single act of persecution which disgraced the whole of those years, and not only so, but it is a positive and absolute fact that from Chester and Bristol, the two British ports from which was then carried on the principal communication with Ireland, the Protestants in England fled in numbers to Ireland because they knew that the public spirit and public feeling in Ireland would make them safe when they touched that shore."

Now, Sir, the motion which I have made I think will commend itself to the sympathy of this House. If passed, as I hope it will pass, I have no doubt it will do much good. It will certainly help to counteract the wrong impressions which might be formed by motions such as the one which I quoted a few moments ago, which was passed elsewhere, and which might possibly tend to convince the people of Great Britain that in this matter the sympathy of the Canadian Parliament had changed. I therefore venture to move the resolution which I have placed in your hands.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not propose to take up the time of the House at any great length on this matter. The hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution has expressed the reasons which have impelled him to bring it forward. I would call attention to the previous action of the House upon this matter. In 1882, as the hon. gentleman mentioned, a resolution was introduced upon this subject by Mr. Costigan, and that resolution was to the effect:

"That an Address be presented to Her Majesty suggesting that the federal system, found so successful in Canada, should be applied by Great Britain for the benefit of Ireland."

This motion was carried and was transmitted to the home Government, and on the 12th June, 1882, the Colonial Secretary replied to that in these words:

"I have received and laid before the Queen the Address to Her Majesty from the Senate and the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, which was transmitted in your Lordship's despatch of the 16th May. I am commanded by Her Majesty to request that you will convey to the Senate and House of Commons Her appreciation of the renewed expression of their unswerving loyalty and devotion to Her Majesty's person and Government. Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the Parliament of Canada on all matters relating to the Dominion and the administration of its affairs; but with respect to the questions referred to in the address, Her Majesty will, in accordance with the constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the Imperial Parliament and Ministers, to whom all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain."

That was the reply to the first resolution. In 1886

another resolution was moved by Mr. Blake which, as amended by the hon. Mr. Costigan, was also carried. That resolution was transmitted to the High Commissioner for Canada for the information of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom. Again, in 1887, a resolution was introduced into this House by the hon. member for Montreal Centre in favour of Home Rule, and copies of it, after it was carried, were transmitted to Lord Salisbury, Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell. I am of the opinion that we have had about enough of this question in this House. I do not rise for the purpose of discussing Home Rule at all, for it has been discussed three times in this Parliament at great length, especially after the answer sent by the Colonial Secretary in regard to this Parliament attending to matters within its jurisdiction, and signifying that the Imperial Parliament would attend to matters within its jurisdiction, for that reply ought to pretty well dispose of this subject. But if the hon. gentleman were actuated by the serious motives, and I do not impugn them, which he has expressed, if he were a wise man he would be guided somewhat by his friends; and I propose on this point to read an extract from, I suppose, the most powerful advocate of Home Rule in this country--I allude to the *True Witness* of Montreal. I suppose it will not be denied, even by the mover of this resolution, that this organ is one that speaks with a good deal of authority on this subject. The extract is as follows:—

"Naturally the public will expect from an Irish Catholic organ like the *True Witness* an expression of opinion on the subject. We are prepared to give an emphatic opinion. It is to the effect that such a resolution is very untimely, inopportune and dangerous to the interest of the cause it purports to assist. Thrice already have Home Rule resolutions been carried in the Canadian House of Commons, and thrice have the people of this Dominion expressed themselves through their Parliamentary representatives in favour of a full measure of self-government for Ireland. This action on the part of the young member for Ottawa County tends most certainly to jeopardize the beneficial effects of the former emphatic resolutions. A defeat to-day, or even a resolution carried by a smaller majority than the former ones, would be tantamount to an expression of feeling adverse to the Irish cause. If the public is rightly informed the mover of this new resolution sprang his notice of motion upon the House without ever having consulted any of his Irish parliamentary colleagues. If it is urged that he did consult with the Irish members of his own party, then it would seem to be for partisan purposes he has taken the step, and for the sake of local political capital he did not hesitate to risk the interests of a cause too sacred to every serious Irishman to be made a play-toy or shuttlecock. If he did not consult with any of the Irish members of the House of Commons it is, to say the least, very imprudent. It is not necessary that every new member—of Irish extraction—should commence his career with a display of Irish patriotism and a set speech, whether the occasion requires them or not, whether his action was judicious or injudicious. In presence of recent deplorable events, which each one in his own sphere is striving to consign to oblivion: in the face of the existing divisions at home and the impending election; under the circumstances of the peculiar position of the political parties to-day at Ottawa, it is highly improper and exceedingly unwise for a man of serious judgment to spring such a resolution upon the House. There are other ways of gaining a name, and fame bought at the risk of a country's cause is short-lived. No resolution passed to-day at Ottawa could add one iota to the influence of the resolutions of former years, but if defeated, or even passed with a slim majority, it would certainly nullify all the good that has been done.

"After some further remarks as to the future prospects of the Irish Parliamentary party, the editor of the *True Witness* concludes as follows: 'For these and many other reasons, we believe the member for Ottawa County has made a grave mistake, has allowed his patriotic zeal to overcome his calm judgment, and we trust he will be wise enough not to persevere in his undertaking. We repeat, the resolution was uncalled for, untimely and eminently menacing to the cause which, next to that of his faith, an Irishman should hold most sacred and inviolate.'"

Upon those who are in favour of Home Rule measures, surely such a warning as this, such language couched in strong and still moderate terms should have some effect. I do not propose further to deal with the resolution proposed than to state, in addition, why I propose to move the amendment which I rose to submit to the House. I have always held the opinion, and I still stand by it, that in Imperial affairs the Imperial Parliament should govern, and that we should not interfere. I would ask the mover of the resolution how he would feel, and how much attention he would pay, if the Imperial House of Commons passed a resolution, and forwarded a copy of it to us, with a view to influence the action of this Parliament in regard to some subject within its control. For my part—and I am simply expressing my own views on this subject—I have always held strong opinions on this subject. I am a strong believer in British connection and British institutions, but I am equally strong in maintaining the opinion that the Parliament of Canada can attend to its own affairs, and I would deplore, and indeed I would resent, any interference, by the Imperial Parliament, in respect to affairs within our own control. I believe, therefore, we should allow the Imperial Parliament the same liberty. But this resolution goes a step further than any of the three previous resolutions adopted in regard to Home Rule as regards the effect intended to be secured, and that is, that on this occasion it is proposed to influence, as the resolution states on its face, the general elections now approaching for the English House of Commons. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman what he would think if the Imperial Parliament passed a resolution to affect general elections in this Dominion? I do not believe such action would meet with the approbation of the people of this country, and I am sure every hon. member on both sides of this House would deem it to be uncalled for, and would pay the same attention to it as the Home Government did when Mr. Gladstone's Colonial Secretary replied to the first resolution passed by this Parliament on the subject of Home Rule. As regards my individual opinion, had this resolution not contained this additional allegation, an allegation intended to affect if possible the general elections in the United Kingdom, the resolution is uncalled for. Without occupying the time of the House further, I move, seconded by Mr. Macdonald, of Winnipeg, the following amendment:—

That all the words after the word "That" be struck out, and the following inserted instead thereof: "any expression of the opinion of this House on this subject being uncalled for at the present time, and this House not being desirous of expressing any views as to the approaching general election in the United Kingdom, the Orders of the Day be now proceeded with."

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not think the seconder of the amendment is in the House.

Mr. WELDON. I second the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have listened with considerable pleasure to the hon. gentleman who has moved the amendment to the motion made by the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin), and I fail to see that he has given any good and sufficient reason why the motion should not be adopted.

He first referred to the resolution passed in 1882, moved by the Minister of Inland Revenue, and also to the subsequent motion passed in 1887, and moved by the hon. member for Montreal Centre, and he referred to the reply received from the Home Government as affording a reason why we should not again approach Her Majesty in regard to this subject. I do not consider that is any reason why we should be debarred from our right and privilege of addressing the Home Government on this or any other question. This House has in fact created a precedent for a motion of this kind. It is only a week or so ago since we advised Her Majesty's Government upon how they should conduct their fiscal policy in England, and the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) at that time supported this motion. He did not rise in his place then and quote the reply we received from the Home Government upon a previous question why we should not adopt the resolution referred to. But now, because it does not suit his political views that the present motion should be adopted, he quotes the reply we received from the English Government to the motions passed by this Parliament in 1882 and 1887. For my part, I do not think that that is any reason why we should not again express our views upon this great and important question. The hon. gentleman from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) also thinks that my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) should have consulted his Irish friends in the House of Commons before he brought forward this motion. I believe that it is the right and privilege of any hon. gentleman in this House, of his own accord, and with or without the advice and consent of other members, to place upon the Order Paper any motion that he thinks should be adopted by this House. Neither do I think that this is an Irish question alone. I am not an Irishman myself, but as a Canadian and as a British subject I can feel as keenly and sympathize as fully with the people of Ireland in their long struggle against misrule and oppression, as any man in this House. This is a question that peculiarly affects not only Irishmen but Scotchmen and Englishmen and every man interested in the unity of the Empire all over the world. We have to a very great extent felt in Canada the effects of the oppression and coercion which has been adopted by the British Government towards their fellow subjects in Ireland. There is no doubt that the great stream of emigration which is flowing from that beautiful Isle to the United States would tend towards this Canada of ours if it had not been for that feeling of anger and of hatred which has sprung up against the British colonies, on account of the oppression and misrule that have followed the policy of the British Government in Ireland. It is on that account that I say that we, as Canadians, should take a deep interest in this question, and if the passage of such a resolution as this now before us will tend in any small degree to remove the feeling of discontent which exists in Ireland, it will accomplish a great deal of good. Now, Sir, as has been stated, various motions have been passed upon this question at other times in this House, and, to my mind, the present time is most opportune that we should pass a resolution such as this. Before I pass to it, however, I wish to reply to some remarks of my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). He quoted largely from the *True Witness*, of Montreal, a Catholic paper which I believe is under the control of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), and he quotes that paper as an exponent of the feelings of the Irish Catholics of this Dominion. If he had gone a little further, he would have seen what the real opinion is; if he had studied the question a little more fully, if he had taken up the *United Canada*, the Kingston *Freeman*, the *Irish Canadian*, the *Catholic Record*, or the *Daily Telegraph* of Quebec, which voice the opinions of Irish Canadians all over the Dominion, or even if he had consulted the Charlottetown *Watchman*; all these papers, I believe, hold as high a position and take as high a stand in the Catholic Church as the little *True Witness* of Montreal, which is under the thumb of one particular member in this House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is not Curran-t literature.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, it is not current literature. So far as the expression of public opinion is concerned as voiced by the organs of this particular church, the preponderance is largely in favour of the motion which has been placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin). I, therefore, think that the hon. gentleman has made no point in referring to the article in the *True Witness*. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) also alleges that this motion is inopportune. In my humble opinion there never was a time when it was more opportune, or when the passing of this resolution would tend to accomplish the object that every true friend of Ireland has in view. What are the facts? We know that at the present time in the United Kingdom, the two great political parties are being arrayed in the order of battle for one of the most desperate political struggles that has ever taken place in modern times. On the banners of the Liberal party, headed and led by the grand old statesman whose name will go down to the ages as one of the noblest men of his time; on the banners of that party are inscribed the words "Home Rule for Ireland," and not only Home Rule for Ireland, but Home Rule for Scotland and England as well. If the great Liberal party should triumph at the coming elections, the dream of every true lover of the little Green Isle which he has so long and fondly cherished would be realized and once again on College Green a Parliament will be assembled to manage the local affairs of Ireland, and in its train I believe it will bring peace and contentment to Ireland and unity and strength to the British Empire. We must not forget that there are powerful forces arrayed against the Liberal party in England. The Conservative party headed and led by Lord Salisbury is strongly entrenched against this just policy. On their banners is displayed the old policy of coercion which for the last hundred years has done so much to crush and debase and pauperize the Irish people, and which has also done so much to weaken the unity and strength of the British Empire, and if that policy is adopted all hope of Home Rule for Ireland will be gone for many long years to come. Under these circumstances is it not most fitting that we, the people of Canada, who have for so many years enjoyed all the blessings and all the privileges of Home Rule, should at this particular time pronounce

our opinion when our voices can give aid and encouragement to those who are struggling for what we consider as right and in the best interests of the British Empire? Why should we not now send forth our voice in trumpet sound to the people of England, Ireland and Scotland who are engaged in this great struggle against all the force and power and patronage of a Government, which is strongly entrenched, with every loophole guarded, every weak point in their armour protected, and with all the power and prestige of the Treasury benches at their back. I say, Mr. Speaker, that now is the time, if ever, and that our action to-day will be hailed with delight by those who need our aid, sympathy and encouragement. It is for these reasons that I have very great pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. friend from Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin). I hope that this House will unanimously pass this motion, and thus give what aid and encouragement we can to the people of Ireland and the British Empire.

Mr. WALLACE. I have listened with a good deal of attention to the mover and seconder of this resolution to find out what reasons they had for bringing this motion before the Dominion Parliament, and Sir, I have been exceedingly disappointed. When we remember the eloquence and ability with which the late hon. leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Edward Blake, brought this question before the Parliament of Canada, when we remember the eloquent speeches that were made in favour of it by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) and by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue in days gone by, and when to-day we hear these milk-and-water apologetic speeches from the hon. mover and seconder of the motion, we cannot fail to be struck by the great contrast between the days that are gone and to-day. Why, Sir, what does the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) say? He says that we should adopt this resolution even in the face of the repulse that was given to us by Mr. Gladstone ten years ago when he told us to mind our own business. This is what he said:

"Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the Parliament of Canada on all matters relating to the Dominion and the administration of its affairs; but with respect to the questions referred to in the Address, Her Majesty will, in accordance with the constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the Imperial Parliament and Ministers, to whom all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain."

Now, the hon. gentleman says that notwithstanding the opinion given by the then Premier of England, we are justified in still obtruding our opinions upon the British Parliament on questions relating to the British Empire and local questions to be decided by them. As has been well said on this side of the House, we would resent the interference of the British Parliament in our local affairs, and therefore we should be more than careful how we obtrude our opinions upon them in regard to matters in which we have no direct concern. But the hon. member for Kent tells us that we advised Her Majesty's Government on her fiscal policy the other day. Now, Mr. Speaker, was that a fair and candid way of stating the fact? We did not do anything of the kind. We did not advise them how they should regulate their fiscal affairs, but we proposed reciprocal trade regulations with them, and that was a fair proposition for one portion of the Empire to make to another.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What advice did you offer to Montreal?

Mr. WALLACE. I am going to refer to that, and I am not going to go back on the advice either.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why did you obtrude?

Mr. WALLACE. It was not a case of the Parliament of Canada obtruding its opinions. We are entitled, as individuals, to express our sympathies with individuals on the other side of the water, and we did so, and we are going to do it again. The hon. member for Kent, as well as the hon. member for Ottawa County, said that we sympathized with the struggles of the people of Ireland against misrule and oppression. Why, Sir, in all the speeches and addresses which they have delivered, they have failed to point out one example of misrule and oppression in Ireland. The hon. member for Ottawa County went back to 1641, two hundred and fifty-one years ago, to the reign of Queen Anne, to find cases of oppression; but neither the mover nor the seconder of the resolution has pointed to a single case of misrule or oppression of the people of Ireland. The people of Ireland are, I think, as well governed as the people of any other portion of the British Islands.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friend is speaking for the hon. member for Montreal Centre now.

Mr. CURRAN. The member for Montreal Centre can speak for himself.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the two members behind the hon. member for Bothwell need somebody to speak for them.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am quite satisfied with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. The people of Ireland, I say, are as well governed as the people of any other portion of the British Islands. Why, Sir, take the land question there. In Canada, in the Province of Ontario if a tenant does not pay his rent, out he has to go. In Ireland, is that the case? No, Sir. There the tenant has an extended time for paying his rent. More than that, if he is not satisfied with the amount of the rent he has to pay, he can bring his case before the Land Court, an inexpensive court, where a speedy investigation is made, and justice is done to all parties.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is a real garden of Eden.

Mr. WALLACE. I was present for some days at these land courts—of Ireland—and I saw there allowance made for improvements which had been made twenty years or more before. In Canada, in the Province of Ontario, at any rate, the tenant has no such redress as he has in Ireland. Then, in regard to other questions, the present British Cabinet are busily engaged in redressing grievances that exist.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You said there were none.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman knows that Parliaments exist for the purpose of redressing grievances and righting wrongs. The Parliament of the British Islands have been more than willing to redress whatever grievances may exist in Ireland, and they are engaged to-day in giving that country a form of local government—not the form advocated by the hon. member for Ottawa County, but a form of local government almost similar to

the form that is being adopted for England and Scotland; and, Sir, I have no doubt that this form of government will ameliorate the condition of affairs in Ireland, because it gives the people a more complete system of control over their local affairs; but, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised—though I am not so much surprised either—at the hon. member for Ottawa County crying out to-day, we want Home Rule for Ireland. What was the attitude of the hon. gentleman the other day when we wanted a little more Home Rule for our provinces in the North-West Territories? Did he cry out for Home Rule for our own people to whom we had the power of giving that privilege? No, Sir, I think the records will show that the hon. gentleman voted against giving Home Rule to our own people in the Canadian North-West. That is the consistency and sincerity of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We want to give them responsible government first.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think the hon. gentleman is very responsible for what he says. I think the discussion of the question of Home Rule in this House will not lead to any practical results in the old country, and has not benefited this Parliament of Canada in any way. Let us examine for a few moments what is asked for by those people on the other side who are demanding Home Rule for Ireland. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) says he is in favour of sufficient safeguards, which, while protecting the unity and the interests of the Empire, will satisfy the legitimate and national interests of the Irish people by granting to them a Parliament with jurisdiction over all matters of local character. But that is not what is wanted by the Parnellites and Home Rulers. That is not what they are asking to-day or what they have been asking for during many years. What does Mr. Parnell himself says:

"Deprive them (the landlords) of the position of an English garrison in Ireland, and then the last knell of English power and government in Ireland would have been sounded. * * * Let us see, as in 1782, one hundred thousand swords, both Catholic and Protestant, leaping from their scabbards, and * * * it will not be a question of chicanery or of acts of Parliament, or of anything that can possibly interfere with the right of our own people to make their own laws on the soil of Ireland."

And in that celebrated speech which Mr. Parnell made in Cincinnati, a few years ago, which I am aware has been denied but which has been proved by its publication in too many newspapers both American and Irish, to be successfully denied, what did he say? He was speaking there to a large audience, and he said:

"With your help in keeping our people alive this winter, I feel confident we shall kill the Irish landlord system."

They were allying the question of the land with the question of the freedom of Ireland and of the government of Ireland. And than he said:

"And when we have given Ireland to the people of Ireland, we shall have laid the foundation upon which to build up our Irish nation. The feudal-tenure and the rule of the minority have been the corner-stone of English rule. Pull out that corner-stone, break it up, destroy it, and you undermine English misgovernment, and let us not forget that that is the ultimate goal at which all we Irishmen aim. None of us—whether we are in America or Ireland, or wherever we may be—will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England."

That was a speech delivered in Cincinnati in 1880, and reported both in the Irish and American newspapers. Now, that is the position taken by a gentleman who has been the only succesful leader of the Irish party almost during the present century—the gentleman who accomplished most in uniting the various elements of that party into one whole. What does he further say?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No surrender.

Mr. WALLACE. He says:

"You must never forget that there is a higher cause than even the land for the people—that we have a nationality, and that we should never fail to ask for the restoration of that nationality—it is the duty of every man now to work to make Ireland a nation: and when I say Ireland a nation, I mean no mockery of freedom, I mean Ireland mistress of her own destiny. Ireland with a national army to guard her shores, Ireland with a national senate, and Ireland with a national government that will know no higher authority than the sovereign will of the Irish people."

I think I have demonstrated by these remarks that the object of these Home Rulers in Ireland is one which does not commend itself to the majority of the people of Canada. If this resolution were passed by this Parliament of Canada, it would not be endorsed by the majority of the people of Canada? I think, therefore, it would be better, if it be necessary for us to pass any resolution, to pass a resolution to help those men in Ireland who, six years ago, when the two great political parties were in danger of surrendering to the demands of Home Rulers, stood in the breach and brought the British nation and the British people to their senses. I say again, if it were necessary to pass a resolution, we should pass one endorsing the principles and the policy and the stand made by these men in the north of Ireland, these loyal men whose principles have not changed, who to-day are the same as they were in 1866, in saying they will never give up their freedom, never give up that property they acquired in the north of Ireland and those principles they have enjoyed, and who deny the right of the British Parliament—not to govern them because they request the British Parliament to continue governing them—but they deny the right of the British Parliament to hand them over practically to a foreign Government; and that party has left no uncertain sound as to what they would do if, unfortunately, Mr. Gladstone should come into power and carry out the policy he has outlined. Why, Mr. Dillon, one of the leaders of the Home Rule party, said not very long ago:

"It is a struggle to undo the system set up in this country by William and Cromwell, and under which the Irish people have toiled for nearly two hundred years. * * When we come out of the struggle, we will remember who were the people's friends, and who were the people's enemies, and deal out our reward to one and our punishment to the other."

What does that mean? It means that if these men got into power and Home Rule for Ireland were passed, they would remember their friends as well as remember their enemies. They would reward the one and punish the other.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That will do.

Mr. CASEY. That is never done anywhere.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman would observe some of the decencies of debate, although that may be something, perhaps, new to him, it might be of some good.

Mr. McNEILL. It is an indecent debate.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not quite approve of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), because I would rather vote down by a straight negative vote the motion which has been made. I do not think the motion of the hon. member for Ottawa was made with very great sincerity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. I would prefer to follow, although at a very great distance, the move made by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Mc Neill), who brought in a resolution stirring up every portion of the British Empire, making us remember that we are all members of the one great Confederation, tending to bind us closer together; while this resolution, if adopted, would tend to disintegrate the Empire, would possibly create civil war, and all the evils in its train, and I, therefore, hope that not only will this resolution be voted down, as I am sure it will be if the House gets an opportunity of doing so, but that the policy declared in it will never be carried out in any portion of the British Empire.

Mr. CURRAN. I avail myself of this opportunity of saying a few words, not merely on the main question, which has been brought into this House by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin), but on the amendment that has been proposed by another hon. member, and the speech which has just been delivered by the hon. gentleman who has just now resumed his seat. It has been stated in the course of the remarks of the seconder of this resolution that I was the proprietor of the Montreal *True Witness*, or at all events that it was my organ. I regret very much to say that such is not the case. I wish it were my organ. I should be pleased to have an organ, but I am too poor to enjoy that luxury, and at the same time I do not think those who own and edit that journal will be at all obliged to those who have insinuated that the paper is under my control in any way. I shall reserve what I have to say in regard to the motion that has been introduced until I have disposed of what I think are the objections to the amendment just proposed. The hon. gentleman has told us that we have no right, in his opinion, to interfere in subjects of this kind. In that respect he differs very materially from the late right hon. leader of the Government, who, on more than one occasion, stated as his opinion that we were perfectly justified in passing such a resolution, and, as we all know, if any such resolution did pass through this House, it was through the influence of the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, without whose influence such a resolution could not pass. In the next place he told us that this resolution was objectionable in its form, and possibly, if I had had anything to do with the drafting of it, I would have avoided the objection to which he alludes; but, as the greater contains the less, the hon. gentleman will see at a glance that, if the House of Commons of Canada is of opinion that a substantial measure of Home Rule should be granted to Ireland, it must necessarily desire that those who are in favour of it should be in the House of Commons, because, if they are not there to vote for such a measure, it would be useless to express any desire for it, as the power to pass such a measure would be absent. I think the grounds urged by my hon. friend thus lack the force they otherwise would be entitled to. But the last speaker, in the course of his observations, told us that Home Rule for Ireland, as understood by its advocates, is virtually separation from the Empire. That charge has been made and refuted over and over again. It is useless to put it forward. It is merely used as a bugaboo to frighten people who have no sense, and to my mind is not entertained seriously even by those who are most ardently opposed to Home Rule. In the recent campaign, Mr. McCarthy, who is the leader of a very large section of the Irish party in the old country, delivered a most remarkable speech at Derry in which he laid down what are the views of the Irish party. He said:

"The Irish people can never give up their demand for Home Rule, and they never will (cheers). The Irish people know that the prosperity of every country depends upon its power of managing its own local affairs. Everyone who has been to one of our great colonies, everyone who has been to the United States of America, everyone who has been—as my friend Mr. Swift MacNeill has been—to the self-governing South African colonies, well knows that in proportion as you give intelligent men the right of controlling and managing their own affairs the more prosperous and safe and happy will the commonwealth become (applause). Now, we ask nothing more for ourselves than is given to the great colonies of Canada, Australia and South Africa. We only ask the right to manage our own affairs ourselves (cheers). We hear occasionally, or at least we used to hear, people agitating for separation. We used to be told: 'You Irish Home Rulers, you don't mean what you say; you don't mean Home Rule at all, but when you get Home Rule you will go in for separation by civil war.' Well, now, can anything be more ridiculous than to say that Ireland would like separation because she had got the grant of all that she wished to possess—the right to manage her own affairs? Why do people separate? Why does one state separate from another state? Because it has been refused its just demands (applause). But did you ever hear of a state breaking away because it had got all it wanted? Demands for separation come when home government is denied, not when it is granted. Why is it that our American colonies broke away from us and that the Canadian colonies remain with us? Because, through the stupidity of the Government then in power, the Americans were told: 'You shall never be allowed to govern yourselves, you shall be governed from the Parliament in Westminster only.' Then it was that the Americans put their backs to the wall and said: 'If you don't allow us to manage our own affairs we will break away and set up for ourselves.' And they did so, and now there is not a single Englishman living who does not say that when the Americans found that they could not get Home Rule otherwise, they were right to obtain it by force of arms (applause). Look at the Canadians. Why the Canadians were in actual rebellion against this country because they were denied the right of home government, but the Government, the statesmen of the day, saw, from the example of the American Republic, that it would not be possible to hold Canada without giving it self-government, and now England has not a more loyal set of people on the globe than the successful Canadians who have obtained liberty, and are now managing their own affairs (applause). You deny that liberty to one people you give unto the Canadians, and they settle down in loyalty to the Crown and Government of this country. Those who deny to Ireland Home Rule, or who would deny it if they could, those are the people who are treading the dangerous ways that must lead to her separation. We say that we who are urging on the English Parliament to give us Home Rule, we are the true men who are going the way for the safe and lasting union of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales (applause). There is our demand explicitly made. There is our full and final demand. We ask our right to manage our own affairs, because we understand them best. We ask of the English Parliament nothing more than that, and we say if they give us that, we will enter into a union of brotherhood, and never another bitter word will be spoken between Englishmen and Irishmen on national questions."

That is the statement made by a gentleman respected the world over for his sincerity, and who is known as a strong constitutionalist. It is an answer, I think, to the statement made by my hon. friend here, who has sought to give an interpreta-

tion to the words of Mr. John Dillon, also a Constitutionalist, a gentleman who stands high in the respect of all parties in England, when he says Mr. Dillon told them they were watching what was going on during this great struggle, and they would reward their friends and punish their enemies. Now, what a terrible statement to make. Really, my hon. friend must have been hard pressed to find some objectionable speech, when he had to pick out words that might have been spoken, that have been spoken, perhaps, by every Canadian speaker on a public platform in behalf of constitutional government. Is it so terrible a thing, after all, to say that they would remember their friends and their enemies? Does that mean civil war? Unless my hon. friend and those who think like him, are liable to take fright at the slightest expression of any kind, I cannot see that there is anything in the language quoted, supposing it to be absolutely true, that can possibly give colour to the statements that he has made here as to its meaning. Now, the hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution has spoken about former resolutions that were introduced into this House. When the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue introduced his resolution, there had been, from one end of this country to the other, a demand for the introduction of such a motion as that. When the hon. gentleman made his motion in regard to Home Rule the hearts of the people here and elsewhere were stirred at the sight of men being incarcerated without even a charge being laid against them, mere suspects, and that motion contained not merely a demand that Home Rule should be granted to Ireland, but that those who were imprisoned should be fairly dealt with. The words of that resolution were as follows:—

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, desire most earnestly, in our own name, and on behalf of the people whom we represent, to renew the expression of our unswerving loyalty and devotion to Your Majesty's person and Government.

"1. We have observed, may it please Your Majesty, with feelings of profound regret and concern, the distress and discontent which have prevailed for some time among Your Majesty's subjects in Ireland.

"2. We would respectfully represent to Your Majesty that your Irish subjects in the Dominion of Canada are among the most loyal, most prosperous and most contented of Your Majesty's subjects.

"3. We would further respectfully represent to Your Majesty that the Dominion of Canada, while offering the greatest advantages and attractions for those of our fellow-subjects who may desire to make their homes amongst us, does not receive that proportion of emigrants from Ireland which might reasonably be expected and that this is due, in a great measure, in the case of many of our Irish fellow-subjects who have sought foreign homes, to their feelings of estrangement towards the Imperial Government.

"4. We would further most respectfully represent to Your Majesty, that in the interests of this, your loyal Dominion and of the entire Empire, it is extremely to be desired that Your Majesty may not be deprived, in the development of Your Majesty's possessions on this continent, of the valuable aid of those of Your Majesty's Irish subjects who may feel disposed to leave their native land to seek more prosperous homes.

"5. We desire respectfully to suggest to Your Majesty, that Canada and its inhabitants have prospered exceedingly under a federal system, allowing to each province of the Dominion considerable powers of self-government, and would venture to express a hope that if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected and secured, sure means may be found of meeting the expressed desire of so many of your Irish subjects in that regard, so that Ireland may become a source of strength to Your Majesty's Empire, and that Your Majesty's Irish subjects at home and abroad may feel the same pride in the greatness of Your Majesty's Empire, the same veneration for the justice of Your Majesty's rule, and the same devotion to, and affection for, our common flag, as are now felt by all classes of Your Majesty's loyal subjects in this Dominion.

"6. We would further express a hope that the time has come when Your Majesty's clemency may, without injury to the interests of the United Kingdom, be extended to those persons who are now imprisoned in Ireland charged with political offences only, and the inestimable blessings of personal liberty restored to them."

Well, under those circumstances that resolution was brought in, and was carried unanimously. Matters remained there for some years, until Mr. Gladstone, then Premier of England, introduced his Home Rule measure. It was then that Mr. Blake brought in another motion, and that motion, as amended by the Minister of Inland Revenue, was also carried by a large majority. But those resolutions had not any particular effect, as we all know. The answer that was transmitted to this Parliament by Lord Kimberley, the Colonial Secretary of State, has been rehearsed often enough, and there is no necessity for referring to it again. In the beginning of 1887, the Government of Mr. Gladstone having been defeated, and Lord Salisbury and those who surrounded him having taken the reins of power into their hands, it was sought to impose on the people of Ireland a new Coercion Act, and the people of Canada from one end of the Dominion to the other, from Halifax to Vancouver, in every great city, held meetings, with the mayors of those cities presiding, in many instances, which meetings protested against this new coercion which was then sought to be enforced upon the Irish people. One of the largest meetings ever held in the city of Montreal was convened in the Queen's Hall there, the mayor presiding, and upon the platform were several of the most influential citizens. At that meeting similar resolutions were passed, and another resolution was carried calling upon me, as member for one of the divisions of Montreal, to introduce a similar resolution upon the floor of this House; and being backed up as I was by public opinion throughout the country, I proposed a resolution in this House, which I will read, because my hon. friend who proposed the amendment now in your hands, stated that it goes further than any former resolution. I think that the language of the resolution I proposed against coercion, and in favour of Home Rule, and which was passed by this House, was strong enough to carry conviction to any man's mind. It was as follows:—

"That the Parliament of Canada in the year 1882 adopted a humble Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, expressing the hope that a just measure of Home Rule would be granted to the people of Ireland: and

"That in the year 1886, by resolution of the House of Commons the sentiments of said Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty were earnestly reiterated, and the hope again expressed that a measure of Home Rule satisfactory to the people of Ireland would be passed by the Imperial Parliament; and

"That such measure of Home Rule has not been granted to the Irish people, but, on the contrary, there has been introduced to the Imperial House of Commons by Her Majesty's Government, a Bill enacting the most stringent coercive measures for Ireland, by which the Irish people will be deprived of rights most dear to all British subjects.

"That this House has learned with profound regret of the introduction into the Imperial House of Commons of the Coercion Bill above mentioned, and protests against its adoption, as being subversive of the rights and liberties of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland.

"That this House again expresses the hope that there may speedily be granted to Ireland such a measure of Home Rule as is enjoyed in the Dominion of Canada, which, while satisfying the national aspirations of the

people of Ireland for self-government, shall also be consistent with the integrity of the Empire as a whole.

"That the granting of Home Rule to Ireland will fittingly crown the already glorious reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty as a constitutional sovereign, will come with special appropriateness in this Her jubilee year, and if possible render Her Majesty more dear to the hearts of Her already devoted and loyal subjects.

"That the present resolutions be forwarded to the Right Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, Prime Minister, to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., and Charles Stewart Parnell, M.P."

I think the language of that resolution cannot be misunderstood. I think no language used in this House can go any further than that language in expressing the sentiments of the people of Canada on the subject of Home Rule. I will say further, that all the more significance must be attached to it because in the Dominion elections which had just preceded its passage, there had been throughout this country a discussion of the question of Home Rule for Ireland on almost every platform, and the members of this House here assembled, having carried that resolution, the only thing to be regretted is that it has not produced the desired effect on the minds of those to whom it was addressed, not even to the extent, I am afraid, of having elicited an answer in reply from any one of them. But this merely goes to show that the sentiment of the people of Canada, represented by their members here, whenever they have spoken, except at the meeting referred to by the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) over which the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) presided, at which meeting there might naturally be expected to be dissenting voices raised against Home Rule for Ireland, has been practically unanimous on this question. Why, there is no more significance as regards a resolution passed at the Grand Orange Lodge Association of Canada against Home Rule for Ireland than there would be in a resolution in favour of Home Rule passed by a Home Rule League. Every one knows, both in Ireland and Canada, that these expressions of opinion must be expected from that quarter. But we hope and we believe that, if Home Rule were granted to Ireland, the very men who have been using the most forcible language against the movement, the very men who have been appealed to in language almost unparalleled in history, would feel that their country, because it is their country after all, would be equally benefited. We believe that ultimately they will see everything as we do, and be ready to walk hand in hand with us. When that day comes and Home Rule is granted to Ireland, as it must inevitably come, for if it does not come it will be through the fault of the people themselves and those with whom they should stand shoulder to shoulder in the supreme hour—when that day comes, the people of the north of Ireland will be just as secure in their rights as the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec are secure in their rights to-day in that overwhelmingly Catholic province. I have no fear upon that subject. I may not view this matter exactly in the same light as the hon. member for Ottawa County, I may not believe as he does that this is an opportune moment, but I am not going back on the principle of Home Rule on that account, I am going to stand, as I have always stood, by this cause for which I have fought since the movement was initiated. But I will take this opportunity of saying that I was sorry to observe in one of the newspapers of this city an attack upon Hon. Edward Murphy, one of the senators of the Dominion, because he expressed the opinion that it was inopportune to bring this motion forward now, and attempt to enforce again what already has been done and which has never been cancelled by this House. That paper wished to know what Senator Murphy had ever done for the Irish cause. He commenced the first movement made here in the days of Isaac Butt to establish Home Rule, and the first £500 sterling that ever left the shores of America was sent through his agency, and collected from the friends of Home Rule in days when Home Rule was not so popular as it is now. From the days of repeal under O'Connell to this hour, Senator Murphy has been the truest and wisest and most self-sacrificing friend of Ireland in this country. Whilst all this is true, and whilst we cannot do otherwise than ascribe the best motives to those who think themselves justified in bringing forward a measure of this kind, there is an opportunity afforded, and I will avail myself of it, to state in this House what I conceive to be not merely the motive of the resolution, but to arouse the friends of Home Rule as to what this Home Rule question means at the present time, and the reasons why it should receive the hearty support of our fellow-countrymen. This is an appeal issued by the National Federation of America to the friends of Home Rule for Ireland. It says:

"Fellow-Countrymen and Friends of Home Rule.—After centuries of misrule in Ireland, after an unbroken line of martyrs have yielded up their lives in protest, after enduring every form of persecution that could be inflicted, making every sacrifice that was demanded, accepting poverty and exile rather than abandon the hope of restored nationality, the constancy, loyalty and fidelity of our race has aroused the sympathy of the liberty-loving, and won from the majority of the British people an admission of our claims and their consent to render the justice long denied."

That does not sound like what the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) would have us believe was the view of those in favour of separation. The appeal goes on to say:

"The Tory Government, the implacable enemy of the Irish people, has been driven finally to bay. Advices from the other side point inevitably to an early dissolution of Parliament. The general election following immediately will decide the Home Rule question for our generation, if not forever. Friends of Ireland in America, will you aid the Irish people now? Will you organize at once and give the necessary material support without which the battle cannot be won?

"The Tory party have arranged to contest every seat in Ireland, to impose new burdens on our people, knowing their poverty. Shall the sacrifices and devotion of the past be in vain, because of indifference now? Shall the present prove recreant to the past?

"The heavy statutory fees must be deposited when nominations are made. The necessary funds should be in our treasurer's hands before the dissolution of Parliament, in order to be available at once. The hour for final effort is upon us. Fellow-countrymen, you have pledged your support to this contest until the victory was won. The purpose and the lines of contest have not changed. Never in the history of the long struggle has Ireland gained a position so full of promise as the present. Avoidance of the duty you owe your race now under any pretence is desertion in face of the enemy.

"The hour of destiny has arrived for Ireland. This is 'Ireland's Opportunity,' and to nations as to individuals such opportunities seldom recur. The fate of the Home Rule question rests now in your hands; defeat can come only through the apathy of professed friends. The hour for hesitation and discussion is passed. To work! To work at once!

"Send on your individual subscriptions without delay; organize branches of the Federation where none exist; appoint collecting committees; remember that on every

man will rest a share of the shame of defeat or the honour of victory."

That is the live question at this moment. We may pass this resolution, as we have passed other resolutions which have expressed our sympathy for Ireland, our sympathy for those who are struggling for the cause; but I would have hon. gentlemen who have influence with their friends remember what Mr. Burns, the great labour agitator, said a short time ago. During the great labour agitation in England the friends of labour in Australia forwarded £13,000 or £14,000 to enable the men to carry on the contest, and some labour organizations in the neighbouring republic sent over messages of sympathy, and Mr. Burns declared that the resolutions of sympathy were all very well but it was hard cash that would enable the men to continue their resistance in the struggle in which they were engaged. In the general election which is coming on now it may be very well to have sympathy, but the poor men have to fight this battle, and the poor people who are unable to subscribe the necessary legitimate expenses for furthering the cause, would, I feel sure, be more thankful to the man who would put his hand in his pocket and contribute a five dollar bill to help them fight the battle and to keep up the necessary organization until the last hour, than if you send them a bushel of resolutions of sympathy. Now, Mr. Speaker, the great point in dispute and the great difficulty in regard to this matter, as it occurs to the friends of the cause in America, is unfortunately the disunion which exists in the ranks of the Home Rule party themselves. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact, we would be recreant to our duty, I should be recreant to mine, I feel, if, having an opportunity of speaking on the floor of this Parliament to-day—if our resolution be worth anything, or if the words that we express are worth anything, if they are to be carried abroad—I should not emphasize my opinion and the opinions of others who think with me, that these dissensions must soon cease if the people are to be rallied once more to the flag that we love so well. We all know that since last we had this question before the House, the great leader of the Irish people has disappeared from the scene. We all remember what were the occurrences which took place shortly before his death. Speaking on the floor of this House on a former occasion, and when the great Irish leader was under the cloud of the accusations which had been brought against him by the London *Times*, I made bold to prophesy that he would overcome and vanquish all his enemies, as he did. Unfortunately, the last hours of his great life were obscured, and dissensions arose amongst his people. But we all know that while the people of Ireland and their descendants the world over, will never, never forget the deep debt of gratitude they owe to Mr. Parnell, will never forget that great name and the deeds that are associated with it, yet they will also remember that he could never had accomplished what he did, that he could never have carried on the battle so successfully, that he could never have won over a Prime Minister of England who had imprisoned him at one time, and who became his ally later, because his cause was just, and he was unswerving in pushing it; whilst we cannot forget all that that great leader has done, we must also remember that he never could have accomplished this without the aid and the assistance of the men who surrounded him, and prominently amongst these men and one who gave strength to the party and hope to the people who supported it, was Mr. Justin McCarthy. He was the chosen lieutenant of Charles Stewart Parnell himself, and a greater compliment could not be paid to the dead patriot in his grave than that the people should rally around the man in whom the great leader himself reposed so much confidence. There may be other aspirants to the leadership of the party, but there could be no mistake in the choice made by Parnell himself in the days of his undisputed leadership. I feel that if the people of Ireland will only join under Mr. Justin McCarthy, if they will put aside their differences, and if they will rally around the one idea of Home Rule for Ireland, that the time of their triumph is not far distant. As the hour is fast approaching, Mr. Speaker, when this motion must, under the rules of this House, be adjourned, and if I keep on this debate much longer, I may preclude others from speaking and prevent a vote from being taken this afternoon which I do not desire, I shall, therefore, draw these few remarks to a close. There are many other points upon which I would like to touch, but time will not permit. I cannot fail, however, to remind those who are in favour of the Irish cause that the venerable and patriotic prelate of Toronto, has consented to take charge of a fund in aid of the Irish cause. I trust that the friends of Ireland throughout Canada will not be discouraged, and will not be disheartened by what has taken place in Ireland. I trust that their hopes will be revived, and that the differences which in Ireland have caused so much pain and anxiety, will disappear. I trust also that the friends of the cause will send material aid in its support to the fund under the auspices of the Archbishop of Toronto. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I must say that as regards the triumph of one political party or the other in England, it matters very little to me. I feel as Mr. Justin McCarthy feels, as stated by him in the speech which he delivered at Derry, that no matter what English party obtains power in Britain, the Irish cause must triumph. Even at the risk of detaining the House a few moments longer I shall venture to quote from this speech of Mr. McCarthy to which I have referred. He said:

"Now, since last I addressed a great political meeting in Derry, many strange, unexpected events, many events of the deepest tragic interest, have happened since last I spoke to my constituents in this great historic city. We have had since that time the close of a superb career. We have seen a great man pass away from the living politics of his country, and pass away into Irish history, to be always remembered there. I can never speak but with admiration, and now with regret, in regard to the career of my late leader and friend—Mr. Parnell; but, although there was division amongst us, although we lost one of the greatest leaders, and one of the greatest Irishmen that time has known, yet, I am bound to say that neither the Irish National party, nor the Irish people were even at that moment wholly discouraged, and I say that even at that moment, the most profound and terrible in that tragedy, they never lost their faith and confidence in the future of Ireland's cause. We stand here as firm as we ever were in support of that cause, and we stand here as free and independent as we ever were, independent of any English or other party whatever—independent of any influence, any power, but the will and command of the Irish people. We take our orders from the Irish people. (Cheers.) What they want us to do, that we shall do. What they want not to have done, that our hands will never do. We stand for ourselves and for our cause absolutely and entirely independent. If any English party will work for us as the Liberal

party is now working for us, then we will help that party to fight our cause and to win it. But we stand for Ireland first and last, and to us no English party is of any account whatever but the party which help us to fight with the Irish hand and to win the Irish victory. We will accept from no English or other party any measure whatever of Home Rule that is not acceptable to the whole Irish people. We put that beyond question and that the result could hardly fail all other considerations, and we say more than that, that we will not pledge ourselves until we have had a chance of hearing the voice and knowing the judgment of the Irish people upon a particular scheme of Home Rule, until we have had the full concurrence and assent of the Irish people to the scheme of Home Rule. We will give you, of course, whatever benefit and judgment and guidance we can give. We will advise you, and we shall also express our own opinion upon the principle of any clause of any measure. I believe for myself that we shall have from the Liberal party and from the great Liberal leader, Mr. Gladstone—I believe we shall have a measure of Home Rule which the whole Irish nation can cordially accept. But when that measure comes to us we will examine it as closely and as carefully as though it came from any other Ministry whatever—even a Tory Ministry—and if it does not come up to our expectations and to what we know to be your expectations and demands, no sense of gratitude for good intentions, no sense of gratitude for former services, will allow us to accept or assist the passage of any measure which is not cordially accepted by the whole Irish nation. That much I felt bound to say in justice to myself and to my friends and colleagues generally, to make you assured if you had the least doubt on the question—and I don't believe you have—that your national interests are perfectly safe in the hands of the Irish parliamentary party. So on every other question, the land question, the labour question, and all questions which interest the Irish community and the Irish public, as a whole, we shall keep your interests in mind in every instance, and shall try as far as possible to act in perfect accordance with the express wishes of the Irish people."

Therefore the Irish party stands, as it should stand, independent of either one or the other of the great English parties. That party is grateful for the efforts being made by the great English leader to-day, and are satisfied that his intentions are sincere. But, Mr. Speaker, far from desiring to see either one or the other of the great parties triumph to any large extent in the forthcoming elections, what I sincerely hope is that they will be so evenly balanced that the power between them will remain with the Home Rulers themselves, so that they will secure that measure of Home Rule for which they are striving, that measure of justice for which they have so long contended, and contended unremittingly; because they have made advances which are really wonderful. When we consider that one point after another has been won from a Parliament that long resisted the aspirations of the Irish people, and when we look at what has been achieved by a united people, led as they have been for some years past, I say that great and rapid strides have been made in the cause of true liberty. All that they want, all that they ask, is constitutional liberty. They feel and they know that the interests of the Irish people are bound up with the Empire. They have contributed too much blood and treasure, too much of their energy and their genius to build up that Empire, to sever themselves from it. They feel that that Empire is as much theirs as that of any other section, no matter what the claims of that section may be. We are all satisfied that in the early future there will be a great triumph for those who are battling on constitutional lines for constitutional liberty, and I say, God grant that that day may soon come.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not occupy more time than is absolutely necessary in order to make plain and clear the views which I entertain on this question. It is impossible to doubt the sincerity of my hon. friend who has last addressed the House on this question, and I think it does him infinite credit that, notwithstanding that the matter has been taken out of his hands by the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin), he throws his influence so heartily in support of the resolution, unwise and untimely as I dare say he thinks it is to offer it at the present time. It is quite true that in 1882 we did here unanimously pass an Address to the Crown in favour of Home Rule. I remember the occasion, I remember what led up to it, and I was one of those who rather reluctantly acquiesced in the view that there should go from the Parliament of Canada to Her Majesty a unanimous expression in favour of the views contained in that Address. After receiving a snub, which I think we all agree was well deserved, after being told by Mr. Gladstone, who has since that day become a very earnest advocate of Home Rule, that we had better mind our own business, that there were quite sufficient matters in Canada for the representatives of the Canadian people without interfering in matters which did not properly belong to this Parliament, we did again reiterate our expression of opinion; but we did not do so quite so heartily as we had done upon the earlier occasion: and the third time, in the year 1887, at the time when the English Parliament proposed to enact the Crimes Bill, we again ventured to express the opinion that the course proposed in the Imperial Parliament was exceedingly unwise. We did not, however, do more than pass an abstract resolution, and we directed that that should be sent to the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, to Mr. Gladstone, and to Mr. Parnell. Well, Sir, as an hon. gentleman has said, we have never received the courtesy of an acknowledgment of that resolution, not even from Mr. Parnell, not even from Mr. Gladstone, much less from Lord Salisbury. So that, we are in this position, that we who have quite sufficient to do to attend to our own affairs, have chosen to step out of our course in order to endeavour to steer the course of the Imperial Parliament on this question. On the last occasion, I ventured to move an amendment, which, although it did not carry, received a very large support, and which I think ought to have commended itself to the judgment of this House, more especially as we now see the good effects which have followed from the passage of the very Crimes Act which the mover of the resolution thought we ought to denounce. I proposed:

"That this House, while justly jealous of any interference in the local affairs of Canada within the jurisdiction of this Parliament or of the Legislative Assemblies of the several Provinces of the Dominion, either by the Imperial Parliament or other legislative body of the British Empire, cannot, without inviting such interference fail to recognize it as within the exclusive right of the Imperial Parliament to legislate respecting matters solely appertaining to the domestic affairs of the United Kingdom: than which none can be more absolutely of local concern than the due and proper administration of the law within the bounds of Great Britain and Ireland.

"That, therefore, it is inexpedient and unwise for this House to express any opinion or in any wise to interfere with the Imperial Parliament as to the course to be adopted by it respecting the Bill now before the House of Commons for the amendment of the Criminal Law and Procedure."

Four years have now elapsed since that law was passed, and peace and prosperity have been restored to Ireland; and I attribute very much of that

peace and prosperity to the firm and wise administration of that criminal law which we know has been many cases now practically withdrawn from Ireland by the proclamation which the law gave power to issue. So that what we, thousands of miles away, with an indifferent knowledge of the subject, ventured to condemn, has brought about in the short space of four years such a condition of affairs with regard to crime in Ireland as is, perhaps, excelled in no part of the British Empire to-day. In 1882, we know that there were many and great grievances under which the Irish people laboured; but if we know anything at all about the history of that country, we know that to-day there is no part of the British Empire—and when I say the British Empire, I may as well say the whole civilized world—where the laws are so just, equitable and merciful in the great matters that concern the Irish people. The agrarian laws have been amended, and they are now such as I am satisfied no Local Legislature in this Dominion would pass. The tenant obtains by mere occupation the tenant right, which gives him an interest in the soil, and his failure to pay his rent, his failure to comply with the conditions of his lease, does not dispossess him of that right. That right remains notwithstanding his previous failings in other respects; and I say, if you will watch the care the English Parliament has taken, more especially during the present generation, to remove the grievances under which the Irish people labour, it would be a great piece of impudence on our part to venture to say that course has been unwise or imprudent. For my part, I am wholly opposed to the resolution of the hon. member for Ottawa. I am not a believer in what is understood as Home Rule. I do believe that, as time advances, as much as possible local government should be extended to Ireland; and we know that at present there is a Bill, which has been read the second time by a very large majority, placing Ireland in almost the same position with regard to local government that England and Scotland for some years have been in. I believe in that, but I do not think it is possible that Ireland can be put in the same position as Canada. I do not think that she can be granted the right to make her own tariff and laws in that respect without virtually bringing about the dismemberment of the Empire, causing great loss to Ireland itself and reflecting great loss and injury to the rest of the Empire, of which we form no inconsiderable part. I do not know either what the hon. gentleman means by Home Rule. We know what Home Rule, as understood by Mr. Redmond, means, for he has made it clear and distinct; we know that Home Rule, as understood by Mr. McCarthy, is an echo of Mr. Redmond's views; but, up to this moment, neither Mr. Gladstone nor any responsible member of the Liberal party has said that they have accepted Home Rule in the sense in which the Irish leaders of the Irish factions have thought proper to state, is the only one in which they would be prepared to accept it. Therefore, even if I knew what the hon. gentleman meant in that regard, it would be impossible to adopt his motion in favour of Home Rule, but I am equally opposed to the amendment of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). I do not want to postpone this vote; I do not want to give any uncertain vote in this matter. I want it to be distinctly understood,

Mr. McCARTHY.

and I trust there is a majority in Parliament who take that view, that we are not going to insult Lord Salisbury and fly in the face of that party and administration which, during the last few years, has certainly been of great advantage and benefit to this Dominion, and has fought out battles and preserved our rights. I am not going to make any uncertain sound or put in any dilatory plea in a matter of this kind, but rather am I prepared here, when the question comes to a vote, to vote that the resolution is not merely inopportune but wrong. I am prepared to go farther, and to ask this Parliament to undo, so far as it can, the mischief it did in 1882 and 1886. Having seen the good effects which have followed wise administration and beneficial amendment of the law, more especially with regard to agrarian matters, having seen the good results which have followed the material aid given by the British people to the distressed districts of Ireland, all of which have rendered Mr. Balfour the most popular Irish secretary who has ever held office—having regard to all these things, I am prepared to say that I was wrong in 1882 in agreeing in the resolution passed that session and that I was wrong in concurring in the resolution of 1886; I am prepared to say that I doubt the wisdom of the course we then took, and ask this Parliament to express the opinion that that course was unwise, unstatesmanlike, and wrong, and that we should, without interference on our part, let the British people manage their own affairs in the way that to them seems meet and proper. Ireland is not unrepresented in the British Parliament. On the contrary, she is over-represented according to number. Eighty would be her full number according to population, and she has a representation of one hundred and one members, if my memory serves me right. She, therefore, possesses enormous influence in the councils of that Parliament. My hon. friend who last spoke says he hopes the Irish contingent will hold the balance of power. That would not be the first occasion they held it. We know they forced Mr. Gladstone to take up Home Rule. We remember that at the last election Mr. Gladstone asked the English people to give him such a majority as would render him independent of the Irish members, saying: If you do not do so, I do not think the virtue of any leader is sufficient to enable him to withstand the temptation to adopt the particular policy these members may be in favour of. He was prophetic, he spoke with almost wonderful prescience, and in his own person, in six or seven months afterwards, he adopted the very policy he had hitherto denounced, because he had not the support of the majority irrespective of the Irish members. Now, the Irish representation constitutes a large body, able and willing to fight their own battles, and who have fought their own battles and obtained, I was going to say by their course, but that would be unfair to Mr. Balfour—but to whom, although they have abused him in everything, he has granted these various amendments and changes in the law which have been so beneficial and advantageous in their interests. Therefore, it appears to me we would be unnecessarily going out of our way in attempting to interfere in matters which do not concern us at all. If it were not for the promise I made my hon. friend I would say a few words more, particularly on the impropriety of our meddling in matters which do not

concern us. I do not pretend that there may not be occasions in which the interests of this country may be involved in any legislation either of Great Britain or some of the sister colonies, and where, therefore, it may be necessary for us to speak. But I say that in connection with this question, which the two great political parties are now going to fight out in that country, it is unwise, imprudent and unfair that we should interfere, and, therefore, I beg to move, in amendment to the proposed amendment :

That all the words in the main motion after the word "That," and all the words in the amendment be struck out, and the following inserted instead thereof: "this House is of opinion that it ought not to interfere in questions not within its jurisdiction, save only in matters of exceptional and extraordinary character.

"That the question of Home Rule in Ireland being one on which the great political parties in Great Britain and Ireland are divided, is a matter on which it would be inadvisable for this House to take sides.

"That regard being had to the peace and prosperity which now exists in Ireland, owing to the wise and firm administration of the law, the beneficial changes which have been made in the agrarian laws and the material aid which has been afforded to the impoverished portions of that kingdom, this House has reason to doubt the wisdom of the course adopted by it in the years 1882 and 1886, in offering to advise the Imperial Parliament as to the course it should take with reference to Ireland, and in expressing an opinion as to the wisdom of the policy in favour of Home Rule for that portion of the United Kingdom."

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have perhaps been identified as closely with the question of Home Rule before this country as any member of this House, and I have no objection that my hon. friend from Ottawa should make any motion on the subject before this Parliament which he may think fit. I moved the resolution in 1882, according to the expressed views of the Irish people of Canada, views that were expressed through their different organizations. At that time this Parliament received the proposition of an Address to Her Majesty very kindly, and the resolution was passed unanimously by this Chamber and with only six dissenting voices in the Senate. In 1886, I was asked to move again in this matter. I asked my friends who approached me at that time if they thought anything would be accomplished by bringing the question before the House again, if they thought we could get a more favourable expression of opinion than we got in 1882. They said : No. Then I said : You are running the risk of doing an injury to Home Rule, and of undoing the good which has already been done. I would give the same advice to my young friend who has moved this resolution now, and I say that I regret that he or the friends who advised him on the matter thought fit to bring this before the House, because I am afraid that the vote which will be taken will be used across the Atlantic as an indication of a reaction from the views expressed in 1882. At the same time I say that the principle of Home Rule is there, that the principle of Home Rule, to which this Parliament committed itself in 1882 so completely, and in 1886 so strongly, is there, no matter how my hon. friend the hon. member for North Simcoe may feel a regret for the generous vote he gave on that occasion, and I will vote for the resolution of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin). I have every confidence that this resolution will not be voted down, as has been stated by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). That hon. gentleman appeals to this House and attempts to justify rebellion in the old country if Home Rule should be carried. Rebellion by whom ? The men of Ulster ? Why, the majority of the men of Ulster are Home Rulers, and these people speak only for the minority in Ulster. The majority of the Ulster people are speaking and working in favour of Home Rule. It is unfair to ask the people of Canada who are enjoying the blessings which we ask for our unfortunate countrymen at home, to vote down such a resolution, and no fair man here can fail to give an expression of sympathy in favour of that system of Government which we in Canada enjoy and of which we are so proud. Why should we not express an opinion in favour of that system ? They talk about the danger of handing over Ireland to the control of the majority. The whole history of Ireland shows that the minority have been the trusted friends of the majority. They have been their representatives in Parliament, the mayors of their cities, members of their corporations and leaders of all the agitations. It is Protestants who have been the leaders of the agitations of Ireland, and even of the rebellions. In the 1798 rebellion what was the condition of the country ? Mr. Lecky, a great Unionist writer, quoting the remarks of the Duke of Portland, said :

"He was much struck with the fact that Protestant Ulster was the most disaffected of the four provinces; that five-sixths of the leaders and United Irishmen were Protestants ; that Munster, though now profoundly disturbed, had shown itself perfectly loyal during the French expedition at the end of 1796 ; that Connaught, the most purely Catholic province in Ireland, was the one province which was still almost untainted."

What indication is there in the old country that the majority professing the Catholic faith are less loyal to the Crown than the minority ? At least that Catholic majority have never proclaimed openly that they would rebel against the decision of the Parliament of the country. There is just one more point to which I want to call the attention of the House. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) states that, while we have been pleading for Home Rule and the sympathy of this Parliament has gone out in favour of it, not a tittle of evidence has been given to show that Ireland has ever been misgoverned. Why, it is the admission of all Governments, Liberal and Conservative alike, that Ireland has been misgoverned for centuries, and it is the fact that both political parties in the old country have been endeavouring to afford a remedy for these evils of late years. My hon. friend drew a contrast between this discussion and that which took place in this House before, and said how tame were the speeches of the mover and seconder of this resolution, compared with the speeches of the hon. member for Bruce and others when this matter was up before. I think the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) must have satisfied the hon. gentleman, but, if there is any lack of eloquence in this House to defend this measure, I can assure the hon. gentleman that the same feeling, the same hope and the same longing throughout this country remains as firm as ever and in fact are increased to-day. I have nothing further to say but that, this motion being before the House, I am wedded to a principle which commands my best and deepest sympathies, and wherever and whenever I am called upon to speak, I speak as a Home Ruler.

Mr. FRASER. We must not forget that there has been exhibited here to-day a marvellous evolution. Not long ago I heard in this House gentle-

men say that the conclusion of this Parliament two or three days before was of such binding force that we ought not to discuss a question two or three days afterwards, and yet now they say that the decision of this Parliament years ago should not bind us or prevent our stultifying ourselves. I am in favour of the resolution of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin), and I am opposed to the amendment of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). That is a miserable way of attempting to get clear of it. I commend the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) for the manly stand he has taken, though he is wrong. There is something manly about his proposition, but I do object to a sneaky way of dealing with these matters. Let us treat them as men.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 91) for the relief of James Wright (from the Senate).—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 92) for the relief of Hattie Adele Harrison (from the Senate).—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Midland Railway of Canada (from the Senate).—(Mr. Tisdale.)

LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. CHARLTON. I have a recast of this section in my hand, which has been drafted by the Minister of Justice, and which I will be glad to substitute for the clause as it at present stands in the Bill, if it will facilitate the passage of the Bill. I will read this section :

"Any railway superintendent, manager, officer, or person by whose authority or order any railway car shall be moved, or loaded, or despatched from any station, or permitted to continue its journey, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour.

"Sub-section 2. This section shall not apply to trains (*a*) which are operated for the purpose of making connection with railway trains running in the United States; (*b*) which are conveying more than one car load of live stock; (*c*) which are being run over the whole length of the line on which they are being operated; (*d*) which are operated on the Lord's Day solely for the purpose of enabling the persons transported thereon to carry on some work of necessity and mercy which may legally be performed on the Lord's Day; (*e*) which are operated for the purpose of making connection with some steamship about to proceed to a foreign country."

The redraft of the section, while not going as far as I could desire, is a concession which it would be folly to decline to accept, and which I propose to accept. I do not know whether the Minister of Justice has carefully scrutinized this Bill and thoroughly weighed its provisions; and so I will suggest that the clause which reads "which are being run over the whole length of the line on which they are being operated," is one that perhaps might be better dropped out, because I fear it will enable the company to take up local freight and carrying it as through freight on the Lord's Day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course this is a subject that requires the very careful consideration of the committee, and I will state my view in making the suggestion I did to the hon. member. It appeared to me that there was great difficulty in arriving at a correct interpretation of section 3, that there was great indefiniteness as to the kind of trains which are mentioned. We ought to endeavour to be sufficiently precise in our expression indicating the kind of trains we mean; as for instance, that clause exempting milk trains, trains with live stock on board, through trains on trunk lines, and trains carrying persons for the relief of those afflicted with sickness, and for rescue from fire, or anything of that kind. Now, the section as drafted is very precise, but I must admit that it is very severe upon railways. However, as the Bill has been before the House for two sessions, and that section of it has been fully discussed, and public attention has been called to it, I suppose one has a right to presume that the railway authorities of the country, as they have said nothing against it, are prepared to accept it in the sense which the hon. member has put upon it. In the expression "through trains," no doubt the word "passenger" ought to be put in there, and the hon. gentleman's interpretation was this: Trains which connect with other trains in a foreign country, or trains which run to make connection with a steamboat going to a foreign country; and for that reason, instead of using the expression "through passenger trains on any trunk lines," I thought we should endeavour to give a more precise definition. If this amendment should be adopted, the only trains which would be permitted to run on Sunday would be trains which are operated for the purpose of making connection with railway trains running in the United States—that covers foreign connections. Trains which are being run over the whole length of line on which they are operated, are passenger trains.

Mr. CHARLTON. That would be quite satisfactory if we defined trains so as to prevent them picking up local freight.

Mr. TISDALE. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he recommends this section to the committee? It strikes me that the whole of this section is open to the same objection as the first section, that is, that it is quite within the jurisdiction of the Legislature of Ontario, or the bulk of it; and the Legislature of Ontario has already shown that by the clauses which they put in their Act for the observance of the Lord's Day. If, as I understand the Minister of Justice, he wishes this to pass, it would be a different thing; but if not, certainly, according to my view, and according to the clauses of the Act which I have here, the Legislature of Ontario has taken possession of this subject and we ought to relegate it to them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That may possibly be. I do not advocate the measure; it is in the hands of the House, and the question is an open one entirely, although I felt called upon to see that the Bill, if it did meet the approbation of the committee, was expressed in language which would make the will of Parliament effective. The first clause is the one relating to foreign connections; the second relates to trains which are run over the whole length of the line on which they are being operated for passengers as express trains. That is an endeavour to meet the definition of a through passen-

ger train on trunk lines; although I think we can hardly confine the legislation to trunk lines, because there are lines which, I presume, ought to have the same right to operate a through train as trunk lines.

Mr. CHARLTON. That will be permitted on any line.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. "Trains carrying more than one car load of live stock" obviates the difficulty of defining what is a train carrying live stock and perishable goods. If there is more than a car load of live stock, I presume the *bonâ fides* of it is established and the necessity for the transit. Then there are these trains which are operated on the Lord's Day solely for the purpose of enabling persons to be transported in cases of necessity or mercy. That covers cases of persons going to render assistance to sick people or conveying means of rescue from fire, and those trains which are operated for the purpose of making connection with steamships about to proceed to a foreign country. This Bill will absolutely prevent the shunting of trains, and I understand that is one of the grievances aimed at. The milk trains I have left out, because I think, if there is really an intention to prevent the carriage of freight and even supplies into a city, a train carrying milk can arrive by midnight of Saturday. I presume these milk trains all run through portions of the country which are comparatively near to large cities, and the milk supply is near enough to enable these trains to reach their destination by midnight of Saturday.

Mr. AMYOT. I should like to ask the mover of the Bill if the train that leaves Quebec at 1 o'clock on Sunday morning for Montreal will be prohibited by this Bill?

Mr. CHARLTON. Not by this section. Passenger trains will be allowed to run over the whole length of the line.

Mr. TISDALE. By a statute of the Ontario Legislature the question of operating Sunday trains and steamboats is dealt with in several clauses. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman, as I am challenging the principle of this section, to give, if he can, an explanation of the law which will satisfy me that I am wrong. According to my view, and I have taken some trouble to examine into the law, this measure should not deal with any railway but Government railways, such as the Intercolonial. The legislation of the Province of Ontario is, at all events on this subject, quite within its jurisdiction. It does not matter whether the railways in that province are through or local lines. Do I understand the hon. gentleman that he admits the Ontario Legislature has jurisdiction over these roads and that he wishes to press this Bill?

Mr. CHARLTON. With respect to the point raised by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) as to the jurisdiction of a province with respect to railway traffic, I suppose it must be admitted that a province has limited jurisdiction within its own boundaries. The Province of Ontario, for instance, has enacted a law, which was first introduced here with respect to excursion trains. The Bill failed to pass here, and the member in the Ontario Legislature representing the constituency represented in this House by the Minister of Militia, introduced the Bill in the Ontario Assembly, and it passed, and it is the law there. That law deals with the question of excursion trains in Ontario. I apprehend, however, there are certain kinds of railway traffic within the limits of Ontario which the Legislature could scarcely deal with, traffic of a national character, and whatever may be the power possessed and exercised by that province, this Bill is applicable to the whole Dominion, and it is eminently necessary and desirable when regulating railway traffic on the Lord's Day, that we should have a uniform Dominion law, because our railway system is a national system, and the traffic is nearly all of that kind which applies to a considerable number of provinces and is not confined to a single province. The provisions of the amendment are very simple, and they are very liberal with regard to the railways. They scarcely interfere with the railways except as regards local freight traffic and the shunting and moving of trains. Trains are permitted to run on any line which connects with the United States lines, or with any steamboat going to a foreign country, and through trains are permitted over the entire length of any line, whatever its length may be and whether it makes connection with United States lines or with a steamship bound for a foreign port. It is a very liberal amendment, and I accept it as being a long step in advance, and one which will remove the most objectionable features of the Sunday railway traffic, and will secure to a very large portion of the railway employés their right to Sunday rest. It is highly desirable that legislation with respect to this subject should be general Dominion legislation. My hon. friend from South Norfolk will readily see that to have one law in Quebec, another in Ontario, a still different law in New Brunswick, and again a different law in Nova Scotia would lead to confusion and collision in the regulation of railway traffic. Almost all our railways are declared to be Dominion railways and railways for the general purposes of the Dominion, and therefore under the control of the Dominion Parliament, and for that reason it is highly proper that this Parliament should step in and exercise authority, which authority the companies' charter invite us to exercise with regard to the management of these railways. I hope the committee will accept the amendment drafted by the Minister of Justice, which will be, on the whole, quite acceptable to those who are in favour of this legislation.

Mr. BOWELL. This amendment does not confine its limitation to the Lord's Day. When the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) answered the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), it occurred to me that either the clause was more liberal than he supposed, or that he did not understand the hon. member. The question put was: if a train left Quebec at 1 o'clock on Sunday morning to proceed to Montreal, would that come within the purview of this resolution, and the hon. gentleman's answer was "no." That would be enabling a train to leave any station in Canada on the Lord's Day and to terminate its journey on the Lord's Day. Now, if that be the hon. gentleman's object I must confess I see very little reason for this clause in the Bill, because it leaves it open for the railway companies to do precisely what they are doing now.

Mr. AMYOT. This is a most important section of the Bill. It is a new clause entirely and I think we are entitled to have at least one day to examine it. I tried to study the amendment but it was not long in my hands because every one seems to want to examine it. For the two minutes I have had it in my possession it has been asked for five or six times, and it has been impossible for me to look into it carefully. I think that this matter should be postponed so that we will have a chance to see what we are expected to vote upon. It is certain that we are going to diminish the privileges of the travelling public, and we must not do that blindly or inconsiderately. I ask that this amendment be printed and distributed to the House. It may please the mover of the Bill, but it is not fair that we should be bound by it. The hon. gentleman stated in reply to my question that the section would not prohibit local trains from Quebec to Montreal or from Montreal to Quebec on Sunday; but from the reading of the section at a glance I do not understand that to be the case. It says "any railway superintendent, manager, officer or person by whose authority or order any railway cars shall be on the Lord's Day loaded or despatched from any station or permitted to continue a journey shall be guilty of a misdemeanour," and then it says to what cases that section shall not apply. I do not see that a local train is excepted in the section, and if it is not excepted it is comprised by the Bill and it will be a misdemeanour for any one connected with the railway to have a train moved from Quebec to Montreal or Montreal to Quebec on Sundays. The hon. gentleman says it does not prevent that train, but from the terms of the Bill it seems to prevent it. Under these circumstances I ask that the clause be not passed now, but that we shall have an opportunity of studying it when it is printed and distributed.

Mr. CHARLTON. I just want to make an explanation. The hon. gentleman asked me if a Sunday train could run from Quebec to Montreal under the provisions of this Bill. The language of the section is "passenger trains which are being run over the whole length of the line on which they are operated." The question is whether the road from Quebec to Montreal is a line. It was once an independent line. It is a line called the North Shore Road.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is part of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CHARLTON. I presume there is no Sunday train running from Quebec to Montreal, but what connects with the train on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. AMYOT. Sometimes.

Mr. CHARLTON. However, I hold that under the provisions of this Bill the old North Shore road would be deemed a line, because the Canadian Pacific Railway, although it may absorb a great number of lines, yet the old Ontario and Quebec would be a line, and the road from Toronto to Owen Sound would be a line, and the road from Toronto to Windsor would be a line. All those are separate lines of railway absorded by a big corporation, and under a fair interpretation of this section, the train from Quebec to Montreal would be a train running over the entire line, and would come within the exceptions of this Bill. With regard to the request made by the hon. member for Bellechase (Mr. Amyot) that this section drafted by the Minister of Justice should be laid over for further consideration; of course that means it shall not be considered this session.

Mr. AMYOT. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, it means that. We have had this Bill before the House for two sessions, and we have had that section 3 before the House for two sessions, and any person who is acquainted with section 3 can at a glance comprehend the changes made by the Minister of Justice in the redraft. This can be taken into consideration by the committee, and this section with the sub-section can be considered and fairly understood by any man of average comprehension, and I believe the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) is a man of that kind.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend himself evidently does not understand the section thoroughly. The train between Quebec and Montreal is essentially a local train.

Mr. AMYOT. At St. Martin's Junction the line from Ottawa to Montreal and the line from Quebec to Montreal join. From St. Martin's Junction to Montreal it will be two railways, and if this section passes it will be pretty well mixed up there. It will require a special provision to say that the line from Montreal to Quebec including both points will not fall under the operation of the law. If this law is only intended to be interpreted by the judges, and to cause many lawsuits, then the lawyers might take another view of it. In that event our fees as lawyers will pay us very well, but if as legislators we want to pass practical laws here, there is no use in adopting the clause as it now stands.

Mr. LANGELIER. The Bill should not apply to the Province of Quebec at all. We know how to observe the Sunday there.

Mr. AMYOT. If my hon. friend will move that I will second it.

Mr. TISDALE. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in his reply to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), furnished a very strong argument in support of the contention of the hon. member for Bellechasse, because when the hon. member for North Norfolk was asked to explain the section, he explained it so that he himself raises a doubt as to its meaning. If the hon. gentleman means by his Bill that each road which has a different name, although operated by the same company, shall be able to run Sunday trains, then it makes the Bill very different from what he evidently intended. I know that in Ontario, and I believe in Quebec also, all these different railways are operated by two large corporations, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the hon. gentleman himself shows that he does not understand the meaning of the amendment when he says that Sunday trains could be run over different portions of these lines. If the hon. gentleman's explanation of the section is the true interpretation, it makes the Bill very different, indeed; because then, I know, in Ontario many trains could be run on Sunday which are not run now, as they could be run

over each portion of the road with a different name, although operated by the one great company. I think so far as that point goes it is a very grave reason why this section should stand over for consideration. If we accept the admission of the promoter of the Bill that he does not contend, but what the Local Legislatures have power to pass this legislation, then in my opinion it is not necessary to consider the amendment at any length. I understand, though I was not here, that clause 1 was rejected on that principle. I understood that the committee had ruled that where the Provincial Legislatures had jurisdiction over Sabbath observance, it was not advisable that this House should interfere; and I believe the jurisdiction of this Parliament was questioned by some hon. gentlemen whose opinion is entitled to great weight in this House. Therefore, my criticism of this clause will be confined to that view of the case. Even though we had concurrent jurisdiction with the Local Legislatures over this subject, I maintain that we should prefer to leave it to be dealt with by them. I speak more especially for the Province of Ontario, from which I come, and with whose laws and habits and customs I am more conversant, when I say that the hon. gentleman is not in my opinion, acting in consonance with the feelings of the majority of the people when he wishes us to adopt legislation with regard to Sunday observance, over which that province has jurisdiction. I am not going to say that the Local Legislature has passed clauses precisely similar to this; but the hon. gentleman will find in the Sunday Observance Act, which is a very full and very efficient Act, clauses with regard to Sunday excursions by rail and by steamboat. Then, let me call the attention of the committee to the danger, in connection with this class of legislation in which concurrent jurisdiction is claimed, of a conflict with the provinces, in case we should legislate in one way and they in another; and the hon. gentleman proposes to make the penalty greater than it is made by the province. However, strong the hon. gentleman's zeal in this matter is, and I do not question it, we as legislators should not be led away from a proper discharge of our duties under the constitution, especially in regard to penal legislation which is likely to provoke a conflict of this sort. In the Province of Ontario I have heard no expression of public opinion against the managers of the railways there or any widespread desire, since the provincial laws have been passed, for such stringent legislation as is proposed here. If the laws which we have in the Province of Ontario are enforced, there are ample provisions in them to meet the cases mentioned by the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill. If not, those provisions should be made more strict, and I believe that if amendments are necessary to a better observance of the Lord's Day, both sides of that House would be willing—and I am glad that in this matter we have no politics in Ontario—to adopt them. The hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill has a brother in that legislature, a gentleman who feels as strongly on the subject of Sabbath observance as the hon. gentleman himself, and who I am sure could gain the ear of the Government, and the Opposition as well, in support of any amending legislation that would be necessary to secure the better observance of the Sabbath day. This being so, I would urge the hon. gentleman not to press his Bill any further. He felt rather sore that it had not a chance to be considered in committee on a previous occasion; but I think that the committee has already, in clause 1, affirmed the principle that whatever comes within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures, this committee desires should be left to them. I can only say, as I said before, that while I feel strongly in favour of proper laws for the observance of the Sabbath day, I feel equally strongly that should be left to the different provinces, and that this Parliament should not arrogate to itself a jurisdiction that does not properly belong to it. What my own province may desire I think the majority in that province should decide, and I am equally strong in saying that the neighbouring provinces, whether on the Pacific coast or on the Atlantic, or wherever they may be, should have the privilege of legislating on this question according to the ideas of their own people. I do think that the hon. gentleman would serve the object of a proper observance of the Sabbath day fully as well if not better by leaving the subject to be dealt with by the Local Legislatures, instead of pressing it at this time and in this way, and accepting amendments of one sort and another which we have not time or opportunity to study. But my principal contentions are two—first, that the committee have conceded that the jurisdiction is with the provinces, and that we should leave it with them, and secondly, that though we have jurisdiction to pass concurrent legislation, it would be highly undesirable for us to pass it, because it would lead to a conflict between the provinces and the Dominion; and also, with regard to furthering the observance of the Lord's Day, in my view the passage of the Bill would be a retrograde step instead of a step forward.

Mr. AMYOT. I insist on my objection, and it is a serious one. In the work by Bourinot, page 615, it is said:

"When a man intends to move an important amendment in Committee of the Whole to a Bill, he is not required, according to Canadian practice, to give notice of such amendment, but latterly it has been found expedient in many cases to give notice, and this practice, obviously so convenient and useful, is gaining ground every session."

Now, we are asked to pass a general act disturbing an existing state of things which is satisfactory to the public. I have tried to read the amendment, but have not had sufficient time to do so; for as soon as it comes to me, two or three pages come to take it elsewhere. Surely the hon. member will not be so cruel to his colleagues as to ask them to vote upon an amendment to such an important law without being able even to read it. Under these circumstances, I do not think we should break in upon a practice which is gaining ground every session; and the committee should not proceed now, but the amendments should be printed for further consideration. The hon. mover of the Bill says that will put it over till next year. Then, he is better informed of the intention of the Government than I am. Suppose it should be delayed, it is better that it should be delayed for one year than that this House should pass a bad law this year. We should pass good laws, and we must not be made responsible for laws which we are compelled to pass without being able to read them. If it was a Bill of less importance, dealing with small matters in which we could trust two or three of our colleagues, it would be all right; but in this matter every one is interested,

and we see by the two answers given by the mover that he himself doubts whether the Bill will apply to the railway I have mentioned. I ask, therefore, that we do not proceed any further with this section as amended, but that it be ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPROULE. There was one reason given by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) why this Bill should pass, which does not strike my mind as being at all a strong one. Being only a layman, I may not have the correct idea of it that some lawyers in the House have, but if I understood the hon. gentleman aright he said that because the Intercolonial Railway is a Government railway, we could pass a law here to control the actions of men who are operating that railway, and that because other railways pass from one province to another or from this country to another, legislation with regard to them in this matter should be passed here. I do not take that view of the case at all. If I understand the question correctly, it is a question of police regulation in the various localities, as regards the observance of the Sabbath, and not a question with which we have to do. The Revised Statutes of Ontario are proof that that province, at any rate, believes it has the right to make laws in this matter. One clause of the statute regulating Sunday observance prohibits selling on the Sunday or the doing of any ordinary work or the holding of a political meeting, or games and amusements, hunting and shooting, fishing and bathing, and Sunday excursions both on railways and steamboats, and then it gives the penalties and procedure. This statute, therefore, covers all the cases provided for in this Bill, and is the ordinary police regulation in the province. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) admitted that the provinces had the right to pass these police regulations, but he gave as a reason why we should pass additional ones, that this Bill would apply to Government railways, assuming, therefore, I presume, that the police regulations published by Provincial Governments would not apply to the actions of men running Government railways. I hold the view that they would apply to men's conduct who work on any railway in the province, whether a Government railway, or a provincial railway, or any railway coming from an outside province or country. The police regulations which control the actions of people in a province would have effect just the same on a Government railway or a railway from a foreign country as on a railway wholly in the province. There were reasons advanced the other evening which I thought were neither valid nor strong why we should pass this law. When the provincial law was cited as providing a penalty for the violation of the Sabbath, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said the non-observance of this law was winked at, and it was not enforced, and he gave that as a reason why we should pass a law here. If we did, who would enforce it? It would be the provincial authorities, as we would not constitute anybody with power to enforce it outside of those who have the enforcing of provincial law. It would be in the hands of the same men, and if they winked at the violation of the provincial law certainly they would connive equally at the non-observance of this law But there are other provinces outside of Ontario, the hon. gentleman says. No doubt; but if one province has a right to legislate in this matter, by the same parity of reasoning the other provinces have equally the right. The Province of Quebec must have the same right to pass regulations regarding the conduct of men on the Lord's day, and so has every other province. I agree with the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) that this is too important a clause to pass immediately after hearing it read. I must say I have not seen the clause at all except in the hands of other members. It is a rule which has generally obtained in this House that when important amendments are to be made to a Bill in the committee of the whole House, notice is given or the proposed amendments are printed so that every member may have full opportunity to consider them. This amendment is not printed and is not in the hands of members generally, and therefore cannot receive the consideration its importance demands. I agree with the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) that this clause ought to be printed so that we may be able to consider it before being asked to pass it.

Mr. OUIMET. I see that among the exceptions made by the Bill are included passenger trains which are being run over the whole length of a line, and the hon. gentleman explained how this would apply to the Sunday trains between Montreal and Quebec. He has said that if it was a whole line, a distinct line, this exception would not apply. I am not very strong in casuistry, and I would like to know where would be the sin, because, of course, the object the hon. gentleman has in view is to prevent the community at large from sinning against the sanctity of the Sabbath.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not at all. It is to secure to the railway hands the right to enjoy the Sabbath.

Mr. OUIMET. It is to secure them a holiday, then. Why should he not have a holiday during the week as well as on Sunday?

Mr. CHARLTON. He may have religious convictions.

Mr. OUIMET. And besides, all the hands might go to morning service and run their trains in the evening without exposing themselves to any great infraction of the moral law. I want to ascertain on what principle of morality is this Bill to be enacted, and how the hon. gentleman is going to invoke morality and religion in order to break up the existing state of things and prevent a number of very honest and religious people who live out of town from going out on the Saturday afternoon and coming back with the Sunday train, and thus be enabled to resume their work early Monday morning. I would like to know on what principle these people who travel during the summer, by the thousands, on that line should be deprived of the means of going to visit their families on the Sunday and perform their religious duties with their families. I think this legislation is going rather far in attempting to make people pious or religious. If the hon. gentleman were to convince me that it is a sin to do one of these things, he ought to prevent every one of them, but, with his admission that it is not a sin, I think the whole House, if they go by his theology, will throw out the Bill without much regret, because it would be only from a

conscientious point of view that we could defend this Bill. I will give the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) a sure remedy for the whole Bill. Section 9 reads :

"This Act shall not extend to the people called Indians when it conflicts with their tribal customs or rights."

We might cure the whole thing by providing that the Bill shall not apply to people who call themselves Canucks or Indians.

Mr. AMYOT. There is another thing which will make the Bill difficult to operate. It provides that it shall not apply to railways which run in the United States and their connections. It is a well known fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway run in the States, so that, if we understand the clause properly, those railways are exempted from the operation of the law. If even the trains which connect with railways running in the States are exempted, surely those railways which run in the States will be exempted. What trains will remain for the hon. gentleman? Some local trains not even running from one province to another. Surely his care will not extend to these. Each province is able to manage that itself. There will remain about ten or twelve small railways extending from one county to the other, and I do not see the use of the Bill in regard to them. I will not accept the suggestion of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, but I will move in amendment to add that this section shall not apply to trains running in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the hon. gentleman should now alter the preamble of the Bill. When an hon. gentleman in charge of a Bill changes the effect of it by such a statement as we have had, we ought to know what we are legislating about. When some time ago I moved that you should leave the Chair, the hon. gentleman took me severely to task for blocking legislation in reference to the observance of the Lord's Day, and he threatened the House as to what would be done by the people who were behind him on this subject of the observance of the Sabbath. Yet now he coolly tells the Minister of Public Works that this clause 3 was not intended to promote the better observance of the Sabbath, but to protect the civil rights of railway employés and give them a holiday on Sundays. In that case I would suggest that the title should be changed to "A Bill for the better protection of the civil rights of railway employés and to give them a holiday on Sundays."

Mr. AMYOT. Have any of these employés been petitioning Parliament to protect them ?

Mr. TISDALE. This is a very pertinent question. If this clause is intended for the purpose the hon. gentleman states, he should put it in a proper Bill. It is not a proper clause to have in a Bill to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day. We might legislate on different principles in that case. If the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) will permit me, I will move in amendment to his amendment that this clause of the Bill stand. I have listened to the hon. gentlemen who have discussed it, but I have not been able to see that an amendment of the length and character of that proposed, and explained in the different ways in which it has been attempted to be explained by the promoter of the Bill is one we should be asked to pass upon without having an opportunity to consider it. In all sincerity, I could not form any idea of what the clause means, as to what class of railways, what companies or what portions of railways the clause applies to, and I do not think it would be unreasonable for the hon. gentleman to allow this clause to stand, and we can go on and discuss the other clauses. The hon. gentleman may say that it will endanger his Bill. I do not know that it will, as no doubt he will have another opportunity, but in any case this has been a long time before Parliament and several times it was called and allowed to stand either at the request of the hon. gentleman or in consequence of his absence. I do not wish to prevent the further discussion of the rest of the Bill, I think for the present it is quite reasonable to ask him to allow it to stand, in view of his having accepted that most important amendment which renders it impossible for any hon. gentleman to consider it with sufficient care to-night. He could have cured that, if he had seen fit, by giving us a notice ; it was not our fault that he did not give us time. Therefore it comes with bad grace for him to say that we are forcing back his Bill. If he was going to accept such an important amendment as this, why did he not give us notice and let us have a chance to read it? I do not wish to impede the Bill any more than is reasonable, but I do think that we should have an opportunity to study the substituted clause that is in your hands.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot move that clause 3 shall stand, because it is virtually disposed of by the new clause moved by the promoter of the Bill, and we are now on the new third clause.

Mr. TISDALE. I move that the clause and the amendment stand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It cannot be done. The only thing that the hon. gentleman can do is to move that I leave the Chair and report progress, and ask leave to sit again. Clause 3 in the Bill is struck out, and we are now on the new clause 3 moved by the promoter of the Bill. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has moved an amendment to the new clause 3, and we are now on that amendment.

Mr. CHARLTON. The great care and anxiety of the member for South Norfolk that provincial jurisdiction shall not be infringed by this House, is very gratifying to me, I must confess, in view of some things that have happened in the past ; but I have no hesitation in assuring the hon. gentleman that the authority of this House is not to be transgressed by the provisions of this Bill. In proposing to deal with the railway question, we have the authority of the Minister of Justice in saying that this power pertains to the Dominion. When this Bill was reported with the clauses—the one relating to Sunday newspapers, the one relating to traffic on canals, the one relating to traffic on railways, and the fourth relating to excursions—every constitutional authority in this House pronounced the opinion that the Bill came exclusively within the domain of our jurisdiction, with the exception of the first clause with regard to Sunday newspapers. If the hon. gentleman will take the British North America Act in his hands and read the powers defined there as pertaining to the Dominion on the one hand, and pertaining to the provinces on the other hand, he will find that the second sub-section of section 91 which defines the powers pertaining to the Dominion, says that the Dominion shall ex-

ercise power to regulate trade and commerce; trade and commerce is a subject exclusively in the hands of this Dominion Parliament. Now, is not railway traffic something pertaining to trade and commerce and is it not possible that the Provincial Legislatures may, in their attempts to regulate railway traffic, infringe upon the prerogatives of this Dominion Parliament? But whether they do or not, there can be no question that the power is vested in this House to deal with every question pertaining to trade and commerce as regards railway traffic or traffic of any other kind by railway or by water. That power is exclusively in our hands, and all the points raised by the hon. member for South Norfolk in regard to this question are merely attempts to throw dust in the eyes of those who wish to have some clear view as to what powers belong to us in regard to the matter.

The hon. gentleman says that if I had wished to place the House in possession of the information contained in this amendment I ought to have given notice of it some days ago. Sir, I presume the hon. gentleman is not unaware that when this Bill was under discussion eight days ago, the Minister of Justice expressed the opinion that the railway clause required reconstruction, and gave a tacit promise that he would attend to that matter. The amendment in your hands is the reconstruction of that section made by the Minister of Justice and placed in my hands to-day, and whoever is conversant with this section 3 of the Bill, is quite capable of comprehending almost at a glance the provisions of that amendment which is in your hands. It varies slightly, it varies essentially in some respects, but the provisions of the amendment to section 3 are easily understood. It goes on to define that the moving of cars upon railways on the Lord's Day shall be prohibited in this Dominion except under certain circumstances, and I will point out what those circumstances are. I will ask the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) and the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) to listen to these exceptions, and then tell me whether there is anything in this matter that their minds are incapable of grasping or comprehending. Section 3 of the Bill has been before them for weeks, and if they have given any attention to the subject, they know what its provisions are. Now, the enacting clause is as follows:—

"Any railway superintendent, manager, officer, or person by whose authority or order any railway car shall be, on the Lord's Day, loaded, or moved, or dispatched from any station, or permitted to continue a journey, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour."

That is the enactment, and there are certain exceptions to the provisions of that enactment. Let us see what they are, and I will ask my hon. friends from Bellechasse and South Norfolk to endeavour to comprehend what these exceptions are. The first exeption is in the case of any trains which are operated for the purpose of connecting with railway trains running in the United States.

Mr. AMYOT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. The Canadian Pacific Railway is running from Montreal to New York, and also from Montreal to Boston—is running in the United States. Is the Canadian Pacific Railway included in those trains running in the United States?

Mr. CHARLTON. When this Bill was under consideration in the committee, day after day, all these difficulties were met and considered by that committee.

Mr. AMYOT. What committee?

Mr. CHARLTON. The special committee that reported this Bill last session.

Mr. AMYOT. Let us speak of this session. I want a straight answer to my question, I want "yes" or "no".

Mr. CHARLTON. I am going to give the hon. gentleman a straight answer. When it was found, on examining this question, that much of the railway business of some roads in this Dominion hinged upon their connections in the United States, when it was found that their business was so inseparably connected with railway business in the United States that the two could not be separated, when it was found that the operations of our railway system and their connections with the United States, required certain things to be done, the committee found it was necessary to allow the trunk lines in Canada, connecting in the east and the west with American through trains, to run their trains, and portions of their trains, as through connections, rather than sacrifice their interests; it was found necessary to grant to the railways of Canada the privilege of running through passenger trains in connection with their American connections, and of running through freight trains in connection with their American connections, because if that was not allowed, they would be placed at a disadvantage in their competition with American lines. This was granted, not because it was necessary to the securing of the Sabbath observance, but because it was a work of necessity to save the railways from ruin. Many of the railways of Canada run in competition with the American lines. If you do not grant this permission, you give the New York Central, the Lake Shore, the Pennsylvania, the Baltimore and Ohio and all American lines running from the seaboard to the west advantages over the trunk lines in Canada in competing for passengers and freight. It is necessary to recognize that fact, and it is recognized in this provision which permits trains to run which make connection with railways of the United States. Does the hon. member for Bellechasse understand that?

Mr. AMYOT. It is no answer to my question. The hon. gentleman will have to give me an answer.

Mr. CHARLTON. The answer is given. If the Canadian Pacific Railway has a connection in the United States, if it runs from Windsor to Chicago, or from Montreal to Boston, or if it has a connection from Sault Ste. Marie to Minneapolis, in each of those cases it has a connection with the American system. There is no difference between the Canadian Pacific Railway as a Canadian line connecting with an American road, or an American branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway connecting with an American line—these both stand on the same footing. Freight carried by trains thus connecting with the American system of road will be permitted to be carried, it does not matter what the road may be. That matter is perfectly plain. Sub-section *b* enables passenger trains to run over the whole length of any line on which they are being operated, passenger express trains. The Minister of Public Works was unable to see how this provision would operate in regard to a certain trains between Quebec and Montreal. Is that a line on which the

train in question is operated as a through train between two points? If so, the train will have a right to pass. But this provision does not give the right to make up local trains, between Quebec and Montreal, at any point, but the train can be run over the entire line on which it is being operated, it does not matter whether it is over the entire Canadian Pacific system or not.

Mr. OUIMET. What does the hon. gentleman call a through train? Am I to understand that when a train passes Three Rivers, the first important place between Quebec and Montreal, it becomes a through train?

Mr. CHARLTON. If there is a line extending from Montreal and Quebec, a passenger train run on that line and operated between those two cities comes within the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. OUIMET. That line is only part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system.

Mr. CHARLTON. The provision does not contemplate that a train must start from Quebec and go to Vancouver. Sub-section *c* provides with respect to live stock, that unless it is carried in quantities of more than one car load, the train cannot be started. Sub-section *d* provides with respect to trains operated on the Lord's Day solely for the purpose of enabling the persons transported thereby to carry on some work of necessity or mercy, which may be lawfully carried on upon the Lord's Day. Sub-section *e* provides an exception with respect to trains connecting with steamships bound for foreign ports. These are the exceptions to the provisions of this Bill. With these exceptions, Sunday railway traffic is not permitted for reasons of public necessity, not because it is right to do the work under these exceptions, but from public necessity and on public grounds and in the public interests these exceptions are granted. It was found in the committee, that it was necessary to make these exceptions, that they were practically works of necessity, and in order to save our Canadian roads from being ruined in competition with the American lines and for other reasons these exceptions to the enacting clauses are made. The Minister of Public Works scarcely did me justice when he asserted that I did not take the ground that it was desirable to secure the sanctity of the Lord's Day, when I stated that the Bill did not contemplate compelling people to engage in religious worship or religious observance, but that the Bill was of the character of a measure to secure a civil right, to secure the right to the railway employés to a day of rest, to a civil Sabbath, to secure to him the right to attend religious worship with his family, and attend as a christian man christian ordinances if he wished to do so. The object of the Bill is to secure to the toilers of this land their Sabbath day's rest with all its privileges, whatever privileges they may consider proper to exercise on that day. This is not primarily a religious ordinance or a religious law, it is primarily a civil law to secure a civil right. Our laws guarantee the enjoyment of life and liberty, the enjoyment of the right of conscience, the enjoyment of the right to worship God as a man pleases, and whether a Catholic, Presbyterian, Baptist or Methodist, the law protects him in the exercise of his religious as well as his civil rights; and this Sabbath law is one calculated to secure him the free exercise of civil rights as a free citizen in the enjoyment of the Lord's Day as a day of rest and of christian privileges, and for the purpose of allowing a man to attend church or Sabbath school with his family, instead of being dragged from home and compelled to go on a train as fireman, brakesman or conductor. That is the object of the Bill, and when the insinuation is made that I do not take the high position that this is a religious law to compel religious observances, but say it is a law to give men a civil and not a religious benefit, it is not a just criticism. It is a law to secure to the toiler his civil rights to enjoy a religious day and the privileges which pertain to it, if he wishes, and not compel him to forego, as thousands of men are compelled to forego, at the demand of capital, the right to enjoy the Sabbath.

The hon. Minister said the men might take a holiday any day in the week. Suppose that hon. gentleman was a christian man and worked on a railway, had a family and desired to enjoy religious usages and attend church with his family on the Sabbath, and it was said to him "it does not make any difference whether you have a holiday on Sunday, so we will give you a holiday on Thursday,"—would that suit the hon. gentleman's purpose? Would that arrangement give him his rights as a christian citizen; would it afford him his Sabbath day's rest? No. The great majority of the people of this country believe in the sanctity of the Sabbath, in having the privilege of enjoying the Sabbath, and they are not willing to allow the law to step in and give them some other day and compel them to work on the Lord's Day. It would be a violation of their consciences and of their rights.

The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) took the ground that the provinces of this Dominion by their enactments can dispose of this whole question, that it is not only unnecessary for the Dominion Parliament to interfere in this legislation, but it is an infringement of provincial rights for this Parliament to attempt to legislate in any respect with regard to traffic on railways. I hold it is necessary that the Dominion should do this, that it is necessary to have some uniform rule and practice with respect to the regulation of the Sunday traffic on our railways. Our railways form essentially a national system, they are not provincial systems, but they are all connected with one another and are essentially a national system, and as the constitution of this country gives the Dominion Parliament the power to regulate this traffic, it is a power which should be exercised. The Dominion Parliament is given control over trade and commerce, while no doubt the Provincial Legislatures are permitted to exercise police regulations. Wherever it becomes necessary to regulate the shipping of this country, or the traffic by railway trains, the power to enforce such regulations rests with this Parliament. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) tells us that we had better change the preamble of the Bill. I have no objection to change it, but what is wrong with it? The preamble has the word "religion" in it, and the hon. gentleman seems to have a great horror of that word. Well it is an innocent word here. The preamble says "it is desirable in the interest of religion, morality and the public welfare that better provision should be made for securing the observance of the first day of the week." Can you make any law of that kind from a purely civil standpoint

that is not in the interest of religion as well as morality and public order? If any man has a particular horror for the word religion it can, if necessary, be left out of the preamble. I have no objection to expunge the word religion if any one has scruples about leaving it in.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Nobody ever raised that objection.

Mr. CHARLTON. It has been raised by the member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale).

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). No, he did not.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I did not so understand it.

Mr. CHARLTON. He did not want the preamble to state that it was in the interests of religion, and if that is not his objection I am at a loss to understand what it is. Let me point out that all attempts to secure Sunday legislation in this country, in the United States, in Germany and in European countries, proceeds on the assumption, not that the law should compel men to observe religious rites and ceremonies, but the object of Sunday laws in all cases is to secure for the workingman the privilege of enjoying the Sunday as he pleases. It does not profess to say to him whether he shall go on an excursion, or whether he shall go fishing or hunting, but the law says he shall have Sunday for a day of rest. If he is a religious man who wants to go to church the law secures him that right, and the law secures to him that needed day of rest which the law of God commands him to observe, and which common sense and experience says is necessary for the labouring man. Whenever an attempt is made to throw discredit upon this movement, upon the ground that it is a religious movement or a piece of bigotry on the part of some religious fanatic for the purpose of compelling men to observe some religious rites, there is not the slightest foundation for that assertion. The law is simply a provision for securing a civil day of rest, that the toiler may have that day at his disposal, that the great mass of the people can be brought under the influence of the christian influence that are seeking them, and that they are naturally inclined to seek, but which the regulations compelling them to work on the Lord's Day prevent them enjoying. Can there be a greater outrage perpetrated on a christian man and a free citizen than to say that he shall not attend church, that he shall not hear the gospel preached, and that he shall not go to Sunday school with his children? That is what is done in a country where the law does not step in to protect that man in the enjoyment of his civil right and the enjoyment of the Sabbath as a day secured to him for christian observance. This Bill is intended to minimize the railway traffic to the utmost extent possible. It does not profess to be able to suppress railway traffic under the conditions of modern civilization and the conditions of trade between this country and the United States where the commercial interests of the two countries are inseparably blended. It is impossible to cut off entirely all railway traffic without concurrent legislation in the United States as relating to international trade. But the Bill aims at putting an end to local traffic which is under our control as far as it can be done without imperilling the interests of our own railways in competition with railways of a foreign state. The Bill is of the broadest and most liberal character. It secures a civil right for the labourers of this country just so far as it can be done without unduly infringing on the rights and interests of the moneyed classes whose capital is invested in the railways. It does appear to me that this amendment is so plain and simple that the House might deal with it, and I am surprised to find that the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), have no confidence in the Minister of Justice who drafted the amendment and to whose party they belong.

Mr. AMYOT. Do not mind that, we will look after that ourselves.

Mr. CHARLTON. Of course you will. The hon. Minister has drafted this section, and I may say it is admirably done. The only objection I have to it is that it is too broad and liberal and does not go far enough, but I am disposed to accept what little I can get, and the trouble with these hon. gentlemen is, that they are not disposed to allow us to have anything. The effect of postponing this Bill for further consideration would be that we would not reach it again this session. It has now been before the House for three sessions and should be understood by hon. gentlemen. If the committee discusses it section after section and sub-section after sub-section they will be in full possession of all the features of it. Of course I am in the hands of the House, but it does appear to me that we should now proceed to consider the principles of the Bill. I do feel that the attacks as to my motives, the attacks as to the character of the Bill, the insinuations that it was a piece of puritanical legislation introduced here by a fanatic for the purpose of depriving men of their civil rights and saying that they shall not have the right to do this or that; these attacks have no foundation in fact.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). That is a little moral man you are putting up yourself to knock down. Nobody said that.

Mr. CHARLTON. It was said by the Minister of Public Works, and it was said by other members also that it was an attempt to force the people to be religious and to observe the sanctity of the Lord's Day. The observance of the sanctity of the Lord's Day is purely a voluntary matter with every man, but the law says that if you want this to be a holy day the law will protect you in your right to do it. It simply secures the citizen the right, but it leaves him a voluntary agent to exercise that right or not as he may choose.

I repeat that we have had the declaration of the best constitutional lawyers in the House, that this Parliament has jurisdiction in matters of railway traffic. It has never been questioned before to-night, in regard to sections 2, 3, 4, of the Bill, and the only section upon which doubt was raised in this respect was section 1, referring to Sunday newspapers. I trust that this amendment will receive a candid consideration of the House now. Let it be considered, and if after considering the amendment section after section and sub-section after sub-section it is felt by the House that it would be immature to press it, then let it rest there, but at all events let us have fair and candid consideration. But do not assume, before having con-

sidered it, that we cannot understand it, and that it ought not to be presented in the shape it is in to-night.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman who is the father of this Bill has called in question the grasping power of my intelligence, and the intelligence of another member. Though it is not exactly the question before us, I may tell him that, whatever may be the grasping power of my poor intelligence, I have not yet heard from his powerful, educated lips the answer, yes or no, to the question I put. The question is: Here is the Canadian Pacific Railway, which starts from Quebec, goes to Three Rivers, then to Montreal, and then to New York, and I want to know from the hon. gentleman if that railway is one of those mentioned as being operated for the purpose of making connection with railway trains running in the States? Is that railway affected by his Bill?

Mr. CHARLTON. I will answer the hon. gentleman as I did before. I said distinctly that a Canadian Pacific train or a Grand Trunk train from Canada passing into the United States or connecting with one of its own trains in the United States was on precisely the same footing, under the provisions of this Bill, as if it connected with a foreign road; and I answer yes, it has a right to connect with its own trains in the United States.

Mr. AMYOT. Then the train from Quebec to Montreal will not be stopped by the provisions of this Bill?

Mr. CHARLTON. My opinion is that it comes within the provisions of this clause and is allowed to run.

Mr. AMYOT. Then, if it stops at Three Rivers will it be allowed to run?

Mr. CHARLTON. If it is necessary to stop there.

Mr. AMYOT. Then, let us take the Grand Trunk, the Quebec Central, and the Intercolonial, which connects with the Grand Trunk; let us take the Lake St. John Railway, the Piles Railway, the Montmorency Railway; they all connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway runs into the United States; so that all the railways in the Province of Quebec are exempt from this Bill, according to the answer given by the hon. gentleman. This is not a question of brains; it is a question of law. We do not want to put the country into a nest of wasps; we want the country to understand the law we are going to pass. The hon. gentleman surprises me very much. He comes here in the interest of society and he wants a law passed which shall compel everybody to rest on Sunday; but here is a railway owned by two or three people, who will suffer pecuniary loss if their trains do not run on Sunday, and for the sake of the wealth of those two or three people, he will oblige hundreds of poor labourers to work on the trains, and his great principles are sacrificed. Will the hon. gentleman go before the public and say that for the sake of the interests of two or three great and rich proprietors of railways, the poor working classes were deprived of their Sunday's rest? Why does not the hon. gentleman apply the invariable rule that it is necessary in the interest of society that nobody should work on Sunday? Let there be no exception whatever, except on grounds of strict necessity in the interest of morality or charity, but not for the object of putting more money in the pockets of two or three individuals. The hon. gentleman finds the principle very good when it pleases those of his friends who may be rich. There is another thing that has surprised me. What is the reason of the hon. gentleman's respect for the railways of the States? The United States may have their railways running on Sundays, but we must stop ours except those that connect with the railways in the States. So we are subservient to the States; our railways are servants to those of the States. That is the Bill the hon. gentleman wants us to pass and the great moral principle that the labourer is entitled to rest on Sunday disappears when the States or the railways of the States are interested. I always understood that the moral principles of society are general, and cannot be departed from for pecuniary interests. The hon. gentleman says that the law provides that we must have a day of rest on Sunday. Will the hon. gentleman tell me where he finds that? In what code? In what statute? In what treaty? I understood when we joined Confederation that the religions would continue to be free in this country, provided we committed no scandal and did not sin against the laws of nature. Where is the law that will force me to observe Sunday as the Lord's Day? The hon. gentleman says it is the first day of the week. I understood from the Bible that God took his rest on the last day of the week. Will the hon. gentleman tell me by what right he changes that to the first day? I would like to know in virtue of what statute, treaty or old parchment he has the right to change what God has made? Suppose for a moment that I belonged to the Hebrew religion, and suppose I were rich—I suppose the hon. gentleman would then favour me by the Bill—suppose he tried to compel me to observe Sunday, and I would say, my conscience tells me to observe Saturday as the Lord's Day. In such a case, what becomes of that provision which says that all religions shall be free in this country? The hon. gentleman's law interferes with religion. I will tell the hon. gentleman frankly the position of us Catholics, at least in the Province of Quebec. On that question of Sunday, we always follow what our bishops and our church tell us to do. If they allow us to go on a pilgrimage on Sunday, we go if it pleases us. If, on Sunday morning, our crops are exposed to the storms and our priest tells us to go and gather them in, we do so. If we are allowed by our bishops to have a little fishing excursion on a Sunday afternoon, we take advantage of it, but the hon. gentleman wants to punish us for that. Now, trains are run on Sunday afternoons to enable us to attend this Parliament in the beginning of the week, and the hon. gentleman wants to forbid that. I say that his measure is interfering with religion. I say it is in violation of the Act of Confederation which guaranteed to every one the practice of religion as he understands it. The hon. gentleman says that we have expressed a horror of the word "religion." Not at all, but we might easily express a horror of —I will not apply the term to the hon. gentleman —the hypocrisy of those who, under the pretext of religion, want to throw trouble into the minds of the public. I say, let everybody enjoy the Sunday in peace, in the way he thinks best, provided he does not trouble his neighbour. Let everybody

practice religion, as he understands it, provided he does not prevent his neighbour doing the same. It is about time to stop bringing on every year these new laws. What is their object? Who is complaining? Some old women, whom we do not trouble; the public, the intelligent public, are all satisfied, and the great railway companies always give one day's rest in the week to their men. If they do not give it on Sunday, they give it on Saturday or Monday. Nobody has any complaint to make except those fanatics who want to force people to act as they act and think as they think. I say this sort of legislation is interfering with the right of every one to practice his religion, and is useless and dangerous. It may be that the grasp of my poor intelligence is not sufficient to reach the bottom of purity and sanctity which is to be found in this Bill: still I express what is my conviction, and I tell the hon. gentleman that whether his law passes or not he will not find one citizen in the Province of Quebec who will put it in force and prevent the public doing freely what is not condemned by any one in our province nor by any other province. We have no need in this Dominion for these men of narrow ideas who endeavour to excite prejudices. We should boldly tell every one that religion is free, that every one is allowed to worship his God as he pleases, and provided he does not interfere with his neighbour he may go on according to the dictates of his conscience without being compelled to give a record of his acts to anybody. The hon. gentleman speaks of Sunday schools, and he wants a law which will allow everybody to go to Sunday school. I may tell him that there are Roman Catholics in this Dominion who have the greatest possible respect for the Protestants of any church whatever. I may tell him that there are a million Catholics in the Province of Quebec who do not know what is Sunday school, but who send their children every day in the week, during ten or eleven months in the year, to schools where they are taught their religion, and on a Sunday they go to mass and vespers. They learn their catechisms in the schools, and their priests teach it very often to them during the week all the year long. We do not require the hon. gentleman's law, but we want the hon. gentleman to understand well that we are constituted as families and parishes, and have our churches, and priests, and bishops, and more than that, a pope, and we go by them, and do not trouble our neighbours: and in return we want our neighbours not to bother themselves about us. According to the constitution, whatever may be our powers, we are entitled to be left alone. The hon. gentleman says this House has jurisdiction. Of course we have. If the Parliament of Ottawa chooses to make the drinking of a glass of water an indictable offence, or the taking of a piece of paper, it can do so and bring these acts under its jurisdiction. But should we do that? Have not the provinces jurisdiction themselves to legislate upon this question and to transfer if they like to the municipal corporation their power? And have the municipal corporations themselves not the right to make all the regulations necessary for the observance of the Sabbath? They know better how to legislate in this matter than do we, and we should leave it to them who knowing the local circumstances can better than us regulate in this matter. I want the hon. gentleman to understand well the reason of our opposition here to-day. First of all, that Bill, as it is, should not pass now because of the unfortunate amendment the hon. gentleman has prepared. Secondly, I put the question to the hon. gentleman, and not to the Minister of Justice, as to what railways the Bill would apply to? He would not answer at first, and it was only when I reiterated my question that he answered that it did not apply to many, virtually to none of the railways in the Province of Quebec. If that is so, what is the use of the law? That is why I move that for the Province of Quebec this section will not apply.

Mr. DICKEY. I voted against this Bill once before on the ground that I thought this subject would be better dealt with by the Local Legislature, and I think whether we consider the preamble of the Bill as a necessary part of it or not, we cannot overlook the fact that the Bill by its very nature deals with religion. The very address of the hon. member for Bellechase (Mr. Amyot) shows that it affects religion in certain portions of the community. Now, I am satisfied that this House has jurisdiction to pass this law; but I also say that in a country like this where we have one French and Catholic province, where we have provinces on the Atlantic coast with one set of opinions, and provinces in the west and the centre and on the Pacific coast with entirely different sets of opinions, growing up with different views of life and a different outlook altogether on this question, if there is one subject more than another which should be left to be dealt with by the different localities it is the question affecting religion. Therefore, upon all questions in this House which affect religion, I have, as far as I have been able to judge, left them entirely to the decision of the local Parliaments. I do not think this clause, in its present shape, is very well considered, at any rate from the standpoint of Nova Scotia. I will take the clause so far as it relates to that province, and I say that it will not affect Nova Scotia at all. There are one or two small lines in Nova Scotia and trains upon those will not be affected because they will run the whole length of the line. I presume the hon. gentleman understands that Government railways, the Intercolonial Railway and all its connections, will not be affected by this Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. I believe the hon. gentleman is right as to passenger express trains, but not as to freight trains on the Intercolonial Railway. Most of the traffic is in freight, and this Bill does effectually provide for minimizing that traffic.

Mr. DICKEY. I understand that no statute affects the Crown unless the Crown is mentioned in the statute itself. The section of this Bill which refers to canals uses the words "no canal belonging to Canada," and consequently it does affect the canals, but this clause does not affect the Crown at all and the Supreme Court has decided that the Government of Canada operating the Intercolonial Railway is the Crown, and is not affected by having assumed the functions of a common carrier. I submit to the Minister of Justice whether the Intercolonial Railway being run by the Government of Canada, would be affected by a statute which does not name the Queen. Assuming that the Intercolonial Railway is affected, however, I would point out that there is a train which leaves Halifax on Saturday night and gets to St. John on

Sunday morning, and if that line is affected by the Bill, that train would be liable to the penalties. The Canadian Pacific Railway train runs through to St. John and stops there on Sunday. The train men have the advantage of attending their religious exercises on the Sunday and start for Montreal on Sunday evening. That train would come within the provisions of this Bill. So I think this Bill is very ill-considered as to its practical effect upon the train service. The hon. gentleman has said that the design of this Bill is to stop local traffic, and I think that is its design. If the Parliament of Canada can touch any railway traffic, it is through traffic. If the Local Legislatures can touch any traffic, it is local traffic. The hon. gentleman has excepted from the provisions of his Bill all the through lines which we can properly affect, lines connecting with the United States and through trains running over the whole line.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the hon. gentleman is under a misapprehension with regard to the lessening of the traffic. His contention is perhaps true with regard to express trains, but it is not in regard to freight trains, for not only local freight traffic but freight traffic throughout the whole Dominion of Canada will be affected by this Bill.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman agrees with me that he has deliberately withdrawn from this measure so far as passenger traffic is concerned the only trains which this Parliament should act upon, and I will show that the other trains are within the jurisdiction of the local parties. I contend that the trains operated by the Dominion Government and their employés are outside of this statute. As to other trains, I do not see the slightest difficulty in the local parliaments dealing with them. If the Canadian Pacific Railway brings a train into Montreal on the Sunday, its employés are bound by the provincial laws. I am not aware of any franchise conferred by this Parliament on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which would exempt it from observing the local laws of any province, or justify it in violating police regulations of any province in which it ran, so that, as to any companies other than the Government, the provinces can deal amply with this subject, the moment the train comes within their jurisdiction. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the question of freight. He says this is not a question of religion purely. It is partly a question of religion, and he said that, because there was a large amount of money at stake in trains connecting with the United States railways, he was willing that this law should be violated, that whatever sacred rights were involved in keeping the Sabbath by railway employés or others, he was willing for a certain sum of money that those rights should be disregarded. I call his attention to the fact that in the North-West there are numerous crops of wheat and other produce to remove, and I would ask him what can be more important, if this question of morality and religion has come down to a question of how much money is necessary to violate this law, than to free the freight traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway and allow them to move the enormous crops of grain which grow in the Territories, and which it is difficult for that road to handle. If the Bill passes in its present shape, every freight train on the Canadian Pacific Railway will have to stop at 12 o'clock on Saturday night, wherever it may happen to be, at Callander or Port Arthur or anywhere else, if the Bill is anything more than a sham, and all the grain that is seeking an outlet to the European markets from the great North-West will have to stop 24 hours out of every week. I would ask the hon. gentleman if there is not enough money in this to justify another violation of this high law which he is trying to impose upon the country, and whether he would not add another sub-section exempting through freight trains from the North-West of Canada. I would appeal once more to the Minister of Justice for his opinion whether or not this clause would bind the Government in its operation of railways, because, unless he holds a very strong opinion to the contrary, I shall remain convinced that the Government are not affected by this, and therefore that the Bill will not affect the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick at all, will affect very slightly the Province of Quebec, and, as I understand, will affect only the western part of the Province of Ontario.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. So far as the point goes which the hon. gentleman has raised, the Bill will not apply to the Intercolonial Railway unless it is made specially to apply. I do not know anything about the freight management, I do not know that any freight trains run on Sunday on the Intercolonial Railway; but express trains are not run to as great an extent on Sunday as this Bill will permit on other railways. The hon. gentleman has just explained that the train which leaves on Saturday night stops on Sunday morning and remains stationary for the greater part of Sunday, in order that the train hands may avail themselves of any Sunday privileges within their reach. If it were a company road, under this Bill, it could run trains the whole day, because these trains run all the way through. There are two other railway lines in Nova Scotia, each of them between 80 to 100 miles in length, but there are no Sunday trains run on this road, certainly no passenger trains.

Mr. TISDALE. I would not trouble the committee with any more remarks had not the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) again misrepresented me in regard to what I said on this Bill, and intimated that I had objected to religion being in the preamble. Now, I never mentioned the word religion in any shape or manner, it never passed my lips to-night. Probably he did not do it intentionally, but he got so warm in describing what this Bill was intended to do, that probably his imagination carried him away. I do not think the Bill goes so far as he says it does, but if it does go so far as to affect the civil rights of the inhabitants of any of the provinces, certainly we would have no jurisdiction at all, because in the British North America Act, property and civil rights belong to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures. I do not think he was speaking at the time for the purpose of influencing the members of this House; he must have been speaking to be reported. But I do not like to have an hon. gentleman say that I said things I never uttered in this House, and particularly anything in the line of an attack upon religion, or that I said anything disrespectful in regard to religion at all. I never have been in the habit of doing that, and I am sure I did not do it to-night. But the hon. gentleman misrepresented what I said for

the sake, I presume, of replying to it in the way he did. In regard to the remarks I offered as to a new preamble or title to the Bill, I simply quoted that as applicable to what he had just said to the Minister of Public Works. I was simply saying that he was abandoning the name of his Bill in claiming that the Bill was entirely for the purpose of freeing railway employés from work on the Sabbath. I understand that the hon. gentleman's Bill was founded on certain petitions presented to this House last year, praying for the better observance of the Sabbath, but they said nothing about the civil rights of individuals at all. Now, I agree with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) and with the Minister of Justice in the view that we have concurrent jurisdiction, we have power to pass this Bill, being for the purpose that its preamble expresses, but we would not have jurisdiction if it covered some of the things that the member for North Norfolk claimed that he intended to cover by the Bill. I have heard no word from any hon. gentleman who has criticised this Bill that would justify the hon. gentleman in saying that they were endeavouring to cast any reflection on religion, or anything connected with a proper observance of the Sabbath. I think his remarks were entirely uncalled for, and as he mentioned my name specifically in that connection, I repudiate them, and I think they were improper. I leave it to the House whether I have not been moderate and temperate, but decided, in my opposition to these clauses of the Bill. Until he mentioned it to-night, I was not aware that those whom he represents were not satisfied with the present law regarding the observance of the Sabbath; and I think it is quite commendable for any hon. gentleman, I would do it myself, to see to the proper observance of the Sabbath by proper legislation. But it is very important, in my opinion, that we do not encroach on the domain of the Local Legislatures, that we do not get at loggerheads with them in connection with these matters. I agree that we have concurrent jurisdiction on this matter, and the only question is whether we should exercise it or not. I think it is one of the elements of the freedom of conscience, of the liberty of the subject, of the rights of property and of a proper license for legislation in regard to the future welfare of this Dominion that we should keep these lines well apart. We should proceed on broader lines in our legislation in Dominion affairs. We should be very careful not to allow any feeling to prevail in any province that because this Parliament is the greater body it is taking away any rights which belong to the provinces, and is dealing with any subject on which they have the right to legislate. The discussion has been a temperate and a moderate one on the whole, but I object to being attacked twice by the hon. gentleman during these discussions, the first time when I moved that the committee rise, and again to-night, when I was acting temperately as I always try to do, and was enunciating principles which should be enunciated, and such attacks benefits no one and often cause discussion to be not so pleasant as otherwise would be the case. I am opposed to this clause and to all the other clauses of the Bill for the reasons I have stated. As I am not in order in moving that that clause stand, I think the hon. gentleman should allow it to stand and take his chance with respect to it in the future.

Mr. TISDALE.

He can do this by consent, otherwise it may bring up the motion that the committee rise. It would even give a better chance to the Bill itself, because it is questionable whether it can be made applicable to some of the provinces. This is the greater reason why delay should be exercised, when it is obvious that a general law cannot be practically applied to some of the provinces.

Mr. HAZEN. I think that the effect of the discussion which has occurred, and of the remarks addressed to the committee by the hon. the introducer of this Bill, must have been to shatter an idol in the minds of many who listened to the hon. gentleman's remarks. Further than that, I feel satisfied that many of the members of the religious bodies of this country, who have been watching this Bill with great interest, will also, if they read and follow the discussion in the *Hansard* or the newspapers, have an idol shattered in their minds. My idea was that the hon. gentleman, in making this motion, was actuated by high feelings of religious conviction. I honoured him for entertaining these feelings, as did members of the religious bodies, because many of the members of those bodies wrote letters, individually, and as bodies, asking hon. members, if possible, to give the hon. gentleman's Bill a hearty support. When such letters were written and the matter was considered, no doubt the writers were perfectly convinced that the sole purpose which the hon. member had in mind, was the carrying out of the strict observance of the Sabbath in Canada, and that the passage of this legislation would have the effect of causing the fourth commandment to be literally observed from one end of the Dominion to the other. That view of the question was fully borne out by the preamble of the Bill which the hon. gentleman submitted. That preamble said: "Whereas it is desirable in the interests of religion and of moralty and of the public welfare that better provision should be made for securing the observance of the first day of the week, hereafter called the Lord's Day." The whole object of the Bill appears to be to promote the religious and the moral well-being of the people. How disappointing it, therefore, must be to many people in this country and to many members in this House to find that the hon. gentleman was not actuated by a high sense of religious conviction and a high sense of religious principle, but that his sole aim was, as he expressed it himself, to secure a day of rest for a certain class of the population, brakesmen and others employed on trains on the Lord's Day, and this must cause a feeling of great disappointment in the minds of the religious bodies who are interested in the Bill which the hon. gentleman has introduced. But when we go further and consider that the hon. Minister instead of acting upon principle, for if he acted on principle I could respect him, and if he truly believed it was wrong to pursue any kind of work on the Lord's Day, that the command to do no manner of work should be strictly and literally obeyed, I could respect him for entertaining that opinion, should have introduced into this clause providing that trains should not run on the Lord's Day, exceptions which make it actually and utterly useless and inoperative so far as Canada is concerned. What are the features of the Bill which make it wholly inoperative? They are that the Bill shall not apply to through passenger trains, and that it

shall not apply to trains connecting with the railways of the United States. I ask if it is wrong on principle that work should be done on the Lord's Day, judged from a moral and religious standpoint, what can justify these exceptions in the present Bill? It is sacrificing principle simply to material prosperity and material well-being. If the principle is right, then it is the duty of the hon. gentleman to say that no matter how great the loss on the country may be, no matter how great the loss to individuals may be, no work shall be done on the Lord's Day, whether it interferes with the business of this country or not. That would be the consistent course for the hon. gentleman to have taken. I would have admired him, although I did not agree with a position of that kind; but it is utterly at variance with such principle that exception should be made in favour of through passenger trains and also in favour of trains connecting with United States railways. I was very much interested in the manner in which the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) catechised the promoter of the Bill, who, in my opinion, failed to answer the question put to him. What is a through passenger train? I have been unable to gather from the tenor of this debate what the meaning would be under this Bill. Would it be a train running from Quebec to Three Rivers? Or would it be one running from Quebec to Montreal? There is no definition of a through train, and if this Bill were passed in its present from, it would lead to endless difficulty and litigation if it was ever attempted to be put in force which I doubt very much, in many of the provinces of this Dominion. Does a through train mean a train running from one end of the line to the other?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That portion is all struck out.

Mr. HAZEN. If that portion is struck out, there are now the words used "running over the whole line as an express." Take the Canadian Pacific Railway: what is the whole of the line? Would it mean a train starting from Halifax to Vancouver, or from St. John to Vancouver? Would it mean a train starting from St. John to Montreal, or one starting from Quebec to Montreal? Or, taking the view put forward by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), with respect to lines connecting with American systems, would all the branch lines connecting with the Canadian Pacific Railway, which connect with American lines, be exempted by the operation of this Bill? If so, the Bill would be utterly useless and ineffectual. But if the hon. gentleman has in his mind to secure a day of rest to those who work on those trains, then the hon. gentleman is defeating, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), the very object he has in view. The hon. member for Cumberland pointed out how a train on the Canadian Pacific Railway starts from Halifax on Saturday and runs to St. John, arriving on Saturday night before midnight, and that it lies over at St. John until Sunday night at 11 o'clock. The men employed on the train have thus the opportunity of going to church and performing their religious duties on Sunday. What would be the effect if this Bill were in force? The train would run right through, instead of stopping at St. John, where the trainmen have an opportunity of attending religious observances. It would go right on through St. John and make no stop, because under this Bill it could not leave again on Sunday night, and so these train hands would be employed on the train the whole Sunday, and would not have the opportunity they have at the present time of attending church and observing their religious duties. In this instance which I give to the hon. gentleman, and I do not know how he can answer it, instead of having the effect of causing the Sabbath to be a day of rest to persons employed on the train, it would have the very contrary effect from what is intended by the hon. gentleman. Apart from that altogether, and coming down to look at the general principle and spirit of the Bill, I think that whilst the great bulk of the people of this country believe in the proper observance of the Sabbath, yet there are very few who would approve of a return to the old Blue Laws which were in force in Connecticut and others of the New England States in days gone by. This question in itself must be looked at from a rational standpoint. I would ask the hon. gentleman, if in a city like Montreal, there is on Sunday afternoon a train requiring ten or twelve hands to operate, but which takes hundreds of people to the country at cheap rates and enables them to lie on the grass or under the trees, or alongside of some lake or river; I ask him if that is not an advantage to these poor people who are so carried away from the dust and the heat and the crowded tenements of the city, and if they are not in a more religious frame of mind, and are not better able to conform their minds to admire the works of the Creator and giver of all good things, than they would be if they were crowded in the streets of that large city, uncomfortable and unhappy as most of them would be. When I was in Montreal one hot day last summer—and it always struck me forcibly in this connection—I went over Mount Royal and there lying under the trees on that hot afternoon, I saw in all directions thousands of people, many of them whole families, perhaps a labourer or a mechanic with his wife and children who had brought their luncheons out with them, lying under the trees and quietly and reverently enjoying themselves on that Sabbath day. These people could not have reached the top of the mountain by any other means than the little cable road which runs up and down, because the walk on that hot day would be too great for the children. There they were enjoying themselves in a moderate, temperate and rational manner. It struck me most forcibly that from the standpoint of a broad christianity, and from the standpoint of religion these people were better there with their families enjoying the cool mountain air than they would have been in a narrow street of the city; and that although one or two men might have been employed to operate the cable road, yet they were doing a good christian work and could not be held guilty of desecrating the Sabbath in consequence of their acts. So far as the Province of New Brunswick is concerned, I feel that we have no necessity for this legislation. The people of that province are a Sabbath-observing and a church-going people. They go to their churches on Sunday, they do not go in for sporting or any improper action, on the Sabbath or Lord's Day, they pass it in a proper manner, and I feel that such legislation as this is not called for and not asked for by the Province of New Brunswick. I further say that any legislation

that may be necessary in order to prevent the desecration of the Sabbath day is found amply sufficient now on the Statute-book passed by the the Local Legislature of the Province of New Brunswick. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I feel called upon to oppose this Bill, which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has introduced to this House.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I did not intend to speak on this Bill to-night as I spoke the other evening, but there have been so many speeches upon one side of the question that it might be interesting for hon. gentlemen to know that there is more than one member who is disposed to support the principle of the Bill. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent and forcible speech of my hon. friend from Bellechase (Mr. Amyot) as well as to the other speeches, some of them forcible and some of them I thought taking the points not quite so strongly. I am sure I am very much gratified to hear from the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) that we have such good people in the Province of New Brunswick that they do not need any Sabbath legislation, and I hope they will always continue to be so. If we are to take the remarks of my hon. friends who have spoken, from the Province of Quebec as an index, I am sure that the people of that province will hardly need any legislation of this kind either. There is, however, a principle involved in this Bill that I think ought not to be overlooked. I do not agree with many of the arguments that have been advanced this afternoon as to what the real principle of the Bill is. It appears to me that the principle of the Bill is two-fold, and that we ought to consider very carefully what would be its aim and object. So far as the preservation of the Sabbath as a day of rest and a day which we ought to observe in religious worship is concerned, there is but one opinion about that, and there is no doubt in our minds as to how we ought to employ the Sabbath day. We are however well aware that in connection with the business of the country a certain amount of work is necessary, and that brings out the other point in the Bill which provides for the protection of the workingmen. I am disposed to think that a great deal has been said about that which does not apply to it very forcibly. For my own part I do not think that we ought to try to force religion upon any man. As some hon. gentlemen have said, I do not think we can take any man to Heaven by legislation, or else perhaps we ought to pass a Bill to send all our people there. I do not think the principle of this Bill which protects the workingman has received fair treatment here to-night; not that I think that any of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken would be intentionally unfair to it, but there are more ways than one of looking at it. We have not only to look to the people who wish to be accommodated on the railways, but we have also to look to the interests of the men who are working on these roads. I do not agree with the hon. gentlemen who say that these men can take their rest on Saturday or Monday or any other day, because it is the Sunday which is observed and regarded as a day of rest by all persons. I feel sure that there are many men who are compelled to work on the Sabbath day who should not be compelled to work on that day, and who would prefer to be at home and be able to go to church with their families. This is the class of men that the principle of the Bill is intended to protect, and we ought to be careful not to throw out the Bill as a whole. I can see that there are difficulties in the way of passing the measure, but we ought to be careful not to pronounce against the principle altogether, because there are many men who are compelled to work on railways and other works on Sunday, who ought not to be so compelled, and who would not be so compelled if we were to throw around them the proper protection. I do not agree with my hon. friends who take the position that the Bill is inconsistent because it says that some trains may run on Sundays and other trains may not run on Sunday. I do not think that that is a fair position to take, because we know there are many things necessary to be done on Sunday, and that there are many things which are done on Sunday which are not necessary to be done. We have, therefore, to take a reasonable view of the situation. We have an enormous railroad traffic in Canada, we have got to keep that traffic up to a certain extent as well on Sunday as any other day, and for my part I am prepared to support the exceptions in the measure so far as they relate to the necessary traffic in order to keep up the volume of business which we are bound to maintain, and which I say is a necessity, because of all the relations we hold, not only between ourselves but with regard to other countries. There is no question in my mind that it is necessary for us to have a certain amount of railroad traffic on Sunday; and the only question which the House is called upon to decide is the volume of traffic which is necessary on Sunday to the proper carrying on of our business. It appears to me that we ought to draw the line there. There is no doubt, as the hon. Minister of Justice said the other night, that there is a great deal of shunting and other unnecessary work done by the railways on Sundays which could just as well be left till Monday, and I think we ought to stop all that kind of work.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Who is the judge of the necessity?

Mr. COATSWORTH. At the present time we must be the judges of the necessity. The Bill is before us, and we as intelligent men know what work is necessary for the commerce of the country. Therefore I take this position, that any works on the railroads that can reasonably be stopped on the Sunday, we ought to stop, not only in the interests of religion, the sanctity of the day, but for the benefit and in the interests of the workingmen who are compelled unnecessarily to work on Sunday. I would take exception to the remarks of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) with regard to excursion trains. I am aware that there are many people who are glad to get away from their hot and dusty homes on Sunday. I am aware that many are so tied down during the week that Sunday is the only day on which they can get away; and I for one would not do anything to prevent a man taking his family out to the parks or somewhere else on Sunday. But I am satisfied that it is not necessary for that purpose that the railway trains should run on Sunday. I believe that Montreal, St. John, and other cities are fully provided with parks as well as the city of Toronto; and I know that in Toronto no person is obliged to walk more than a quarter of an hour to reach one of the parks,

where he can take his family to enjoy themselves and have a pic-nic, if they want one, just as well as he could if there was a train running thirty or forty miles out of the city. I can assure you that we fought this question out in Toronto on the Sunday car question last January, and it was decided that even the street cars were not necessary to take the people to the parks on Sunday.

Mr. AMYOT. Would the street cars be included in this Bill?

Mr. COATSWORTH. No, I think not. I am merely mentioning that as an illustration.

Mr. AMYOT. And the electric cars in cities?

Mr. COATSWORTH. I think not. There is another point I would like to speak about, and it is this. Should we not take a somewhat inconsistent position if we were to throw out this clause to-night? The other evening, when the Bill came up for discussion, we threw out the first clause, possibly properly so, although I did not vote against it, though I felt that it was liable to bring us into conflict with the Local Legislatures, but we passed the second clause, with some slight amendments, which reads as follows:—

"No canal belonging to Canada shall be open for traffic or business on the Lord's Day, between the hours of six in the morning and ten in the evening, but this provision may be set aside by Order in Council after the 15th day of October in each year."

Now, if it is wrong for the canals to work on Sunday, and I suppose I have a right to assume, from the action taken by the committee the other evening, that they believe that those who work on the canals should be allowed to go to church and have their Sunday rest, it is equally wrong for those employed on the railways to be compelled to work on Sunday.

Mr. TISDALE. But the Provincial Legislatures have no jurisdiction over the canals as they have over the railways.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I have some doubt about the Provincial Legislatures having jurisdiction over railways which are inter-provincial lines or public works for the general advantage of Canada. They would not have a right to interfere with them, I think, except where they came within their own province; and, as we the other night passed the clause enacting that the canals should be closed between certain hours on Sunday, the same argument applies to the railroads. Let me say in conclusion—because I see that there are difficulties in the way—that I would not wish my remarks to be taken as applying to any but work that is unnecessary on the railroads. I think that so far as it can be done consistently with our commercial interests and the interests of our carrying traffic, we ought to prevent all works on the railroads on Sunday, not only for the purpose of preserving the sacredness and sanctity of the day, but for the purpose of preventing men engaged on the railways being compelled to work unnecessarily on that day.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Like my hon. friend from Toronto, I did not intend to speak on this question to-night. However, one or two points have been raised on which I wish to say a word or two. The first point was raised by my hon. friend from South Norfolk. He found fault with the preamble of the Bill. So do I. I gave notice that I intended to move, when it came before the committee, to have the preamble changed, and I do so intend. The next question he raised was the question of jurisdiction. Now, no man in this House feels more strongly than I do the necessity of leaving to the Local Legislatures matters of local concern, but it has been stated in this House on high authority, and I am inclined to think that the statement is correct, that so far as those lines of railway are concerned which have been declared by this House to be for the general advantage of Canada, the Local Legislatures have no power over them.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. promoter of the Bill, when I asked him the question at the commencement of the discussion, admitted that the Local Legislature and this House had concurrent jurisdiction.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is not the information I have had, and I think I have had it on good authority. Now, with regard to the clause now before the House, I think there is very little in it. In fact, so far as passenger trains are concerned, it leaves the matter in a worse position than it is in now. It is true, I have not had an opportunity of reading the amendment, but I have heard it read, and I have heard the answers made by the hon. promoter of the Bill. If I understood that aright, if I understood the amendment aright, and construction he put upon it, it just amounts to this that wherever a train makes up on Sunday, that is a passenger train, at one end of the road and runs to the other end, it will not infringe upon the provisions of this clause. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that a train made up at Quebec and run to Montreal did not come under the provisions of this clause. Well, if that is correct, I submit there is not a single railway in the country which does not do the same thing. A train may be made up in the city of London and run to Hamilton or Toronto or Niagara Falls, or be made up in London and run up to Kincardine, and it will not be affected by this clause, and the same may be said of every other railway in this country. The Intercolonial Railway has been brought up as a case in point. The Minister of Justice said, and said truly, that if this clause became law, it would give the Intercolonial Railway far greater powers than it has under the law as it stands. I have been on the Intercolonial Railway on a Sunday morning, and when we came to stop at a divisional point, we did not start until late Monday morning; but if this clause becomes law, and the construction put upon it is correct, it will give that road authority to run every hour on Sundays.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not want the hon. gentleman to misunderstand what I said about the Intercolonial Railway. While I said the Bill did not apply to the Intercolonial Railway, there is no restriction now on the Intercolonial Railway as to running trains on Sunday.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Except what the Government themselves impose, and as far as I can learn the Government have been very strict in seeing that the employés have their Sundays regularly. And now a word or two about my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). He claims the right to keep the Sabbath in his own way. If he chooses to go to church, he wants to have the right to go. If he chooses to go and lie down in the shade, he wants the right to do so. He claims the right to

spend Sunday as he sees fit so long as he does not interfere with his neighbour. I agree with the hon. gentleman, and whenever my vote is necessary to secure him in that right it shall be given cheerfully. I claim the same right, and I believe my friend would vote as cheerfully as I would in his case that I should have the full exercise of that right. Now, we are both agreed on that point. But there is John Brown, and John Brown has the right to be secured as effectually in the enjoyment of these rights as my hon. friend and myself; and if John Brown is in a position where another authority steps in and says he shall not enjoy those rights, those who have the power to secure that right to him should not fail to do so. If John Brown is a railway employé, and the railway demands that he shall work on Sunday and not be allowed to rest, then it is our duty to step in and see that he shall have the enjoyment of his rights. It is easy to say, as the Minister of Public Works said, that Brown may take another day for a holiday, but it is not at all likely that he will be allowed that privilege. It is easy for any one to say that if he does not like to come under the rules of the railway and obey the commands given him, he has the privilege of stepping down and out. But it is quite possible, it is more than likely, that John Brown is the head of a family, whose bread and butter depend on his retaining his situation, which would be in danger if he dared to refuse the demands of those in authority over him.

Mr. AMYOT. John Brown is satisfied now. I have seen him.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If he is satisfied to do it, let him do it, but if he is not satisfied, then those incur a frightful responsibility who have the authority to secure him in the enjoyment of his rights and refuse to do so. That is the sole reason why I support this Bill. I hope the House will pardon me if I just read a few sentences to show what John Brown thinks about it. Some years ago, 450 locomotive engineers on the New York Central Railway sent a petition to the manager of that road. They pointed out that the Sunday running had become a great hardship. They said:

"We have borne this grievance patiently, hoping every succeeding year that it would decrease. We are willing to submit to any reasonable privation, mental or physical, to assist the officers of your company to achieve a financial triumph, but, after a long and weary service, we do not see any signs of relief, and we are forced to come to you with our trouble, and most respectfully ask you to relieve us from Sunday labour, so far as it is in your power to do so. Our objections to Sunday labour are:

"(1) This never ending labour ruins our health and prematurely makes us feel worn out like old men, and we are sensible of our inability to perform our duty as well when we work to excess.

"(2) That the customs of all civilized countries, as well as all laws, human and divine, recognize Sunday as a day of rest and recuperation; and notwithstanding intervals of rest might be arranged for us on other days than Sunday, we feel that by so doing we would be forced to exclude ourselves from all church, family and social privileges that other citizens enjoy.

"(3) Nearly all of the undersigned have children that they desire to have educated in everything that will tend to make them good men and women, and we cannot help but see that our example in ignoring the Sabbath day has a very demoralizing influence upon them.

"(4) Because we believe the best interests of the company we serve, as well as ours, will be promoted thereby, and because we believe locomotive engineers should occupy as high social and religious positions as men in any other calling. We know the question will be considered: How can this Sunday work be avoided with the immense and constantly increasing traffic? We have watched this matter for the past twenty years. We have seen it grow from its infancy until it has arrived at its now gigantic proportions, from one train on the Sabbath until we now have about thirty each way; and we do not hesitate in saying that we can do as much work in six days with the seventh for rest, and is now done. It is a fact observable by all connected with the immediate running of freight trains that on Monday freight is comparatively light; Tuesday it strengthens a little, and keeps increasing until Saturday, and Sundays are the heaviest of the week. The objection may be offered that if your lines stop, the receiving points from other roads will be blocked up. In reply we would most respectfully suggest, that when the main lines do not run, tributaries would only be too glad to follow the good example. The question might also arise, if the traffic is suspended for twenty-four hours will not the company lose one-seventh of its profits? In answer, we will pledge our experience, health and strength that at the end of the year our employers will not lose one cent. but, on the contrary, will be the gainers financially. Our reasons are these: At present the duties of your locomotive engineers are incessant, day after day, night succeeding night, Sunday and all, rain or shine, with all the fearful inclemency of a rigorous winter to contend with, the great strain of both mental and physical faculties constantly employed has a tendency in time to impair its requisites so necessary to make a good engineer. Troubled in mind, jaded and worn out in body, the engineer cannot give his duties the attention they should have in order to best advance his employer's interests. We venture to say not on this broad continent, in any branch of business or traffic, can be found any class in the same position as railroad men. They are severed from associations held most dear, debarred from the opportunity of worship, that tribute man owes to his God; witnessing all those pleasures accorded to others, which are the only oasis in the desert of this life, and with no prospect of relief. We ask you to aid us. Give us the Sabbath for rest after our week of laborious labours, and we pledge you that, with a system invigorated by a season of repose, by a brain eased and cleared by hours of relaxation, we can go to work with more energy, more mental and physical force, and can and will accomplish more work, and do it better, if possible, in six days than we can now do in seven. We can give you ten days in six if you require it, if we can only look forward to a certain period of rest. In conclusion, we hope and trust that, in conjunction with other gentlemen of the trunk lines leading to the seaboard, you will be able to accomplish something that will ameliorate our condition."

Such is the cry of John Brown, and it is the duty of those in authority, those in whose hands legislation lies, to see that John Brown gets his rights. Now let us see what a railroad man says, one who long was president of the Michigan Central Railway, Mr. Ledyard. He says:

"There is no question as to the desirability of prohibiting Sunday work on railways. The law of nature, to say nothing of the higher law, requires that men should have rest one day in seven. Is there any reason why a railroad engineer or conductor is not entitled to his rest as much as a merchant or manufacturer? I do not believe at the end of the year the loss in traffic would be appreciable were all Sunday work stopped; and in the better morals of the men, the railway companies would be abundantly paid for doing away with the work on this day. Looking at the question from either a moral or economical standpoint, no candid person can uphold the running of trains on Sunday. What is there in the essence of a railway company different from any other business which will require an exception to be made of it and its employés to work when others are allowed and expected to rest? The effect of this constant and never-ending work is not only injurious to the men themselves but most deplorable to their families. If it is true, as Lord Bacon says, that a man who has a family has given a hostage to fortune, it is equally true that he should be allowed to live at least part of his time with those for whom he has to care, and certainly should have at least one day in every seven, which, under our system of railway labour, he cannot have, to devote to his own family and private matters."

So that not only the men, but those who are qualified to speak for the railways unite in declaring that the rest of one day in seven is an actual physical necessity.

Mr. DAVIN. This is a very important question and there are other members who would like to speak on it. I would like to say something on it myself, and I beg to move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. BOWELL. I would suggest that the amendment proposed should be published in the Votes and Proceedings so that every member may be able to read it. For myself I have been unable to understand its import. I intended to ask the mover some questions in regard to it. From what he said to the Minister of Public Works, I understood that the amendment would permit a line 30 miles long, running from Belleville to Madoc village or El Dorado, to run on the Sunday—the thing he professes to desire to prevent—because that line connects with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway connects with American roads, or would enable the road to start a train from Madoc to connect with the Grand Trunk train from Toronto for Prescott, Kingston or any other place where it connects with the American roads, or at Montreal where it connects with the Vermont Central for Boston or New York, and so to the westward by the Niagara Falls route. I do not know that it is necessary to pursue the discussion of these questions to-night ; but, if the motion of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is carried, I think the amendments should be printed in the Votes and Proceedings so that every member may be able to read them.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose the motion which had been made by the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and endorsed by the Minister of Militia had better be adopted and the amendment printed. I may make what is almost a personal explanation. The House is aware that the amendment is not the clause I am responsible for, and I am quite sure that the Minister of Justice will feel highly complimented by the severe criticism the amendment drafted by himself has received from his friends in the House. The motive which actuates me is, if I cannot get what I want, to take what I can get. The Minister of Justice, in drafting this amendment, gave something, not what I wanted, but something of importance. It was a concession, and I was willing to accept it if I could not get more. I am not responsible for the amendment in the sense of its giving all I want, but I accept the amendment and the concession granted thankfully if I can get no more, and I think the Minister of Justice has treated me as promoter of this Bill with extreme courtesy and kindness. He granted in the section as to canals practically what the Bill asked for, and in this matter he has granted an important concession. It is true, as the Minister of Militia says, and as other members have said, that the lessening of passenger traffic will be slight, the diminution of that traffic will be very much less than I could have hoped for. The effect of the amendment, however, will be to curtail the freight traffic. It recognizes the principle of lessening Sunday traffic. It does not go as far as I desire, but it recognizes a principle, it grants a concession, and it makes a material step in advance with reference to Sunday legislation and opens the way for more mature consideration of this matter at some future session. For that reason, while I think the criticisms indulged in by various members towards myself and others because we do not go on high religious grounds, alleging that for the sake of money we do not put an end to through traffic with American lines, and so on, are very unfair. We are thankful to have an important concession made, even if it does not go so far as the promoters would desire. I again thank the Minister of Justice for his courtesy and kindness in this matter. The provision which he has drafted, and which has been so severely criticised, has been unjustly criticised, in my opinion. He has given us a material concession, he has recognized the principle and given us a standing, and on another occasion we will be able to deliberate on this matter more at our leisure. I consent to the motion, with the understanding that the amendment shall be printed and considered by the members.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 7th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEGOTIATIONS AT WASHINGTON.

Mr. LAURIER. I notice that the gentlemen who went some time ago to Washington have come back, and I would ask if it is the intention of the Government to lay on the Table any written communications which passed between them and the Washington Government ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There will be a statement made to the House in the course of a few days on the subject, and by that time probably there will be some communications to submit as well.

Mr. LAURIER. In the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is in charge of his department ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Prime Minister.

RAILWAY STATISTICS.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways if he could answer the question which I put a few days ago and which he kindly promised to enquire into with regard to the annual year book and yearly statistics. When may we expect them to be laid on the Table, and what is the cause of the delay ?

Mr. HAGGART. The delay was caused by the railway companies, not making their returns in proper time. However, the report was prepared and put in the hands of the Queen's Printer on the 19th of April last.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir John Thompson : That Bill (No. 76), to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, be read a second time.

Mr. McCARTHY. In resuming the discussion upon the second reading of the Bill for the purpose of readjusting representation in this House, I desire, in the first place, to state why I felt it impossible to vote for the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. I think the amendment was of that character, so vague and uncertain, that it was almost impossible, not to say impracticable; and although it was based, or purported to be based, upon the precedent of 1884 in England, when the great scheme of redistribution took place with the concurrence of both political parties, nevertheless I think the hon. gentleman moving the amendment and those who supported it failed to observe that that conference was brought about at the instigation of the majority and was not imposed upon the majority by the vote of either House of Parliament. Now, a conference necessarily means, in a matter of that kind, that it is the act of both parties. It is not a matter that can be forced, say by one party, even a majority, upon the minority, and much less of course would it be possible to force a conference upon the majority by the minority. Therefore the scheme proposed by the leader of the Opposition seemed to me impracticable, though I do not at all mean to say that if the majority had thought fit to follow the lines laid down at that period in England, such a course would have been unjust or undesirable. But even had there been a conference in that way, I do not see what practical benefit could have resulted, because the conference, representing, as it was suggested it should, the majority and the minority according to numbers in this House, would, unless they agreed, have merely reproduced the scheme of the majority. It would merely have reproduced the scheme which Government have now presented, and which this House, representing in the same way the same proportion of numbers, will ultimately adopt. We have seen too often that matters, not perhaps involving as this does political interests—although I do not pretend to say that this ought to involve political interests in that sense—are decided by the majority. Even in matters affecting privileges and elections, where the characters of members of the House are at stake, where their seats are in question, and respecting which, if ever it can happen, there ought to be a conference irrespective of political considerations, we have seen, with regret it may be said, that the decision arrived at,—and arrived at, curiously enough, by gentlemen professing to act according to conscientious convictions—represents in the strongest possible way the political divisions which prevail even in that committee. Therefore, I do not think any good purpose could have been served by voting for the resolution which the hon. gentleman proposed, and to which I felt, for this and other reasons which I need not dwell upon now, unable to give my consent. I was challenged by an hon. gentleman who spoke late in the debate as to my opinion on the legal question presented by the hon. member for Queen's (P.E.I.) (Mr. Davies); and although I do not suppose that any view which the lawyers of this House may express will prevail upon the majority or induce a solitary change of vote, nevertheless I think it is not unfair that I should have been asked, being a member of the legal profession, what my views were, and before I sit down I will state what conclusion I have come to. I think it will be found, and I will refer to this later on, that, whatever may be the true view to take of that particular section of the Act of Parliament cited by the hon. member for Queen's, it does afford, if this House is invested with the power this Bill presumes it has, as to which I shall have a word or two to offer before I close, a rule for the guidance of the House. If this House has the authority and the power to make for itself the division which the statute implies, or rather expresses, should be made for it by some authority constituted by the House, I think it must be perfectly plain to us all that we should, if we are to assume that power, act upon some rule, because, adopting the argument for the moment—though not at all saying that I endorse that argument of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)—that if we have the power to constitute the authority, we have the power to act ourselves, we cannot, in that case, free ourselves from the lines on which that authority should act. Having said just so much upon that point at the moment, I propose to consider the question of the second reading of this Bill. I perfectly well understand that of course the details of the Bill are not now in question, but that it is the principle of the measure which is the particular subject of discussion on this occasion. Nevertheless in a measure of this kind, its principle depends on its details, and if we are to find the principle in the Bill, we must endeavour to find, as I have endeavoured to do, upon what lines the Bill has been drawn. Now, it has been urged by one or two gentlemen—I think the leader of the Opposition was one of them—that it was unnecessary for any redistribution to take place either in the Province of Ontario or in the Province of Quebec, because, there being no increase of representation in the first-named province and the representation always remaining the same in the Province of Quebec, there was no necessity for a redistribution at all. I do not argue that a redistribution within the province was essential. I do not go that length at all, though perhaps it would not be a very great straining of the statute to say that after each decennial census there should be not only a redistribution as between the provinces, but within the provinces themselves. Whatever may be the true legal view as to that, I do not at all agree with the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who said there ought to be no redistribution in either of the provinces to which I have referred. On the contrary, I think we have only to refer to the condition of affairs which existed, and which still exists, to satisfy ourselves that, if a redistribution ever is necessary, it is necessary on the present occasion. In order to show how I reach that conclusion, I must enter somewhat into detail. I shall contend by and by that, after all, the true basis of a redistribution is equality of population so far as that is practicable, and, if that be the view, and I understand that that is the contention in departing from county and city limits, then it is capable, I think, of the very clearest demonstration that the existing condition of things does not satisfactorily bring about or act upon those lines, that if county limits and city limits are to be disregarded, then, if there is any rule which is to be found governing the present condition of affairs, it appears to me it can be only the rule of equality of representation. I know of no other, I believe there is no other justification, I believe the only justi-

fication ever offered for the Act of 1882 was that it did produce more fairly than by adherence to county or city limits an equality of representation. Now, the unit in the Province of Ontario is, as I understand, a little more than the unit in the Province of Quebec.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is impossible. It must be precisely the same.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, it is not impossible, because there may be a certain number required additional before Ontario becomes entitled to an additional member. Of course it is merely fractional.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It must be very small, indeed.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the hon. gentleman will not find it so. You divide the population by 65, and when you ascertain the numeral in Quebec you ascertain the number for Ontario and the other provinces, but unless they exceed that number by a half they do not become entitled to an additional member. I believe the exact figure for Ontario is 22,983, so that the numeral may be called 23,000, and I understood the Minister of Justice to say that the divisor obtained from the Province of Quebec is 22,800. Of course, the difference is merely fractional. If that be so, I think the first matter that has to be considered is what excess beyond that would be an unreasonable number of population for a particular division, and what number below that would be an unreasonable shortage, if I may use the term, for a particular division. I have adopted, though I do not say there is any virtue in the figures I have taken, 20 per cent in excess and 20 per cent below the unit as being a fair number within which the constituencies might be as nearly as possible kept. Beyond that I would say there was an excess; below that I would say the constituency had too small a population. But I do not at all mean to say that should be a hard and fast rule. It would be governed and controlled by other circumstances. I merely offer it as one might take 25 per cent or 15 per cent as a fair basis in order to judge whether there ought or ought not to have been a remodelling of the constituencies at this time. I find this result, that, in the Province of Ontario, with which I propose principally to deal, though I think the diminution is even greater in the Province of Quebec, there are 10 constituencies which have a population beyond the unit with the added 20 per cent. They are Toronto West, with a population of 73,832; Toronto East, 43,564; York West, 41,863; Algoma, 41,856; and altogether running from 31,533 up to 73,835 in excess, not merely of the unit but of the unit with 20 per cent beyond that, which would be 27,600. Thus there are 10 constituencies with a population of 118,000 souls over and above what, if population is to govern in any sense, they ought to have. Taking the other constituencies in that province, I find there are no less than 21 constituencies which fall short not merely of the unit of 23,000 but of that less 20 per cent, or 18,400. They are North Brant, Brockville, Cardwell, West Durham, East Durham, Frontenac, South Grenville, Haldimand, East Hastings, Leeds and Grenville, Lennox, Middlesex West, Monck, South Norfolk, Northumberland South Ontario, Peel, West Peterborough, North Victoria, North Wentworth and South Wentworth. So we find that, out of 92 constituencies in the Province of Ontario, no less than 31, or more than one-third, are either under-populated or over-populated, not merely as to the unit but as to the unit swelled by 20 per cent in the one event and diminished by 20 per cent in the other calculation. That, coupled with the fact that in the Province of Quebec there are 32 constituencies with a population below the unit and 13 with a population above it, establishes the propriety of a Bill of this character. That is not the ground put forward by the Minister of Justice for the Bill, but rather that there were such gross inequalities that they called for some change in the representation, and that it was by reason of the condition of a Toronto on the one hand and an Algoma on the other that the Bill was to be justified. I do not agree in that view. I say the condition of affairs required a much more sweeping change than the present Bill proposes to make, and I do not agree in the least that the Bill, falling short as it does of dealing with anything except Toronto as far as it goes and Algoma as far as it goes, at all answers the expectations one would naturally have formed when the Government proposes to deal with this important question. But I think it does. I have been able, if my figures are right, to demonstrate that there is such an inequality of population. In the great Provinces of Ontario and Quebec there ought to have been a measure of distribution of seats based upon a much more radical plan than that which the Government have adopted. Now, let me see what the Bill does accomplish, so far as Ontario is concerned. In the first place, the Bill reduces the population of Russell, which is one of those that come on the list of over-populated constituencies, from 31,643 to 25,399. It might be said that as regards population merely that was a change in the right direction. Unfortunately, whatever benefits are to be ascribed to that change, they are minimized by the fact that Prescott is put back in place of Russell, and has a population of 30,417; and I hardly think it will be seriously contended that the mere object of settling the population of Russell by reducing it and substituting Prescott for it, would be any justification for that particular change, or that particular grievance has in any sense been redressed. Then take Algoma. The population of Algoma, given by the census, is 41,859, and Algoma is divided; but with what result? I have no desire here to attribute motives to my friends on this side of the House, and I think this clause of the Bill must be merely an outcome of a want of due consideration, or else we could hardly have the figures which I am told now represent the proposed electoral district of Algoma. It is now too large, we all admit; the representation ought to be increased. For my part I think the proper increase for Algoma would have been attained by dividing it into two constituencies, and by giving two members to what is practically a province, a great territory, containing 41,856 inhabitants, very nearly sufficient to make, by equal division, two counties of 23,000 each. But the way it has been divided is to leave to Algoma no less that 35,811, and certainly that does not improve matters on the basis of population. Then Eastern Algoma is to be tied up to Nipissing, and they together will make a constituency fair enough so far as population is concerned; but I would suggest to the Government that the district of Nipis-

sing, representing as it does, and as we hope it will even more largely, a mining county, should have a representative of its own. I will point out by and by that the true rule to follow is not merely population, but interests ; I do not mean political interests ; I do not think the people of this country ought to be labelled as belonging to one party or the other. But if we find a community which has a commercial business, or a manufacturing business, or a mining business, these interests as well as the agricultural interests, ought to be represented on the floor of this Parliament, even if we depart in some respects from the principle of representation by population. Then, Sir, as I proceed further with an examination of what the Bill has accomplished, I find that it gives a second member to West Toronto. Now, I have my own views with regard to the representation of cities; and they are not at all in accordance with those which are put forward by the leaders on either side of the House. On that subject I will say what I have to say later on, but in the meantime I do not think anything fair has been accomplished towards West Toronto with its population of 73,000. I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that the principle of double constituencies is one that ought not to be increased, but so far as possible, it ought to be put an end to. I quite agree that the constituencies ought to be single in every point of view; but West Toronto with its 73,000 is to get another member, so if we divide that into two constituencies, they will present the anomaly of having 36,000 of a population each, some 13,000 or 14,000 beyond the number which they ought to have. Now, that is what is accomplished, to some extent, by the Bill ; but some other things have been done by it. I am still speaking, it must be remembered, of the Province of Ontario only. It is a pretty big task to master even the geography of one's own province, because the townships are not in the census list, and one can only work them out by reference to a map, and I have not attempted to do that in the Province of Quebec. But in this Bill we find what I cannot help characterizing—I do not wish to use strong language, but I think I am justified in calling it a most iniquitous proposal with regard to Russell, that of taking the township of Clarence from Russell and tacking it on to Prescott. I see no justification whatever for this proposal; on the contrary I believe it is a blot upon the Bill which I trust will not be acceded to by the House, no matter what the fate of the whole Bill may be. I see no justification, no pretense, for it. Even the great object of hiving the French—which ought to be a tempting thing to me—does not induce me, I must confess, to support this proposal, which is, as it seems to me, a very great wrong. I believe that what the hon. gentleman who represents Russell (Mr. Edwards) said the other night, will take place, and that if this Bill is carried through in that way, that hon. gentleman will come back to this House the next time, supported by a sufficient number of independent electors of the County of Russell, although shorn, it may be, of the township of Clarence, because all experience has shown that people will not consent to be gerrymandered out of their proper and natural affinities without resenting it. That has been our experience in the past ten years, and I think that will be found to be our experience in the future. Then take the case of London. Now, London is too small, and no one would contend, if the population of London had still remained at 21,000 as it was ten years ago, that it ought to have been deprived of its member. The municipality of the city of London has now 31,100, and nothing could have been more natural, nothing could have been more proper, than that the district of the city of London should have been enlarged to its present municipal boundaries. But the Bill leaves a portion of the city of London out in the county, and takes in another part of the county, adding it to London. No matter what the object may be, so far as I am informed, there is really no political object to serve; I do not know how that is. The very best information I can get is that London would have been just as much strengthened from a Conservative point of view by taking the district as it now stands. I say, no matter what the object may be, the Government, and the hon. gentleman who represents the city of London, could ill afford to have made or tolerated a change of that kind. Now, that is what the Bill has done, and I submit that it is wholly inadequate as a measure of representation. I fail to understand what the principle is for which or against which I am now expected to record my vote. Is it the principle of equality of population? I do not find it in the Bill. Is it the principle of adherence to the county or city bounds? That is not covered by the Bill before us. But if the Bill amends the Bill of 1882, I take the fair reading of it to be that it adopts the lines of 1882 when not requiring amendment, and amending them when they do require amendment. Virtually we are endorsing the present position of affairs, we are not changing them. We have to look at the law as it stands, and the change that is proposed, in order to arrive at a conclusion in regard to this measure. The law as it has been since 1882, and as it is proposed to be continued for another ten years, does not in the slightest degree follow city or county limits. On the contrary, I find on looking at the Act of 1882 these conditions are to be ascertained from it. There are electoral districts, four, I think, which are partly in three different counties—North Brant, Cardwell, Leeds and Grenville, and Monck.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And West Middlesex.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. member for Bothwell, who is more familiar than I am with that part of the country, says West Middlesex.

Mr. McMULLEN. And North Wellington.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then in two counties there are Addington, Bothwell, East Elgin, East Grey and North Lanark, two of the Middlesexes if the third is in three counties, North Norfolk, North Ontario, West Ontario, North Oxford, Perth, South Oxford, South Perth, West Peterborough, Russell, East Simcoe, South Simcoe, Centre Wellington, North Wellington, South Waterloo, East, West and North York.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And West Elgin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have endeavoured to give all the cases, but I appear not to have been quite successful in doing so. However, it is quite apparent that, for some reason or other, our counties have been cut up and parcelled in the way I have endeavoured to indicate, not perhaps with entire exactness, yet with substantial accuracy.

That being so, I have to ask again: is there anything in the law as it now stands which affords a basis for a measure other than representation by population? And if it has failed, as I submit it has failed, and does fail, to give that result, it does appear to me that the Bill does not by any means go far enough, and I ask that it should go to a much greater length in order to accomplish that end. But perhaps it may be said: You have pointed out inexactness, you have pointed out inequalities, you have pointed out various objections; but it is one thing to object, and it is another thing to construct. Well, Sir, I have taken the trouble to go through the counties of the province from which I come, I have gone over the province county by county, and city by city, and I venture to say that I can point out that, even on the question of population, a much greater equality can be obtained by adherence to the county lines and city limits than is to be found within the law as it stands at present, or the law as it is proposed to be amended. Taking the excess in the one case on that principle, and, of course, that will depend very much upon the view the House will take in regard to the representation that ought to be given to the cities, I have, for the sake of adopting some figures, thought that Toronto should have its full and fair share of representation. By and by I will give the House my reasons in favour of that proposition; but my other statements must be regarded, and no doubt will be regarded, as based upon the statement which I make with respect to the city of Toronto. Giving the city of Toronto, therefore, its full representation, there would not be more than nine or ten counties with an excess of population, the largest of which would be Carleton or Wentworth, and the city of London, and none of them would be so excessive and unequal as the conditions which prevail at present, and which it is proposed to continue by this present Bill. The number I find will be ten. Then, if you look at the matter from the other point of view, the constituencies which would have less, and endeavouring as I do to consider them without reference to party considerations whatever, I find there would not be more than 12 under the minimum—I do not mean the minimum of 23,000, but the minimum of 20 per cent below 23,000. So on the question of population we have this result: In the one case there is at present a proposal to continue 10 constituencies very largely exceeding the maximum which I have defined; while there are 21 below. Of the 21 below it is proposed to merge North Brant and Monck, and to increase Haldimand, South Wentworth and North Wentworth. So of the 21 below the number becomes 16, according to the scheme. Practically it leaves the number about as it is, reducing the excess in the case of West Toronto from 73,000, to two constituencies with a population of 36,000. So on the one hand we have 10 above and 21 below. It is proposed to leave the 10 at 10 and reduce the 21 to 16, but the proposition I should like to see adopted, namely, of the county and city limits being followed, would leave us with but 12 below and about the same number above. So in the matter of population and equality of representation there is much to be said in favour of adherence to county and city limits. But, Mr. Speaker, what I desire to contend for is, that the chief principle ought to be representation by population, that that ought to be qualified by a full and fair expression of public opinion by regard being had to community of interests existing in localities, and also by some regard being paid to what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) advocated the other night in a very forcible manner, permanence and stability. Why should there be community of interests? From time immemorial the country has been the political unit. It was so prior to the Reform Bill in England in 1832, it has continued to be so in England from that day to the present, notwithstanding the changes made; and in the Dominion of Canada, in both the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and I understand in the Maritime Provinces, there has always been representation upon the basis that the county or city is the political unit. I believe at first the franchise was conferred on the county, authorizing it to send certain representatives to Parliament—I think that was the earlier history; but since 1832, Parliament has dealt with the matter by its own hands. I submit that no good reason can be found for the departing from it. I do not mean to say you can find anything in the Mosaic law, or even in the christian dispensation in favour of county lines or city limits, but where the people serve together as jurors, act together in political matters, in every way work together in the management of their local affairs, there is a community of interests growing up between them which should not be destroyed, unless there is some controlling reason which offsets these other considerations. I know no possible practical benefit of dividing counties or adding townships to counties. I know of no possible advantage, unless it be the one of an equality of representation, which I have endeavoured to show has not been attained by the scheme which now exists. But there is much to be said also in favour of what my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said about permanence and stability. My hon. friend has spoken on that matter much better than I could, and I have no desire to repeat again in another form what he has said, but I realized its importance in every way. My object is to lay down a rule. As I stated a moment ago, the law contemplates that this should be done by rule, whether it is done by an authority constituted by this Parliament or whether it is done by this Parliament itself. The section of the statute says:

"On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority in such manner as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides."

A rule, a manner of readjustment is to be laid down, and I do not care what that rule or manner is, it is a matter of comparatively little consequence; I believe substantial justice would be done to all the great interests of the country if there is a rule. Whether we follow it, or appoint some authority to work out the details of that rule, by that rule substantial justice should be done. I submit to my hon. friends on this side of the House who may not, perhaps, think that the argument in favour of the legal proposition put forward by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) is entitled to much respect, that at all events there is to be found in that section of the Act of Parliament a clear and unambiguous condition on which the decennial re-

distribution is to take place. I have given the matter the very best consideration in my power, and my own conviction is that there is no rule by which these ends can be so well attained as by adopting county and city limits. I have demonstrated, and it can be shown with perfect satisfaction to every impartial mind, that substantial equality of representation can be obtained in that way. It preserves the community of interests which exists in localities, it enables a certain permanence and stability to be maintained and worked out, and it will in the end give a fair and full expression of public opinion. Whether it be looked at from a political standpoint, or whether it be looked upon from other interests, I venture to say that worked out on any fair lines it will give the results which I have indicated. Whether we follow or do not follow the precedent laid down in England in 1884, by having a conference I think that we will be exceedingly blind if we do not look and ascertain the principles upon which that redistribution took place. We know that it was not the result of a party victory, we know that it was the deliberate action of both political parties and of the greatest men in each political party, and if we find that they have laid down rules which we know have given satisfaction it is our duty to consider them carefully. I may say that I have never heard a complaint about the enormous redistribution which took place in England in 1885, much more gigantic than anything we ever will be called upon to attempt; I never heard a complaint from one party or the other with reference to the redistribution of seats in England, Ireland or Scotland. Now, what were their rules? As the House knows, the practical work of the redistribution was done by boundary commissioners; and if we have the power, I agree with what the hon. the leader of the Opposition said in his opening statement, that we ought not to delegate that power, because in this case there is no necessity for it. I submit that if my hon. friend who introduced this Bill had the time, with the maps of the provinces and the census in his hands, he could map out a fair scheme of redistribution. It is otherwise in England. It would be utterly impossible in England, without going upon the ground, without a close study of ordnance maps, without doing what the boundary commissioners were called upon to do, to practically work out a scheme of redistribution there. But it does appear to me we ought to study the principles which controlled the boundary commissioners, and we ought to see whether they suit us here, and, if they do, we ought to adopt them. Now, what were these rules? They differed with regard to counties and boroughs. With regard to counties the instructions were that in forming the divisions the population of the several divisions should be equalized as far as practicable. There was equality of population, but no county was to be divided and a portion put into an adjoining county, the rule being, "take the county as far as practical; divide that county, when it is to be divided, so as to equalize population." I will show, by and by, that, although unequal in some respects, some counties being much larger than others, yet the whole result of the county representation was that there was a unit obtained which equalled that of the boroughs. Then, as a subjective rule to the one I have mentioned, which is the governing one, care was to be taken that where there were populous localities of an urban character, they should be included in the same division, preserving, as much as possible, the community of interests in the electoral body. If in a division of a county there was a certain population of an urban character, that was if possible to be retained within the division and not to be swamped in other divisions of the county. Then this rule was to be subject to this further limitation: "Unless this cannot be done without producing grave inconvenience and involving boundaries of a very irregular and objectionable character." I may say that this has not been the guide with us, because the boundaries of the counties are not picturesque; they may be picturesque, but they certainly are not practically useful as will be found in the Bill of 1882, and which we do not propose now to amend. The main rules laid down in England in 1884, were: first, equality of population, and secondly, retaining in the division any particular portion of the population which was of an urban character. That was subject to the limitations to which I referred. Then there were other rules: "Subject to this rule each division should be as compact as possible with respect to geographical position," should be based upon well-known existing areas, parishes, not townships. I suppose area was a more comprehensive word than parish, and I introduced it into the amendment I intend to propose, so that it will cover in this province and the neighbouring Province of Quebec, townships and other divisions which would not be embraced in the use of the word township. Then it should be based on well-known existing areas. In some instances it may be found necessary to include separate parishes; but a divisional boundary must never be allowed to intercept a parish. Then, the rule with regard to boroughs was as follows:—

"The commissioners will therefore take the necessary steps for satisfying themselves whether or not there are any considerable number of houses beyond the boundaries, but contiguous thereto, the occupants of which, either from community of interests with the borough or from other circumstances, form part of the same town population proper. Any alteration should be consistent with well-established limits, such as parochial or other similar boundaries."

Now, Sir, I venture to say that these rules, based as they are, not on a political victory of one party or the other, but on the conclusion arrived at by the consensus of both parties as to what was fair and just, we might well adopt, more especially as the statute requires that we should adopt some manner or principle in redistributing the seats in this House. I will read what Lord Salisbury said in the dedate in the House of Lords on the subject. Speaking on the 9th of July, 1884, he said:

"The question is, how is political power to be so distributed that all classes may receive their due position in the state, that all interests may be respected, that a true mirror of the actual numerical condition of opinions in this country may be introduced within the walls of the other House of Parliament, that minorities may be able to receive that just power of expressing their opinions which is essential to the just protection of their interests, and which belongs, as one of its characteristics, to the first idea of true and genuine representation."

Now, I think that these views, which I commend to the consideration of the House, can best be attained in the manner in which I have endeavoured to point out. The political unit in England is 53,500. There is, I believe, a general impression prevailing that cities are not represented on the

same basis as counties. That is a mistake. The unit for counties and the unit for cities are practically identical. The population of all the cities is added up, and the total is divided by the unit of 53,700, and the result is that the cities as a whole are represented just as the counties are. For instance, taking the whole United Kingdom the unit of division in the counties is 52,800; England having 53,500, Wales 48,400, England and Wales together 53,100, Scotland 52,900, and Ireland 52,000. If you compare the unit for the whole United Kingdom with the unit for England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland separately, you will find that they differ very little, Wales being the lowest with 48,400 and England the highest with 52,500. Now, the same thing will be found with regard to boroughs, which are equivalent to our cities. The unit of division of boroughs in England is 53,500, in Wales 40,000, in England and Wales together 52,900, in Scotland 53,800, and in Ireland 47,300, the unit of the United Kingdom being 52,700, against a unit for the counties of 52,800.

Mr. SCRIVER. Is not the unit for some of the boroughs, notably London, much larger than that?

Mr. McCARTHY. Of course, the population of some of the boroughs in London is larger; but this unit is found by taking the population of all the boroughs together and dividing it by this unit of 52,700. For instance, in Liverpool one division has 70,905, and another, the Exchange division, 72,000; in Manchester one division has 76,217. Then, there are small divisions,—Bedford, with 19,533; Windsor, with 19,082; Whitehaven, with 19,295, and another as low as 17,780. I believe the minimum was 15,000. But taking the cities as a whole, they secure according to their population as many representatives as the counties; that is what I want to impress on the House. If they are taken separately, of course the representation of the larger cities is proportionately less than that of the smaller; but taking them altogether their representation is equal to that of the counties. Well, I said that I believed in equality of representation. I do not mean to say by any means that we should get arithmetical accuracy, or that we should deprive an old city of its representation because its population has fallen largely below the unit; but I am unable to appreciate the argument which says that the people of the cities should be represented in a less proportion than the people of the counties. That argument would apply with much greater force to a city like London than it would to any of the cities in Canada. We are told that in both Montreal and Toronto a number of gentlemen live who in this House represent country constituencies, and that they are here not merely to protect the constituencies they represent, but that they will no doubt protect the constituency in which they happen to reside. Well, I am a resident of the city of Toronto, but so far as its political concerns are at stake, I am quite free to say that I take not the slightest interest of the city of Toronto, any more than I do of the city of Montreal. I leave it to my hon. friends representing Toronto, three of whom are sitting in this House, to look after its interests; and I think that perhaps the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) will say that he feels his business to be more to look after the interests of North York than those of the city of Toronto. But apply this same argument to London, which I suppose has 5,000,000 population. We know perfectly well that the Carleton Club and the Reform Club in many cases select the candidates for the counties and send them there; so that the argument would have more weight in England than it has here. But here we want to have our cities represented; we want to have our commercial and manufacturing interests as well as our agricultural interests represented. These we are building up in this country, some gentlemen will say, at the expense of the agricultural interests. But if we take our census returns, we find that the cities are the only places that have increased in population, and they have increased very largely, I think about 40 per cent; and I think that the various interests which have induced the people to leave the country and go to the cities should be represented on the floor of this Parliament, whether they are commercial, mechanical, or whatever they may be. Nor need this in the slightest degree alarm the agricultural element of our population; because if you give all the cities their full quota of representation, it will not amount to more than 32 members all told. This would entitle the city of Ottawa to two members, as at present; Kingston, though below the unit, would have one member; Hamilton, although its population is a little beyond 46,000, would have two members; London would be entitled to one member, although its population is 31,000. Montreal, I will not speak of, because if I spoke of giving it its fair representation, I am afraid I would be trenching on dangerous ground; but I fail to understand why the great city of Montreal, with its large commercial and manufacturing interests, should not be fully and adequately represented in this House. I think Montreal and Toronto are the only cities that would be more fully represented than they are now. But not only is there that unfortunate condition of things, but in the case of the city of Toronto, you find that two portions of the city are attached to portions of the county. I think East York is partly made up of two of the old wards of the city, and West York is also partly made up of one of the wards of Toronto. Now, if the theory which found favour in England is admitted to be the proper one, the representation of the cities should not be neutralized in this way. Nothing can be more out of line with the theory upon which the true representation of the people ought to take place than the system which attaches to a portion of Toronto a portion of the county. Either the city neutralizes the county, as I believe happened at the last election in East York, or the county neutralizes the city, though they may sometimes agree, as I think they did at West York, for I think the hon. gentleman who comes from West York had a very large majority both in the county and city. But the tendency is, leaving out for a moment the question of politics, for the opposing interests to neutralize and destroy each other. For all these reasons I feel that the Bill ought not to be read a second time on this occasion. I think that we ought now to recognize that the Bill does not produce any satisfactory results. I think it is quite clear from what I have said, that the Bill does not secure equality of population, which is its only supposed merit. The Bill ignores community of interests absolutely, and without the

slightest pretense dislocates all the interests which have hitherto bound people together in public life and kept them together in public life for years. It disregards geographical compactness; and we have constituencies formed in such a manner that they are only to be excelled by those which the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) described to us the other night in his graphic way as being the result of Sir Oliver Mowat's gerrymander. They are, perhaps, not up to those, but are not very far behind. They certainly do not commend themselves to any one as representing what might be called geographical compactness; and if you do not base your system on some lines, there may be great injustice done. Take the county which I have the honour to represent, the largest in the province, and that county, if geographical compactness be disregarded, may be so manipulated as to inflict serious injustice on those political interests which after all are dear to some of us in this House. But if you observe geographical compactness and limit the constituencies to their county limits at the time of Confederation, having regard to community of interests and inequality of population, I venture to say it will be almost impossible that injustice can be done to either one political party or the other. On the contrary, I think their political interests will have full and fair representation on the floor of this House. Now, I want to know why at this stage we should not do what is right. Perhaps it will be said that I was as deep a sinner as any of them in 1882. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Bowell) says I was a bigger sinner. I can only say that, if so, at all events I have the merit of not persisting in my iniquity. I am not going to apologize for my act in 1882, or to do more than say that I fully realize by this time that in every sense, party and political, that act was a gross mistake. I venture to say that the party to which I have the honour to belong gained nothing by it. I venture to say that it has had the effect of attaching to the party the stigma of having done what was wrong, and enabling Sir Oliver Mowat in the Local House to do what was wrong with the sanction of public opinion. I venture to say that this House, with two-thirds supporting the Government, can do what is right. Now is the time to do what is right; and if this House does what is right on this occasion, I believe it will be impossible for any party—even for my hon. friends opposite in whom I have not as such confidence as I have in the party I support—should the occasion arise, to do what is wrong. But I agree in what the hon. member for Queen's said, that if they ever get the chance they will be perfectly justified in introducing such a gerrymander as will keep us out, so far as they can, from political life for twenty years, They will be perfectly justified in doing that. I mean to say that if we continue the system which exists, we cannot expect, when the other side get in, as they may, that they will do otherwise. Surely it cannot be that we have the right to cut up the constituencies in order to gain party advantages, and howl at the other side, when they get in, for doing the same. Why, they did it in Ontario, and with all his eloquence in denouncing them on the floor of Parliament, Mr. Meredith was unable to gain the ear of the public, because the answer was the *tu quoque* argument, not a strong argument but a complete answer, and one which prevented the public ear being gained. This Government, with two-thirds of the House at its back, has no reason to do wrong. We are taunted by being told that we are a party of English traditions, and I glory in that; but we are not showing our faith in English traditions when we copy that most infamous system which prevails on the other side of the line. Neither in 1832, nor in 1867, nor again in 1884 did either political party seek to gain the advantage by the means which we have learned to describe, from the name of its author, a governor of Massachusetts, on the other side of the line, as the Gerrymander Act. For my part, I do not wish to have attached to the party to which I belong the stigma of having desired to gain political advantage by means of that kind; and therefore I will move, when I have said a word or two on the legal question, the resolution of which I have given notice. Now, on that legal question, as I have already said, I do not at all suppose that any legal argument in this House will induce any one gentleman to change his vote or alter perhaps his opinion. It is difficult sometimes for judges, men who have given up their whole life to the study of legal questions, to decide nice legal principles and points which from time to time present themselves, and it is not to be expected of a popular body of this kind that it could arrive at a conclusion satisfactory to themselves or the country on a question of this kind. But of course this question can be decided. There is no doubt about it. If the view put forward by my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) is correct, it can be solved and settled by the courts. We are undoubtedly working under a written constitution, and, if we are transgressing our powers, our acts are *ultra vires* and are not effective for any purpose whatsoever. I would, therefore, suggest that it might be well that so important a question as this should be decided by the Supreme Court before this Bill becomes operative. It would be easy to provide that the Bill should not come into operation until it was brought into force by Royal proclamation, and under the Supreme Court Act it might be submitted to the Supreme Court for decision, otherwise the Bill might be found to be beyond the power of Parliament, and the whole of our labour would go for nothing, possibly after exciting some bitter and hostile feelings. The best opinion I can form upon it is that the powers of this Parliament in regard to itself are not to be found, as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice suggested, in the 91st clause. If the powers are to be found in the 91st clause, which confers general authority to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada, it would be quite unnecessary to have included the special provisions found from clause 41 up to clause 52. Rather is it clear that we must find our authority to alter the constitution of either this or the other House of Parliament in clauses altogether apart and different from the 91st clause, which gives us general power in matters of ordinary legislation. We cannot, for instance, abolish our Senate. It is said that it is curious that we have not the same powers as the local bodies. They can, and they have abolished their second Chamber, but we have no such authority. We cannot decrease the number of members in this House. The Local Legislatures can. We can by a special provision increase the number of members, but it is because express provision is made for that purpose. I take it that we cannot

alter our quorum. It is 20, and it must remain 20. It is one of the fixed lines of the constitution so far as regards this House. That being so, we have to look and see within those various clauses what our powers are as to the alteration of the House of Commons. Clause 40 says :

"Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall, for the purposes of the election of members to serve in the House of Commons, be divided into electoral districts as follows."

"Until it otherwise provides." There is no express power, it will be seen, there, but there is implied power, because "until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides" plainly imports that we may provide otherwise, and therefore, as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) very properly put it, that standing alone would give us power to increase or decrease, to alter the distribution of seats, and in fact would give us almost unlimited power, but, notwithstanding that, it is plain that we cannot decrease the number of our members. We can increase the number, but why? Because by another clause there is power given us to increase. Read clause 40 and clause 52 together. Clause 52 says :

"The number of members of the House of Commons may be from time to time increased by the Parliament of Canada, provided the proportion of representation of the provinces prescribed by this Act is not thereby disturbed."

If it was not for clause 52, we would have the power not only to increase but to decrease, but as clause 52 merely gives us power to increase, it is plain that the implied authority which would have arisen under clause 40, is limited by the power and authority merely to increase. So, in dealing with the question of redistribution, if there was nothing to be found but the power to redistribute given in clause 40, there would be power to do as we thought fit in regard to that, but the Act goes on to say that :

"On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules."

We get here the explanation of the power which is given to us by clause 40. We are not at liberty, therefore, to imply more than is expressed, especially when that would be at variance with the expressed authority given. I have looked into some of the best constitutional works on that subject, and this is a question which has engaged the best constitutional writers on the other side of the line because their powers are largely implied, though perhaps they may be said to some extent to be expressed, because it is provided that any power necessary and convenient for the exercise of the powers conferred is to be exercised, but all the authorities agree that that provision is unnecessary. It appears to me, though on this matter I suppose it is natural that the House should take the law from my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, that it will be found that the view put forward by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is the correct one. It is, of course, very extraordinary that the late Sir John Macdonald, who was present at the London conference, and other gentlemen on the floor of Parliament failed to take note of this, in 1872, and that it was never suggested by the fathers of Confederation, and other able and distinguished men in the House, that this was the true reading. Nevertheless, we cannot, by taking power to ourselves in 1872 or 1882, enlarge our jurisdiction. Is it to be found in this Act? We have no inherent authority. We are a statutory Parliament with defined powers, and within the four corners of our charter we must look for authority to legislate as we propose. On the whole, I believe we will all agree —I know it has been the aspiration of my friends in local affairs and that Mr. Meredith has expressed it frequently—that some independent body should do this work for us. I hope, if we have the power, we will be equal to it, and will be able to lay down rules fair and equitable not only in regard to this redistribution, but to guide in future the redistributions which will take place. If it should be found that we have not the authority and power, perhaps a just result would be arrived at, leaving it to this Parliament to say what the rule should be, whether county lines or equal constituencies should be adopted, and I think perhaps a happy result may be attained and one which we would all in future feel happy to have adopted. I, therefore, conclude by moving :

That the said Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved, that the distribution of seats of the members of this House should, so far as practicable, be based on equality of population, due regard being had to the community of interests existing in localities, a full and fair expression of public opinion and the permanence and stability of constituencies.

That the most effectual way of accomplishing these ends is to assume county and city boundaries as the natural limits of electoral districts, with equitable divisions thereof constituted with compactness as regards geographical position, and based on well-known existing areas where the population entitles the city or county to two or more representatives.

That the system now prevailing, and proposed to be continued by the said Bill, fails to secure equality of population, ignores community of interests, disregards geographical compactness, renders stability impossible, and is liable to gross abuse in affording opportunities in the arrangement of electoral districts for promoting party aims and obtaining party advantages regardless of the considerations which ought to determine the settlement of the representation of the people in this House.

Mr. DICKEY. I rise for the purpose, chiefly, of discussing the legal question which was raised by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) and which has been referred to by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I regard it as an extremely interesting and important point, and I do not agree with the hon. member for Simcoe that discussion upon it in this House is useless. Indeed, notwithstanding my respect for those hon. gentlemen who have discussed it on the other side, I think a full discussion of the point in this House would cause the difficulty to vanish entirely. More especially is this discussion necessary when the hon. member for Simcoe has suggested a reference of this question to the Supreme Court of Canada, which would involve a delay in the coming into force of this Act. I do not think any hon. gentleman in this House would be glad to find that the construction which the hon. member for Queen's has put upon that section 51 of the British North America Act is a correct construction. It is either a limitation of our powers or it is not. If it is not, it is of no importance whatever; but if those words in that section, "shall be readjusted by such authority in such a manner and at such a time" are intended as a limitation upon our powers, we must feel that the British Parlia-

ment, when it was giving sovereign powers to Canada, had some distrust of the Parliament which it was creating, and that it proposed deliberately to rob us of a sovereign power which is possessed by the legislature of every other country enjoying constitutional government. Therefore I say at the outset that every member of this House would be sorry to be driven to the conclusion that our powers are limited in the way that has been described. Now, I will state shortly to the House my construction of this section 51, and I invite the attention of those who consider this question of importance. My contention is that section 51 simply regulates the representation of the different provinces as a whole, that is to say, it secures within the Dominion the state right of the various provinces, and says that so far as the total representation of each particular province is concerned, it shall be fixed according to certain rules. Now, when the hon. member for Queen's stated that this limitation was put into the British North America Act by the British Parliament at the suggestion of those Canadians who framed the resolution on which this Act was founded, I think it is fair to ask where that idea came from. It is clear that at that time there was no idea that the redistribution of seats in England was to be delegated to any power outside Parliament. In the year 1867, the very year when this Act was passed, there was a Reform Bill before the House of Commons in England; that Reform Bill, and the accompanying Redistribution Bill, were dealt with by Parliament itself directly, without the interposition of any other authority or commission; so that in England at that date there was no practice, nor, as far as we know, was there any theory of delegating the power of distributing the constituencies represented in the House of Commons. Now, it is quite clear that there was no such idea in Canada; it is quite clear that the gentlemen who framed the Quebec resolutions never meant that the distribution of seats was to be performed by any other authority than that of Parliament itself, although I do not say that their intention will have any legal effect upon the construction of the Act. I propose to read one or two of the deliverances of men who framed the Quebec resolutions. In the Confederation Debates, the late Premier, Sir John A. Macdonald, discussed this very question, and now when this point is being raised, it is extremely interesting to look back and see what view that statesman, then fresh from framing the resolutions, with every detail still in his mind, took regarding the construction of this clause 51, or the corresponding clause in the Quebec resolutions. We find that in the Confederation Debates, at page 39, Sir John A. Macdonald, then John A. Macdonald, expressed himself as follows:—

"A good deal of misapprehension has arisen from the accidental omission of some words from the 24th resolution."

Resolution 24 is the Quebec resolution which deals with the distribution of seats, and is analogous to section 51 of the British North America Act.—

"It is thought that by it the Local Legislatures were to have the power of arranging hereafter and from time to time of readjusting the different constituencies and settling the size and boundaries of the various electoral districts. The meaning of the resolution is simply this, that for the first General Parliament the arrangement of constituencies shall be made by the existing Local Legislatures; that in Canada, for instance, the present Canadian Parliament shall arrange what are to be the constituencies of Upper Canada, and to make such changes as may be necessary in arranging for the 17 additional members given to it by the constitution, and that it may also if it sees fit alter the boundaries of the existing constituencies of Lower Canada. In short, this Parliament shall settle what shall be the different constituencies electing members to the first Federal Parliament. And so in the other provinces, the legislatures of which will fix the limits of their several constituencies in the session in which they adopt the new constitution. * * * It would evidently be improper to leave to the Local Legislature the power to alter the constituencies sending members to the General Legislature after the General Legislature shall have been called into existence. Were this the case a member of the General Legislature might find himself ousted from his seat by an alteration of his constituency by the Local Legislature in his section. No, after the General Parliament meets, in order that it may have full control of its own legislation and be assured of its position, it must have full power of arranging and rearranging the electoral limits of its constituencies as it pleases, such being one of the powers essentially necessary to such a legislature."

It is, therefore, quite evident that Sir John Macdonald at that time claimed as a sovereign right for this Parliament the right to regulate its own constituencies. During the same debate, at page 85, Hon. George Brown said:

"It has also been objected that though the resolution provided that the existing Parliament of Canada shall establish the electoral districts for the first organization of the Federal Parliament, they do not determine in whose hands the duty of distributing any additional members is to be vested. No doubt on this head need exist; the Federal Parliament will, of course, have full power to regulate all arrangements for the election of its own members."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Those speeches were made on the Quebec resolutions and before the Imperial Act was passed.

Mr. DICKEY. They were made on the Quebec resolutions and before the Imperial Act was passed. Every hon. member who looks at the question fairly will admit that if such a radical change was proposed to be introduced into the constitution as is contended for here, if it was proposed to delegate this power to some other authority, the gentlemen discussing and explaining these questions before Parliament would undoubtedly have alluded to it. They would undoubtedly have explained what the authority was, and the circumstances under which it would be exercised. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has said that these remarks were made on the Quebec resolutions. I admit it. If you come to the British North America Act itself, we find that the only debates to which we can refer are those which occurred in the English Parliament. On moving the second reading of the Act in the House of Lords Lord Carnarvon made a statement which has an important bearing on these clauses. In section 51 it will be observed that the principle of representation by population is applied, and upon that head Lord Carnarvon said:

"The principle on which the House of Commons is founded is that of a representation in accordance with population. It will not be indeed a representation of mere numbers distributed equally in electoral districts, but * * * each province will have its own number of representatives in proportion to its own population."

If section 51 applies at all, it establishes representation by population. Accordingly, the statement of Lord Carnarvon, that representation by population was not contemplated by the British North America Act so far as distribution in electoral divisions was concerned, shows that so far as that noble earl was concerned he did not understand section 51 to apply to the distribution of seats within the provinces themselves, but only to the

provinces as a whole. That is the only deliverance I have been able to find in the debates of the English Parliament on the passage of the Act, because it was passed without very much discussion. Coming to the first Redistribution Bill in this House, it has struck the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and it must strike every hon. gentleman who approaches the consideration of the subject, that it is a most extraordinary circumstance that those able men who were the framers of Confederation and who were familiar with this Act should not have known in 1872 and 1882 that they were misconstruing the Act. I believe the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was one of the members of the House in 1872, during the discussion of the Redistribution Bill, and it is extraordinary that the point now raised did not strike him at that time. There was some discussion on that measure which is relevant to this question. Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, at page 200 of the Debates of 1872, spoke as follows:—

"He would say that the Bill set at defiance the principle of representation by population adopted at the time of the Union. It might be said that that was adopted with reference to the provinces only. While that was true he contended that it was still intended to apply to the different sections."

There Mr. Mackenzie admitted that the British North America Act established the doctrine of representation by population only so far as the provinces were concerned as a whole, and all he contended for was that that principle, as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) contended in one part of his address in regard to section 51, should be carried through the electoral districts, but he admitted distinctly that so far as he understood the Act the doctrine of representation by population was not set up for the different constituencies. At page 202 Mr. Mackenzie also said:

"That principle was recognized at the Union. It was specially provided at the time of the Union that while Lower Canada should remain stationary with 65 members the same relation should be established between Quebec and the other provinces as to members in this House, as existed under the census of 1861. While the Bill complied with the letter of the Act of Union by giving additional representation it did not meet the anticipations of those who had so long advocated that members should be taken into consideration in this House."

This statement shows clearly that Mr. Mackenzie understood section 51 to refer only to the provinces as a whole. I think, on a fair consideration of these statements made at the time the Quebec resolutions were passed, made at the time the British North America Act was passed, made at the time the first Redistribution Bill was before this House, these utterances must all be proved to be inaccurate before an hon. member decides that the framers of Confederation were all mistaken in their contention. This position has been followed up by the action of Parliament on two occasions, in 1872 and 1882, and because I feel I have this history behind me, I have the less delicacy in meeting the arguments of such leading constitutional authorities as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) as well. Now, I think these considerations show, to use a philosophical expression, *a priori*, there is a very strong presumption against this construction being correct. There is a very strong presumption against this eleventh hour discovery being a correct construction of the Act, and I believe that that *a priori* presumption will be found to be perfectly correct. The hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) has arrived at this conclusion under circumstances that are eminently unfavourable to reaching a fair conclusion on a point of law. He has arrived at this conclusion under the circumstance of strong political debate, and strong political feeling. He has taken this Act to discover the means of defeating the present Bill, and not in that calm frame of mind that is conducive to arriving at a fair conclusion. It may be said that I am in the same frame of mind, and I admit I am open to that retort; but I think that other members of the House who are not like the hon. member from Queen's (Mr. Davies) and myself, when they are able to consider the argument upon this question, will find not very much difficulty in settling it. I will turn to the narrower and the legal construction of sections 51 and 40. I would like to direct the attention of the House to section 51, first, and in doing so I would like to strike out altogether from the consideration of the House the words "by such authority" and all that follow to the end of the section. In other words, strike out the words that gave the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) his difficulty, because the great question is, not whether that difficulty exists or not but what that difficulty applies to. My contention is that the difficulty of how to construe these words, "by such authority" applies only to the readjustment of the total representation of each province. In 1867 when this Act was passed, it is a matter of history that there were strong contentions between the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario. There was also considerable reluctance on the part of the Maritime Provinces to enter into the Union, and all the provinces stipulated for what is known in the United States as state rights. They stipulated, in the first place, that they should have certain representation in the Senate, and they stipulated secondly that they should have certain fixed proportionate representation in the House of Commons. In the Senate that was settled by a fixed number, because it was not variable, but in the House of Commons, owing to the fluctuation of population from time to time, it, of course, was absolutely necessary to provide a sliding scale which would do for all time to come. In accordance with the wish of the various provinces the Act prescribed that that sliding scale should always be on a fixed ratio, that a certain unit should be taken for the Province of Quebec, and that the rest of the provinces should be represented in a like proportion. Now, Sir, the object of that provision is very evident. It is that each province should have a fair representation, that afterwards the smaller provinces should be left to the mercy of the Province of Ontario, or even of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec together, and their representation reduced. Therefore, before they would enter into this compact, they required that a certain ratio of this representation should be secured to them. I may say that that very evident proposition throws a great deal of light upon some of the observations of the hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The hon. gentleman instanced how inferior our powers were to the Local Legislatures in this regard. He said: We cannot abolish the Senate; and I ask why can we not abolish the Senate, when the Local Legislatures can abolish the legislative councils? It is simply

for the reason that the Senate is there as the guardian of the smaller provinces of the Dominion. It is a matter of indifference whether the legislative councils of the different provinces exist or not. The compact that we were making then had no reference to the internal affairs of the provinces. They were willing to allow the provinces to deal with the legislative councils, with the members of the legislative assemblies, and with all these matters because they were communities who knew one another. But in joining together, the central Parliament was prevented from interfering with anything that would infringe upon the rights of the different provinces. It is the same with regard to increasing the number of members of Parliament. We cannot decrease the number in each province, for the same reason, namely, to preserve the state rights to the various provinces in the Dominion. I would like now to direct attention to the particular wording of section 51, which says :

"On the completion of each decennial census the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted."

I ask any hon. gentleman in this House to say, if the British Parliament meant by that the representation of the different constituencies, they would have used that language, "the representation of the four provinces." According to the natural construction of the words that means the representation of the provinces as a whole ;—the representation of Nova Scotia shall be so many members, the representation of Ontario shall be so many members, and that was simply fixing the representation of the provinces as a whole. If you needed any further argument to support that contention you will find this : "If section 51 regulates the distribution of constituencies in the various provinces, you will find that the five rules that follow section 51 are of no use whatever, and cannot possibly be applied to a redistribution within the provinces." The words are entirely applicable to the representation of the provinces as a whole. They cover the whole ground in that respect while they are of no use whatever, when you come to deal with the question of the representation so far as the different constituencies are concerned.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the meaning of sub-section 5 ?

Mr. DICKEY. "Such readjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing Parliament." That means the readjustment of the number of members representing each province.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not a readjustment at all.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman may say it is not, but he will find a good deal of difficulty in maintaining that by argument. I will invite the hon. gentleman to take up section 52, and to read it in the light of ordinary English and common sense :

"The number of members in the House of Commons may from time to time be increased by the Parliament of Canada, provided that the proportion of the representation of the provinces described by this Act is not thereby disturbed."

What does the phrase "representation of the provinces" mean there ? Does it mean the different constituencies within the provinces ; does not that mean the total representation of each province ? Does it not mean that if you increase the numbers, you must alter the representation of the provinces ? Is that capable of any other construction than the representation of the provinces as between themselves, so as preserve their state rights, or their local authority within themselves ? Now, some light is thrown upon this question, although I admit that from a legal point of view it is not relevant, by the Quebec resolutions themselves ; and if the Quebec resolutions had been embodied directly in the British North America Act, there would be a great deal more in the contention of the hon. gentleman opposite ; but as a matter of fact, they were not. Section 17 of the Quebec resolutions says that the basis of representation in the House of Commons is to be population. If that section had found its way into the British North America Act there would be some basis for the contention that the representation should be on the same principle in electoral districts as it is between the different provinces ; but it was deliberately left out. In the Quebec resolutions the divisions which are referred to in the British North America Act as provinces are referred to as sections ; and for the purpose of throwing light on this question, I will read the 10th section of the Quebec resolutions :

"Immediately after each decennial census representation for each section in the House of Commons is to be readjusted on the basis of population."

Those sections being Upper Canada, Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island ; and each is given its own number of representatives. The use of the word section, which is serviceable for this purpose, is peculiar, showing that there was no reference whatever to any other than political arrangement ; it removes the idea suggested by the word provinces contained in the British North America Act, and renders the distinction more clear than the Act does. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Bothwell asks what I make of the word readjusted. I understand the word readjusted to mean readjustment of the total representation of the different provinces as between themselves, as to-day we readjust the representation of New Brunswick and the representation of Nova Scotia by reducing it on account of the relative decrease of population in those provinces. But, Sir, why need we seek for trouble or difficulty in this matter, because, on the one hand, section 51 covers the whole ground with regard to the representation of the provinces, each being considered as a section of the whole, and on the other hand, section 40 deals with this very question of electoral districts. It says that until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, these provinces shall be, for the purposes of the election of members to the House of Commons of Canada, divided into electoral districts ; and then it gives the electoral districts. What does that mean ? It means that the Parliament of Canada has the authority now, and the British Parliament intended it to have the authority, to provide for a change in the electoral districts. That phrase, "until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides," is used in various other sections. For instance, section 41 says : Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws regarding the disqualification of members and various other matters, shall apply. Section 41 says : Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, the House may elect one of its members as Speaker. So

that either one of two things must be the case—either that phrase, until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, confers on us the power of dealing with this subject, or it assumes the existence of that power as an inherent power in a body such as this House ; and whatever view you take, under section 40, this Parliament has the right to deal with these electoral districts. Now, it will be said, as the hon. member for North Simcoe said, you must read these sections together, that is to say sections 40 and 51. In some cases the intention is that sections should be read together. For instance, the 37th section provides that the House of Commons shall, "subject to the provisions of this Act," consist of so many members. So that if the British Parliament meant in section 40 to refer us to section 51, it would have done so by using the words used in section 37, "subject to the provisions of this Act," or "subject to the provisions of section 51." Now, I shall not detain the House at any greater length. My contention is that section 51 was intended to reserve the state rights as between the provinces, and that the words of that section are fully and amply satisfied by applying them only to that power ; and that section 40 gives us all the power to deal with electoral districts, and that those words are fully and amply satisfied by that construction. That is a harmonious construction of the Act, it is a construction which maintains the power of this House to deal directly with its own representation, it is a construction which involves us in no difficulty and one which, I submit, any court will adopt. But I have not the slightest fear that this question will ever go to the courts. Now, one more illustration. If hon. gentlemen opposite are right, if the hon. member for Queen's is right, they must contend that this House could not pass an Act to cut off a township from one constituency and add it to another. If they hold that at the decennial period this Parliament has no rights in the matter of redistribution, although obliged to redistribute every decennial period, since readjusting includes redistribution, they must hold that this Parliament in the plenitude of its power could not say next year—without regard to the census, without regard to the representation of the provinces, but simply to meet some particular difficulty which arose, say in the Province of Nova Scotia—we will take one district in the County of Cumberland and put it in the County of Colchester. Their contention goes so far that an Act for that single purpose would be *ultra vires* this House simply because the British Parliament had not sufficient confidence in this House to trust it with the distribution of seats without filtering the decision of the House through some outside medium. I do not believe any such forced and inconvenient construction is necessary, in order to get at the meaning of the British North America Act. Now, as to the resolution which the hon. member for Simcoe has offered to this House, I shall not say very much. It seems to me to involve three principles. In the first place, the maintenance of the city and county boundaries ; in the next place, the doctrine of single constituencies ; and in the third place, the equality of population. I notice that, towards the close of his resolution, the hon. gentleman says that the system prevailing now and proposed to be continued fails to secure equality of population, disregards geographical compactness, and so on. Still, I think we are entitled to hold the hon. gentleman responsible, as indeed he admitted himself to be responsible very largely, for this state of affairs. In the year 1882, the Government had a majority, I believe, of about 70. They had then this two-thirds majority which the hon. gentleman thinks is such a convenient thing when hon. gentlemen want to act upon just and right and proper principles. The Bill of 1892, so far as I know, has not very grossly violated the principles the hon. gentleman has laid down. I must say that the Act which was offered to the House in 1882 was a very much better subject for the hon. gentleman's criticism and the hon. gentleman's good feeling than the present Bill, because I do think that at least it argues a very great change of heart in a gentleman who could swallow the Act of 1882 to strain at the present Bill. The hon. gentleman says his stomach is not so good now. I am sorry to hear that after swallowing such a severe dose as he did in 1882, he is not capable of taking the dose in this Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think you make a little face yourself at it.

Mr. DICKEY. I must say, although perhaps this is irrelevant, that the Act of 1882 does not commend itself very strongly to my judgment. I do not know, but I suppose I would have followed the hon. gentleman from Simcoe, if I had been here in supporting the Act ; but looking at it through the vista of years, it seems to me a very objectionable Act. Certainly it is one which called for the application of the principles the hon. gentleman has enunciated here, if they were ever to be applied, but the difficulty is this, that these principles were presented to the House by the Hon. Edward Blake, the leader of the Opposition, and were discussed by him in a very able and lengthy speech, and then they did not convert the hon. member for Simcoe. After reciting the statements of Sir John Macdonald when introducing the Bill of 1872, and adhering to the doctrine of maintaining the county boundaries, the resolution of Mr. Blake concludes :

"That the old principle of observing, as far as possible the limits of the municipal counties in adjusting the parliamentary representation, is sound and should be followed in the said Bill for the reason so given by Sir John A. Macdonald, and approved by Parliament, and also"—

This is almost identical with the hon. gentleman's resolution ; I think the hon. member for Simcoe must have borrowed some expressions from this resolution.

—"because it affords some safeguard against the abuse of power by the party in office to adjust the representation unfairly towards their opponents. That the said Bill is framed in utter violation and total disregard of the said principle, since it takes away territory from the municipal counties for electoral purposes and conjoins for electoral purposes territories having no municipal county relations with each other in a very large proportion of the constituencies of Ontario ; while, at the same time, it does not effect the proposed object of equalizing the population of the electoral districts."

And the hon. member for Simcoe had not a word to say on behalf of that resolution. He did not then agree at all in the doctrine enunciated in that resolution. I do not know that we can get at the secret of the hon. gentleman's action at that time, but at any rate it is true that on the 9th of May, 1882, the constituency of the hon. gentleman himself was attacked by the hon. member for Bothwell as being one that took two townships out of another county altogether, and the hon. member for Simcoe defended that ardently as perfectly right.

Mr. McCARTHY. So it was quite right.

Mr. DICKEY. I am glad that the hon. gentleman still maintains his view, but I think if there are exceptions to the principle which he is laying down—and I do not suppose they are all to be met in the County of Simcoe—he should have mentioned some of these exceptions and given us the principles on which exceptions can be made to the rule laid down in his resolution. There were other resolutions moved, notably one with regard to the County of Wentworth. Mr. Rymal, then a member of this House, moved a resolution, which I shall not read to the House, but which showed that the County of Wentworth was hacked up in such a manner that to form the County of Monck there were three counties dismembered, and he explained that in a long and clear speech. Yet I find that the hon. member for Simcoe on that occasion voted that the hacking up of this constituency was quite a proper and reasonable thing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Do you approve of it?

Mr. DICKEY. I have already given my views of the Bill of 1882. I quite admit that any hon. gentleman not only has the right but is bound to change his mind if the conviction that he was wrong is borne in upon him, but I should have liked a little explanation from the hon. member for Simcoe as to how and when this light occurred to him. The hon. gentleman is a supporter of the Government. He has, I believe, a very strong opinion as to the tendencies of the trade policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. He fears that will imperil our connection with Great Britain. He may be wrong in that, but it seems to me very unfortunate that having those strong opinions the hon. gentleman has chosen to stake the existence of the Government upon the resolution he now lays before the House. The hon. gentleman might have suggested this resolution earlier in the session. I will not do him the discredit of saying that this amendment expresses an idea which has occurred to him within the last two or three days. Since he is going back upon his record of 1882, I assume that his present view is a result of long and mature thought, and as a member of the Government party I have not one word to say against him for opposing the Government. But I say that, as a member supporting the Government, it would not have been out of place had the hon. gentleman offered this amendment as a resolution, earlier in the session, under notices of motion. It would not then have assumed as serious an aspect as it does now, and might have done some good, because then the scheme was still under consideration, and the instruction of this House might have been of some service to the Government. The hon. gentleman might, therefore, have done some good then by moving this resolution as a notice of motion. It seems to me, although that is only my opinion, that the hon. gentleman, while exercising his undoubted privilege, has done that in rather an unfortunate way, in so far as public confidence is concerned, because he has waited until the wrong was done, if wrong there be—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is not done yet.

Mr. DICKEY. I am speaking of the hon. member for Simcoe as a member of the Conservative party, and my remarks do not apply to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. DICKEY.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And they must take whatever the Government offers.

Mr. DICKEY. Not at all.

Mr. COCHRANE. You'll have to take it, too.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong, and when the hon. member for Bothwell shows some disregard himself of party ties and votes according to his own convictions——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do.

Mr. DICKEY—I shall be quite ready to accept advice from him on the question before the House. Now, as to the merits of the resolution I shall not say much. I observe that the British North America Act did not adopt the county as the unit. The British North America Act varied the county lines in several cases, both in regard to towns and in regard to counties, so that, if we go back to our own charter, we find that the principle the hon. gentleman wishes us to adopt now was not adopted when both parties met and discussed this question. The hon. gentleman spoke only of the Province of Ontario, and quite rightly, because that is the only one with which he can be very familiar. Taking the principle of maintaining county boundaries and the principle of equality of representation, I think the hon. gentleman will admit that these are conflicting principles, that it is difficult to maintain the county boundaries and at the same time to get equality of population. I will take the Province of New Brunswick. New Brunswick has 14 members. It has 14 counties and one city. The County of Restigouche and some other counties have about 8,000 or 9,000 people, while the County of Westmoreland has, I believe, about 42,000. So, if the hon. gentleman took the Province of New Brunswick and endeavoured to apply his principles to it, he would have to give up either the one or the other, either his county boundaries, or the equality of population. I assume that the hon. gentleman would give up his county boundaries because he said the equality of representation was the proper, and should be the ruling, principle. So far as I am concerned—and I suppose it is a high Tory doctrine to enunciate—I am not enamoured of the application of mathematics in these matters. I do not believe there is any sovereign virtue in counting a certain number of heads to make up a constituency. I am even so reactionary as to believe that there is a great deal to be said in favour of having constituencies of unequal size. I believe this House should consist of men representing every class and every interest in the country, and it is obvious that a city requires a different kind of representative from a county. I think it gives a character and an individuality to this House when some members are representing large and some are representing small constituencies. I do not mean to lay that down as a principle. I am not concerned whether it is logical or not, but, looking at the authority of this House, I do not believe that authority is weakened or that the country suffers because one constituency may be a little smaller or even a very great deal smaller than another. It seems to me that the resolution of the hon. gentleman from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) comes too late in the day. If he had moved this ten years ago, it might be a matter for serious consideration, but the mere statement that it involves changing almost every constituency in the Province of Ontario is sufficient to show that, if it were acted upon, it would interfere more than any other

scheme with vested interests. These constituencies which were established in 1882 have been those which have been used in various general elections. They have been found to be fairly, roughly useful. The people have become accustomed to them, and, if there is any unit of population, I would rather take these extraordinarily shaped constituencies as they are, and if we are to preserve anything, I would endeavour to preserve the *status quo*. For my own part, I shall look upon this Bill when it comes into committee, if it ever gets there, in this light—how far does it reasonably and fairly allow the *status quo* to rest? Is there anything in this Bill which unfairly disturbs the *status quo*? I should certainly regret if the Government were to undertake any such scheme as the hon. gentleman's resolution would involve, of reorganizing the whole representation of the Province of Ontario and the Province of Nova Scotia as well.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no occasion for remodelling Nova Scotia or the Maritime Provinces at all, because the county lines are maintained.

Mr. DICKEY. I am also strongly impressed with this opinion, that the real safeguard of the minority in this Parliament is the justice and good sense and fair-play of the majority. If this resolution were adopted to-day, and that principle were laid down, I do not pretend to know much about the Province of Ontario, but I will guarantee that I can take a map of that province and a census book, and while maintaining county boundaries and coming as fairly within that resolution as you like, I will gerrymander the Province of Ontario so as to wipe out a dozen Liberals. I certainly could gerrymander the Province of Nova Scotia under the same conditions. Rules are very well to have, but the only real safeguard is the justice of the Assembly that administers those rules. So far as I am concerned, when this Bill is read the second time, if it is, I propose to consider it fairly in the light of that proposition, and, if the Bill is based upon fair-play, if it is substantially a fair and reasonable one, I cannot allow any resolution like this, coming up as it does, to prevent my voting for the second reading or to induce me to withdraw my confidence from the general policy of the Government, which has not in the slightest degree been shaken by anything I have seen in the present Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I entirely endorse the opinion expressed by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Dickey), that there is not the slightest likelihood that anything the Government can do, or will do, will break his party allegiance. We have no reason to expect it, we did not expect it. But I think the hon. gentleman has scarcely dealt, with the fairness which might be expected from him, with the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in making it a special charge against that hon. gentleman that because ten years ago, when he was a much younger member of the House than he is to-day, when he had very little practical experience of the working of these Gerrymander Acts—for it may be remembered that the Gerrymander Act of 1882 was the first of those infamies which have disgraced the history of Canada—I say it is very little to the discredit of the hon. member for Simcoe that after ten years of experience of the working of such a measure, he should have come to the conclusion at which he has arrived to-day. It is, I think, very much to his credit that having arrived at that conclusion he has had the moral courage to avow that change of conviction, and to lay down the principles on which, as a matter of fair-play and equity, such a Redistribution Bill should be framed. Now, Sir, I am not going to enter into the legal argument which has been discussed between the hon. member for North Simcoe and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) further than to say a few words. I was myself a member of the Legislative Assembly of the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario in which this scheme of Confederation was inaugurated, and I may recall to the minds of hon. members of this House that the *a priori* argument which the hon. gentleman has addressed to this House, as opposed to the argument of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Davies), has no value or weight, for this simple reason: It is well known that the resolutions which were passed by the four provinces, and which, in my judgment, ought to have been much more faithfully followed than they were by the London conference, were altered by the Imperial Parliament at the suggestion of that London conference, and notably the particular resolution having reference to the distribution of seats in Parliament was altered by the Imperial authorities at the instance of the gentlemen who met together in London. Therefore, I submit to the House, and to the hon. gentleman himself, that part of his argument which is based on speeches made by the late Sir John A. Macdonald, or by Mr. Mackenzie, or by any other man who took part in that debate, is entirely beside the question, because they were dealing with a set of resolutions which were not afterwards embodied in the Imperial statute. However, I desire to address myself more particularly to another aspect of this important question than that which has been dealt with by the hon. member from Simcoe. But before I proceed to that, I may be allowed to mention to the hon. member for Simcoe that I think, in one trifling matter of no great importance with respect to which I interrupted him, he will find that the actual unit of population between the Maritime Provinces and between Ontario and Quebec at any rate, differs so infinitesimally from the absolute unit, that it is hardly worth taking into account. I find by actual division that the true unit of population for the Province of Quebec amounts to 22,901 souls; I find that on the readjusted scale, giving 39 members to the 880,000 people who inhabit the Maritime Provinces, the actual unit of population for those 39 members amounts to 22,896, being exactly five below that from Quebec. In our own Province of Ontario the exact unit of population is 22,966, being a difference of 65, rather less than one-quarter of one per cent; and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that under those circumstances I was not altogether incorrect in stating that there was practically no difference whatever in the unit of the population that prevails in all the major provinces. One thing more I would say, and that is on the legal question. I listened with great attention to the reply made by the Minister of Justice to my hon. friend beside me me, and without presuming to discuss these legal subtleties, I think that those who followed the speech of the hon. Minister of Justice will agree with me in say-

ing that after all said and done the main argument which that learned gentleman found it possible to advance against the contention of my hon. friend, was mainly this, that on two previous occasions a similar distribution Act had been allowed to become law without that objection being taken. Well, Sir, I do not mean to say that that fact may not raise some small presumption as against the correctness of the argument of my hon. friend; but those who, like myself, although not lawyers, have had occasion to pay a great many lawyers' bills, will know that there is scarcely one thing more certain than the glorious uncertainty of legal decisions, and that it is a matter within the knowledge of every one, layman as well as lawyer, that new points are continually being taken with respect to statutes of various kinds, and that it is no answer whatever to a legal argument to say that a particular point taken as to the construction of a statute has not been taken already. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is a great misfortune that the Government did not see fit to introduce this Bill at a much earlier period of the session. Although we have departed very widely from English traditions in this and in other ways, and although we have allowed ourselves to be very greatly imposed upon by the Government of the day, for these many years back, in their conduct of public affairs, I take it that every man who has paid the slightest attention to constitutional principles will agree with me that when a Government have important measures to introduce to Parliament, when those measures have been announced from the Throne, it is the duty of the Government at a very early day, even if they do not see fit to proceed to the second reading, to place their measures in full detail in the hands of Parliament for the express purpose that their measures, as well as their conduct in the past, may be considered and criticised by Parliament at the time when Parliament is able and free to do so, before we are called upon to grant supplies. The statement of the Government's policy, and the examination of the Government's conduct, are things that, in every well regulated parliamentary assembly, should precede the granting of supplies for carrying on the Government during the succeeding year. In this, as in many other things, the Government have for many years back, deliberately and systematically disregarded the wholesome traditions of the mother country; they have continually postponed consideration of the most important measures that can affect the community, until the very last possible period within which they can introduce them to Parliament, with the two-fold result of very unnecessarily prolonging the duration of the session, and of preventing the full discussion which measures of that importance deserve. Now, Sir, speaking for myself alone, and in no way desiring to commit any of my hon. friends on this side of the House to the proposition, I will say that for my part, in common with many persons who have bestowed a good deal of attention on these subjects, I have come to the conclusion that the practical working under our system of our representative institutions in Canada, are very faulty. I do not pretend to say that it may not be found on examination to be on the whole the lesser of two evils, but I say that circumstances have so changed since the introduction of our present form of representative government, that very grave evils indeed have developed in the course of time, and that, had this Bill been introduced at an earlier season, we might with very great advantage to ourselves, and with great advantage to the commonwealth, have bestowed a certain portion of our time, at any rate, in examining the evils which no doubt exist, and in endeavouring to ascertain whether they could be remedied in any way. Sir, there was one statement made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) which I for my part heartily endorse, and that is this, that not merely in the Parliament of Canada, but in the various legislative assemblies throughout this Dominion there has not been to my knowledge for many years one single general election which has resulted in the Opposition for the time being fairly represented in Parliament in proportion to the number of votes they control in the country. That has been traceable to causes to which I will advert a little later on with respect to the present Opposition sitting in this Parliament, not merely on the present occasion, but in the case of the elections of 1878, of the elections of 1882, of the elections of 1887, and of the elections of 1891. Sir, one result of our present system is that worked as it is, existing as it is, it is a system which offers a positive premium to all kinds of unfair means of obtaining a parliamentary majority as contradistinguished from a real majority in the country; that its tendency is to cause the party in power to have recourse to every species of unfair expedients, and notably to these two—it tends to induce them to perpetuate their majority by all sorts of legalized fraud, whether it takes the shape of fraudulent Franchise Bills or whether it takes the shape of fraudulent Gerrymander Acts and Distribution Acts, like the Act of 1882 and the present Bill we are now discussing, and it further offers a very high premium indeed to the use of corrupt means of various kinds for the purpose of influencing the several constituencies. I am sorry to have to say so, but every hon. member here if he would speak the truth as he knows the facts to exist, must admit that I am stating a most lamentable but at the same time a most certain truth when I say that, as regards the 215 constituencies of this Dominion, with the exception of a very small percentage, the balance of power under our system is practically placed in the hands of the most corrupt section of the community. I make this statement advisedly, as I make it with very great regret, but it is so; and to all intents and purposes the only practical difficulty which stands in the way of the party possessing the reins of power, and having at their disposal sufficient sums of money, is simply the difficulty of bringing these corrupt means into direct and actual contact with the great mass of the electors. Were that mechanical difficulty, as I might almost call it, overcome, then I have no doubt whatever that the Opposition in this country would be practically exterminated at any general election that might take place. It is a danger which we know is continually increasing. It has increased, it is increasing, and most assuredly it should be diminished, and it is the necessity of obtaining the requisite funds to carry out that process of corruption that has been at the basis of all those infamous rascalities which were in part revealed by the investigations of last session, and which has brought into existence the "reptile fund," the details of which are now being daily and hourly displayed to the gaze of the people of Canada,

and, I am sorry to say, of every country that takes an interest in this Dominion. It is the need of obtaining that money which has led to the introduction of this systematic and organized corruption into our political affairs, and of the attempt thereby to take absolute possession of this country.

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

After Recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose I had been expressing my own individual personal conviction that it would be almost indispensable to us, if we desire to avoid Gerrymander Acts in future, introduced by either party in politics, that we should consider, and consider very seriously, whether it was not possible for us to remove the temptation and the cause. As I have said, I am giving on this occasion my own personal conviction only, and I desire to be understood as in no respect expressing the opinion of anybody but my individual self. I am firmly convinced, after an experience of a good many years of political life in Canada, that there is no chance whatever of our doing away with the attempts which will be made from time to time to attain an unfair advantage over either political party by means of Acts like the present, unless we succeed in removing the temptation which is the main cause for their introduction. As regards the motion of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Mc Carthy), while I entirely approve of almost all, and perhaps I may say of all, the statements which it contains, although not entirely of all the arguments upon which the hon. gentleman supported it, I myself still record my belief that at the utmost it would only mitigate and not completely remove the evil. I am convinced, for my part, that until some sort of system is devised by which the respective political parties are enable to secure in Parliament a proportionate representation, nearly, if not absolutely in proportion to the number of voters whom they represent in the country; I am convinced I repeat that we will from time to time have a repetition of these measures presented to us. Now, Sir, we have not had any difficulty whatever, and we never have had any difficulty, under our federal system in providing for the perfect proportionate representation of the several provinces on the floor of Parliament; and, as every hon. gentleman knows, we have completely solved the problem of giving each party in proportion to its parliamentary representation perfect proportionate representation on the several committees into which this House is divided. But as regards the far more important problem, the problem on the proper solution of which I for one am disposed to believe that the success of parliamentary government in the future is likely to depend; the problem of giving to each political party a fair representation on the floor of Parliament, neither we, nor any other English-speaking people that I know of, have made any progress whatever for at least one hundred years. In point of fact I am rather inclined to think we have retrograded, not in theory but in practice, and that the old Parliaments in some important respects did afford a fairer and better proportionate representation than is practicable under our present system. More than that, I am of the opinion that in Canada, at the present time, the progress of events is causing the evil to increase and intensify, and that if we go on as we have been going, before many years we will see even worse evils than those which were admirably well depicted by my hon. friend the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as having occurred in the United States under the operation of the several Gerrymander Acts that have, from time to time, been put in force there, and by which, as that hon. gentleman well showed, it is not only possible, but it is a matter of constant occurrence, that the minority control the larger proportion of the representation in the several assemblies, or, at any rate, that a very small majority are able to secure for themselves a wholly disproportionate representation in their several assemblies. Now, Sir, as regards our own Province of Ontario, I have no hesitation whatever in saying that, so far as regards its parliamentary representation in this House, for the last 12 years at least, it has been based on deliberate fraud, and that during these 12 years, at no time whatever, when the Parliament has been in session, have the Opposition enjoyed anything in the slightest degree equivalent to the representation that they were fairly entitled to had their members at all represented the number of votes that they had actually polled in the several electoral contests. I am not prepared to say that it is possible to remedy this state of things entirely, but I do believe that it is possible to introduce a system of proportionate representation which will go very far indeed to get rid of the two-fold evils that I have pointed out: the evil of direct corruption of a large proportion of the electorate, and the evil of legislative fraud either carried out through the medium of Franchise Bills or of Gerrymander Acts such as the present. I am well aware of the numerous technical difficulties which have presented themselves in the consideration of this extremely important question, and I am also aware of the real though unexpressed conviction which has probably rendered parties on both sides of the House indisposed to consider the question. I know very well, Sir, that no system of proportionate representation could be introduced, if effective, which will not be more or less inimical to our present system of party government, and I believe that it is very largely for that reason that we have seen so few attempts to grapple with this great question. However, that I admit is a question which might have been better discussed had this measure been introduced at an earlier period of the session, and my special business to-night is not so much to deal with the theoretical aspect of the question as to examine the scheme which has been submitted to us, and to consider how far it is one which deserves the support of Parliament or the censure which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has, in my opinion, very justly bestowed upon it. I do not propose to deal with the question of the redistribution, so-called, about to be attempted in the Province of Quebec. That has been done far more fully than I could pretend to do it by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) and his colleagues from that province. But I will take this occasion to say to the Conservative members from the Province of Ontario, that if they choose to consent to see one of the great parties in Quebec practically wiped out, they wil find, and that before they are very many years older, that they have been fashioning a scourge fo

their own backs, and that they will see very great cause to regret in process of time that they have lent their aid to allow one particular party in Quebec to obtain practically absolute control. However, Sir, be that as it may, I propose as I have said, to deal more particularly with the case of my own Province of Ontario. I hold that the scheme which is submitted to us is objectionable in two distinct ways. In the first place, everybody knows, and practically everybody admits to-day, that a most gross injustice was perpetrated on the Reform party of Ontario by the Gerrymander Act of 1882; and I confess, Sir, that it was with some considerable surprise that I heard the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) condemn the Gerrymander Act of 1882, which as you well know was chiefly applicable to Ontario, and at the same time condemn the hon. member for North Simcoe for entertaining the same opinion as himself, while he was not prepared to raise his little finger to amend the very injustice he complained of. Under that Act, as is well known, every canon which can be laid down for the proper formation of a Redistribution Bill, was completely set aside. Pretty nearly every county boundary in the Province of Ontario was dislocated; a number of hives were created for the express and dishonourable purpose of depriving a large proportion of the people of their rightful share in the representation of Parliament; some 54 ridings, I think, were altered on the alleged pretense of assigning four new seats to the Province of Ontario; and, as far as legislative enactment could do it, provision was made that at all hazards and under all circumstances the Conservative party, even if in absolute minority of votes, should maintain a clear majority in Parliament. How well that nefarious scheme succeeded, all of us know who paid any attention to the electoral returns of the general election of 1891. Sir, I have in my possession an official document, issued from the Government Department of Agriculture, and signed by the chief statistician of that department, in which it is on record that while the Reform party in the general election of 1891 obtained an absolute majority to the extent of 7,200 of the total votes polled in the Province of Ontario, nevertheless they were in a minority of 4, having only 44 seats in Parliament against 48 held by their opponents. That last case was perhaps the grossest, although, as I have said, the general elections of 1882 and the general elections of 1887, so far at least as the Province of Ontario was concerned, were carried by a deliberate legislative fraud. One of the complaints, and a very just complaint, which we make as regards this present measure is that it makes not the slightest pretense to remedy the wrong then done. That in itself is bad enough. That in itself is proof that these hon. gentlemen have in no way repented of the evil then done. But, Mr. Speaker, it is much worse when, after having, as I have said, altered the boundaries of 54 out of 92 constituencies in 1882, for the purpose of granting four additional seats to the Province of Ontario, the Government now proceed to aggravate the injury. Sir, the hon. member for North Simcoe has treated of one branch of the injustice which has been done to the several constituencies, and I will not, therefore, attempt to go over the lines which he has followed. But I want to call the attention of the members for Ontario, and more particularly the attention of those who hail from the western part of the province, to the very grave injustice which is being done to the richest and most important division of our province. Now, Sir, in Ontario our territory is naturally divided, as one may say, into three great groups. There is, first of all, the group of constituencies which lie east of Toronto, or rather east of the County of York; there is, next, the central or metropolitan group, composed of Toronto and the three ridings of York; and there is, in the third place, the great western group containing the several constituencies which lie west of Toronto and the County of York. Now, I call your particular attention, Sir, to certain important facts affecting these divisions which I think will go very far to convince every member in this House, although it may not perhaps influence the votes of very many of them, that this whole Bill, so far at any rate as Ontario is concerned, is based on the gravest and grossest injustice. I take first that great group which lies west of the County of York. The total population of the constituencies composing that group amounts to 1,184,865 souls, who are at present represented by 51 members. Now, anybody can see for himself that that 1,184,000 people possess precisely the number of members to which they are entitled on the principle of numerical representation. We turn next to the central group, composed of the three ridings of Toronto and the three ridings of York. That contains 241,327 people, and is at present represented by six members, being, as has been frequently stated both by the Minister of Justice and from this side of the House, too few in proportion to their numbers. But, Sir, when you come to the eastern group, comprising those constituencies which lie east of the County of York, you find a total population of 688,283 souls with 35 members, being nearly 20 per cent more than they are entitled to on any principle of equitable numerical representation. Now, having these three great groups before him, what would an honest Minister, what would an honest man, have done? Sir, I say that the last thing any honest Government or any honest Minister would have proposed under such circumstances would have been to deprive the west, which has rather less to-day than its fair number of representatives, of a member for the purpose of increasing the representation of the centre; and to let the east, which possesses a very considerable number more than it has any right to possess, go absolutely free. Mr. Speaker, I call that a palpable and gross injustice, and I call the special attention of the Minister of Justice to it, inasmuch as he has declared time and again that his individual object, at any rate, is to have a measure which shall commend itself to all fair-minded men. Now, Sir, let us analyse a little further what the Government propose to do. As I have stated, the unit of representation for the whole Dominion practically is 22,900. The eastern group has 688,000 souls and 35 members; consequently, its total average is barely 19,700 for the entire 35 seats; that is to say, it has 3,200 souls below the average unit, and it has 3,500 below the average of the 51 eastern constituencies. Taking them collectively, it is at least 112,000 below its fair number; and if you divide 688,000 by 22,900, you will find that the eastern section of Ontario to-day is only fairly entitled to 30 members

instead of 35; while if you analyse the western section, you will find that the average is 23,200, being at least 300 per county in excess of its fair proportion and being collectively over 15,000 in excess. Now, if we review the eastern group further, we will find that of the entire 35 constituencies of which it is composed, barely five out of the 35 are in excess of the number which entitles them to a representative. We find that 30 of the 35 are absolutely below; and that there may be no dispute about the matter, I have prepared a list showing the identical constituencies, and also—which is important—the extent to which they fall below the unit of representation. I find, in the first place, that Brockville has a population of 15,850, and that Brockville is therefore 7,045 below the unit; Carleton, with a population of 21,746, is 1,151 below the unit; Dundas, with a population of 20,132, is 2,768 below the unit: East Durham, population 17,053, is 5,847 below the unit; West Durham, 15,375, is 7,525 below the unit; Frontenac, 13,495, is 9,455 below the unit; Glengarry, 22,447, approximates closely, being only 453 below the unit; South Grenville, 12,931, is 9,969 below the unit; East Hastings, with 18,053, is 4,847 below; North Hastings is almost up to the unit, lacking only 687; West Hastings, with 18,963, is 3,937 below the unit; Kingston, with 19,264, falls short by 3,636; North Lanark, with 19,265, is short by 3,635; South Lanark, with 19,864, is short by 3,036; North Leeds and Grenville, with 13,523, is short by 9,377; Lennox, with 14,902, is short by 7,998; West Northumberland, with a population of 14,947, is short by 7,953; North Ontario, with 21,380, is short by 1,620; South Ontario, with 18,371, is 4,529 short. The two ridings of Ottawa collectively amount to 37,281, and consequently fall short by 8,519 of the number that would entitle them to two members. West Peterborough, with 15,808, is short by 7,092. Prince Edward, with a population of 18,892, is short by 4,008. North Victoria, with 16,849, is short by 6,051; and South Victoria, with 20,455, is short by 2,455. Now, the House will note that of these 30 constituencies, barely six come within 1,000 of the unit of representation, 16 are 4,000 and over below the unit, and nine are 7,000 and upwards below the unit of representation. It is scarcely necessary, I think, for any one to do more than peruse those figures in order to see that there is not the slightest or the faintest justification for the assertion made yesterday by the Minister of Justice, or by certain of his supporters here or elsewhere, that the object which the Government had in view was to equalize the representation according to population. If we turn to the western group, we find that out of 51 ridings, 27 are in excess of the unit of representation. Sir, I think that that simple statement, that of the two great groups, from one or the other of which any additional representation that might be required by Toronto or Algoma was to be taken—I say that the simple statement that of the eastern group all but five are far below the mark and of the western group 27 are in excess, alone would show every fair-minded man how utterly unjust and unreasonable is the proposition of the Government to deprive West Ontario of one member for the purpose of giving it to those constituencies whose population they say entitles them to extra representation. On every principle that can be conceived, whether you have regard to the convenience of uniting one or more counties together, whether you have regard to the distribution of the population, whether you have regard to the wealth and tax-paying qualities of the population—on every conceivable principle any members that it may be necessary to give the central group in order to afford it such representation as it may be entitled to, should, if you disturb the representation at all, in all fairness and justice, be taken from the eastern group, whose population is at present nearly 20 per cent below the figure required to entitle it to its present representation, and not take it from the western group, which at present has barely the representation to which its population entitles it, taken collectively. Now, I do not conceive it desirable, any more than the Minister of Justice does, to spend any time on what I may call the minor iniquities of this measure, particularly as they have already been brought to light by several other hon. gentlemen. But I will simply say this, that neither with regard to Russell, or Bruce, or London, or Huron, has any one argument been advanced to justify the wilful tampering with these several constituencies. Now, you will observe that, so far as regards Ontario, every conceivable principle which has been alluded to on either side in this debate appears to have been violated. You ignore the proportion between the sections; you utterly ignore the absolute population of the western and the eastern groups; you utterly ignore the several county boundaries; and under what pretext is this done? Do the hon. gentlemen pretend to tell us that it is impossible for them to allow my friend from North Wentworth to retain his seat because, forsooth, North Wentworth barely contains a population of 14,591, while at the same time these virtuous individuals can see no harm whatever in Frontenac with 13,445 being left undisturbed,—while it appears to them very meet, right, and proper that South Grenville, with 12,931, should continue to send a representative to Parliament,—while they can see no harm in North Grenville, with 13,523 people, having a representative here as heretofore,—while, in the case of the County of Lennox, they consider that 14,902 people must on no account be disturbed, although it grieves them beyond bearing that 14,591 should send a representative to Parliament? Sir, we must go further if we desire to find out what motive has influenced these hon. gentlemen in the distribution that they propose to us as far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, and a study of the electoral returns will, I think, convince the dullest on either side of the House that the Government in one respect were well advised when they refused to lay their sacrilegious hand on the ark of the covenant, the eastern part of the Province of Ontario. I find on examination that, out of the 35 constituencies which now return representatives to this House east of Toronto, 30 return supporters of the Government, and 5 return members of the Opposition. I turn to the other side of the picture, and I find that, out of the western section of Ontario which to-day returns 51 members, the Liberals hold 27 seats. Need I say more to explain to my hon. friends or to explain to the people of western Ontario why it has been found

absolutely indispensable to cut and carve the boundary lines of half a dozen constituencies in western Ontario while not a finger is held up to touch a constituency east of Toronto, with the single exception of Russell and Prescott?

Mr. MADILL. How did these constituencies stand after the gerrymander of 1882?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My recollection is that they returned six-sevenths supporters of Sir John Macdonald, as you will find on reference to the general election returns for 1882.

Mr. MADILL. No, it was the other way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, it was not. I happen to have been a member of Parliament at that date and I am quite aware what the returns showed.

Mr. MADILL. Ontario went Reform then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Ontario might have gone Reform had not the Reform party been deprived of six or eight of the representatives it was entitled to in consequence of the gerrymander. Now, I desire to refer for a moment or two to the principles which have been laid down by the Minister of Justice. He was good enough to tell us that this Bill was introduced in discharge of his duty after the taking of the census. He said:

"It was not introduced, nor is it pressed with any design to secure a party advantage"——

As he has shown in the manner in which he has dealt with the representation in these two provinces—

—"and I affirm in the most distinct manner, notwithstanding the denial which has been given to it by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and notwithstanding the challenges which have been made as to the various details of the measure."

And he goes on to say:

"We have been guided, Sir, by the principle almost exclusively—and where we have acted on any other principle that will be explained when we come to the details—that we should only interfere with the representation in those districts where additional representation for increased population has to be provided."

Sir, I think the facts I have given to the House serve as a most admirable commentary on how these two excellent sentiments have been carried into practice by that hon. gentleman. We are not surprised at such statements and we are not surprised at such results. Certainly none of us has occasion to be surprised who remembers the loud and fervent declarations made by that hon. gentleman in public a few months ago, as to the mode in which he and his leader proposed to deal with any charge preferred against any member of Parliament or any colleague of theirs, and the method in which they have recently redeemed their pledges. The men who courted and defied investigation, but, when a proposal was made for that investigation, saw fit to wipe out the only tribunal before which the Opposition had any chance of being represented, and to allow the criminal not only to choose his own judges but to draw his own indictment, are not men from whom it is surprising to find a similar result of the promises they made to us in regard to this Distribution Bill. As I have stated, I do not deem it desirable, in view of the fact that we shall be shortly called upon to deal with the details of this measure in committee, to do more than I have done, that is, to call the attention of the House to the gross and manifest injustice which is being perpetrated by this measure on the two great divisions of the Province of Ontario. Let any hon. gentleman who pleases take the two sections of the province, the section west of Toronto and the section east of Toronto, let him from the census returns verify the figures I have given, and say for himself on the floor of this House or elsewhere if there is any possible rule by which he can justify taking a member or two members from that section of the province which is to-day under-represented rather than taking them from that section of the province which, as I have shown, has 20 per cent less population than it has representation in this House, other than the fact that in the one section six-sevenths of the representatives support the Government and in the other a decided majority support my hon. friend. That and nothing else is the reason and the cause which has led the Government to introduce the measure we are now discussing, and that, as has been shown by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) time and again, if hon. gentlemen have any regard for their own character and reputation, ought to induce them to pause, and, wholly apart from the legal difficulties which have been suggested, to content themselves at this period of the session with dealing with those provinces only which, under the British North America Act, may require to have their representation adjusted, relieving in the meantime the members from Ontario and Quebec from the necessity of discussing a measure, which, as far as those two provinces at any rate are concerned—in regard to the others I am not qualified to speak—is as unjust, as iniquitous, as unfair in practice if not in principle as any one of the Gerrymander Acts which have been perpetrated in the adjacent republic from which those hon. gentlemen seem to have drawn their inspiration, and which in that country have drawn down on the authors time and again judicial reproof and judicial correction in such states as were able, fortunately for themselves, to invoke the protection of the courts against the perpetration of a wrong like this by the majority upon the minority of the representatives.

Mr. HAGGART. I shall endeavour as much as possible to confine myself to the principle which has been enunciated in this Bill, and to the amendment which has been moved by the leader of the Opposition. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) accuses the Government of a great many things in the Bill which they have introduced; many of them are sins of commission, but more are sins of omission. He seems to think that no principle underlies the Bill, that it is one which cannot commend itself to this House. I failed to hear a single remark in reference to redistribution in New Brunswick, in Nova Scotia, in Prince Edward Island, in Manitoba or the North-West Territories. There has not been a single objection to the details of the Bill with reference to these provinces. Hon. gentlemen opposite give as a reason for not going into the details of the Bill, that the Bill could not be understood, but I have not heard a single remark with reference to the redistribution in those provinces I have named. The whole complaint has been with reference to the redistribution in Ontario and Quebec. I am not able, perhaps, to discuss the legal question, or the meaning of the British North America Act;

it has already been more ably discussed than I can possibly do it. It was a duty incumbent upon the Government under the 40th section of the British North America Act, to bring down a Bill of redistribution; and that Act gives to the Government all necessary powers to do so. The hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island, says that under the 51st clause of this Act we have no such power. I do not pretend to be able to draw the nice legal distinctions that are drawn by some hon. gentlemen. That clause says:

"The representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, and in such a manner, and at such a time, as the Parliament of Canada, from time to time, provides."

They say that is a limitation of the powers given in the 40th section of the Act. I do not think that it is anything of the kind; according to my understanding the words do not convey any limitation of the power of this Parliament, as given under the 40th section, to bring in a Redistribution Bill. Eminent lawyers in this House are of the opinion, and I believe their opinion is correct, that when full power is given it would be unnecessary to use these words, because if we have the power we can delegate it to such authority as we think necessary for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of the Act. I mean to say that this is simply an explanatory clause; it gives the Government not only full power to redistribute the representation, but in an explanatory clause it says that it may be done by such authority, and in such a manner, and from such time, as the Parliament of Canada shall think proper. That is not a limitation of our power, it is merely explanatory of it. It says further that the Parliament of this country may delegate the power to judges if they like, they may delegate the power to the provinces if they like, and they may exercise the power themselves. I think there is not the slightest doubt that under the British North America Act we have this power. However, this question has never been raised before during the last twenty years. I have been in Parliament since 1872, and I never heard any member in this House raise a question that this authority was not vested in Parliament itself. However, we thought we had the power, we thought the constitution was mandatory upon us to bring in a Bill for redistributing the representation. How did we proceed? There were two ways in which we might proceed. Under the census which was taken last year, we found that Quebec and Ontario were not entitled to an increased representation; that New Brunswick had lost some members, that Nova Scotia had lost some members, and Prince Edward Island had lost some members, and that Manitoba, from an increase in population, was entitled to increased representation. There were two plans open to us of securing the object of redistribution. One was to leave the Maritime Provinces with the representation they had, and to give increased representation according to their numbers to Quebec, Ontario and the North-West Territories. It was thought desirable to retain the number that Quebec has always had, and to retain the number that Ontario has now. Then we decided to redistribute the seats in the fairest possible manner, according to our opinion, with the least interference with the constituencies as they are at present. The plan we adopted was to divide the provinces to cover the very principle that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has laid down; but instead of dividing the Province of Ontario into three sections, we divided it into two sections, making the division line beween York and Peel, moving the line northward to the Georgian Bay. In that division the eastern part of Ontario has 46 members as at present, and the western part has also 46 members as at present. The population of western Ontario is 1,018,695, the population of eastern Ontario, according to that division, is 1,097,844.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you include Algoma in eastern Ontario?

Mr. HAGGART. We divided it on a line between Peel and York, following up the Georgian Bay, and leaving Algoma in eastern Ontario, each side of that line having 46 members. In that division the east has over 80,000 more poulation than the west. In order to give to the populous city of Toronto, to Algoma, which has increased so largely in population, and to Nipissing which sent no representative to this House, we decided to give those sections two additional members. Where were those two members to be taken so that we might make a fair redistribution under the Bill? Were they not to be taken from the western portion of Ontario? As the eastern portion exceeded the western portion by over 80,000, we gave one of the two members to Toronto, and the other to a portion of Algoma, along with the Nipissing district, which had 15,000 people and was unrepresented. Is that not following the lines suggested by the hon. member for South Oxford, and was not that a fair way of dividing the representation? I have failed to hear from any hon. gentleman any word of complaint that the rearrangement we have made in the Niagara Peninsula was not entirely fair, and I have heard no suggestion that any arrangement could be made in that section of the country which would be better or fairer, even from a political point of view, than the one we have made in this Bill. Now, suppose we adopted the suggestion in the amendment of the hon. member for Simcoe, what would be the result? A gerrymander of the very worst form. We would be obliged to change every one of the ninety-two constituencies of Ontario except eighteen. As the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) well said: Lay down the county lines, lay down the principle of representation by population, and under the last census I will perform a gerrymander which would bring even a blush of shame to the hon. member for Simcoe. The policy adopted is one which interferes as little as possible with boundaries of the electoral districts as they at present exist. There have only been two charges in the line of gerrymandering made against the Bill introduced by the Minister of Justice. One of these is the charge that we have gerrymandered the County of Prescott and the County of Russell. Let us look at the facts, and when I have given the figures let hon. members consider whether any iniquity was perpetrated in either of those two places. The population of Prescott, according to the last census, was 24,173. By adding Rockland and the village of Clarence it is increased to 30,417. The population of the electoral district of Russell was, according to the last census, 31,643, and separating the township of Clarence and the village of Rockland it became 25,399. Let us go further.

Let us see the vote cast in Prescott and Russell during 1891. The total vote polled in Russell was 6,678 and in Prescott 4,406. Take the united vote in Rockland and Clarence, numbering 1,162, from the vote in Russell, and add it to Prescott, and the result will be that one county will have 5,516 votes and the other 5,568. Take the voters' list for this year and see whether the division is not a fair one. The revised list in Russell shows 7,544 votes, in Prescott 4,344 votes, or a majority in Russell of 3,200 votes. Is that a fair division of the two places, both of them in the same municipality and in the same judicial district? One would think we were tearing them from the judicial district, from the county to which they were united, and that we were perpetrating, according to the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) one of the most glaring acts of gerrymandering ever perpetrated in any country in the world. According to this statement, the vote in Russell exceeds the vote in Prescott, according to the Bill, by over 449 votes. Where is the injustice done in the subdivision of one part of the Counties of Prescott and Russell when, after the division, Russell will have nearly 500 more votes than Prescott? Surely there is no injustice done in that case. Then we come to North and South Renfrew. Head, Clara and Maria are taken from North Renfrew, but they give only 50 votes altogether. At the last election you, Mr. Speaker, polled 13 votes and your opponent 23 votes; so that is a difference of only 10 votes. Is it for political purposes or to assist our friends that this division is made? Then look at Scugog, the island which has been changed from one riding of Ontario to another to which it naturally belonged; but in regard to that change there is only a difference, when it is looked at politically, of 7 votes. The Government could have no object in carrying out this change. Thus from York to Russell there has been no objection taken to the Bill, except as regards the addition of a certain number of votes to the city of London. That could not have been done for a political object, because if we had added any of the suburbs of London it would have given to our friends in that city more votes than they will obtain under the present Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Any of the divisions we might add would give that result, and so there is no political significance in that change. Then the hon. gentleman talked about the gerrymandering of Bruce. What has been done? Port Elgin, which is separated by a few miles from the county in which it is at present, is added to the county to which it properly belongs. There can be no objection to that change; indeed I have not heard any hon. gentleman suggest that any wrong has been done in that regard. The only wrong-doing charged is with respect to Russell and Prescott, and the addition of certain votes to the city of London—a change which has no political significance, because as I have said, if any of the outlying municipalities were added to the city it would give a greater Conservative majority than the present Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand the hon. gentleman to contend that Rat Portage and Port Arthur are in the eastern division of Ontario?

Mr. HAGGART. What I said was this, that I divided Ontario so that one-half of the 92 constituencies would lie on one side and the other half on the other side, and I placed the dividing line between York and Peel and ran it up Georgian Bay, and I added Algoma to the east. That made 46 constituencies on each side.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then Rat Portage is in the eastern division?

Mr. HAGGART. It is, for the purposes of my calculation. I ask hon. members if it is not a fair division? How could you divide it in any other way so as to place 46 constituencies on each side? Let us next look at the Niagara peninsula. It has been suggested that we gain a political advantage in the distribution made there. Have we not taken from our friends a sure Conservative constituency, and is not the result a loss of one on each side? We shall obtain one additional member in Toronto, which probably will return a supporter of the Conservative party, and every one knows that the County of Ottawa will give a supporter to hon. gentlemen opposite. Thus it appears that we have been carrying into effect the very doctrine laid down by the leader of the Opposition that any division made should have no political significance and that hon. gentlemen opposite should be considered in the distribution. Whether that is a correct doctrine or not we have followed it. That is the whole case in regard to Ontario, and I have not heard a suggestion from hon. gentlemen opposite that it is not a fair division, that it has not been carried out on the proper principle, and I have not heard, nor do I believe there can be adduced, any suggestion by which redistribution can be better carried out than it has been carried out in the present Bill, provided a member is given to Toronto and also to Lake Nipissing district, and thus secure equality of representation between the east and the west. We have endeavoured to lay down this principle and carry it out—that we should disturb as little as possible electoral districts as they at present exist. We have done so as little as possible, and I maintain that this is as fair a Redistribution Bill as any conference of political parties could agree to, or as could be prepared by any plan proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. If the Bill was drawn as the hon. member for Simcoe proposes, if it was founded on the principle of redistribution according to county lines, what effect would it have on the House? It would have been attacked by every member of the Opposition on the ground that 70 odd constituencies would be changed in Ontario, though a dozen of those hon. gentlemen were wiped out at the last election and replaced by a dozen of our friends here. Would it be possible to introduce a Bill framed on the lines proposed by the hon. gentleman? Such a scheme of redistribution would receive the execrations of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. The principle that we introduced is, I think, the right one. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) supported the Redistribution Bill of 1882, and his amendment is as much a reflection upon himself as upon any member in this House. No member of the House and no supporter of the Government had the same influence outside of the Ministry that the hon. member for North Simcoe had, and if the Redistribution Bill assumed the lines which it did in 1882, there is no member in the House more responsible for it than the hon. gentle-

man who is now casting stones at his own work. The hon. gentleman seemed to blame the Government of this country of which he professes to be a supporter, because this Bill was not introduced earlier in the session, when his proposition would have been announced. I would remind him that it was due to the party of which he considers himself a leader in this country, that we should have had sufficient notice of what the intention of the hon. gentleman was, but at the last moment he sprung upon the House a want of confidence motion against the Government who were doing the best they possibly could to introduce a Bill which would be acceptable and fair to all parties. I have confined my remarks solely to the Province of Ontario. The accusations against the redistribution in the Province of Quebec have been fully argued and the view of the Government set forth by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. As to the details of the Bill which will be gone into more fully in committee, I shall be prepared to defend every portion of it, and to show to my friends and to the country that the Bill now before us is as fair a measure as could possibly be introduced considering the onus thrown upon us by the British North America Act to have a redistribution after every decennial census. I need not weary the House as to the details of the rearrangement of the Niagara district, but I can show that the population is as nearly as possible equalized, and that it is more fair than the lines of population as rearranged by Mr. Mowat. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that politically it is as fair a redistribution as possibly could be done in that section of the country, and I therefore need not enter into the question. I think the Government is entitled to praise rather than to fault-finding by some of its own supporters. It is enough for those parties who are on the opposite side to abuse us. We are not deserving of any abuse from either side of the House, because every fair-minded man in the House, and every fair-minded man in the country, when the details come to be looked into, will find that it is an honourable Bill and as impartial a Bill as we could possibly propose under the directions which are given us in the British North America Act.

Mr. CASEY. The appeal of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has been very pathetic. He has told us that the Opposition to the Bill has not come from the opponents of the Government but from his own side of the House, and he has stated in so many words that it was a very mean thing that anybody on his own side should oppose the Government. I cannot agree with him in that, because I claim freedom of speech and freedom of action for the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) as well as for any other member in the House. The hon. Minister of Railways has told us that this is as fair a Bill as could be expected from him and his friends, and in that I agree with him because I have not much faith in the fairness of hon. gentlemen opposite. The difference between the Minister of Railways and the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is that the Minister thinks that the Government can be trusted to fairly distribute the constituencies, while the hon. member thinks that no political party can be trusted to fairly mark out the boundaries of political divisions. I believe that no political party can be trusted with this power, and I would hardly trust myself. I maintain that some plan should be devised which will not leave it in the power of either party to tinker with the representation in this House of Commons. Before we get through this debate, which will probably be a considerable time yet, I hope to have something to lay before the House with regard to the abolition of the geographical divisions of constituencies which I do not believe should exist. I would not trust the party on the other side of the House, or scarcely my own party to say what the boundaries of these ridings should be, and far that reason I have great pleasure in supporting the independent and manly and correct motion, as far as my judgment goes, of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I commend the hon. gentleman for his independence in bringing forward a motion which he must know will be opposed by the great majority of his party friends. They have felt that they have it in their power to divide this country into electoral districts in such a manner as to return a majority in their favour, and the hon. gentleman has declared that this unjust power should be taken out of their hands. Now, I fully agree in the main proposition which is comprised in this resolution, namely, that the majority of this House should not pick up a deadly weapon to kill their opponents in this manner. The hon. gentleman knows that I have opposed him before now; but whether I have opposed him or followed him, on this occasion I think I can not only follow him, but I can appreciate the honesty and uprightness of his purpose in proposing that the great majority of this House should not pick up a slung-shot to knock the other side silly.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, before addressing myself to the question now under discussion, I have a word or two to say to the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey). That hon. gentleman, in one part of his remarks, charged the hon. member for North Simcoe with something which, translated into plain English, was very like treachery to the party of which he is a member.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I assume from that encouraging "hear, hear," that the sentiment is applauded by the gentleman who uttered it. He is also accused of having sprung this motion on the Government without giving them any notice of his intention, and without communicating to them his objections to the Bill which they had introduced. Now, Sir, I am not going to say a word in defence of the hon. member for North Simcoe; he is perfectly able to take his own part here or elsewhere. But I wish to say this, that any reflection upon him as the mover of that resolution, applies with equal force to myself as its seconder and supporter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Hear, hear.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I thank the hon. member for Haldimand for that "hear, hear," for I understand exactly what it means. Now, taking to myself, as I am justified in doing and bound to do, the charge made by the hon. member for Cumberland, I say that as soon as I became aware of the nature of this Bill and of the course the Government proposed to pursue with regard to it, I took the very first opportunity of acquainting the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government with my objections to it, and my intention of opposing it. So that that charge falls to the ground.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You were willing to lose one of your townships, were you not?

Mr. O'BRIEN. When the hon. gentleman has heard what I have to say, perhaps he will not be quite so free with his interruptions. With regard to the more serious charge, which is that a member supporting the Government, and professing general confidence in them, had placed himself in opposition to them and virtually moved a vote of want of confidence in them, I desire to say that I was not a member of the House in 1882 when the Redistribution Bill of that year was passed. I am therefore in no sense responsible for that measure. But I go further: I say that when I had an opportunity on one occasion in this building of expressing an opinion to those engaged in drawing up that Act, I told them that I utterly disapproved of it and of the principle on which it was based; and I have never hesitated on any occasion to say that I was entirely opposed to the Redistribution Bill of 1882. I am therefore perfectly consistent in my opposition to the present Bill, which is simply an extension of the previous measure. With regard to the question of confidence in the Government, I have had the misfortune to be opposed to them on several matters and on several occasions; but I have had the advantage of being in this position, that having foreseen that a difference would arise between us on those questions, I came to this House with the guarantee of my constituents that if I took that course, they would support me in so doing. I came here perfectly independent with regard to those questions,—not only independent, but obliged to take a certain course with regard to them, which course I have never hesitated to take. Now, if it is to be understood as a doctrine of the hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches that no man can hold an independent view or take an independent course in this House without being charged with treachery to his party, especially after he has used reasonable means to inform his leaders of the course he intends to pursue, all I have to say is that if that is treachery to the Conservative party, and if the view taken by the hon. member for Cumberland is endorsed by the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, while it is not in their power to take from me my Conservative principles, which are based on something better than personal considerations, yet if they choose for that reason to read me out of their ranks, they are welcome to do it, and the sooner they do it the better. I am not going to be tied hand and foot by any measure which the Government choose to introduce, and which was not specially under consideration when the last election took place. Being a supporter of the trade policy of the Government, I was elected as one of their supporters; but I was not elected to be a supporter of a measure such as that now before the House, either with regard to its principle or want of principle, or its details. I was not sent here, so far as legislative action can do it, to vote a member out of this House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is not done.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. member for Haldimand is very ready with his interruptions. He is one of those who to-day know that this Bill sacrifices two of the members of western Ontario for purposes which I will not attempt to characterize. But I tell him and all who take his course, that they will find it very difficult to justify themselves when they go back to their constituents.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The member for Haldimand does not sacrifice any more than you do.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I was unwilling to take these personal remarks.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Don't make them, then.

Mr. McNEILL. I think the hon. member for Muskoka might be allowed to continue his remarks without interruptions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am not at all uneasy about the interruptions, especially from the quarter from which they come. I was going to say that I would not have ventured to obtrude these personal remarks but for the language of the hon. member for Cumberland, which, I think, justified what I have said; I could not have said less under the circumstances. Now, with regard to the measure which we are discussing, the best that has been said on its behalf was said the other night by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin); and the best that he could say for it was that it was not as bad as it might have been. Now, Sir, I for one do not come here to make myself responsible for legislation for which the best that can be said is that it is not as bad as it might have been; and I will take this opportunity of saying, even though the remark may not be pleasant to some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that the insolent threats which have been made, insolent I deliberately call them, by persons and papers undertaking to speak on behalf of the Conservative party, that if hon. gentlemen opposite were not prepared to take this measure they had better look out that they do not get a very much worse one. That was an insolent threat, unworthy of the great party such as I would like to see and believe the Conservative party to be. Now, Sir, we have in the resolution before us something which enables us to discuss, apart from political considerations, the principles upon which the representation of our people should be based. And I do not think that a much more important question could very well come before us. The Minister of Railways, in discussing this question just now, based his whole argument upon the assumption that the arrangement of the constituencies under the Act of 1882 was something that should be accepted as good in itself. If his premises were true, I should have very little fault to find with his conclusion. If the arrangement of 1882 were fair and just to all parties, if it were one that fulfilled the conditions which every one will admit properly belong to a Bill of this character, I think it would be hardly worth while to discuss the principle upon which that hon. gentleman dilated. But if that measure was of an entirely opposite character; if, so far from being based upon any principles upon which such a Bill should be based, it violated every one of them; if it not only set aside all idea of municipal boundaries—and in that respect I may say that when the hon. member for North Simcoe was charged with being inconsistent in his course now compared with that of 1882, he was not any more so than the late Sir John Macdonald was in his course in 1882 compared with his declarations of 1872, so that the charge of inconsistency thrown upon the hon. member for Simcoe, falls upon shoulders

of an altogether different character. We are discussing, I say, this question, as to the principles on which respresentation should be based, and I say that the principle, or rather the want of principle upon which it was being based in 1882 and upon which it is based on this Bill, is what this House should not accept, what it should never have accepted, and what it should have reversed at the earliest possible opportunity, and I think it is very much to be regretted that the Government, strong as it is in the confidence of this House, strong as it is, or at any rate strong as it has been, in the confidence of the country, and strong as it would remain in the confidence of the country if its actions in the future justify that confidence as they have, I must admit, with some few exceptions, justified it in the past—do not take the opportunity to bring down a measure which would place the representation of the people on such a basis that no one hereafter would venture to interfere with it. Hon. gentlemen on this side seem altogether to have become oblivious of the fact that there is such a thing as public opinion. They think, so long as they can satisfy the interests of their party, that is all they need consider, but I think that is even from a party point of view an exceedingly short-sighted policy. No party can possibly exist and retain the confidence of the country, no matter how clever its leading may be, no matter how able in general respects its policy may be, unless that policy is based on principles of justice and reason, and there is no man, except the most violent partisan, who will venture to say in his calm moments that the Bill of 1882 is one which ought to be regarded as finality in settling the basis of the representation of the country. If the basis established by that Act is not a proper basis—and its inequalities have already been so fully shown that it is hardly worth while further to dilate upon it—let us see by what means we can ascertain what ought to be a fair basis of representation. We want to arrive by the resolution now before us, at equality of representation as nearly as possible. Now, I quite agree with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) that political wisdom is not based upon the counting of heads or noses or votes. I think that the essential principle of representation by population should be modified by a variety of other considerations, considerations which that resolution in your hand, Sir, very fully and, I think, clearly sets out. One of these is community of interests, to which reference has already been made, and to which I need not further allude; another is stability and unity of representation. Now, in the Bill under discussion these things cannot by any possibility be arrived at. It is impossible, if we once begin the system of cutting and carving constituencies here and there—even if we do it with the honest desire to obtain equality of representation—to achieve the result desired. We are continually altering the boundaries of constituencies, we are continually changing the interests of the people, and no human ingenuity can avoid wrong and injustice. Then how are we to arrive at a different settlement? We can by no better means arrive at a solution of the problem than by the means suggested in the resolution—that is county boundaries. A number of hon. gentlemen on this side are very fond, and properly fond, of declaring their regard for British precedent, and I hope we will always be able with justice to claim that this House has a regard for British constitutional practice and precedent. Now, if there is any one principle upon which the English system is founded and upon which it has been based, going back to time of the Anglo-Saxon, it is the principle of representation by counties. At every period in English history, that has been the basis. Was it ever heard of at any period in English history, from the earliest times down to the latest—for the sake of equality of representation or any other purpose—that the boundaries of counties were interfered with. No matter how great even the difference of population might be, they always adhere to their county boundaries. There is a striking instance of that in the last Representation Bill. Although it is perfectly true that the commissioners appointed to work out the details of that Bill were advised to adhere as much as possible to equality of representation, yet when they came to counties which were too large for one and not large enough for two members, they made no change in the boundary. Take, for instance, the County of Westmoreland. The whole population of that county was very little more than the average of population of the county adjacent to it, yet they did not disturb the County of Westmoreland, but gave it two members although it gave each member only a population of 32,000. So that while these commissioners were acting on their instructions to regard as closely as possible equality of population, yet still they never departed from the principle of county boundaries. I do not mean to say that there is anything sacred in municipal boundaries, but unless we have some established rules to go by there is no possibility of avoiding the errors which must necessarily arrive under the present system. Can any one suggest a better system than the county boundary? I care comparatively little what principle you do adopt, provided you adopt some principle on which to base representation—some principle by which you can obtain the objects properly set forth in that resolution, and which will prevent a dominant majority stifling public opinion in order to serve party interests. Those who find fault with this resolution, and who admit the principles on which representation ought to be based, being unwilling to accept the basis suggested there, are bound to suggest a better one, something equally good. Has any one suggested anything equally good? Has the Minister of Railways, who has spoken on behalf of the Government, suggested anything at all? No, he simply says that in 1882, by virtue of the majority we had in this House, we arranged the constituencies according to a plan that suited ourselves, and that being established we are determined to adhere to it. Well, that is a very bastard sort of conservatism. Because ten years ago we established something that was radically wrong in itself, now we are to adhere to it. If that is a conservatism, it is a sort of conservatism I should be very unwilling to subscribe to. I concern myself very little as to the details of the Bill, but it might be worth while to point out that while it professes to equalize representation, it comes very far short of what a Bill ought to provide if it is intended to equalize the representation. Why should the East Riding of Simcoe be left with a population of 35,000, while there are half a dozen constituencies in the eastern part of the province that have a population under 15,000? There are many other cases, which, though perhaps not

equally forcible, require attention quite as much as Toronto does. This Bill, then, utterly fails to attain the object it professes to have in view. As I remarked with regard to the Bill of 1882, it is based on no principle and it violates every principle, and yet it is astonishing and really touching to witness the anxiety shown by the Government to equalize the representation in one particular case. Why, in the name of all that is sensible, is the County of Russell singled out? While East Simcoe is left with a population of 35,000 and North Ontario with less than 20,000, the Government must travel down to the extreme east of the province in order to equalize the representation between Prescott and Russell. That is a very extraordinary and a very touching illustration of adherence to principle. It is to be regretted that the Minister did not equalize the representation in some more glaring cases. One cannot help suspecting that there is some reason other than meets the eye for this course, some reason which the Minister did not state to the House in the remarks he made a little while ago. In fact, though it may be a secret, it is perfectly well known why the Minister, leaving unredressed these inequalities that I have referred to, travelled down to pick out the County of Russell and to do justice there which he failed to do in so many other places. Hon. gentlemen are very fond of appealing to British practice. There is one thing that the British people have generally tried to do. One must go a long way back to find instances of tyranny and injustice on the part of majorities. The British people have generally tried to secure a fair and full expression of opinion. Instead of doing that, and adopting a measure to attain that object, this Government have introduced a measure to prevent the people from doing it. Instead of following British precedents and British practice, they have adopted the very worst feature of the American system. I am astonished that hon. gentlemen, after all we have heard from them of British practice and British precedents, will attempt to justify a proceeding which is utterly at variance with every one of them. Any one who is acquainted with English parliamentary history and English parliamentary practice cannot fail to come to the conclusion that, though we claim to be democratic as compared with England, those who sit on these benches are comparatively the veriest slaves to party and slaves to the executive.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Some hon. gentlemen who ridicule that statement have not paid much attention to English parliamentary practice. Any one who does know anything of English parliamentary history knows that things are done session after session in this House by virtue of a majority which would never be tolerated in the English House of Commons, which no English Minister would dare to do, but which hon. gentlemen here dare to do, confident that whatever they do will be condoned because otherwise the Government might be in danger. I say it would be better for the Conservative party and better for the country if they allowed the Government to go out of power for twenty years to come than to maintain them in office by acting in variance with the best principles and the best traditions of English parliamentary history. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, I can easily understand, makes very merry over my remark. I can quite understand that, to a gentleman of his ideas, what I have said may be the subject of ridicule. I think the hon. gentleman has a very poor appreciation of his position as a Minister of the Crown. I think the hon. gentleman knows little of English practice and English precedents and English constitutional history, judging by his own actions and by the policy he has supported and pursued, but, if he did know a little more, I do not think he would have followed the course he has. For my own part, I think I have expressed with sufficient clearness the reasons why I oppose this Bill and support the amendment. I support the amendment because it lays down the principle upon which the House ought to act. I oppose the Bill because it is based upon a want of principle, upon rules upon which this House ought not to act, and although it may be unpalatable for some members to retrace their steps and go back on the doctrine laid down by their leader in 1882, it would infinitely strengthen them in the country and in public opinion, to which they pay very little regard, and I think, instead of weakening them, it would strengthen them in the country. They have sufficient experience from their knowledge of what took place after the elections of 1882 that people do bitterly resent being taken from one county to another. The carefully laid plans of 1882, like many other plans of men and mice, went vastly agee, and many a constituency which had been carefully arranged to return a Conservative, though it had a majority of Conservative votes, turned round and returned an opponent of the Administration. I have very little faith as to the results expected from any system of gerrymader. It matters little, though, whether these results are attained or not. It is the principle which is at issue. It is the injustice which is done to the minority. The minority has surely some rights. It has its fair rights, according to the expressed opinions of the people, to be represented in this House, and for a majority to attempt by legislation to prevent that expression of opinion is an act of tyranny just as much when perpetrated by a majority in this House as if it were perpetrated by any individual despot who ever lived. At the risk of incurring what I know by bitter experience is not very pleasing, at the risk of that sort of treatment which more than once I have been made to feel in this House, I support this motion, because I believe it to be a right motion. I say that I am entirely free from the charge which was made by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) of having acted in a manner unbecoming my party allegiance, because at the earliest possible opportunity I gave the leader of the Administration distinctly to understand that I should be opposed to this measure. I do not admit the doctrine laid down by the Minister of Railways, by which it appears that the gentlemen on the Treasury benches expect absolute and unswerving obedience to their behests, no matter what they may be. The hon. gentleman said it was bad enough to be opposed by hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, but surely they had a right to expect implicit obedience from hon. gentlemen on their own side of the House. Now, Sir, if that is the doctrine upheld by the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, then I am glad to have this opportunity of expressing my entire dissent from it. I was elected as a free repre-

sentative of the people. I was not sent here, as I have heard many hon. gentlemen say they were sent here, to support the Government; I was sent here to support a policy, the policy which was in question at the time of my election, and I have supported it in this House. But I was not sent here to support a measure, and I am sure my constituents will sustain me in refusing to give assent to a measure, which I think they will agree with me in saying is in every sense and every particular a bad one. If my course in this respect disentitles me to the position of a supporter of the Government, I must humbly take the consequences; but the moment that is intimated to me, I shall then know what course it will be becoming for me to take, having regard to my own dignity as a member of this House, and having regard to the interests of my constituents.

Mr. MASSON. I will not occupy much time of the House in replying to a few of the remarks which have fallen from the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. The hon. gentleman waxed indignant that people should charge him with treason to his party because he chose to differ from the leaders of the party in some few particulars. I would be very sorry to say that any member of this House was so tied up by party allegiance that he would be unable to express his own opinion, even to the extent of voting against his party. But while the hon. gentleman waxed warm and wrathy over the treatment he had received, he gives to all the other supporters of the Government, not by any means a curtain lecture, but a scolding for their allegiance to their party. He charges them with political corruption, he charges them with gross outrages on public opinion, and he charges them with a great many other offences, and uses such hard names that one would almost be led to believe he had been under the tutelage of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who has a special license for hard words. Without attempting to follow the hon. gentleman, I would refer briefly to some of the reasons which he gave for supporting the amendment. First, he says he supports the amendment because it lays down a principle. What principle does it lay down that is new to this House? There is not one that has not already been advocated in the various redistribution measures. He has gathered together a number of expressions, a number of rules, which if attempted to be followed would be found to be inconsistent. Has the hon. gentleman ever considered how his various rules would work out? He does not give us any example of how they would work out; he does not point out any of the iniquities of the Bill he is condemning, but in general terms he condemns the Bill and in general terms he supports the amendment. Now, Sir, I think that members who owe allegiance to a party require something more than mere platitudes to induce them to support a motion which is moved as a direct want of confidence in the Government. There is no gainsaying the fact that it is an absolute and unqualified motion of want of confidence. Now, the question before the House is the adoption of a Bill for the readjustment of provincial representation, rendered necessary by our constitution, a Bill that, at the same time, attempts to equalize representation within the provinces, and in doing so corrects the most glaring discrepancies between the maximum and minimum representation; a Bill that is definite and fair in its terms, and interferes with existing boundaries as little as possible. The hon. gentleman says that it disregards public opinion. Now, I claim to have some regard for public opinion; I claim also to have some knowledge of public opinion, and I believe if there is one thing on which public opinion speaks out strongly, it is that the existing boundaries of the constituencies should be left undisturbed as far as possible in this redistribution. Now, we have certain boundaries, not created yesterday, not even created last year, but created ten years ago, on which there have been at least three elections in every constituency. These boundaries must be considered as existing boundaries, and they are boundaries that every Redistribution Act must respect as much as possible. I believe that public opinion requires us to respect them. I believe that public opinion requires us to redistribute the representation without interfering with them except where it is absolutely necessary, Now, Sir, the amendment suggests certain rules, rules, as I have said before, that are inconsistent with each other, and cannot possibly equalize the population in most cases without interfering with boundaries. The amendment is impracticable in its execution, and as the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment said in reference to law generally, it is gloriously uncertain, and it is beautifully indefinite. Besides that, it destroys the existing boundaries of nine-tenths of the constituencies in the province it refers to. How would it be possible to work it out without changing almost every constituency in the province? Here we have 11 above and 20 below the margin he gives us; that is, he takes the unit of 23,000, in round numbers, and from that he says he is willing to deduct 20 per cent, or he is willing to add 20 per cent. Now, let us see just how far that one latitude might extend. Deduct 20 per cent from 23,000 and you will have only 18,400; add 20 per cent to 23,000, and you will have 27,600, or between his maximum and his minimum you will have 9,200. Now, that is a very large latitude, and even with that latitude he would have to change, as I say, nearly nine-tenths of all the existing boundaries throughout the Province of Ontario. Then when you bring into action his next rule regarding the observance of county and city boundaries, these two rules together are so cumulative in their disturbing influences that they would leave hardly one constituency in the southern or western portion of Ontario undisturbed and I do not think they would leave one constituency in the south-western portions of Ontario undisturbed. Under the proposal in regard to city and county boundaries Toronto would receive its full representation, eight members, which would have to be gathered from other portions of Ontario; and this would prove another disturbing element, and in fact it would be difficult to say where the disturbing influence would end. So if we were to adopt the rules laid down by the hon. member for Simcoe, the rules so vigorously supported by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. O'Brien), the rules which that hon. gentleman condemns in such unmeasured terms other hon. members supporting the Government for not adopting instead of obeying public opinion and altering as few boundaries as possible, we would have license

to change every boundary in Ontario. The hon. gentleman said he was disapproving of the principle of the Bill in supporting the amendment, not as stated by the hon. gentleman who moved it and by hon. gentlemen who have supported it, but the principle of the Bill as gathered from the details. He carefully avoided giving us the details of the measure he suggested, otherwise I am afraid the principle therein involved would be subjected to very severe criticism. The hon. gentleman did not favour discussing details, but he was prepared to gather from a few of the details the principle of the Bill, to the second reading of which he declared himself to be opposed. The hon. gentleman wants a Bill prepared on the principle of equalization of population. Has not that been an element in every Redistribution Bill passed in this Dominion Parliament? Has it not been claimed to be at least the basis of every Bill of redistribution passed in any of the provinces, as, for instance, in the Province of Ontario, where, I think, most people will admit some very iniquitous changes were carried out? With county boundaries and with a margin of 9,000 to come and go upon, what sort of a gerrymander might not be worked in any of the counties, aided by drawing in, where necessary, a few county boundaries to help out the scheme. But it is urged that there must be geographical compactness. Fault has not been found with the present state of affairs in this regard, except in a few instances. The ridings in Ontario, and I speak of them more particularly, are geographically compact. I suppose the County of Wellington which is divided the long way intsead of the short way, giving long narrow constituencies instead of short and wide ones, may be an exception; but hon. gentlemen opposite surely cannot complain because they at present hold the three constituences of that county, whereas were it divided the other way, they could not possibly hold more than two. I do not for a moment propose to enter at any length into the details of the measure; but as a few items have been mentioned, from which hon. gentlemen have attempted to draw the spirit of the measure, I crave leave to refer to a few of them. The change made in Prescott and Russell has been stigmatized by the mover of the amendment as a most iniquitous proposal. Why so? It agrees with his rule—it does not disturb county boundaries. Prescott and Russell have been one county since my earliest recollection, and I doubt if they were ever anything else. From my earliest boyhood they have been one county, with one county town, with one set of municipal institutions, with one judicial district, and one in all except the double name. Different political constituencies they were. But here you have one county, and within it one constituency having 7,470 inhabitants more than another constituency and it is quite within the hon. gentleman's rule to equalize the population without interfering with county lines. There are no county boundaries to interfere with, because they are one county and one community. But by taking one township from the greater of these constituencies and adding it to the other you reduce the difference from 7,470 to 4,680, advancing towards equalization by 2,800 souls. There is an equalization of population within county boundaries, and as the Minister of Railways has shown, if you take the votes cast, the equalization appears to be greater still. Moreover, this change is not interfering with the community of interests, which it has been claimed we should regard. I understand, that the township transferred is principally a French township, and that the people of the constituency affected are principally French, that the constituency from which it is being detached is mainly English; so that a community of interests is being fostered in harmony with the views of hon. gentlemen. We have, therefore, an example of what the hon. mover of the amendment calls a most iniquitous proposal directly within the lines of his own rule. I do not wish to raise any feeling between the rural districts and the city, but I consider it a very extreme proposal to say that at one bound you should place Toronto on an equal footing by population with the rural districts, when it has for years occupied a different position. I agree with the Bill so far as it goes in that direction, but we should not make any such radical change. It is not in the interest of the public that such a radical change should be made. It introduces too many disturbing influences, and where you wish to obviate inconsistency and want to reduce the maximum and raise the minimum, let it be done gradually, and let not advantage be taken of the fact that the Government controls two-thirds of the members of the House. Let not advantage be taken of this position to adopt some new set of rules and apply them in such a manner that they would disturb every constituency in the province, or in all the provinces, for such is not called for by public opinion, and indeed public opinion would condemn it. Another detail mentioned by an hon. member who has addressed the House was with respect to Port Elgin. That was evidently a mistake in the Act of 1882—an oversight no doubt. Looking up the debate I find that it was introduced at the suggestion of an hon. member opposite. The hon. member who made that proposal evidently did not know the geographical position of Port Elgin, otherwise he would not have made the suggestion, because it was at least two miles distant from the constituency to which it was attached. There is such a glaring inconsistency here that it is only just to change it, and this is done with that object. It really goes towards equalizing the population of these two constituencies, and although that change was mentioned as being rather peculiar, I do not see, nor do I think any fair man can see, that fault is to be found with it. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) stated that East Grey was one of the places where county boundaries were interfered with. What are the facts? A constituency was framed entirely in Grey when the township of Melancthon was a part, and no unimportant part of that constituency, but the Local Government chose to make a new county there. Is this House to change the boundaries of a constituency on every change that is made by the Local Government? Why, there is hardly a Local Parliament which passes without a new county being applied for or some change being made. Are we to follow every change they choose to make in Ontario, or are we to respect the boundaries of counties as they have been laid down here for years? I say that this example is one which shows that county boundaries are not by any means the sacred thing we are told they ought to be considered. Now, as to the legal question. Perhaps being a member of the legal profession I might be excused were I to occu-

py the time of the House on that point, but considering the able manner in which it has been presented on both sides, I will not deal with it, further than to say that when the question was first brought to my attention, on looking at the Act I could not see that the suggested difficulty existed. I then thought at first glance that it did not apply to redistribution within the provinces, but that it referred to the adjustment of the provincial representation, and I must say that having listened to the arguments of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) as well as other hon. gentlemen, I have found nothing to change my opinion in that respect. On the contrary, from the able argument presented to this House to-day by the member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), I have seen great reasons to adhere to my first opinion, and to believe that the expression as used in section 51 of the British North America Act refers to the provincial readjustment rendered necessary by change in the population as a whole, and that the power for redistribution in the provinces themselves comes from an entirely different clause. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I can see nothing in the amendment which justify me in voting for it or in voting against the Government measure. I see nothing in the Bill itself to call forth my opposition. It was not claimed, and it never has been claimed that this Bill is perfect, and I would refer hon. gentlemen to the words of the hon. Minister of Public Works where he stated frankly to the House that he invited criticism and invited amendments, and that they would be considered, and if fair adopted. With a Bill introduced on such a promise, wherein can it be charged that it is so grossly iniquitous that party allegiance should be severed on account of it? No doubt objections will arise to the measure from different standpoints, and it would be impossible for one mind or one set of minds to frame a Bill of this kind that would be acceptable to every member of this House. It would be impossible to frame such a measure as would be acceptable in all its details to all the members even on this side of the House. But it is open for amendments to be proposed and considered, and we have the frank assurance that if they are fair they will be adopted. The details of the measure with regard to the Province of Quebec have been ably and I think satisfactorily explained by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who are acquainted with the various constituencies, and as we have not heard much dispute about the other provinces, I do not propose to enter upon this branch of the subject. Before closing I would refer to the remarks of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) where he charged a number of the members on this side of the House with not having read English precedents or studied English practice. There is a possibility of laying too much weight on English practice and precedents, and I think the hon. gentleman has laid a little too much stress upon the county boundaries in Canada, especially in the Province of Ontario, as compared with the county boundaries in England. I believe that the county boundaries have been more stationary in the Province of Quebec than in the Province of Ontario, but so far as the latter province is concerned we cannot look upon them as permanent in any respect, because they are liable to be changed at any session of the Local Legislature, and they have been constantly changed. They differ from the English counties which have centuries of age to give weight to their existence, and which on account of their antiquity are entitled to far greater respect than are the county boundaries in this province. For the reasons stated, Mr. Speaker, I see no objections to the principle of this Bill, and if any objections in detail are given I will be ready to consider them upon their merits when the House goes into committee. As to the amendment I shall certainly vote against it. Although the various expressions in it, are reasonable as taken individually, they are, when taken collectively, indefinite, inconsistent with themselves, and impracticable in execution, and it would be impossible to carry them out without destroying a large percentage of the present existing boundaries of constituencies in Canada.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, I noticed amongst the last remarks of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson) that he stated that the Bill as introduced by the Government was not one that they were entirely wedded to, that the Minister of Public Works had suggested that he would be glad to hear any amendment, and that if anything better could be proposed he would be quite willing to entertain it. I think the hon. Minister of Justice spoke somewhat in the same direction, and it seemed a proper tone to assume, and members of the House at least desire to attribute sincerity to the utterance of Ministers, and those who have been in the habit of following them I suppose are confident that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are sincere when they speak. I presume that the hon. member for North Simcoe thought that they were sincere when they asked that amendments should be offered and changes suggested; and believing that they were sincere and that it was in the line of his duty, he has offered this amendment, when lo and behold, he is denounced as little less than a traitor, and all the names that can be thought of are applied to him. We are rather at a loss to understand this, and I fancy that the hon. member for Simcoe is rather at a loss to reconcile the candid request for amendments and suggestions with the vials of wrath which have been poured out upon him for taking the hon. gentlemen at their word. Now, while I am not prepared to agree with all that the mover of the amendment said with reference to the representation of city populations and as to some other points, I think he is not insisting, as he said he did not insist, on any hard and fast lines. He is laying down what he conceives would be a proper principle upon which to base this measure, and he gave the House clearly to understand that while they might adopt the principle of maintaining municipal lines, and while they could not have any other equality of representation than the municipal bounds would afford, he would allow a certain margin, and if the population exceeded that margin, two members could be given to the county, while if it was under that margin one member should be given. That margin, the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has said, would amount to about 9,000, and he says, give him that 9,000 to play upon and he could produce a gerrymander Bill that would astonish you. Now, if I understand the amendment aright, the 9,000, if that is the correct number, is not to be used in that way at all. It

is no part of the scheme of the hon. member for North Simcoe, as I understand it, that there may be a division of a county into two ridings, one of which may have 9,000 more population than the other ; and the hon. member never uttered a word to justify any such construction being placed upon his amendment. On the contrary I understand that if a county has a large enough population to entitle it to two members, the division should be made as equally and as equitably as it can be made, regard being had to well-defined areas, geographical lines, and as township lines, and so forth. Yet we are told by the hon. Minister of Railways that if this amendment were adopted and the county lines were to be maintained, with the necessary information under his hand, he could bring in a gerrymander Bill that would arouse astonishment in the country. Is that the principle followed by the Minister of Railways when he introduces a measure of this kind—that it should produce results favourable to one of the political parties of the country ? If so, I understand that the hon. member for North Simcoe does not give his adhesion to a principle of that kind. He proposes that a division should be made irrespective of its application to existing political parties—that it should be done on well-defined and equitable grounds ; and his resolution commends itself to my favour because it goes in the direction of rectifying iniquities that were perpetrated by the Bill of 1882. Sir, is there any attempt made in the present Bill to remedy the injustice that was done then ? No ; on the contrary it aggravates the evil ; it goes in the same direction, and the only defence urged by hon. gentlemen opposite is, not that it does not aggravate the iniquity of their proceedings in 1882 ; but they say, if we had more time, we could commit even greater iniquities than those. That is the only defence which they have offered. The resolution of the hon. member for North Simcoe at any rate lays down a principle by which you may be guided ; but what is the principle laid down by the Government for their measure ? They have been asked for it time and again ; but no one has given it and no one can give it. Will they say it has reference to the equalization of population ? Why, they know that the census returns, showing the population of the different ridings which are not touched by the Bill, would give the lie to any assertion of that kind. Do they say it has reference to maintaining county lines ? They know that it has not, but that on the contrary it destroys county lines. Will they say that it is to equalize the strength of the political parties ? No, with all their hardihood they dare not do that, because their Bill is founded on the principle of giving unfair and unjust advantages to one of the political parties in this country, and I believe they know it, and I believe that is the design of the Bill. If there be any other principles in the Bill, let them state them. They justify some of the minor details of their Bill, such as the outrage perpetrated in the County of Russell, which the last speaker undertook to defend, saying that it equalizes the population ? Is that the reason that change was made in the County of Russell, I ask the hon. member ? If that was the reason, and it was necessary to do it, I ask him how he justifies jumping over half-a-dozen constituencies between the Niagara Peninsula and the County of Russell, where far greater discrepancies exist. I ask him how it came to pass that Northumberland, where if I mistake not there are 22,000 in one riding and 16,000 in another, was passed over ? Why did he pass ever Leeds and Grenville, which are short of the unit ? Why pass by Lennox ? Why pass Frontenac ? Why pass Brockville ? I cannot enumerate them all. The hon. gentleman says they are united for judicial and municipal purposes. If I mistake not Northumberland and Durham are united for municipal purposes, and if he adds the population of those counties, he will find that they contain only about 72,000 people, entitling them to three members, whereas they have four. When he was so anxious to remedy these discrepancies and remove these anomalies and injustices, I ask him why all these ridings were overlooked ? Why they go to western Ontario, which is under-represented in the House at the present time, and wipe out a seat there, and leave untouched eastern Ontario, which taken as a whole is some thousands short of the unit of representation in each of the ridings ? Why this wholesale neglect of all that is right and just, when hon. gentlemen are so anxious to equalize the population that they must do it in the Counties of Russell and Prescott ? It is worse than useless, it is a wonder men would have the hardihood to stand up in the House and attempt for one moment to justify, on any principle whatever, that change in Prescott and Russell, leaving all the intermediate counties that are short or over untouched, on the ground that they did this in the interests of the country and because it was necessary to be done. Why, take the figures given by the hon. member for South Oxford, and what do they show ? Do they not show plainly that the division he had made was one which would commend itself to the judgment of every fair-minded man, as far as the representation of the different parts of Ontario is concerned. Are not the lines that he drew, lines that would commend themselves to the judgment of right-thinking men ? Was not his reasoning such as ought to commend itself to the judgment of reasonable men ? Yet the Minister of Railways rises and says that the division made by my hon. friend from South Oxford is not a right division, and he proceeds to make a division, and by his division he found that the population was just about as large in eastern as it was in western Ontario. How did he arrive at this ? He arrived at this result by putting Toronto and Algoma into eastern Ontario. Hon. gentlemen on this side, and I dare say the hon. member for North Simcoe as well, are under the impression that Algoma lies rather west of Ontario instead of east ; but it appears we are all wrong in our geography. And gentlemen going to British Columbia and Manitoba, passing through Toronto, when asked where they are going, will reply that they are going east. There was an idea that Manitoba lay somewhere west of the Province of Ontario, that Rat Portage is 150 miles or something like that just east of Manitoba, but Rat Portage, according to the division of the Minister of Railways, is in eastern Ontario. And so by putting Algoma and Rat Portage and Thunder Bay into eastern Ontario, he has equalized the population, and men are very unfair, he says, who cannot be satisfied with an arrangement of that kind. And the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) especially are men who are to be scolded. I do not know whether

they will be read out of the party or not because they have been unable to bring their ideas of geography down to the level of the ideas propounded and acted upon by the Minister of Railways. Why, the very speech of the Minister of Railways is enough to convince any one of the iniquity of this measure. When men are forced to defend a measure of that kind with such arguments I ask how any intelligent man in this House can fail to see in that very fact how unjust this measure is. Fault has been found with the hon. member for North Simcoe because one of the effects of his amendment would be to remedy the gerrymander of 1882, as far as Ontario was concerned. That ought to commend itself to every one. The Government measure does not propose it. What it proposes to do is to make that gerrymander worse again. After the Bill of 1882 was passed, there was not a man who could be found to get on a public platform in Ontario and have the cheek to defend it. It was denounced by all lovers of justice and British fair-play as a cowardly and mean act, done by a Government with a majority at its back which would yield implicit obedience to every command, no matter how unreasonable and dishonourable. Fault is found with the hon. gentleman, and he is denounced by the hon. member for Cumberland, because he was in the House at the time that Act was passed and gave his adhesion to it. But the rebuke of that gentleman came with very bad effect, since he candidly admitted that, having seen that Act in operation, and viewing it through the lapse of years he could not help coming to the conclusion that it was unjust. Yet he has denounced the hon. member for Simcoe as taking an unworthy position by the amendment he has moved, and has sought to read him a lecture, standing on the high platform of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite who will not permit any deviation from what is laid down by the Government. He attempted to read the hon. member for North Simcoe a lecture, but if hon. gentlemen opposite were listening to him so were gentlemen on this side, and tens of thousands of Canadians, through the instrumentality of the press, will read his words and will be able to judge the conduct of the hon. member for North Simcoe and the stand he took in comparison with the stand taken by the hon. member for Cumberland. What does the hon. member for North Simcoe say? He says an injustice was done, which I see now, and I do not propose to go further, I do not propose to have greater injustice committed. My idea is not to go any further in that direction, but to undo the evil and the injustice we did in 1882. And what did the hon. member for Cumberland say? He said: I was not in the House in 1882, but I suppose if I had been I would have supported that act too, but I never thought it was a fair and just act. That is the hon. gentleman's statement. He did rise and say that he knew a certain act was unjust and iniquitous, but when a measure is proposed to remedy that, he will sacrifice all the honour, which ought to compel a man to remedy an injustice, and he says: Though I know it is unjust, I will sustain it and I go further, I will be the instrument, I will be the lash which the Ministry will use to lash the man who had the honour and the manhood to say that he will rectify what is wrong when he finds it is wrong. That is the position of the hon. gentleman who lectured the member for North Simcoe. I think the latter need not care much for a castigation coming from such a source. Sir, it is the duty of every member of this House, in legislating on a measure of this kind, to legislate on some principle, and that principle ought to be one embodying something like fairness and decency. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that the present electoral boundaries of Ontario, as arranged in 1882, are a violation of all that is fair and just and right, and they know that if there were a return to county lines and if a division were made in a fair and equitable way, as proposed in the amendment of the hon. member for Simcoe, it would meet with the approval of the people. They know that their late leader, in 1872, laid that down as the correct principle, they know that it was violated in something like 54 instances in 1882, and yet they will not listen to a proposition to remedy any of the injustice done then, but on the contrary, they introduce a Bill in which they intend to perpetrate the same injustice in the Province of Quebec and to add to the injustice they did in Ontario at that time. The principle of legislation ought to be that there should be fair expression given to the voice of the people of this country in selecting their representative in Parliament. The majority in power should not use its power to enact legislation that will give them undue advantages, undue facilities to stifle the free voice of the people, and I charge upon this Bill introduced by the Government a continuation and enlargement of the principle of that Act which is now the law in Ontario at present, an Act designedly seeking to give to a minority of the people of the Province of Ontario the power to send a majority of representatives to this House. It is a wrong principle. The hon. member for South Oxford has told you that, according to the figures of the Government statistician after the last general election in 1891, the Liberals had 7,000 majority of the popular vote while they were in minority of four in this House. That was the effect in part of their Gerrymander Bill of 1882, and yet, because a gentleman proposes a resolution which will remove that iniquity in part, he is denounced, and a Bill which is designed to extend that principle of injustice and to accentuate it is spoken of with approval, while upon the heads of those who are in favour of what is manly and fair is brought down the reproach of the Ministers and some of their supporters. I need not go into the details of this measure. They have been explained already. There is no principle on which you can justify this Bill except the principle of giving political advantage to the party in power. If there be any principle, let them say what it is. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) at all events lays down a principle, but the Government have not laid down a principle because the only principle upon which this measure has been brought into the House is to secure an advantage to the Conservative party and to give them an undue advantage in future elections. It is certainly not introduced with a view to equalizing the population. Take it how you will, you will see that that is not the case. If you divide the province into districts, if you take it with reference to the ridings in order to see how they stand as to population, you will find that the argument of equalizing the population will not hold for a moment. It cannot be said that this measure is rectifying the injustice which was done in regard to geographical limits, because it proposes to add

to the iniquity which was perpetrated in Ontario in 1882 in that respect, and it also proposes in the Province of Quebec to destroy old existing county lines and to produce a state of things in that province somewhat similar to what the Act of 1882 produced in Ontario. It does not matter to hon. gentlemen opposite that one of the results of their unfair attempt to stifle public opinion was that there were enough honourable minded independent Conservatives and independent men to nullify their iniquity in part. The intention was there, and it may be that the same intention now on the part of the Government in the introduction of this Bill may be defeated, but it will be no extenuation of their guilt if they find some of their opponents returned to this House from Quebec, if there are sufficient independent men in those counties in the Province of Quebec which are thus disfigured to return men who will not hesitate to vote against the Government which has passed such a measure as this. It is hard to see what can be said in favour of a Bill which no one defends, or what can be said by those hon. gentlemen in reference to an amendment which at least this has this to commend it, that it is an honest attempt to arrive at a conclusion as to the principle upon which the distribution of electoral districts may take place on a fair and honourable basis. I give the hon. member credit that that is his desire, and I shall be glad to support it, and I would like to see enough independence in this House to lead Conservative hon. members to say: We will adopt some system which can be justified before honourable men, that we will not be ashamed of supporting, and we will have an equitable distribution and a fair fight, and we will not try to entrench any party in power by legislative means which will not express the will of the people if the will of the people was allowed to be openly and unfetteredly expressed.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has stated, in unmeasured terms, his surprise at the measure which is now before the House being opposed by a Government supporter. Coming from the Province of Ontario, I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is surprised, a province where the Local Government have always been supported by their supporters, no matter how bad their measures might be. As to the Bill and the amendment, I must confess that the hon. gentlemen view them with very mixed feelings. Several, Sir, who have spoken on your left have professed to be rather gratified at the Bill becoming law, because they say there will be such an upheaval of public opinion that they will be transferred to the Treasury benches. But some who are older in these matters seem to think this will have the effect of keeping them still in the position they have so long held. One point they all seem to agree upon, and that is to denounce not only the Government and their supporters in the House, but the Conservative press and the Conservative party throughout the Dominion. If denunciation were proof and if abuse were evidence, the Conservative party would have long ago been plunged to a depth lower than that which Lucifer occupied. But, in addition to their long record of abuse, they have established this, that they have been in power in the Local Legislature, and were in power from 1873 to 1878, and their attempts to legislate, to give full and fair expression to public opinion have not been to their credit. I am not going to refer to the Province of Quebec, because I am not conversant with that portion of the Dominion, but I believe the hon. gentlemen from that province would prefer any number of Bills of this kind to the sharpshooters who have gone on ahead of them in the shape of the Mercier party. Little can be said about the Redistribution Bill of 1872. From 1873 to 1878, those hon. gentlemen held possession of the Treasury benches, and they tried their 'prentice hand on redistribution. The riding of Centre Wellington had been carried by a Conservative, and they proposed to add to North Wellington, which had a population of 30,000, 5,000 more from the centre riding, and then, as Centre Wellington would be diminished, they proposed to take two townships from South Wellington, so that if the Bill had gone into effect, the northern riding would have had 35,000 inhabitants, and the south only 14,000, and that is a fair sample of what they would if they could arrange the constituencies as they chose. The Bill of 1882 was before the electors in the general elections of 1882, in 1887 and in 1891, and the fact that the Bill received the endorsation of a large majority of the popular vote in the whole Dominion, I think gives the Government an additional reason for passing this Bill. Now, the hon. gentlemen are in this position, that they are not in power to-day, and therefore they can only promise what they would do if they were in power. I presume it is only a fair test to take what has been done by their friends in the Province of Ontario, as a guide of what they would do in the whole Dominion if they had an opportunity. Now, in the Province of Ontario it is a conceded fact that the Provincial Legislature has no constitutional right to make a redistribution at any time; they have not been bound by census returns, nor by any stated periods at which they should make such a division; but they have from time to time profited by the party advantages which the opportunity gave them. The hon. gentlemen say that the proposition made by the hon. member for North Simcoe is right. I agree with the member for North Simcoe that it would be fair and proper if all the ridings throughout the Dominion could have the same basis of population; but there are many difficulties, which must be borne in mind, before that could be accomplished, difficulties which have been pointed out, and which I need not traverse again. It must also be borne in mind that in olden times what are now small constituencies, were then large constituencies, and it is a case, I presume, of their taking their turn in their order. Now, what has been done in the Province of Ontario by that model legislator, Sir Oliver Mowat? These hon. gentlemen, when they are driven from post to pillar, when they are taunted with the corruption of their party in the Province of Quebec, disavow all connection with their party friends in that province, and they say: Look to Ontario, and to Ontario alone; take the Reform party there as our criterion and our guide. Now, taking the figures in the Province of Ontario what do we find? I will take a list of ten counties, namely, Algoma West, North Brant, Nipissing, West Simcoe, Carleton, Cardwell, Frontenac, West Northumberland, South Lanark, and North Wentworth, which together polled in the last election a total number of 21,576 votes. Then in the ridings of Hamilton, West Kent, Ottawa,

North Perth, East Middlesex, West Lambton, South Essex, Lennox, South Ontario, and Welland there were polled 53,238 votes. Now, taking ten as a divisor, that being the number of counties, we find in the first group there is an average number of 2,157 votes polled, and in the latter the average vote polled was 5,323. Now, if the hon. gentlemen are honest, if they are consistent, do they think it is right that ten ridings in the Province of Ontario should have an average number of electors of 5,323, while the other ten should only have 2,157? I am bound to say not one of those hon. gentlemen has ever denounced on the public platform the scheme of Sir Oliver Mowat in the readjustment of the constituencies in Ontario. But, Sir, this is done designedly, it is done for a purpose, in that, while there are certain seats with a very small number of votes, there are Conservative seats with a very large number; and I propose to take another group of ridings. North Brant polled 1,835 votes at the last election; Algoma West polled 1,513; Nipissing, 1,310; Wellington West, 2,684; East Wellington, 2,665; North Wentworth, 2,650; West Northumberland, 2,513; or a total of 15,170 votes polled in those ridings. Now, if we take seven more ridings which returned Liberal-Conservatives, we find a total of 36,748 votes; so that while the seven Conservatives represent 36,748 votes, seven Reformers represent only 15,170 votes; yet the hon. gentlemen do not say that this is wrong. They say that is right, and all honour and glory to Mr. Mowat for conniving at a scheme that gerrymanders constituencies in this way, subverting the rights of the people and trampling them under foot. I will be bound to say that none of the hon. gentlemen have ever denounced these iniquities, and this is what they would do if the opportunity was afforded them here. I find that in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), when the Bill of 1882 was under discussion, he asked that the principles of justice and fair-play should be observed. Surely the hon. member for Bothwell does not contend that it is right that 36,748 voters should be represented by seven men, while 15,170 other voters should also be represented by seven men. If that is the hon. gentleman's idea of the principles of justice and fair-play as represented by Mr. Mowat's arrangement of the constituencies in Ontario, what a gigantic scheme he would formulate for the whole Dominion. But the then leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Mr. Blake, went even further, and he laid down the principle that the new seats should be assigned, so far as possible, to those places where there was the greatest discrepancies in the population. Now, let us take the city of Hamilton in which, at the last general election, there were polled 8,136 votes. Now, the city of Hamilton was justly entitled to two representatives, but what did the friends of these hon. gentlemen do? They would not concede to Hamilton the representation that the city was entitled to on the principles of justice and fair-play; but they gave to the two Brants, with only 5,325 votes, two representatives. Now, the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, I will be bound to say, never raised his voice against that iniquity, but to-night he rises and cries out in the most doleful strain that this Bill is most iniquitous. The hon. gentleman should be consistent, he should be honest, but I think that consistency is a jewel that you will never find conspicuous about his record. Take the city of Toronto. We know the position that city stands in to-day, under the iniquitous act of our Local Legislature. The Conservatives only have an opportunity there of electing two members, and the hon. gentlemen know that if the electors of that city were permitted to vote, as they would like, if that city were divided into three divisions as it is divided for Dominion elections, the Reformers would not be able to return a single member. They know that.

An hon. MEMBER. They did the other day.

Mr. BENNETT. Why, don't they know that Mr. Mowat himself was driven out of the city of Toronto by the popular vote? and don't they know that he never dared go back again for re-election, but he sought for refuge in Oxford?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would the hon. gentleman excuse me for asking a question. He has alluded to the County of Brant. Perhaps he knows how Mr. Mowat has arranged it. Can he mention any of the divisions in the County of Brant? Can he pick out any townships in the County of Brant and put them together geographically, that would not return a supporter of Mr. Mowat?

Mr. BENNETT. I will come to that matter in a moment. Now let us take some of the amendments that have been brought up from time to time in the Local House, where the Opposition there have asked that this principle of fair-play should be accorded to them, and where they have also asked that the population should be equalized. Take North Ontario, which showed a population of 28,434, and South Ontario, which showed a population of 30,378. Unfortunately, North Ontario had returned a Conservative member, and as a consequence Mr. Mowat thought that equalization should be made perfect, and so he changed them round and made the south riding contain 28,000, and the north riding, 21,000, making almost as bad an inequality as existed before, and doing it simply for the purpose of depriving the Conservatives of the seat that they then held in the House. What did they do in Kingston? They knew that time and time again the electors had returned to the Local Legislature a Conservative, and so they went outside of the city and took from Frontenac, which was irredeemably conservative, one or two townships with the vain hope that they would be able to defeat the member. So, too, when they came to Addington. Finding that Frontenac was strongly Conservative, and that it was impossible to win it from the Opposition, and that Addington was a very close constituency, he took certain townships from Addington and added them to Frontenac with the hope of being able to defeat the Conservative member. But the hon. gentleman has dwelt on the fact that Mr. Mowat has never seen fit to infringe on county boundaries. I grant he has not done so, although I have reason to believe that it has been done in one or two cases. But Mr. Mowat knows there are other ways of shuffling, and some of the artful manipulators at cards in his Cabinet saw ways to cut and carve the constituencies. And this is how he did it. Take the County of Simcoe. It returned a Conservative in the southern division. The eastern division had returned a Reformer by 15 majority. The western division had returned a Reformer by 17 majority. By their little manœuvring Mr. Mowat succeeded in holding the

two ridings, although the chances were, judging by the signs of the times, that he would lose both of them, because since then, notwithstanding this gerrymander, we have succeeded in winning one of them. He changed the whole riding and he carved it into such a shape as to resemble nothing in the heavens above or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth, and the result has been that they have succeeded in making one of the Simcoes irredeemably Grit, and thereby holding it, whereas had they followed the old principles which had prevailed for years and in view of all the old associations, the Grits would not have succeeded, to-day, in holding one of the Simcoes. We will now turn to Huron. That county, at the time of the first redistribution, which gave that county three seats, was divided in this way: They split up three townships, so that men who polled their municipal votes found that when the election came round the whole system had been trampled under foot with the result that they carved up the townships of Turnberry, Goderich and Hullett. What was the result of that distribution? The result was this, that by dividing three different townships, the Local Government succeeded in holding the three seats, while, had they permitted the township of Hullett to again go into East Huron or West Huron, they would have lost one of the seats. The hon. gentleman says it is unfair to detach a township from a neighbouring riding or county; but they say it is perfectly fair to split a township into any shape you like in order to accomplish some object you desire. Going into Wellington, what do we find? We find that the Conservatives had succeeded in returning the member for the northern division. That was considered a most iniquitous act, I presume by the Local Administration, and forthwith they proceeded to cut up and carve the constituency, and no doubt the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), despite his protestations of the provisions of this Bill, smiled at that action and thought it was a most excellent joke; and so they succeeded in carving and cutting up North Wellington so as to return a Reformer, whereas if the old lines and principles had been maintained, the Conservatives would have had a fair share of the representation. Going to South Victoria, what do we find? The boundaries of the county for the Local House and for the Dominion House were identical and had existed since 1867, and it only fair and right that after that redistribution had been made, after it was found to work satisfactorily so many years, the boundaries should have been retained. But what did the Local Government do? Finding the seat held by a Conservative in the south riding and that it was likely to be held by the Conservative party for years, as it had been held in Dominion elections, and knowing that the north riding was irredeemably Conservative, Mr. Mowat carved up the whole of Victoria so that his party succeeded in returning one Reformer. That may be fair and honest, but are hon. gentlemen opposite prepared to endorse such a measure? The result was that, while we formerly held the south riding of Victoria we have lost it, and the result was brought about altogether by this shuffling and carving of the constituency. What is the result of the gross total of the changes affected in these ridings I have taken into consideration? The result is this: If the old lines had been observed, there would have been returned one Conservative in Huron, one in Wellington, three in Simcoe and two in Victoria, while the Reformers would have returned two in Wellington, and two in Huron. But Mr. Mowat so transformed the riding as to secure eight supporters, while the Conservatives are compelled to be satisfied with only three representatives in the Local Legislature. What is the result? It is that whereas if an honest vote of the electors was taken, there would be a Conservative majority of three, by this infamous rearrangement of the constituencies Mr. Mowat succeeded in securing five majority. If Reformers would do that in the Local House, what would they do here?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Worse.

Mr. BENNETT. If they should try their 'prentice hand in Dominion affairs as they did in Wellington, where they were prepared to make a riding with 35,000 people and another with 14,000, it is only fair to infer that, with the long experience they have had in the Province of Ontario, they would cut and carve the Dominion constituencies in such a way that the Conservative vote would never be heard of in the whole of Canada. As regards the principle of the Bill under discussion, I have nothing to add to what has been said by hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the Government side. It is true, perhaps, that some trifling objections to various details may be made to the Bill, but I contend that every Bill is framed by the Government rather in the interests and advantage of their supporters than in the interests and advantage of their opponents, and in this country, where party politics run so high, and where party lines are so tightly drawn, would it not be absurd for the Government to concede to the Opposition after what they have done towards the Conservative party in Ontario. At the elections of 1887, there was a popular majority of only 300 votes in Ontario for the Mowat Administration, and yet by their infamous gerrymander they succeeded in securing 20 or 22 of a majority. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite while in opposition to make profession and to make promises, but so far as regards the Bill now before the House, I propose to support it. As regards the amendment of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I must say that, considering all the changes that would be involved in carrying out that plan, considering all the other opportunities afforded to the predominating party to make a gerrymander much worse than this, if this can be termed a gerrymander, it is better to follow the lines suggested by the Bill, taking as the basis the old redistribution; and as the Government in the past have been sustained in the stand they have taken on these redistribution measures, they will be again endorsed by the electors when the time comes for appealing to them. As regards the opposition given to the Bill, I presume it is quite within the right and province of hon. gentlemen opposite to offer that opposition. I do not envy them or doubt their right, but I believe, as in the past, the electors of the Dominion have seen fit to endorse the Redistribution Bills, because they have gone to form part of the general policy of the Government, so do I believe they will endorse this measure of representation when an appeal is made to them.

Mr. WELDON. Before the vote is taken on the amendment of the hon. member for Simcoe

(Mr. McCarthy), I should like to address a few words to the House, and having regard to the lateness of the hour I shall endeavour to make them somewhat brief. The point taken by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) under section 51 of the British North America Act has been spoken to by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and on this side of the House by the hon. members for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), and with reference to that point I wish to say a few brief words. The hon. member from Queen's (Mr. Davies) argued this question skilfully when the attention of Parliament was first called to it, and he contended that certain peculiar words under section 51 made it clear that whatever power Parliament had in the matter of altering the boundaries of electoral districts within the provinces, was to be exercised by some intermediary authority. The words of section 51 are:

"The representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules."

I confess that when I heard the argument first made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) it was new to me, and I was struck with the skill and ingenuity with which he presented it, and for the moment found myself somewhat at a loss to interpret rightly that section. But, having had the very great advantage of hearing the arguments of so many hon. members, and having proper respect for the great legal acumen and ability of the hon. members for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and Queen's (Mr. Davies), I am entirely at a loss to follow them and to accept their explanations, for reasons which I will state to the House with the greatest brevity. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) reads section 51 as dealing with two separate and distinct matters, which for convenience we may designate by two separate and distinct names. There is the matter of readjustment made every ten years after the census is taken, as between province and province, and determining how many members shall be allotted to each province; a power that is the outgrowth of our federal system, closely related to that which the American States exercise when their census is taken in determining how many members shall go to Congress from the several states of the union. For convenience, let us call this "readjustment." The duty is cast upon us of making this readjustment, and we have no choice in that regard, because the words of the Act are that we shall do so after the census is taken. Let us for convenience sake use the word "redistribution" to describe the alteration of the boundaries of counties, or the alteration of the boundaries of electoral districts within the provinces, an undertaking that is not the outgrowth of our federal system, that is in no way connected with the federal system, which it is competent for us to make any year, and the like of which the English Parliament has made three times during the present century. Let us call that alteration of boundaries a redistribution. Now, the argument of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is that section 51 casts upon this Parliament the duty every ten years, after the census is taken, of making first the readjustment as between province and province which at the present time means for New Brunswick fourteen members, for Nova Scotia twenty, for Prince Edward Island five, for the old Provinces of Canada 65 and 92 respectively, and for Manitoba seven members and so on. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) holds furthermore, that in this section there is the additional power granted of altering the boundaries of electoral districts within a province. In that matter I fail to follow the argument of the hon. gentleman, and I am persuaded from the argument of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) that this section does not, and that this section cannot apply to both powers. I am of opinion that it deals with the matter of readjustment, that it does not deal with the matter of redistribution, that it confines itself exclusively to determining how many members shall represent each province in this Federal Parliament, and that it does not in any way touch the question as to what are the districts from which the members from New Brunswick or any other province must come. I am not now pretending to state a new argument, because this question has been conclusively argued in my opinion by the Minister of Justice and by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey); but I base my opinion upon the fact, already given in the argument of these gentlemen, that we have attached to section 51, certain rules in the nature of limitations which indicate how the power granted is to be exercised, and those rules are of a nature which do not in any way apply to redistribution but which do admirably apply to readjustment. They are arithmetical rules and they cannot be very easily figured out. There is first the statement of fact that Quebec has 65 members, then there is the rule of three: for example as the population of Quebec is to the population of New Brunswick, so is 65 to the number of members in New Brunswick. Then there is the modification; that if the fourth term of the proportion contains a whole number and a fraction less than the half, then it shall be that number, and if that fourth term be a whole number, and a fraction more than one-half, then it shall be one more than the whole number. Then there is a fourth rule; if the ratio as between the populations of New Brunswick and Canada in the present census, as compared with the ratio between the population of New Brunswick and the whole population of Canada ten years ago, has shrunk by a certain percentage, then the rules above work without hinderance? But if the latter ratio has shrunk by 5 per cent or less then the rule given above does not apply. These are elaborate rules that can be applied only by persons skilled in arithmetic, they are somewhat troublesome rules I admit—but they help you to work out the idea of readjustment. They have no use, and no possible significance if you are devoting yourself to the work of redistribution. Therefore, these words of limitation which help you to carry out the power given under this section are only significant when applied to the exercise of the power of "readjustment," and they have as I said, no significance at all when applied to the exercise of the power of "redistribution." Mainly for that reason I am drawn to the conclusion that the position taken by the Minister of Justice and my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) is the sound constitutional position. I agree with my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that clause 40 glances at, but does not expressly confer, the power of redistribution, and if it does not the case

would present no difficulties. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) interrupted my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) when he was speaking, and asked, what about clause 5 of section 51. I hold that clause 5 presents no difficulty whatever. It says "such readjustment cannot take effect until the termination of the then existing Parliament." Let me explain what I understand that rule to be introduced for. In the constitution we are familiar with English usage, we follow their example, we know the rule pursued in England in 1832, and again in 1867, and again in 1884. According to the English rule when each of those Bills was carried, the House was promptly dissolved and a new election brought on. It was expected that some parties familiar with English usage would propose to observe the English rule in Canada after the union of the provinces, and, therefore, in order to make it not necessary to dissolve the House immediately after a Bill like this was carried, the sensible proviso was put in, that this readjustment should not take effect until the termination of the then existing Parliament. That explains to me the meaning of the 5th clause under section 51.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Under that construction, will my hon. friend state what meaning he attaches to the word "manner" in the first part of the section?

Mr. WELDON. I confess that though having looked very carefully at the language of the Act, I do not find it easy to give any exact meaning to these words. I acknowledge the difficulty, but if the hon. gentleman will solve the difficulty pointed out by my hon. friend from Cumberland to-day and by the Minister of Justice the other day, and show what possible relevancy there is in these rules attached to section 51, if the first part of the section bears the meaning assigned to it by the hon. member for Queen's, the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for North Simcoe, then I will undertake to interpret more clearly the meaning of the words of this section. I must say that the section seems to be loosely drafted. I looked at the statutes constituting New South Wales and Victoria, which had been passed by the same Parliament before the British North America Act was passed, to see if I could find the model on which it was drafted. I found that New South Wales had been given ample power to redistribute the constituencies. But, even if there had been no section 40, and no section 91, there would be no shadow of a doubt about the competency of the Parliament of Canada to go on and redistribute after it had readjusted the constituencies. Take the case of 1871; the rule of three was applied on that occasion. The census had been taken; Quebec had its 65 members; Ontario was discovered to be entitled to six additional members, or 88 in all. Are we to suppose that our hands would be tied, and that we would be unable to place in Ontario the additional members? Even if no express powers had been given in the Act, we would have to apply the rule of common sense to the Act and discover the power. The case would present no difficulty, because there must be such a power, an implied power after these members had been assigned to Ontario by the rule of three, to place them. For these reasons, given so briefly—it would not be courtesy to say that I have no doubt of the incorrectness of an opinion expressed by gentlemen who have forgotten more law than I ever knew; but if it were not for the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Queen's, the hon. member for Bothwell, and the hon. member for North Simcoe I would have very little doubt about the soundness of the view expressed by the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Cumberland on this point. Now, I desire to say a word or two about the other aspect of the Bill. I am one of those members who came into this House at the beginning of the last Parliament, five years after the famous redistribution of 1882 was carried. Our hon. friends across the House say that it is a cheap and easy form of virtue to stand up here and say that we do not like the Act of 1882, when we do not take the next logical step and try to undo that wrong. I agree with what the hon. member for Cumberland says in regard to that. Although a lower province member, I deemed it my duty to look at the statutes of old Canada, as well as at the statutes of 1872 and 1882, and also at the election returns and the census, to take a map of Ontario in order to find out by patient study, and by the assistance of some experts, what the merits of the Bill of 1882 exactly were: and I am free to say here and now, after having reconstructed the old political map of 1867, and having gone over the counties of Ontario one by one as they were then defined by the British North America Act, and having compared the old map with the map of 1882—having found in some cases townships scattered like flocks of birds upon which the dogs had pounced, one being here and another there, so that it was hard to find them and replace them in their old positions—after this study, I am free and frank in saying that I think the Redistribution Act of 1882 was one that reflected very little credit upon the Parliament of Canada that passed it. But what is our duty now? Three elections have been held on the basis of that Act—that of 1882, that of 1887, and that of 1891; and I have figures here for which I feel able to vouch, because they have been prepared with great care from two independent calculations made by different parties; and whether the Act of 1882 was fair or unfair, they show that in that part of the Province of Ontario where the most changes were made and where there was the greatest complaint and the greatest reason to complain, that is the western part of the province—I mean the peninsula bounded by the Georgian Bay, Lake Huron and Lake Erie, described as the hon. Minister of Railways described it, being west of a line run between the Counties of York and Peel and projected northward to Nottawasaga Bay—in this district you will have, not approximately, but exactly one-half of the population of Ontario, which was represented by 47 members. Now, let me give you some figures to prove that whether the redistribution of 1882 was fair or unfair, the Liberal voters in that part of the province have more representatives in this House than they are entitled to by number. These figures will show that the Bill of 1882 was not effective, and did not succeed in doing its work. In south-western Ontario in the last election 190,607 votes were cast; and without tiring the House with these elaborate calculations, I may state the general result, that taking into account the bye-elections, that district is represented in this House by 26 Liberals and 20 Conservatives; but if the members of the respec-

tive parties had borne the same ratio as the votes, there would have been 24 Liberals and 22 Conservatives. Therefore I say that the Redistribution Act of 1882, in its operation in that part of Ontario where the readjustment was supposed to have been made most unfairly to its opponents, has not been effective in giving to the Conservative party a voting power in this House in excess of, or even equal to, its voting power in the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the hon. gentleman any figures as to the representation which the Liberal party ought to have in the House in proportion to the votes cast in the section east of Toronto?

Mr. WELDON. The hon. member can very easily ascertain that for himself by subtraction from the figures I have given.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the hon. gentleman no idea?

Mr. WELDON. I have, because I made the calculation, but I have not the figures before me, but I know that the number of Conservative members in the northern and eastern section of the province is in excess of the voting power of Conservative electors. I know that. But this is my argument: If the Act of 1882 was unfair, as I think it was, it brought at all events punishment on those who perpetrated it for their unfairness. And that is the reason why, as practical men, it would be better for us to put our feet upon the basis we have, although I feel a wrong was done in establishing that basis, rather than attempt to right that wrong, because, if the figures I gave are true, in the districts where most complaint was made the party which that act was intended to benefit suffered. Time has righted the wrong, and there is no need for us to undertake to do now what time has done already. Is it not therefore a common-sense proposal to ask Parliament now to take things as we find them and to put our feet upon the platform we find built, and see if we cannot lay down some sound rule of practice that will prevent the abuse of power in the future? The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition is certainly not surpassed by any member of this House in the courtesy and guarded language he uses in debate; and when I heard that hon. gentleman, who always seemed the very flower of courtesy to those opposed to him, say that this Act was an infamous attack by the majority on the minority, an attempt to stab the minority, I confess that I felt stunned and wounded; and if he could convince me that his language was merited, I would give my vote against this measure. If it be true that this Bill is an attempt to stab the minority in the back, I am one of many who will take care that no such infamous attempt by the majority to beat out the brains of their foes by Act of Parliament will be successful here. But are we not, said the hon. member for South Brant, to undo the wrong we have done? Suppose we repeal the Act of 1882 and go back to the *status quo* of 1872, which is practically the *status quo* of Confederation—if we could now, as reasonable men, discard altogether the changes made in 1882, that would be going back to a sound basis. But can we do it? Would it be wise to undertake to do it? Is it not a more proper suggestion that we should put our feet upon the basis of Ontario, divided into districts as she stands, with her present boundaries, and try and take care that some sound rule is laid down to guide us in dealing with this Bill.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why not leave all Ontario as she is? You are making changes in Russell.

Mr. WELDON. If the hon. gentleman will hear me, and I will be pretty brief, he will catch my point before I have done. Well, what is the most reasonable method? The leader of the Opposition proposed the other night a conference of leading members on either side of the House. I must confess that is a proposal repugnant to my opinions of parliamentary government. Many hon. members on this side have suggested an impartial tribunal, and the suggestion has had a charm for me, if we can only discover that tribunal. It is certainly a dangerous power to place in the hands of any party every ten years to pass an Act of Parliament which has so great potency of mischief. But if we suggest the judges, we are met by the difficulty the hon. members for Guysborough and Yarmouth set up the other night, when I was arguing for a commission of three judges, that we would be throwing upon the judges, who have already quite enough political duties to do, other political duties, and this might excite suspicion and bring the judiciary into disrepute. The duty is one which we must exercise ourselves in the best way we know how. If we cannot succeed in getting a good, sound and fair settlement by the agency of some commission, some independent authority, I agree with the hon. member for Simcoe that we must have some sound, safe basis on which to act, and my notion would be not to disturb the boundaries of some 55 constituencies, as that would not seem to me to be practical, common-sense politics, but to keep the basis we have. I would like, if it had been possible, to spare the County of Monck; I would have liked to respect its boundaries. I would be sorry to see disappear from his House my hon. friends from Monck and Wentworth. I would like very much, if it were possible, that these old districts should be maintained, and that in making our changes we should respect county lines and leave old districts untouched. Where we have two small districts, I would let them stand as one county, not paying too much regard to arithmetical equality. I remember the words of Mr. Burke when he spoke of this "low minded inquisition of numbers." I do not prize the arithmetical equality of constituencies as being of the first importance. It is not a model system where the constituencies are cut up like the squares on checker boards. It seems to me a matter of no great concern that you should have one county of 30,000 and another of 15,000, but what is important is that all the lumber, mining, manufacturing, and commercial interests and the greatest of all, the farming interest, should be fully and properly represented. It does not seem to me a matter of importance that the counties should all number something between 20,000 to 30,000 population, but it seems to me very advisable, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) argued so convincingly, that we should have our constituencies fixed and stable, that we should cultivate in this country that proper pride in their county traditions which the people in the old country take in their own historic boundaries. We know with what pride the people of Bucks look upon their county

as being that which John Hampton represented, and we know how proud the people of the constituency which the great Edmund Burke represented are of that fact, and with what wholesome pride the people of the various counties in the mother country point to the noble traditions of their counties. I can understand the feelings of people who say: My father and grandfather have voted here, and I would like my children to follow in our steps, and vote in the same old constituency, keeping the old name. You may call that sentiment if you will, but it is a wholesome, strong feeling, which we ought to do a great deal to preserve. Furthermore by adhering to these constituencies as we find them to-day, by retaining the present boundary lines, we put it out of the power of any administration to do two-thirds of the mischief which an unfair and dishonest administration is capable of doing. That is a strong argument in favour of this rule. It is a rule which compels a party to a reasonable and measurable degree of fairness in the exercise of its discretion. I have said nothing about our provinces in the east, for we have nothing to complain of.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do not include Prince Edward Island.

Mr. WELDON. I will except that, because I know nothing about the districts there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is the worst gerrymandered place in the whole Dominion.

Mr. WELDON. From information I have had, it is precisely the opposite.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You have broken every county line there.

Mr. WELDON. I can only give the information I got, not only from members from the Island here, but from friends of mine on the Island for whose notions of fair-play I have the greatest respect. I, however, do not pretend to speak on that question. In our own province, we have nothing to complain of. In the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia there are great disparities of population, but the Government have left inviolate every county line. When districts were too small, they lumped up the counties and it seems to me fair to ask why that excellent rule pursued in 1867, 1872, 1882, and 1892 in the east should not be a good rule in the west. The hon. member for Brant asked me as to the details. I have very little to say about the details of the measure. When the Bill comes to committee, I will have the opportunity of hearing the arguments and expressing my opinion. There are details of the Bill which it strikes me are not founded on any principle, and unless I am convinced to the contrary I must exercise the liberty of opinion and in committee use my right to vote against those details. On the other hand, if facts, are brought before me which I do not know now, my mind may be changed.

Mr. BORDEN. I would ask the hon. gentleman if those details do not involve principles.

Mr. WELDON. It seems to me that this is not a convenient stage at which to enter into details. It is better to deal with the general principle. I forgot one point of my argument which I desire to emphasize before sitting down. The fact that we do not feel free to cast upon some outside party, upon some commission, the duty of deciding as to these boundaries, seems to me a reason for the exercise of greater liberty in this House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I resent the warmth with which the Minister of Railways rebuked the member for North Simcoe. If we are competently to exercise the undoubted right which members must exercise in a free Parliament, seeing that the temptations to an abuse of power are exceptionally great in such a Bill as this now before us, the House must claim an exceptional degree of liberty of opinion, and liberty of action in this regard. I do not think it necessary to pledge myself as to what course I will take in committee, but I would like to see this excellent idea of the preservation of county boundaries more largely carried out than it is in this Bill.

Mr. FLINT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. McCARTHY. This is the first opportunity I have had of making a personal explanation, and I avail myself of it with a view of putting before the House an answer which I think will be satisfactory to every fair-minded man as to the course which I took which has been so unfairly dealt with by the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Railways, and by the subordinate gentleman who, I suppose by direction of some member of the Government, undertook to read me a lecture as to the course I ought to take in this House. Sir, I do belong to the Conservative party. I was elected to support the general policy of the Government, but it was on the distinct understanding that I should take such a course as I did in the previous Parliament as a free and independent member of this House; but, recognizing my position as a member of the party, I called this to the notice not of the Minister of Railways, because I have not fallen so low as to recognize him as my chief, but of the gentleman whom I do recognize as my leader, the course which I thought should be taken in reference to this Bill, I waited upon the First Minister and put before him fully and frankly the course which I thought ought to be taken. Under those circumstances, I think I have done all that in party allegiance I was called upon to do. I do not understand any principle which calls upon me to adopt and support every Act which the Government in whose general policy I agree chooses to introduce, but I did take the course of informing the leader of the Government of whose party I am a follower, of my opposition to this measure. I thought I should make this statement at the earliest possible moment, and I hope that in the minds of all fair-minded members of this House, it will excuse me from the accusations which have been made against me.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not intend to trouble the House on this subject, but I was challenged the other night by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) and by another member behind me when I declared that counties had been distorted and disfigured by the Prime Minister of Ontario. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), who has made a speech to-night so forcible and of so much promise, has entirely vindicated the position I took up then, but as, when I am challenged, coming from a fighting family, I am always ready to respond to the hostile invitation, I have prepared myself for the hon. member who was behind me and who defied me to show a single case where any county had been in the least disfigured by that pink of political perfection who pre-

sides over the political destinies of Ontario. I have taken a county, and incidentally I may say it will bear on an argument which has been used in this debate. The argument has been used in favour of confining the redistribution within county lines, and I must say, from whatever point of view you regard the argument, when you take it in connection with the context of the speeches of the hon. gentlemen, it is amusing in its grotesque absurdity. Take the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He was arguing in favour of adhering to county lines, and he gave you a whole list of constituencies which he said fell so far below the unit that I suppose he argued it was a perfect scandal, and my hon. and learned friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and other hon. gentlemen have argued in favour of equality of population and then in favour of redistribution within county lines. How can you do that? If you are going to have equality of population, and the counties will not furnish the population to come up to your unit, how in the name of all that is reasonable can you have county lines and at the same time equality of population? You have to break up the county lines if you are to have the equality of population. I entirely agree with the spirit and letter of some of the language which has fallen from my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon). In matters dealing with the life of a nation, which is not a thing to be weighed in your scales and measured by your rules and totted up in your sums, the thing we want in the matrix of a representative is what will give us the best representative here. The best representative here would be that which would combine the largest number of able and patriotic men, men fit to deal with the varied interests of the country, men who would represent all its interests, its mining interests, its farming interests, its manufacturing interests, its mechanical interests, its artistic interests, all the life of a nation; that would be a mirror of its life; and if, by having a constituency of 10,000 here and a constituency of 70,000 elsewhere, you could secure that, what would you think of the political pedant——

Mr. McGREGOR. Do not get mad.

Mr. DAVIN. I will not get mad. I do not come from the clan McGregor which I am told has contributed to madhouses a larger proportion of inmates than any family that ever existed. I say that for a man to weigh these things in little scales and deal with them arithmatically, is a piece of political pedantry. Now I recognize that there are hon. gentlemen in this House whose education is somewhat defective, and I delight not merely in appealing to their ears, but also to their eyes, to give them object lessons, so as gradually to nurse them in their political education, and I have here for the benefit of the great Reform party some maps which I intend to show them. But I will reserve that, because there is another challenge I want to reply to. For six years the statement has been made in this House, and was made again the other night by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), that the Regina *Leader*, of which I was at one time sole proprietor, and of which I happen to be principal proprietor now, has received, I suppose in the shape of work from the Dominion Government, some $6,000. Now I have no doubt those gentlemen believe that. This is what the hon. member for Kent says:

"I presume that the hon. gentleman will not go back on the organ which represents his views. I believe the Regina *Leader*, which receives some $6,000 to $7,000 a year in subsidies from the Dominion Government, is the hon. gentleman's organ, and it speaks pretty plainly on this question. I will read an extract from this paper, published the 23rd of May.

Mr. Speaker, the Regina *Leader* has never received any work from the Dominion Government other than, I think, on two occasions, when there were some election papers printed, and I have been informed by Mr. Young, the manager of the paper, that on each occasion the office lost by the transaction, and found great difficulty in getting its money. The work that those sums in the Public Accounts represent neither the Minister of Justice, nor Sir John Abbott, nor any member of the Government, could control the giving of; they have nothing whatever to do with giving the work. The work is given by the Local Government. It happens to appear in the Public Accounts of the Dominion, because you keep our accounts; we are technically under your control; but the Government of the Dominion has nothing to do with giving that work, has never attempted to control it, and could not control it. The Minister of Justice, who leads this House; Mr. Abbott, who is Prime Minister, could neither of them say to the Local Government there, that the printing of the Ordinances, or the printing of the forms, should be given to this, that or the other office. They have never tried, and if they tried they could not do it. Besides that, most of these things are given out by tender, and if you look at the Public Accounts you will find that other newspapers in the Territories have got work from the Local Government; and if the bulk of the work has been done by the Regina *Leader*, it is because the Regina *Leader's* office has a large plant, and has been the only office in the Territories that could have done the work. I have scrupled to take up the time of this House with the private affairs of that company. I intended to treat the remarks of the hon. member with scorn, as I have treated these remarks for 6 years. There are no words of Alexander Pope I admire more than those magnificent lines:

"For ten years slandered did I once reply?
Ten thousand suns went down on Dunstan's lie:"

and for that matter I would have allowed 20,000 suns to go down on the witticisms, the admirable humour, of those gentlemen, that consists in exuding remarks of this sort without any foundation in fact. But, some friends of mine who belong to the Conservative party, told me they were under the impression that these statements, namely, that the Regina *Leader* office had been patronized by the Dominion Government, were true, and when I told them that there was not a tittle of truth in the statements, they said I ought to make that clear. I may say here that I have now been six years a member of this House, and one word to any member of the Government of Canada about any private affairs of mine, directly or indirectly, never passed my lips or escaped from my pen. The hon. gentleman thinks, probably, that he is a dangerous customer in debate, a powerful man, but if I were to stoop to that sort of attack perhaps I could round on him.

An hon. MEMBER. I guess he is not afraid.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend guesses he is not afraid. Well, suppose I am afraid; there are some things you may squelch, but the best thing is to let them run away. Now, I was proceeding to make an illustration. I meant to illustrate that the best thing that can be done by any party in power, or out of power, for that matter, is to do right; and because "right is right to do right were wisdom in the scorn of consequence." I say that in the end I believe, for a party as well as for a man, that it will pay best. But whether it pays best or not, I re-echo those glorious words that Tennyson puts into a very sacred mouth, indeed, that to do right in scorn of consequence is the best thing. But I will illustrate by referring to Mr. Mowat; and I may say here that there is a dreadful lesson connected with the career of that same Sir Oliver, although hon. gentlemen do not seem to appreciate it. Has the fact that he gerrymandered, and tinkered, and bedevilled those constituences, had the least effect in the regard which the great Reform party in Ontario have for him? Not an iota. After perpetrating that iniquity, he dressed himself up the next Sunday in his black suit, put on his polished hat, and went to church, and appeared, as I say, the pink of Presbyterian and political respectability. Now, I wish to illustrate by the South Riding of Bruce. In Mr. Mowat's gerrymander of 1885, that riding consisted of the Townships of Brant, Carrick, Culross and Kinloss, the town of Walkerton and the villages of Lucknow and Teeswater. I think I may say literally as well as figuratively that I hope the patriotic sentiment of the Reform party will properly respond in admiration of Sir Oliver's handiwork. So careful am I of the lynx eyes around me that I have verified all the drawings or maps. I am not like the leader of the Opposition, who when cornered the other day by the Minister of Public Works, was obliged to say that the figures were furnished by somebody else. The Act says:

"The Centre Riding of Bruce shall consist of the Townships of Greenock, Kincardine, Elderslie and Huron, the town of Kincardine and the village of Paisley and Chesley."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will the hon. gentleman give me the map of the adjoining constituency so that I may see how they fit.

Mr. DAVIN. I intend to auction off these maps, and no doubt they will fetch a high price, and I intend to get some Reform money. Although there is some laughter, I am engaged in a much more serious work than indulging the childish desire to put a puzzle together, as is the wish of my hon. friend. I grant the hon. gentleman may be thinking of his childhood when he put [illegible] together, but as it is 12.25 a.m. and as [illegible] says that nothing prevents our being wise and laughing at the same time, we can laugh and do a little statesmanship of the higher order. The Act says:

"The West Riding shall consist of the Townships of Ashfield, Wawanosh (east and west) Corlborne and that part of Hullett which lies west of the road called the Guard road, and that part of the Township of Goderich north of the said Huron road and 'cut line,' and the towns of Goderich and Clinton, and the villages of Blyth and Wigham."

Now this is a map of West Simcoe. We now come to Wellington, where you have a county completely gerrymandered, and it bears out the proposition laid down by the Minister of Railways that you can take the county boundaries and carry out gerrymanders within them, that you can still have your figures of antic shape and also work a party advantage or disadvantage. Here is a map of West Wellington. Here is a map of South Wellington. Here is a map of East Wellington. The Act says:

"The County of Wellington shall be divided into three ridings to be called respectively the south riding, the east riding and the west riding. The south riding shall consist of the townships of Guelph, Puslinch, Pilkington and Eramosa and the city of Guelph. The east riding shall consist of the townships of Arthur, Nichol, Erin, West Garafraxa and West Luthur, the town of Mount Forrest and the villages of Erin, Fergus and Elora."

One of the reasons I may tell my hon. friend of the Opposition why that riding looks so dreadful is because Erin went into rebellion at being united with anything so utterly wanting in the aesthetic as this combination.

"The west riding shall consist of the townships Minto, Maryborough and Peel, the town of Palmerston, and the villages of Harriston, Arthur, Clifford and Drayton."

Mr. McMULLEN. I defy the hon. gentleman to divide the county so as to make the population more equal.

Mr. DAVIN. I could not very well hear what the hon. gentleman said, but it is quite clear to me that at this moment he is gerrymandered himself.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, and I am here.

Mr. DAVIN. Let me say a word in regard to the question that has been much discussed, and not too much discussed, and on which so much light has been shed by one lawyer after another, great light having been shed by the admirable speeches of the hon. member for Cumberland and the hon. member for Albert. The hon. member for Cumberland quoted the utterances of the Fathers of Confederation, and although I grant that those utterances do not control the interpretation of this statute, and in fact they could not be quoted in dealing with the statute in a court of justice, nevertheless they have moral weight. Here is a report of what Sir John Macdonald said a year after the utterances that have just been quoted by my hon. friend. He quoted the speech made by Sir John Macdonald in 1865. In 1866 in this House the question was brought up by Hon. Mr. Brown. Speaking with respect to the distribution of seats Mr. Brown asked:

"Was it the intention of the Government to place its control in the hands of the local or the general government?

"Hon. J. A. Macdonald stated that the general parliament would determine the distribution of any future increase of representation in the general legislature."

I am not going of course to labour that now, which I believe has been pretty well dealt with, and I think that that completes the part of the discussion under this head. As bearing a little also on the subject that we are discussing here to night, let me quote that great man further. He says:

"By the system in Canada the people had every opportunity of electing men whom they knew, men who had been trained in the municipal system and who were capable and qualified for the high duties of a representative. It seemed to him that in an old country the periodical redistribution of seats would be undesirable, but in a new country like this, or the United States, it was necessary on account of the rapid increase of the population."

He says this in conclusion, and I would commend it to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and to all his followers around:

"He hoped that all the old party lines would be swept away by the confederation of British North America."

I think myself that we might almost sweep away the party lines, and that all these hon. gentlemen in the opposition after the discussions here, and after what has taken place for so many years, and after seeing the success of the policy of the Government, I think that they might come quietly into the fold and afterwards we could meet and have no party discussions here at all. I have read the speech of the leader of the Opposition on this question several times, and he will be surprised to know that I would not ask better material for making a speech in favour of this Redistribution Bill than is supplied by the figures which he gave to the House. I do not know that anybody has stated that there was a principle in this Bill, and I may tell you that when I read it at first, I did not think that there was any principle in it, but I have been studying the Bill, and it seems to me the principle of it is this: not to disturb constituencies in any part of the Dominion of Canada, except where it was absolutely necessary in order to make the redistribution. In this direction they had to deal with Toronto, Montreal and Hochelaga, and what had to be done in order to meet the demand for increased representation, the Government have done to the best of their ability, and with the least disturbance they could to existing arrangements. That would seem to me to be the principle of the Bill, and if that is the principle of it, then it is a good principle and it is a principle not inconsistent even with the motion of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I am not going to say one word against the member for Simcoe for taking an independent course on this matter. I do not think it is a wrong thing for the member of any party, Reform or Conservative, to take an independent course. Why Sir, when we become politicians we do not take our consciences and throw them to the dogs. We ought to obey our consciences, and when my hon. and learned friend, as I have no doubt he does, conscientiously takes a certain view he has no other course open to him than to announce it. Even supposing the view he takes had only come recently to him, he is in duty bound to express his honest conviction. Mr. Speaker, it would be a disastrous day for this House, and a disastrous day for Canadian political manhood, if the time should ever arrive that the members of this House universally would shrink from expressing their honest thoughts because of the party muzzle. I echo here the language put into the mouth of his hero by the greatest writer of all time, the greatest poet that Greece produced.

"Who thinks the thing he dares not tell
My soul abhors him as the gates of Hell."

I say that the hon. and learned member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) taking the view he did, had no other course open to him; but, Mr. Speaker, I must say, because my hon. friend is an able man; I must say about the speech that he made in support of that course, that I do not think either the wisdom of the course or the cogency of the speech were consonant with his capacity, with his past achievements, and with his reputation in this country. I could not help smiling when I saw the political enemies of twenty years hob-nobbing across the House; when I saw the stern member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) smiling on the rigid conservatism of the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) I could not help thinking of what Lord Byron says in his "Vision of Judgment" when he is describing the meeting between the Archangel Michael and the Devil.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Which is the devil?

Mr. DAVIN. I will leave that to you to find out; I will leave him in his own place. I want to make converts here to-night. I am always anxious to make converts; I do not care where the devil is, but I intend to remain a staunch Conservative and I want to run against that gentleman as little as I can. Now to resume—Byron pictures the two meeting on somewhat neutral ground, and they met with a certain courtesy, and the great poet says, and this would admirably describe the somewhat strained cordiality between the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright):

"They did not kiss;
Yet still between his darkness and his brightness
There passed a mutual glance of great politeness."

I could not help thinking of that, Mr. Speaker, when I saw the stern orbs of the member for South Oxford light up with a flame of courtesy as he glanced across the floor at the hon. member for North Simcoe. But *absit omen*. I thought it a bad omen for my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that he should merit the disastrous eulogy of the member for South Oxford. Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said when I spoke in the early part of this debate. I say that this measure is not a gerrymander in the sense that the measure of 1882 was. I say that above all it is not an approach to that odious thing, which as we have seen has been immortalized by Sir Oliver Mowat. I will not at this late hour weary the House with the figures quoted by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, but if you take the constituencies, you will find that the hon. gentleman mentions one constituency after another that was very much below the unit, and he tells you that the Government measure adds to the population in those constituencies. And now what is his comment? Oh, he says the Bill does not bring it up to the full amount of the unit: but if it does not, it approaches it, and leaves you, from the point of view of population, a better constituency than was there before.

Mr. LAURIER. Does that apply to Bagot?

Mr. DAVIN. Bagot may be an exception; but as my hon. friend has mentioned that case I think I shall have to deal with one or two others. I know that anybody on the Treasury benches supporting this Bill, might take that speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, all except that part where he fell into the Slough of Despond in regard to English precedents, and use it in support of the measure. The hon. gentleman commits a well-known rhetorical fallacy when he states what is done by the Bill and although what is done, so far as the figures show, really appears to be a good thing proceeds to say: "this is dreadful," but he does not show what is dreadful about it. The hon. member, for instance, takes Montcalm. He says:

"The population of Montcalm, according to the census, is 12,131, and by the addition of the parish of St. Paul, it is brought to the figure of 13,616, that is to say, 9,000 short of the unit of 22,800.

But still it is improved, and probably it could not be further improved without a more general arrangement and derangement of the constituencies. Then, he says :

"The population of L'Assomption is 13,674. The parish of Berthier is taken from the County of Berthier and added to L'Assomption, bringing its population up to 14,661, very far yet from the unit."

But still, is not the constituency improved? In some cases you may point out that a few Conservatives are added here or a few Liberals there. That was inevitable. I defy any man, however ingenious to frame a redistribution at all, which will not add some votes to either of the political parties; and as the hon. Minister of Public Works pointed out, the hon. leader of the Opposition complained in some cases that Liberals were added, and in others that Conservatives were added. But I repeat, the measure is one which, as the hon. Minister of Justice stated has not the character of a gerrymander; and when we go into committee, I echo what the hon. member for Albert has said, that if a man on this side points out a wrong done, an error committed, an undesirable move made, I will support him in redressing the wrong, in correcting the error, in getting rid of the undesirable move, and in making this moderate redistribution as useful, as effective, as fair and as desirable as we all would wish it to be.

Motion (Mr. Flint) agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 8th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WINDING-UP ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MONCRIEFF moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 94) to amend the Winding-up Act. He said: In working out the winding-up of incorporated companies, and notably in the instance of banks, difficulties have been found in regard to the disposition of papers which have been delivered to the liquidator after he has performed his duty. A case recently occurred in regard to the Central Bank. The first clause follows very closely on the lines of section 155 of the English Companies Act of 1882, which provides that these papers shall be subject to the order of the court, and this Bill says that after the affairs of the company have been wound up, the books and papers of the institution shall be deposited as the court may direct. The Bill also deals with another class of difficulties which have presented themselves in the same matter. At the end of the liquidation there are some odds and ends, or small matters, which require the liquidation proceedings to be carried on and increase the expenses, and it is proposed that, when the estate has been practically wound up by the liquidator, the court may discharge the liquidator and close up these small matters by ts own officers.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. DAVIN.

CARETAKER OF WOODSTOCK, N. B., DOMINION BUILDING.

Mr. COLTER asked, Whether any successor has been appointed to the position of caretaker of the Dominion building at Woodstock, N. B., lately held by Richard Maxstead, deceased? If so, who and when? If not, why not? What is the salary attached to that office?

Mr. OUIMET. William Kennedy has been acting as caretaker since the 27th February, 1891, at the salary of $400 a year.

C. P. R.—NORTH SHORE SECTION.

Mr. FRÉMONT asked, On what date did the Government execute a deed of agreement in pursuance of the Act passed during last session, intituled: "An Act respecting the North Shore section of the Canadian Pacific Railway"? Under the said agreement, what improvements and other works are to be executed during the present summer; or what proportion of the said works is to be carried out now? Is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company bound to report to the Government, from time to time, as to the execution of the works, and at what dates? What security has the Government taken under the said deed of agreement for the immediate execution of the works and improvements mentioned in the said deed?

Mr. OUIMET. The date of agreement is 22nd December, 1891. The work to be undertaken is the providing of sleeping cars, day coaches, baggage, mail and express cars, locomotives and freight cars, involving an outlay of $350,000. The improvements on the whole line from St. Martin's Junction to the city of Quebec, to bring the road up to the highest standard of the other Canadian Pacific Railway sections, including additional accommodation for passengers at nearly every station, increased space for handling freight, the lengthening of platforms and sidings, the furnishing of new sidings, the substitution of iron for wooden bridges, and the following specific works :—1st. In the city of Quebec—A grain elevator, a flour shed, such local improvements and facilities as are necessary, for handling the traffic of that city. 2nd. In Three Rivers—A grain elevator. Improvements over the loop line, improvements over Piles Branch involving an outlay of about $300,000, making a total of $650,000 to be expended, which, added to the amount already expended, $339,174.66, makes $989,174.66, of which at least $200,000 shall be expended during the year ending 1st April, 1893, an aggregate of at least $350,000 to end of year 1st April, 1894, an aggregate of at least $500,000 to end of year 1st April, 1895, and an aggregate of $650,000 to end of year 1st April, 1896. No, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are not bound to report to the Government from time to time as to the execution of the works, but no doubt they will in their own interests do so; but I shall send an engineer over the works about the end of each of the periods named to see that the agreement has been carried out. The Government hold the obligation of the company to carry out the works.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir John Thompson: That Bill (No. 76)

to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, be read a second time ; and the motion of Mr. McCarthy in amendment thereto.

Mr. FLINT. I do not propose to occupy the time of the House at any great length in the observations I shall make in regard to the Bill, and in regard to the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I shall endeavour to allude briefly to the position assumed by that hon. gentleman, and others on that side of the House who support his views, as to the proper course in dealing with this Bill. I think from the temper and tone of the discussion on both sides of the House, there theoretically exists among hon. gentlemen opposite, and there practically exists among hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, a strong opinion that the principle of gerrymander as usually understood, that is, of arranging the seats in any legislative body with a view to party success, or to dividing the opposing party by means of arranging the boundaries of electoral districts, is very strongly condemned. It requires no argument to justify the strongest condemnation of legislation based upon any such lines. It must be condemned by the first instincts of every honest or honourable man; it must be strongly condemned by all who have in view the general interests of the country from a large political stand-point. In the first place it demoralizes and debases Parliament, it demoralizes and debases the electors throughout the country, and the result of it misrepresents the wishes and interests of the people who are to be affected by legislation, and it leads naturally, from the very constitution of our common human nature, to reaction and reprisals on the part of those who are thus treated, when they come to be in a majority. The only argument I have heard in this House at all supporting the reasonableness of what has been claimed to be on this side of the House, at any rate, the gerrymandering tendencies of the Bill now before us, has been that the Legislature of Ontario, while under the control of a political leader who upon Dominion questions favours the general principles of the Opposition in this House, has done something equally as bad, if not worse, than what has been claimed by the Opposition for the present Bill, and its predecessor of 1882, in regard to Dominion elections. Now, it requires no argument whatever to show that admitting to the fullest extent the monstrous character claimed for the distribution of seats by the Government of Ontario, it is no excuse for the application of the same so-called abominable principle to redistributing the seats for the election of representatives to this House. As one residing outside the Province of Ontario, which was affected by that measure, but not intimately acquainted with the details of the discussion that took place upon the redistribution of seats by the Legislature of Ontario, I have listened with a great deal of attention and care to all that has been said by way of attack upon Sir Oliver Mowat's so-called gerrymander Bill, to see upon what ground the charge could fairly be made against him, that he had applied this outrageous, this indefensible, this abominable principle, to the redistribution of seats in the Legislature of Ontario ; but I have failed entirely to hear anything beyond general observations and general denunciation of that Bill. It is true that last evening we were highly amused, and to some degree instructed, those of us who came from other provinces, by the amusing cartoons presented to us by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Assuming the correctness of those pictures, assuming that they portray the shapes of the constituencies referred to, surely no argument could be derived from them, because if you displaced many of the counties in the Province of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, or Quebec, from the surrounding districts, from the water-stretches by which they may be surrounded, the lakes or rivers, and give a picture of them upon a full sheet of paper, many of them, as regards mere shape, would look almost as absurd and ridiculous as some of the pictures given by the member for West Assiniboia. Take even many of the counties of the Province of Ontario as arranged at the time of Confederation, and previous to the passage of any of these Bills distributing the seats ; take, at least, the main counties themselves, and in a map by themselves, many of them are very curiously shaped, some of them are long drawn out, with extraordinary protuberances in various portions of them, and they would look to the eye of a casual observer, without explanation, as most extraordinary shapes for constituencies to represent. But we require some proofs that the gerrymandering principle, the improper and unfair, the wicked principle I may call it, of arranging the outlines of constituencies for the purpose of hiving one party, and for the purpose of giving another undue advantages, was carried out in that arrangement. These proofs have not been brought before us, and if they were brought before us, I contend it would be entirely apart from any proper discussion in this House, for us to occupy time in refuting them. I think it would be entirely unfair to hon. members from other provinces to have a lengthy discussion in regard to the advisability, or the wisdom, or the fairness, of the arrangement existing in the Province of Ontario—at any rate, I understand that the Premier of Ontario, and his supporters did not go beyond county lines, that one of the principles, at any rate, laid down in the resolution of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was strictly complied with. I understand that notwithstanding the criticisms that have been made against that arrangement of seats, the constituencies substantially represent about the same number of population, and that where some of the changes were made which are most open to criticism on the part of persons not familiar with the localities, many of those changes were made at the request and solicitation of the electorate themselves, who, for certain local reasons, desired these changes to be made. However, whether this is true or otherwise, I contend that it bears, to a very trifling extent, upon the merits of the subject now before the House. Let us assume to the fullest extent you please, that the redistribution of seats in the Province of Ontario might be characterized by these strong adjectives that have been used against it by hon. gentlemen opposite, yet it will be no sort of an excuse, but rather an aggravation of the offence, that they should apply the same principle they have so denounced to an arrangement of the constituencies for the House of Commons of Canada. It amounts to this, that because one party in a local sphere has done that which was abstractly improper, it is a

complete justification for the majority of this House to go them a great deal better, and apply the same wrong principle to the representation of the people in the House of Commons. But a study of the Bill before the House has convinced, not only the gentlemen upon this side of the House, but some of the most far-sighted and most experienced and most upright and honourable of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, as to its substantial inequity, as to the entire lack of any guiding principle upon which the Bill was framed. We look through it in vain to discover where any rule has been applied to all the constituencies which are thus rearranged. I think the Government of the country, I think the majority who come before this House with so important a measure as this, should be able to lay, fairly and explicitly, before the House and before the country, the leading principles by which they were guided in making this rearrangement. This Bill certainly cannot be said to be based upon population; the Bill cannot certainly claim to have been framed with any regard to the voting powers of the various constituencies, nor with regard to the convenience of the electorate in the various constituencies, but one province seems to have been arranged upon one basis, another upon another, and several upon no particular basis whatever except that of gaining a mere temporary and forced majority for the party in power, by the application of their power as a majority to rearranging the constituencies. The manner in which this has been brought forward has led to a discussion upon an important principle, which it seems is now for the first time brought prominently to the attention of the House and the country, and that is the power of this Parliament in connection with its dealings with the arrangement of the seats. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), in a speech which was received with a great deal of interest, and in some quarters with a great deal of surprise, raised the question which it appears has not been raised during the lengthy discussion of the two previous redistributions. The fact that that question was not raised previously has been brought forward as a powerful and conclusive argument that there is nothing in the contention of that hon. gentleman. Now, if we are to assume this is at all a fair argument, then we must assume that no new argument of any kind in regard to principles which have previously been established is of any validity, simply because it was not previously discovered. This argument has been brought up in connection with almost every political, religious and scientific question from the beginning of history. I presume those who first advocated the reasonableness and the scientific truth of the fact that the globe on which we live revolves upon its axis in a certain definite space of time, and that it was spherical in its shape, were received by a large number of able men of the day with the same argument. They would say: Do you suppose such an important truth would so long have escaped the attention of philosophers and divines and scientists? Thus with one swoop, one indignant expression of their confidence in the past and utter distrust of the discovery of the present, they would do away with that grand argument which is now universally accepted. So when my hon. friend brought forward his argument based on the British North America Act, that this House did not have the power to directly deal with the subject in the manner now proposed, he was met in very much the same fashion. Hon. gentlemen opposite said: Do you suppose there is any truth in this argument, when such distinguished statesmen as the one who recently led the Government, and the previous leader of the Opposition, who is not now a member of the House, had overlooked this argument, which has now been brought forward by men who do not claim perhaps to be of equal experience or equal intellectual capacity. The mere statement of such an argument is sufficient to refute it. The mere argument as to whether it was previously discovered or presented can certainly have no merit whatever as an argument against the reasonableness or truthfulness or substantial character of the argument itself. We have had a very ingenious argument from the Minister of Justice, whose position and experience are such as to give more weight to his words than words of exactly the same bearing from almost every other hon. gentleman opposite would carry, in which he held, and he claimed the support of his followers upon the holding, that the clause relating to this subject, the "representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such manner and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides," is permissive and not imperative upon this Legislature. That is the furthest point to which the Minister of Justice went, in a somewhat brief, and I venture to say, perfunctory argument on this matter. He was followed upon the same side of the House by two hon. members from the Maritime Provinces, each of whom took a different view of this question. They held, and they followed the hon. Minister in that particular, that the question of readjustment is settled in clause 51 of the British North America Act, and that it applies simply to the provinces as a whole, and it did not apply to the distribution or arrangement of boundaries and electoral districts within each of the several provinces. There seemed, at the first blush, to be something in the argument as stated by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), but when it was extended in the ingenious speech of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), the argument was not strengthened. The hon. member for Albert, in a very laboured and ingenious way, endeavoured to impress on the House that there was a subtle distinction between the term "readjustment" and the term "redistribution," that while readjustment applied to the settlement of the number of seats to each province under the British North America Act, redistribution meant the arrangement of the electoral districts within each province. If the hon. gentleman had the whole world of philosophy and philology in which to roam in order to gather arguments to support this contention, he might possibly make something of it; but when I call the attention of the House to the fact that the word "redistribution" is not used throughout the British North America Act, and that the term is a modern one, the argument based on these ingenious definitions must entirely fall to the ground. Readjustment, therefore, means all that is included in the signification in the term redistribution, and when the word "readjustment" is used in the British North America Act, it must be held to include the term redistribution in its fullest and completest sense. The only clauses of the British North America Act which deal with this important subject, or which have been brought forward during this discussion

as dealing with this important subject, are clauses 91, 40 and 51. Clause 91 was quoted by the Minister of Justice as to some extent limiting the signification of clauses 40 and 51. That clause reads, so far as its application by the Minister of Justice goes, as follows:—

"It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is declared that, notwithstanding anything in this Act, the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated."

Then follows a schedule of 29 classes of subjects on which this Parliament may legislate or make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada, not one of which classes of subjects is the subject of readjustment or redistribution or the arrangement of the electoral districts of the representatives in the House of Commons. Had the list of 29 subjects alluded to or included the readjustment or adjustment or redistribution or distribution of seats, then no doubt the argument of the Minister of Justice would have been perfectly conclusive. But unfortunately for his argument, as was pointed out in the clearest and most cogent manner by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), an hon. gentleman whose reputation as a legal luminary is exceedingly high, and deservedly so, throughout the whole of the Dominion, the powers of Parliament as described in section 59, not only did not in so many words include the power of distributing the seats, but by implication they are excluded in consequence of the fact that the subject of the distribution or readjustment of the seats is fully and amply and completely dealt with by other clauses of the British North America Act. Clause 40 gives it in this way:

"Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides the province" (we will say of Ontario) "shall be divided into certain electoral districts,"

a complete list of which is given in the schedule of the Act. Clause 51 then provides in what way these electoral districts shall be readjusted after the taking of the census. Now, there was a long discussion during the passage of the resolution, accepting the results of the Quebec conference, in the old Parliament of Canada, and I will call the attention of the House to the manner in which this subject was discussed, and the terms that were used in that discussion by the founders of the constitution, by the fathers of Confederation. I would call attention to the manner by which they dealt with this very subject and the views they held in relation to it, and which to a large degree must be the light by which we ought to be guided during our study of the significance of clause 51 and clause 40. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), although he had made a very careful study of clause 51, was obliged to admit, in answer to a question of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that there were phrases in clause 51 that he could not reconcile to his argument, and which he did not profess to clearly understand. Consequently, we must have the light of the language of the founders of Confederation upon the significance of these terms, and what is more, as to the substantial meanings of the terms and their views as to how the representation of the people should be arranged from time to time in the House of Commons. The original Act, from which the British North America Act was afterwards prepared, states as follows in clause 23:—

"The Legislature of each province shall divide such province into the proper number of constituencies and define the boundaries of each of them."

It will be noticed that the word "distribution" or the word "readjustment" is not used in this clause. The number of representatives to which the province was entitled was clearly defined in the same manner substantially as was subsequently defined by the British North America Act; but the method of distributing the seats within each province was not defined in this clause. Now, in the discussion upon this clause in the Parliament of Canada the late Sir John Macdonald referred to it in these terms:

"A good deal of misapprehension has arisen from the accidental omission of some words in the 25th resolution."

I think he must have meant the 23rd resolution, because the 23rd was evidently the one intended.

"It was thought that by it the Local Legislatures were to have the power of arranging hereafter, and from time to time of readjusting, the different constituencies, and settling the size and boundaries of the various electoral districts."

The House will kindly observe that the Attorney General of that day used the word "readjusting" to mean dividing the provinces and defining the boundaries of each constituency. It is as plain as could be that that experienced man, speaking with great definiteness upon a subject which he thoroughly understood, intended to mean by the word "readjustment" the division of the provinces into and defining the boundaries of the electoral constituencies in the province, and when afterwards the very word "readjustment" turns up in the British North America Act, no doubt under the instruction and direct advice of that gentleman who was chairman of the conference in London, it was done with the intention of explaining away the loose expression of clause 23. The meaning of the resolution he says is simply this:

"That for the first general Parliament, the arrangement of constituencies shall be made by the existing Local Legislatures; that in Canada, for instance, the present Canadian Parliament shall arrange what are to be the constituencies of Upper Canada, and to make such changes as may be necessary in arranging for the seventeen additional members given to it by the constitution; and that it may also, if it sees fit, alter the boundaries of the existing constituencies of Lower Canada."

In order to emphasize still more strongly this view, let me call attention to a few words of the Hon. George Brown, who was an earnest advocate of the Quebec scheme, and in his extraordinarily able and thorough argument upon this subject in the same debate he says:

"To this proposed constitution of the Lower Chamber, I have heard only two objections. It has been alleged that until after the census of 1871, the number of members is to remain as at present; but this is a mistake. Upper Canada is to receive from the start 82 representatives, and Lower Canada 65; and whatever increase the census of 1871 may establish will then be adjusted.

"It has also been objected that though the resolutions provided that the existing Parliament of Canada shall establish the electoral divisions for the first organization of the Federal Parliament, they do not determine in whose hands the duty of distributing any additional members is to be vested. No doubt on this head need exist: the Federal Parliament will of course have full power to regulate all arrangements for the election of its own members."

Although he was dealing directly with this subject, and although the position that he took is sustained by the change of verbiage as it afterwards appeared in the British North America Act, you will notice that that statesman used the words "will have full power to regulate all the arrangements." In other words, there is nothing in the speech of either Sir John Macdonald or the speech of the Hon. George Brown to indicate that Parliament should not hand over the authority, or, was not to hold within its jurisdiction the power to hand over the authority to rearrange that matter by the Parliament of Canada. Later there was a speech on the same subject by the Hon. Mr. Dunkin, who pointed out the difficulty which was afterwards sought to be remedied, and was to a certain degree remedied by the British North America Act. He said:

"A delightful ambiguity is found, too, upon the point as to who will make the future apportionments of the constituencies. The leader of the Government, in explaining the scheme, the other night, admitted that the decennial revisions of our representations of districts are really not to be left to the Local Legislatures, but are to be dealt with altogether by the Federal Legislature."

Now, this seems to be all that I can find as to the discussion on this subject by the Parliament of Canada in dealing with the results of the Quebec conference which preceded the British North America Act, and it amounted to this: That, as complained by Sir John Macdonald, owing to the dropping of a word or two which has not yet been supplied, we are left in doubt as to what the words are which are accidentally omitted in clause 23. The original intention of the founders of the Quebec scheme was that the Local Legislatures should divide the provinces into constituencies and define the boundaries; and the signification of their phrase was expressed both by Sir John Macdonald and the Hon. Mr. Brown by the use of the word adjust for the word readjust. When the delegates had the scheme rearranged by the statute draftsmen in England, a rearrangement which was much needed, and the wisdom of which was proved by the subsequent history of the British North America Act in the courts, that clause turned up in this shape: That until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, the constituencies shall be divided according to the provisions of the British North America Act, and after the census the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such manner and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject to certain rules. Now, had it been intended clearly to prevent the Parliament of Canada handing over to the Local Legislatures the power and authority to define the electoral districts and to distribute the boundaries, I contend that it would have been so provided in clear and explicit language, and the road to that course would not have been left open as it has been by the phraseology of the Act. Now, it will be remembered that at the formation of the union there were a great many conflicting interests. There was, particularly in the Province of Quebec, a strong determination that the rights of the minority should be strictly protected and guarded, in order to prevent the majority imposing on the minority any rules or laws which might be contrary to their feelings or interests. Therefore, in regard to the representation in Parliament, it was deemed necessary that the road should be left open to the Local Legislature or some other authority to redistribute the constituencies in each province, and the meaning of the word redistribution is included in the signification of the word readjustment. We know also that the smaller provinces were coming into the union with a certain amount of fear and trembling, if not with decided reluctance; and some of the Maritime Provinces would not have come into the union at all but for the strong assurance that their rights and interests, and even their prejudices, would be respected. We have those feelings shown in the conference in London; and we have the unbroken policy of English statesmen and the English Parliament that such a matter as the arrangement of seats and the distribution of the powers of Parliament by means of electoral divisions should be kept as much as possible out of the political arena. Take the history of reform in England, and what do you find? In 1832, after the passage of the Reform Bill of 1832, the distribution of constituencies and the defining of boundaries, was arranged by a boundary commission, formed under a separate Act passed through Parliament after a most severe discussion, and on principles which are outlined in the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe. In addition to the principles laid down by Parliament, the most careful technical instructions were given to the commissioners, so that the rules laid down by Parliament should be carried out entirely free from political bias, in order to avoid the very impropriety of which we now complain, and of which hon. gentlemen opposite profess to agree with us in complaining, in order that the powers placed in the hands of a political party should not be used in any respect to promote party advantage. In 1867 another Reform Bill was passed through Parliament, and, if I am not mistaken, under the auspices of a Conservative regime; and there we find that the rules and principles for the arrangement of the boundaries of the various constituencies were handed over, not to the Government, but to an impartial technical commission appointed by the boundaries Act of 1867, the arrangement to be afterwards confirmed, of course, by Parliament, after full and free discussion; and that arrangement became the basis of the representation which was again altered in 1884. Therefore, we have to support our view of the clause which has been so much discussed, not only the fact that the statesmen who formed the Confederation held the signification of the term readjustment to include not merely the number of the representatives from each province as a whole, but the arrangement of the seats within each province; but we have the grave anxiety on the part of the Province of Quebec and the smaller provinces that their rights should be protected by any legislation establishing that constitution: and then we have the traditions and principles of the British Parliament that matters of this kind should not be settled by party votes in the legislature, but by some impartial tribunal. Now, I am aware that it has been contended with a great deal of ingenuity that the authority mentioned in the British North America Act is only to be invoked to determine the number of representatives to which each province is entitled, a position which I think can no longer be maintained. But assuming for the sake of argument that there is something in that position, assuming that the hon. member for Cumberland has discovered the key to the apparent mystery which we are endeavouring to

unlock, I ask, have the Government who are bringing in this Bill acted on that principle, or do they propose to act on that principle in any way whatever? If so, by what authority has Parliament provided that the Province of Nova Scotia should have 20 members instead of 21? Has Parliament provided that the Province of New Brunswick should have 16 members instead of 18? Has Parliament provided that the other provinces in the west should have a greater number of members? Has Parliament provided an alteration in the representation of the Province of Prince Edward Island? The change in the numbers of representatives from these various provinces has been settled, not by any authority provided by this Parliament, but by the British North America Act itself, especially by the section which follows that providing that Quebec shall have 65 members. It was arranged that a certain unit was to be established, and according as that unit is divisible among the population of the province, the number of representatives to which they are entitled is arranged. Therefore, taking hon. gentlemen on their own ground, I contend that the Government has violated this provision of the Act in endeavouring to settle the number of representatives from these provinces, and that this Parliament, if it goes on and arranges by statute, without previously providing some authority to settle this matter, is also violating this clause. I presume that the time is not far distant when this very grave and important matter, which must, if decided adversely to the view held by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, affect not only the seat of every hon. gentleman who will sit here after the next general election, but will provisionally affect every item of legislation which may follow, will receive judicial determination at the hands of the highest court in this country, and perhaps by the highest court in the mother country. In anticipation of that, it perhaps will be out of place for the legal gentlemen of this House to further take up time in expressing their various views. But there can be no doubt after the prominence given this point in the discussion by the able speech of the hon. member for Simcoe, that nothing will satisfy the people of the Dominion generally, as regards their safety from any legislation which may follow the next general election, except a judicial determination of this important point. I consider, therefore, that responsibility is thrown upon the Government and the majority here not to remain satisfied with the perfunctory settlement of the question which they propose by this Bill, but to take steps in the near future to have it settled beyond all question by the court which the people of this country look up to with veneration and regard. The remark was made in this discussion by the Minister of Railways that he had not heard any objection to the details of the Bill from other provinces than Ontario and Quebec; and in speaking briefly upon the subject of redistribution as arranged in the Province of Nova Scotia, I do not desire to say that the idea of a gerrymander was present in that arrangement. In fact, as far as my province is concerned, I think it is conspicuously absent, because there is only one change made, and that does not lead in this improper direction which is properly condemned upon both sides of the House. The only change made, then, is the uniting of the Counties of Queen's and Shelburne into one electoral district, and I desire, not on the principle of opposing a gerrymander, but on the principle of objecting to the lack of principle, to the utter abnegation of all rule or principle, to protest, on behalf of the people of the counties mentioned, against this arrangement. Probably we will have an opportunity later, when in committee, to discuss more fully its bearings, but, at the same time, I think that this measure, in its details, far from being satisfactory to the people of Nova Scotia, and of the Maritime Provinces generally, has no backing to support it. The County of Queen's is one of the old counties in the Province of Nova Scotia. It covers a large area, it has great resources, and has, perhaps, as great a future before it as any of the counties in that province. It has certainly a small population, so has the County of Shelburne, and if the population were entirely insignificant so that it would be absurd to give it a separate representative, perhaps something might be said in favour of the amalgamation of the two counties into one. But Queen's has a population of 10,000, and is to be united with Shelburne which has a population of 14,000, so that by the union we have one district with a population considerably above the unit. At the same time, there is left in Nova Scotia the County of Victoria, with the small population of 12,000, which yet has one representative. Richmond, with a population of 14,000, retains one representative. Then, going to the Province of New Brunswick, the County of Restigouche, with a population of 8,300, has one representative, and the County of Albert, with 10,900, has one representative; yet the Counties of Queen's and Shelburne are united, and this is one instance of the anomalies in the Bill. In the Province of Quebec, we have a number of counties, such as Vaudreuil, Soulanges, Quebec West, Montmorency, Montcalm, L'Islet, and in Ontario we have Frontenac, Leeds and Grenville, Lennox, West Northumberland, West Peterborough and Peel, all of which counties are much below the unit of population, and yet they retain to the fullest extent their old representation. Now, I contend that since the County of Shelburne has had one representative ever since Confederation, for its 15,000 population, it is an injustice and an outrage to take away from it the representative it had, when the Government leave representatives to so many other constituencies with a smaller population. The rearrangement could have been made much more consonant with the principle laid down by the hon. member for Simcoe, that is by keeping as nearly as possible the solidarity of the old counties, and still continuing to them the representation to which they are entitled, and have always enjoyed. Take the Province of Nova Scotia under the present rearrangement. We find that while that province, as a whole, is very evenly distributed, about 22,000 to each member, yet if we separate Cape Breton from the rest of the province, we find that that Island, under the present arrangement, has a unit of representation of about 17,355, showing that under the present arrangement the Island of Cape Breton has a much larger representation proportionately in this House than the rest of Nova Scotia; and I think if the idea was to equalize or come any way near equalizing the population as a basis of representation, our hon. friends should have at any rate gone to the Island of Cape Breton and reduced the repre-

sentation there by one representative, leaving the rest of the province as it was. The proportion of representation to each county would then have been much more evenly divided than it is under this scheme. It may be said that this was difficult to do. The County of Cape Breton has two representatives, and has only a population of 34,000 for these two. Well, I do not desire that the representation of any particular county should be reduced, but I contend, when we consider the fact that throughout the Dominion, in many places, there are constituencies having a larger population than Cape Breton and which are yet allowed but one representative, I think the Government would have dealt more justly with the province at large and created less friction had they taken a representative from the Island and County of Cape Breton. At any rate, I do not think it was wise to have, for the first time in the history of the Confederation as the result of twenty-five years' progress and prosperity, these gentlemen claiming that the County of Queen's should be united with that of the County of Shelburne, and that the County of Shelburne should find itself denuded of at least one-half of the representation it has hitherto had. Passing to New Brunswick, perhaps there is not much to object to on the principle of a gerrymander, yet I think, when we get into committee, objections can be shown with regard to the arrangement in that province. I think a little more careful study might have enabled hon. gentlemen to have arranged the representation of the Province of New Brunswick more in accordance with sound principles, but, as that is a matter of detail, I will discuss it at a later stage when a more lengthened discussion on the points involved may more properly take place. I will not comment at any length upon the redistribution in the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario, after the very able observations which have been made by hon. gentlemen representing both of these provinces, but I have failed, in listening to the defence made for this measure on the other side of the House, to find upon what principle the rearrangement has been made in either of those provinces. Yesterday, for the first time, we had the introduction of a new principle by the Minister of Railways and an hon. member for one of the Simcoes. They brought in the question of the proportion of votes. Are we to have all our calculations rearranged on the basis of votes? The House should be slow to adopt such a principle. Are votes to rule, or is the population to rule? If population is to rule, I should like to know how any of the anomalies which exist have been remedied by this Bill. Prescott had a population of 24,000 under the old system, and under the new will have 30,000. The electoral district of Russell had a population of 31,600 under the old system, and will have 25,399 under the new. The utterly indefensible character of this rearrangement has been so clearly pointed out by almost every speaker on each side of the House, and at all events by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that I need not further refer to it. We find here the abnegation of every principle which should urge this legislature to rearrange a constituency. The reason given by the Minister of Justice was that the electors of the township of Clarence would feel more at home in the County of Prescott than in the County of Russell, but they have themselves, by one of the most complete protests which ever came before Parliament or its committees, protested against the change. They have stated by their petition, and by their voice, and by their representative on the floor of this House their objection to this change. Under these circumstances, what shred of reason or what tatter remains for taking Clarence from Russell and adding it to Prescott against the will of the people? If the Government had equalized the vote, something might have been said in favour of it, but they have left in the County of Russell a portion of a large city which it would be entirely in accord with the amendment which I intend to support to have placed in the city of Ottawa. Why dismember the city of Ottawa and take out a large number of electors and place them in the County of Russell, and take another number of electors out of the County of Russell and place them in the County of Prescott? I regret to be obliged to say that no other reason can be given but that which is to be derived from a consideration of the election returns. We find that this township gave the hon. gentleman who represents the county such a majority as to ensure him his election. There is no doubt that those who instigated this had no other object than to affect an election, but I am glad to know that there is spirit in the people of this country, there is a feeling in favour of fair-play and a desire for honest fight, which will react upon the men who have endeavoured in an underhand way to deprive these people of their share of political power. I believe that among the men who support the Conservative party in the district of Russell, hon. gentlemen will find such an amount of indignation that this well-laid scheme will come to naught. There is also great complaint as to the rearrangement of the County of Ottawa. It will be pointed out in the committee that not only is the population not equally divided, but that county lines have been so drawn as to give one district a population over 50 per cent larger than the population left in the other, and that a great many local hindrances are placed in the way of the electors at each end of the two counties. The electoral district of Lincoln and Niagara has been rearranged, and the electoral district of Welland also. In some of these there may be possibly some local reasons with which a representative from another province would not be familiar. He would not know that the reasons for making the change were based on political considerations. I think the principle which is laid down not only in the resolution which has already been voted down, but in the amendment which is before the House, should meet the approval and support of every fair-minded man, and of every one who is desirous of seeing the representation of the people in this House established on such principles that no charge of unfairness, dishonesty or underhanded dealing can be made against the ruling party. Unless it is settled on this basis, it will never be settled, for the people of this country will never settle down to undergo injustice from any party. A day of vengeance will come, and, whether reprisals are indulged in or not, a large number of the most honourable and intelligent of our public citizens will become disgusted with public life and will withdraw themselves from public affairs, and the tone of Parliament will be reduced as its ability to protect the rights of the

people will be reduced, and we will be contributing to the downward course which many of us have seen to be approaching for some time, if we deal with this question in the wrong direction. We find a Franchise Act which is expensive, which is cumbersome, and which has been susceptible, in the hands of wicked men, of men who look solely to political influence for their reward, and who are anxious solely to advance the interest of the party with which they are identified, of giving them a power altogether disproportionate to the influence which they ought to exercise in the country. We find the resources of the country squandered in order to corrupt the people, and add to these evils a persistent series of gerrymander Acts after the recurrence of each census, and the time is very near when the honest people, the people of this country upon whose shoulders the burden of legislation, or, at any rate, the burden of political action, ought to rest, will withdraw themselves entirely from the consideration of public affairs, and when the welfare and the resources and the legislative interests of this country will be left in the hands of the corrupt classes, and then ruin cannot be far away. I think if the Government had consented to draw up a series of carefully considered rules, in consultation with hon. members of experience who hold a different political view from what they do, had they placed the carrying out of the details of a redistribution in the hands of a high and impartial authority, not moved by any political bias, we would then have such a redistribution as would have given confidence to men of both political parties throughout the country, and would have added to the regard and affection with which the people view their political institutions, and would have made a reality of those British institutions which we profess to venerate; and that the flag of England, which we are all proud of, and which is invoked too often to justify intolerance and injustice, would then have floated over a really freely governed people. I think that the principles which underlie this amendment are so sound, so just, and so equitable, that the rejection of them will be a disaster to this Parliament, and a disaster to the people of this country.

Mr. HUGHES. In addressing a few remarks to the House on this redistribution measure, I shall endeavour to confine myself to the question as closely as possible. We are treated on every occasion when hon. gentlemen opposite address the House, to the same old story of purity in elections. They are the only party, they are the only persons, in whom purity is to be found, and therefore they are for ever impugning the honour of their opponents. Now, Sir, let us examine this Redistribution Bill. In the first place, what is the object of a Redistribution Bill? It is to equalize the population on the basis laid down under our constitution. Let me make this remark on the points which were brought out by the legal lights of the Opposition: I do not wish to say anything adverse to the legal learning of this House, but I do say that if the legal ability shown in the elucidation of constitutional law as exhibited by members of the Opposition is to be taken as a type of the legal knowledge of this House as a whole, then I think the House should be pitied rather than congratulated. Statements have fallen from the speakers upon the constitutional points under discussion, that are certainly very wide of the mark, and do not call for any comment on my part. The Redistribution Bill in the present instance, so far as Ontario is concerned, has touched very light on the constituencies. In one or two places additional representation has been given where the population was altogether too large, and the same number of members of necessity had to be taken from other localities. That, I think, has been done with as little change in the redistribution as possible. In the amendment proposed by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) we find he laid down two rules, which he says should guide us in making a redistribution; one is that county boundaries should be observed, and the other is that equality of population should be taken into consideration. Now, he has failed, so far as I could learn, to show wherein the present Redistribution Bill does not meet both these requirements. It is true, the population is not accurately equalized; it is not possible to equalize it; but that a fair attempt has been made to equalize it without disturbing the boundaries of too many of the ridings, no one will deny. The county boundaries have, to a fair extent, been observed. We find that the present bounds of the city of Toronto are recognized; we find that the county boundaries of Welland, Haldimand, Lincoln and other counties in the Niagara Peninsula, are recognized as far as it was at all possible in the peculiar grouping of the population of these places. Where we find that a change has been made, as in the Counties of Prescott and Russell, it is confined entirely within the two counties, because the two counties are one municipality; therefore there is no violation of his principle in those places. Were county boundaries to be observed in the Province of Ontario, the change would be so sweeping that those gentlemen, in place of detaining the House some few weeks in obstructing this measure, would detain it for a twelvemonth with pessimistic cries as to the injustice of the measure. I was not in the House when the Act of 1882 was passed. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have condemned that measure, but I have failed to hear one solitary argument advanced by any hon. member to show that that Redistribution Act of 1882 was not what it should be. They have simply given us their opinion that it was not judicious, but without giving any facts to back up their opinion. It is an impossibility to redistribute a province and add four new members, as was done in 1882 in the Province of Ontario, without changing the boundaries of constituencies. In other words, take any checker-board with 88 squares in it, and change those 88 to 92, and there must be considerable changes made upon the board. Now, our hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has referred to the British practice in these matters of redistribution, and he has left the impression that the ideas as advanced by the member for Simcoe, and endorsed by himself, are carried out in British practice. Now, I will take the liberty of showing the House what the last redistribution Act of the British Parliament has accomplished. It has given 23 members to 23 constituencies, and each of those constituencies has a population of less than 20,000; some of them a population as low as 15,000. It gives seven constituencies seven members, and each of those constituencies has a population of from 85,000 to 90,000. It gives eight

constituencies to eight members, each constituency having a population varying from 20,000 to 25,000. It gives 24 members to 19 constituencies, each one having a population of from 25,000 to 30,000 per member. It gives five constituencies to five members, each constituency having a population exceeding 30,000. It gives 32 members to 30 constituencies, each member representing a population of between 70,000 and 75,000. It gives 12 members to 11 constituencies, each member representing a population of from 70,000 to 80,000. It gives nine members to nine constitueneies, each constituency having a population of between 80,000 and 85,000. Thus we find in Great Britain, taking the precedent laid down by the member for Muskoka, a diversity in the representation, varying on the one hand from a constituency of 15,000 population, to one on the other hand with a population of 90,000. Were we to go into the details and examine the boundaries of constituencies in Great Britain, we would find that a much greater latitude has been allowed in the redistribution of seats in Great Britain, than is at all proposed in the Dominion of Canada. I would take exception here to the propriety of observing the provincial county boundaries in a Dominion redistribution measure. We find these counties are established for purely provincial purposes, for educational, municipal, taxation, judicial purposes, and other matters pertaining purely to the county, such as the management of bridges and roads. In counties it is absolutely necessary that there should be county representation, in order that when matters pertaining to these counties come before the Provincial Assembly the members representing the particular districts should be able to represent a district or county, and they should not overlap. But how do we find it in Ontario? In that province, from which all the wisdom of the Reform party is supposed to come, and to which all Reformers point, there are instance after instance in which county boundaries overlap, in which municipalities have been cut up and divided, and where the rule laid down by the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition has not been observed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. HUGHES. Take the Counties of Lincoln and Haldimand and the riding of Bothwell, which is represented here by a member who has a good deal to say on these matters; and then there is Cardwell and Addington and Frontenac and one of the Brants—all of these have overlapping municipal boundaries. In the Dominion Parliament it is essential that these provincial matters should not be introduced. What has been one of the chief cries of the Opposition in the past? That the Tories in the Dominion House introduced provincial affairs and took part in provincial elections. In order as far as possible to completely separate provincial and Dominion politics, statutes were enacted years ago by which a representative could not sit both in a Provincial Parliament and the Dominion Parliament; in other words, that so far as legislation could bring it about, the politics of the provinces were separated from those of the Dominion. If we were to observe county boundaries in regard to representation in the Dominion Parliament, the same township, district and county organization would be used for both provincial and Dominion political contests. But, under the system of redistribution in the Dominion, county boundaries are not necessarily recognized, and these local organizations of a purely provincial character do not come into play, and the people look upon Dominion politics from a broad, national view-point and separate them from the politics of the provinces or counties. What is there that comes under the jurisdiction of this House that affects the counties --as affording a reason why a county boundary should of necessity be recognized in a Dominion redistribution measure? Post offices, lighthouses, railways and canals, weights and measures and all such matters are under the jurisdiction of the Dominion, but with them county boundaries have nothing whatever to do. So in these respects there is no necessity for having county boundaries observed. As to the equalization of population: as far as practicable, it certainly would be advisable that the population should be equalized; but it is quite evident that the number of the electors in new districts will be greater proportionately than in old settled districts. I have no hesitation in saying that a rural district, especially one covering a large area, is entitled to a representative for a smaller unit of population than a city. This is carried out in the old country, and is also recognized here, as it is in almost every country where responsible government exists on the basis of representative institutions. Redistribution in the Dominion is carried out more equitably than redistribution has been carried out in Ontario. I have here the complete figures, but they have already been quoted. They show, among other facts, that North Brant, represented here by the hon. gentleman who spoke at length last night, has a population, under the provincial redistribution, of 11,000, while South Brant has a population of 19,000. Yet that hon. gentleman endeavoured to show that this House is unfair in its treatment of the district, because the present Bill does not equalize the population, although his own party in their redistribution measure made the enormous difference of 11,000 and 19,000 in adjacent constituencies. Both these are represented by Grits. We find that Brockville, with 17,724, returned a Grit; Lincoln, with 26,408, returned a Tory; Middlesex East, with 26,710, returned a Tory; Monck, with 15,800, returned a Grit; North Perth, with 29,560, returned a Tory; West Peterborough, with 15,211, returned a Grit; Welland, with 26,172, returned a Tory; Wentworth South, with 14,993, returned a Grit; Toronto, which gives overwhelming Conservative majorities, with a population of 180,000, returned a Tory, for it has only one seat in the legislature under the Mowat redistribution Act. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite come here and endeavour to persuade the country that the Redistribution Bill of the Liberal-Conservative party does not deal fairly with the constituencies. It does one good to hear the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) express their penitence. The sight almost reminds one of the latest fashion in religious circles where we find reformed renegades expressing regret for their past careers and promising they are going to live better lives for the future. It is also very refreshing to hear the hon. member for Muskoka boast of his independence; but in my little experi-

ence I have never yet seen the hon. gentleman's independence exhibited until the hon member for North Simcoe pulled the string, and then he suddenly became independent. We should like to see a little ebullition of independence on other occasions when his leader did not pull the wires. As the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) pointed out, it was really refreshing to see the members of the Opposition pat the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) on the back, smooth him down and tell him what a nice fellow he was; but by endorsing the hon. gentleman's proposal those hon. gentlemen are condemning their leader in Ontario; if they support the policy advocated by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), they must of necessity condemn the policy laid down by Sir Oliver Mowat. The charge has been made in this House on more than one occasion that at the last general election held for the Dominion Parliament the Reform party had a majority of the popular votes cast. I have taken the trouble to go through the whole list of the elections, and wherever two Conservatives contested a riding, as in Carleton, and wherever two Reformers contested a riding, as in West Ontario, I have referred back to the previous elections when a Conservative was opposed by a Reformer, and I find, on the basis of that calculation, 44,712 votes were cast for the Conservatives in Ontario and 42,891 for the Grits, or a Conservative majority of 1,821. Or a majority of 1,821 for the Province of Ontario with only a very small majority of three or four members in the House. The figures are given here by constituencies. We also heard these hon. gentlemen opposite boast of their majority in the Province of Ontario in the provincial election, but I have here a statement made officially in the Ontario Legislature on the 11th of March, 1891, which shows that although the Government of Sir Oliver Mowat has a majority on the floor of the House of 28 or 30 members, it is due not to the votes of the people, but to the gerrymander by the Government. We find, summarizing the official figures, that the total vote cast against the Reform Government in the Province of Ontario last election amounted to 168,445, and the total vote for the Government 162,803, scattered votes 1,474, or a total majority against the Reform Government of the popular vote of upwards of 5,600. Therefore, Sir Oliver Mowat and his Government hold office in the Province of Ontario to-day, although there is a popular vote of upwards of 5,000 against them, and they hold office only on account of the gerrymander of the constituencies in that province. These figures were given on the floor of the Ontario Legislature and they were not contradicted. No figures were adduced to disprove them and they are here in the public prints to-day, and they cannot be very well denied. This statement also gives the total vote for Toronto, and deducting Mr. Clarke's and Mr. Bell's vote from the one side, and Mr. Macdonald's vote from the other, that is to say the second candidate in each case, the figures stand for the Province of Ontario: Total vote for the Conservative Government, 158,902; total vote for the Reform party in the province, 157,454, or still a popular majority against the Reform Government of the Province of Ontario of 1,458, and yet they occupy the Treasury benches and have a majority of upwards of twenty members on account of their infamous gerrymander. Now, in the Dominion Parliament, as I have shown, the Liberal-Conservative party had a majority in Ontario of about 2,000 in the last general election, although it only gave the party a majority of four seats, I think, in the Province of Ontario. However, I am pleased to state that as a result of the bye-elections, the lists having been revised and the rising young men of Canada having been enrolled as voters, we find that the popular vote for the Government has largely been increased, and that it now exceeds nine or ten thousand. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) took occasion yesterday in his reference to the Redistribution Act of 1882 to complain of the state of some of the constituencies. Well, I have here a map which is scarcely so artistically drawn as the one presented to the House last night by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), but it will show the extraordinary shape of some of the ridings for the Ontario Legislature. The county in the centre with the indescribable outline represents East Wellington. It is hung in the middle, and is almost cut in two, and yet hon. gentlemen in the Opposition do not go into a rage over the shape of that riding. Alongside of it is West Wellington, and as a gentleman pointed out the other day, you have to step across a corner about an inch wide to get from the northern part of the riding to the southern part. Hon. gentlemen can also see the fantastic shape of South Waterloo. That the House may properly appreciate how South Waterloo is doctored up and to what extreme these purists of the Liberal party will go to gerrymander a county, I shall read you a description of the County of Waterloo from the Revised Statutes of Ontario, and you will notice that, not content with dividing the municipalities, they even divide lots, and in some places where there is a good old Tory with four or five sons, they draw a line around his lot and hedge him off into another riding in order that he may not do any injury by his vote to the Reform party. This is the description of the county from the Act itself:

"The said northerly portion of the township of Waterloo shall include and consist of that part of the said township lying within the following limits, that is to say: Commencing at the south-west angle of lot number forty-six in the said township; thence easterly along the southerly limits of the said lot, and of the lots numbers forty-seven, forty-eight, fifty, fifty-one and fifty-three, and the prolongation thereof, to the middle of the Grand River; thence along the middle of the said river, against the stream to the prolongation of the limit between lots numbers one hundred and thirteen and one hundred and fourteen, and along the prolongation of the limit between the said lots numbers one hundred and thirteen and one hundred and fourteen, and along the limits between the said lots numbers one hundred and thirteen and one hundred and fourteen, northerly and easterly, to the westerly limits of lot one hundred and seven; thence along the westerly limits of the said lot number one hundred and seven, northerly to the northerly limits thereof; thence along the northerly limits of the said lot number one hundred and seven, and of lots numbers one hundred and six, eighty-four and ninety-six, easterly to the easterly boundary of the said capital township; thence along the easterly, northerly and westerly boundaries of the said township, in a northerly, westerly and southerly direction, respectively, to the place of beginning; and the said southerly portion of the said township of Waterloo shall include and consist of all the remaining part of the said township."

You will notice that lots 49 and 52, as well as other lots which happen to be occupied by Tories, are omitted so as to make the gerrymander complete. That will give hon. gentlemen an idea of how the Reform party in Ontario, where they have the power, gerrymander the constituencies. Our hon.

friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) last night took the hon. Minister of Railways to task about his geography, and I will now present to the House from the official map a representation of what is called North Brant in the Ontario Legislature. I would respectfully remind the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) that when he undertakes to criticise the geography of the Minister of Railways, he had better look a little nearer home, and I find that his Government in Ontario evidently made a mistake in calling this riding North Brant because it takes in the whole southern part of the county. When the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) supported the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Mc Carthy) in his amendment, he was passing a vote of censure upon himself, because he was the man who carried out the redistribution in reference to the County of Brant at the time. I would also point out that in one riding of Brant the population is only 11,000 and the population of the other riding is 19,000, and consequently that neither in reference to municipal boundaries nor to equalization of population is the hon. member sincere in his statements before this House. There are other ridings here which I would point out to show the iniquity of their gerrymander. Here is the County of Bruce ; here is the County of Simcoe, in which, as an old veteran told me the other day, you are obliged to go from the north part of the riding to the south part by a bridge over a river. Here is North Ontario, gerrymandered out of all recognition. I can point also to the iniquity of their gerrymander in the County of Victoria, whence I have the honour to come. Formerly that county was divided for local purposes into the north riding and the south riding. The Liberal Conservative party held the north riding, and were likely to hold it, and they came within seven or eight votes of carrying the south riding. That was coming a little too close for the party of purity, who consequently brought in a gerrymander, and fixed both ridings so as to give good majorities. They attached the arable lands of part of the south riding to the rocky, barren regions of the north, uniting townships that had no community of interests at all. Wherever you look in the Province of Ontario, you will find evidences of the insincerity of that party in regard to redistribution. I thank the House for their attention.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no intention of following my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, further than to reply briefly to some of the assertions he has made. He has stated that the Hon. Oliver Mowat, the Premier of Ontario, has made many invasions of county boundaries in that province. I deny that statement, and I challenge the hon. gentleman now to show one single instance in which a county boundary has been invaded by any Act which the Hon. Oliver Mowat has passed for the readjustment of constituencies.

Mr. WALLACE. He destroyed township boundaries, let alone county boundaries.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, both in Brant——

Mr. McMULLEN. I say that there is not a single case in which the Hon. Mr. Mowat has invaded county boundaries. If there are any such cases, they existed before Mr. Mowat became Premier, and they have been left as they were. My hon. friend has mentioned Waterloo. Will he dare to say that the formation of Waterloo was made by Mr. Mowat ? He will not dare to say so.

Mr. HUGHES. It was made under the rule of Mr. Mowat.

Mr. McMULLEN. There never was an alteration of the County of Waterloo by Mr. Mowat. That constituency remains as it was when Mr. Mowat came into power. Yet the hon. gentleman tries to show to people in this House who do not know what was done that Mr. Mowat gerrymandered, and he is trying to make an impression on the House that is not true ; and if he did not know it, he ought to have known it. I say it is unfair. I am not here for the purpose of defending Mr. Mowat or his Redistribution Act. I do not know very much about the changes that were made, but I know this : that there is no case in which county boundaries have been broken by any Redistribution Bill that Mr. Mowat has introduced. Now, my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) last night drew the attention of the committee to the County of Wellington. If any hon. member of this House will take a map of the Province of Ontario and look at the County of Wellington, he will come to the conclusion that it is the balance left after the garment has been cut. It looks as if all the counties around it were cut off, and it were left as the balance. It is the most peculiarly shaped county in the Province of Ontario, and I defy any man to form three constituencies out of that county without making them very awkward in shape ; it is impossible. Now, I admit that there have been changes made in the County of Wellington, but they were not made for a political purpose. I have lived in that county for thirty years, and I know whereof I speak. I will give the House the reason the change was made there. Do hon. gentlemen profess to say that the County of Wellington would have returned a supporter of Mr. Meredith if the change had not been made ? That county never returned an opponent of Mr. Mowat but once, and that was when two Grits were running against one Tory. I contend that if my hon. friend or Mr. Meredith had the full opportunity of gerrymandering Wellington in any shape they chose, it would be impossible to form one constituency out of the county which would return a member in opposition to Mr. Mowat. On the one occasion when the Conservative was elected, there had been an agitation for the creation of a new county, and deputations were sent to Mr. Mowat from two towns to urge that the formation of the new county should be made at once. Each of these towns had its own map of the division which it wanted, and there was great rivalry between them ; and one man who was supposed to have committed himself against one of those places only got four votes there, whereas his opponent got about 200. The votes were not cast according to the political complexion of the place as shown on previous occasions, but owing to this man's supposed hostility to the change the town wanted. In that way he was defeated. Now, these two towns have been placed in separate ridings, so that the same difficulty cannnot occur again. That is the only occasion on which a man was elected from that county in opposition to Mr. Mowat. He has tried to make out that at the last general election the Tories or the Conservatives held the majority in the Pro-

vince of Ontario, and he showed some figures to the House. I would recommend the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), before he again risks his reputation in this House by submitting his ridiculous figures, to try and present something sensible and give some evidence that he is able to deal in figures with some degree of accuracy. He said there were forty-four thousand who voted in the Province of Ontario last year for the one party and forty-eight thousand for the other.

Mr. WALLACE. One hundred and forty-four thousand.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman gave forty-four thousand and forty-eight thousand. Now, we have before us the statistics furnished by Mr. Johnson, the Government statistician, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite should be willing to accept those figures. Mr. Johnson says that the Government, at the last general election in the Province of Ontario, obtained 171,505 votes and the Opposition 178,871 votes, so that there was an opposition majority of 7,276 votes, yet the representation from Ontario in this House is about 36 members on the Opposition side to 56 on the Government side. Now, my hon. friends may resort to their peculiar method of figuring up and figuring down, which we have seen practised with such effect in letting the work on the Kingston docks, but we do not want any more of this figuring up and down particularly in connection with matters of this kind. My hon. friend has figured up and down, and made such a muddle of the whole business, that I would advise him to begin again and go over his figures, because he is all astray. Now I shall attempt to say something in reply to the hon. member for Albert who addressed the House last night.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman one question. In ascertaining the relative strength of the two parties in Ontario and the relative votes taken, do you not take the strength of the parties as they are now, counting the Conservatives, as their number appeared after the last bye-elections took place, and taking the vote as given before the bye-elections?

Mr. McMULLEN. I take the statistician's figures which have been presented to this House, which I think ought to be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I leave my question to be answered by my hon. friend. If he is not prepared to accept these figures, he had better explain to this House his system of figuring up and down, and he might bring about a new condition of things.

Mr. SPROULE. I only want to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to this——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman intentionally wish to misrepresent me?

Mr. McMULLEN. Have I the floor, Mr. Speaker, or has the hon. gentleman got it?

Mr. SPROULE. Evidently the hon. gentleman wants to misrepresent me.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know what seat the hon. gentleman occupies, whether on the front row or one of the rows behind, or what constituency he represents in this House, as he seems to change his place very often?

Mr. SPROULE. That argument is quite as strong as the one the hon. gentleman has been using.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to say a few words with regard to the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). He suggested that he found himself at a loss to interpret the clause to which the attention of the House had been called by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). I have noticed the conduct and the actions of the hon. member for Albert in the past. From the time he came to this House in 1887 down to the present, he has tried to secure for himself a kind of dignified position; he has tried to act, as it were, as the censor of all that is done on this side of the House, and to constitute himself the balance-wheel of the Tory party on that side. I notice that whenever technical, legal questions come up he gives them a great deal of attention, and puts on a very solemn and earnest face, but after criticising all the points raised, he generally comes out in support of the Government—he always votes Tory. Now, he said that when this question came up it bothered him wonderfully. He could not see his way out of it. Of course he could not see at all that he would be right in taking the course dictated by my hon. friend from Queen's. No, that would not suit, because it would put him into the Opposition, and he laboured very hard to bring himself in accord with the Minister of Justice. And after labouring very arduously and earnestly in order to achieve that result, he gave deliverance yesterday in this House to what he had conceived. And what was the result of his deliberations? After arguing the question first on the one hand, and then on the other hand; after appearing to balance the whole weight of argument so nicely, first to the right and then to the left, he made up his mind in closing that the Minister of Justice was about right. That is the conclusion he wanted to come to, and the great difficulty he had was to find a sufficient argument to enable him to come to it with some degree of plausibility. There was no desire to convince his own mind, but still he says he is yet open to conviction. He told us yesterday that he is yet willing to be convinced, but I would like to see the man in this House who could convince him. Then he said that in the committee he was still open to review the clauses in detail, and if there was any particularly objectionable clause pointed out to him he was prepared to look into it. That hon. gentleman also gave us some figures. He went through the Province of Ontario, being anxious to compile a little statement of his own to justify, if he could, his own view and show if possible that the divisions made in Ontario were after all pretty fairly correct. And he, too, drew a line. He was a little more careful than the Minister of Railways, but still he travelled a long way to get his centre line, and he put the city of Hamilton in the eastern portion of the Province of Ontario. Then he went on to settle what he conceived to be the western portion, and after he had figured up the whole thing he came to the conclusion that we had not very much to complain of. He came to the conclusion that the Reformers were pretty fairly represented in this House. But what is the fact? We know perfectly well that the figures he has given to this House, for I am sure others have gone over them as well as myself, do not represent the actual re-

sult. I have taken down every vote polled in every constituency, both on the Reform side and on the Conservative side, and I find that the Reform vote polled was 177,522, and the Conservative vote 176,471, or 1,051 less Conservative votes than Reform. How are these votes represented in this House? We have 36 Reformers and 56 Conservatives from the Province of Ontario. Divide that up, and you find that you have very nearly 5,000 votes to every Reform representative in this House, and 3,151 Conservative votes for every Conservative representative, and still my hon. friend from Albert laboured very hard to tone that down, and if possible overcome that difficulty. He overcame it to satisfy himself, and endeavoured to present the figures in such a way as to dispel any suspicion that a wrong had been done by the gerrymander effected in that province, and he felt he had accomplished a great deal when he presented the statement he did. Now, I want to say a few words with regard to the hon. member for North Simcoe. I think he deserves a great deal of credit for having brought forward the resolution he did. I think he has shown himself to be possessed of a spirit of fairness, manliness and statesmanship very much to be admired; and if we had more independent men in this House we would have more action in accord with the course taken by the hon. member for Simcoe, than we have witnessed for the last ten years. If he was looking for a judgeship or seeking a place in the Cabinet, it is not very likely he would have brought in the amendment he has. No, he would know very well that he was almost putting an end to his political existence or to any hope of getting a position of that kind. I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman occupies such a distinguished position at the bar that a Cabinet position or a judgeship would be no temptation to him, and in that respect he is not in the same position as my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon). No doubt that hon. gentleman is looking forward to becoming a Cabinet Minister, and it is possible that he might take an independent position if his desire in that direction is not complied with in a few years. But the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is not looking for a Cabinet position or a judgeship, he takes an independent stand, and he has pronounced in plain terms in his amendment what he thinks of the whole of this Bill. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), in his remarks on that amendment, found fault with the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He said his amendment was too late, that he had not expressed his views in time, that he had not made known those views so as to enable the Government to comply with them if they thought fit. I think the hon. member for Simcoe, in replying to that statement, completely flattened out the member for Cumberland, because he stated that the moment he became aware this Bill was to be presented to Parliament, he took the earliest opportunity of waiting on the First Minister and making known the objections he had to the Bill, and telling him in plain terms his objection to the continuation of the gerrymander system. So the Government were aware of it and were cognizant that the hon. member would not submit quietly and accept the change the Government were about to propose. The Minister of Justice, when he introduced the Bill, asked us not to call it a gerrymander, and said he hoped that no one on this side of the House would be so unkind as to give it that name; but I challenge the hon. Minister to show where, in the Province of Ontario, he could have obliterated two constituencies such as North Wentworth and Monck, and utilized so well, in his own interests, the fragments of those two constituencies. In the case of Monck he adds to the constituency represented by the hon. member for Haldimand a township that will secure that county to him or his successor. Another township is added to South Norfolk to strengthen the position of the hon. gentleman who sits for that riding, and the balance of the townships, which are and likely will remain Grit, are added to the County of Lincoln to increase my hon. friend's majority from 400 or 500 to 800 or 900. These townships are politically buried with their friends in the County of Lincoln. The County of Frontenac has two or three hundred less population than Monck. If the hon. gentleman were to obliterate Frontenac, where would he put the townships that now compose it? He would have to put them in counties which are now represented by friends of his own and are politically safe at present, so he leaves them as they are; and other counties in the same district, such as Brockville and Renfrew, which are far below the minimum, because the fragments of which they are composed could not be so distributed as to benefit hon. gentlemen opposite; but he takes a county in the west, and pitchforks the municipalities backwards and forwards to make Haldimand and South Norfolk sure, and to bury the balance with the other Grits in the County of Lincoln, where they are not wanted at all. Then take North Wentworth. The hon. gentleman takes that county and obliterates it. He says he obliterates one Tory and one Reform constituency, but he uses the fragments of both counties that are wiped out to strengthen his Conservative friends in both cases. He adds Dundas to South Wentworth, which is represented here by a gentleman who was elected by one of a majority, which is a very dangerous majority, in order to make him safe. The balance of the riding is added to North Brant, so that my hon. friend, who has a majority of 1,100 or 1,200 there, will have a majority of 1,500 or 1,600. These townships are buried with the Grits of North Brant, where their influence cannot be felt, because they will have the satisfaction of only returning one member. I ask any hon. gentleman to point out one constituency that he could obliterate and make better use of than has been made of North Wentworth and Monck in the distribution of the municipalities of which those constituencies were composed. Yet the Minister of Justice says we must not call it a gerrymander. Any man who will investigate the changes which have been made must come to the conclusion that this bears all the evidence of a well-devised scheme of gerrymander, so far as it goes. The press says it might be worse. We admit that. You might go on and make as big a gerrymander as you did in 1882, but gerrymanders do not always carry out their intended ends. All the constituencies which were changed in 1882 with the intention of enabling them to be represented by Conservatives are not represented by Conservatives. They gerrymandered my riding by adding the township of Wallace to it out of Perth. I have carried that riding three times since, and now the township of Wallace is worse wanted in

North Perth than in North Wellington. I dare say if they had brass enough to introduce an amendment to that particular section, they would put back Wallace into North Perth in order to beat my hon. friend, but I do not think they dare to do it. That would be gerrymandering it back again where it was. I contend that a number of changes have been made that have not resulted as hon. gentlemen opposite declared they would result. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways had something to say about this question. He told us that there had been no objection made at all to the redistribution proposed by this Bill. I wonder where the hon. gentleman's eyes have been. Has he not been reading the public press of this country? Has he not seen that the newspapers have declared in most pronounced terms in opposition to the proposed gerrymander? If he gets outside the *Empire* and reads any other Conservative papers in this country, he will find that with few exceptions they have declared that it is an unjust Bill, and nothing but a gerrymander. Still, the hon. gentleman says he has not seen any objection to the Bill. Then with regard to the legal question raised by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) he answered it by saying: Well, we had a readjustment in 1872, and we had another in 1882, and during these twenty years this Act has been interpreted in a way that enabled us to make the readjustment, and it is too late in the day to raise an objection to that particular clause. Sir, I contend that the fact that it has been so interpreted for twenty years is no logical argument why we should allow the error to continue. I cannot understand such an argument, and I was surprised to hear it fall from the lips of a Minister of the Crown. Again, he said that they had done the best they could in the readjustment proposed by this Bill. Well, so they have, and from their own standpoint it is admirably good. As I said before, he has used the obliteration of these two counties to the very best advantage, and when he said they had done the best they could, I am quite sure that he meant it. He talked of his own province. We are, of course, compelled to recognize the hon. gentleman as the leader of the Province of Ontario. No doubt he occupies that position. He talked of his own province, and talked very flippantly in regard to the changes that have been made in the representation sent to this House. I am glad to notice that there are some members at least who are not willing to recognize him as the Conservative leader of the Province of Ontario. I do not know that it is any great credit to the Conservative party of that province that they have no better material out of which to make a leader, than the Minister of Railways. Now, I want to draw attention to the case of East Simcoe. That riding has 35,000 of a population; Russell, as I understand, has 31,000. How hon. gentlemen opposite can justify leaving East Simcoe as it is with 35,000, without readjusting it, and coming down to Russell with 31,000 and readjust it, is a mystery to me, if it is not done with a desire to gerrymander. As has already been stated, the township of Clarence, which gave a large majority to the hon. member representing Russell (Mr. Edwards), has been put into Prescott undoubtedly for a plain purpose. Why was that done? Simply because there was a hope that he might be defeated if Clarence was put into Prescott, and that move has been made for the purpose of defeating that hon. gentleman, and is a gerrymander on its face. Then the Minister went on to say something about public opinion requiring them to respect the boundaries of the present ridings. I have not seen any evidence whatever that public opinion has spoken out regarding the present arrangement of the ridings of the Province of Ontario. The fact of the matter is that at the time of the redistribution in 1882 public opinion was most pronounced in opposition to the changes then made. I see it has been stated on that side that it is impossible to preserve county boundaries. The hon. member for North Simcoe showed last night that if you preserved the county boundaries and gave increased representation to counties where they were entitled to it by increased population, you would have a better and more equitable representation on the floor of this House than you will have by changes now proposed. It was shown that nine-tenths of the counties have been broken up in order to bring about the condition of things we have in Ontario, that the lines of nine-tenths of the counties have been interfered with. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) said that counties and county formations were something that belonged to the Local Legislature. I do not know but one instance in the Province of Ontario, in twenty years, where a new county has been formed; that is the County of Dufferin, which was made into a new county some ten or fifteen years ago, but there has been no other case of a new county being formed. There have been additions made to constituencies where villages became incorporated, or where towns became incorporated; they have in some cases been added to one or other of the counties of which they formed part; but in no other cases have counties been interfered with. He said we had nothing to do with counties in this Chamber. Why, Sir, we appoint the judges for those counties. Those counties are used for judicial purposes as well as municipal purposes, and we appoint the judges, and I would like to know if we are not, therefore, interested in the formation of the counties. Another point I will mention, is, that when we were readjusting the representation we should have made all single constituencies. Wherever it was convenient for the Government to keep double constituencies so that they could elect two men of the same political stripe to support themselves, they have kept these constituencies in existence. Now, what excuse was there, for instance, in the case of Toronto West? Why is Toronto West kept as one constituency? Simply because if they divided it into two constituencies the probabilities are that one of them would elect a Liberal member, and in order to prevent a disaster of that kind, West Toronto is left as it is, and is given two members. The hon. member for Simcoe advocated that Toronto should have its full share of representation. I did not for a moment challenge that statement; I think it is quite right that it should. Of course, Toronto has a great many members residing in the city who represent outside constituencies. But it is rather singular that although Toronto has three representatives in this House, who must have been fully aware of the readjustment that has taken place, not one of those hon. gentlemen had manliness enough to get up in this House and demand that Toronto should get its full representation; it remained to the hon. member for North Simcoe, who represents an outside

riding, to demand that Toronto should get its full representation. That fact shows the measure of independence that is exercised by those hon. gentlemen. Now we come to the case of London. The hon. gentleman who now sits for London (Mr. Carling) has been a representative of that constituency for a great many years. A portion of that constituency was taken off the city of London some years ago in order to enable him to retain his seat, that particular portion gave a Reform majority. In order to lessen the difficulties that he had to contend with in getting elected, that portion of the constituency was struck off. Now, Sir, by the results of the revision of the list, and by the assistance of the judge, he has managed to hold the seat, with a registered majority of the electors in opposition to him. But to provide for future elections the village of London West is added to London, although it does not belong to it, and wards which properly belong to the city are left out because they are not of the proper political complexion. If that does not show a barefaced intention to gerrymander, I do not know what would prove it. If London does not contain at the present time sufficient population to entitle it to a member, why in the name of common sense should the Government go outside of the corporation and add London West? Why should they not have added a portion of the city which properly belongs to it? But if this were done, the hon. gentleman who now sits for London could not be elected, so hon. gentlemen opposite leave out a portion which properly belongs to the city and add London West, which is outside, and this is done to assist the hon. gentleman in securing the seat he now holds. The statement made last night by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) clearly shows the principles on which redistribution is conducted in England. That system is practically the principle of representation by population. The hon. gentleman showed that the constituencies were divided so as to give about equal population to each, and every effort was made to carry out a readjustment there so as to secure community of interests and geographical boundaries, and to meet the approbation of the people themselves. If you compare the manner in which Ontario is divided the contrast presented is a striking one. For example, in Middlesex there is a Reform majority of 1,100, and that majority is represented by only one Reformer in this House. That is a most scandalous condition of affairs. If that does not clearly evidence the result of the gerrymander of 1882, I do not know what does. I was amused with the remarks of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) with respect to the gerrymander of 1882. He declared that if he had been in this House at the time he would have opposed that Bill, that he did not consider it a just Act. But the hon. gentleman did not think we should touch the Act now, for to interfere with it might do harm, it would disturb present arrangements. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if he had a farm, and as a consequence of a survey made he was compelled to surrender three acres, and on a survey being made ten years afterwards it was found that he was entitled to those three acres, would he be willing to accept the statement of the person who had acquired the land, that no change should not be made, for it would disturb the present boundaries, that the fences had been put up, and that those three acres were under cultivation? The hon. gentleman would refuse to do so, and he would demand the restoration of his three acres. But notwithstanding the fact that many constituencies in Ontario have been by the readjustment measure of 1882 deprived of their privileges, the hon. gentleman is prepared to say that the provisions of that Act should not be interfered with, and that, if they were touched, harm would be done. I notice a very respectable gathering of divines which met in the western portion of Ontario a short time ago, in dealing with the political corruption and the scandals and abuses that were exposed last session, and also dealing with the representation of the people, declared that in looking at the constituencies, especially in Ontario, it appeared as if they had been laid out by chain lightning. The hon. member for Cumberland last night, in order to strengthen the position of the Government, quoted from the speeches of the framers of the British North America Act, quoted from the utterances of Sir John Macdonald and the Hon. George Brown, and endeavoured to show that because those hon. gentlemen had made statements that would to a certain extent justify the conclusion at which the Government arrive, they confirmed the position taken by the Minister of Justice. But the hon. gentleman entirely omitted to state that all those resolutions on which the speeches were delivered were changed after the delegation went to London. The hon. member for Cumberland also challenged the action of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) as being too late. The hon. member for North Simcoe, however, showed that, at the earliest opportunity, he had taken the objection, and had laid the matter before the First Minister. That completely answered the charge that it was too late to bring forward the motion which the hon. member for North Simcoe has submitted to the House. A careful perusal of the Bill would satisfy everybody that the changes proposed were for the purpose of strengthening hon. gentlemen in the positions they now occupy; but one would imagine they could afford to be generous, and yet, although as a result of the bye-elections, the Government have a majority of sixty at their back, they have so little confidence in the principles they advocate and the policy they support, that they are prepared to gerrymander the ridings in order to secure a verdict at the elections. If they were willing to meet us fairly before the people on the great national questions which divide the two parties, we would be quite willing to quietly accept the verdict; but they are not willing to do so, but they want to place the constituencies in such a shape that the political complexion of the majority will favour the present Government. Where they could get a few townships of Grits who could not be brought into line for the Government, they hive them together and give them one representative by themselves. We cannot afford to have a perpetuation of the gerrymander in Canada. I do give the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) credit for the manly course he has pursued by which he possibly jeopardizes his connection with his party to which he has belonged for twenty years. He has openly and frankly and honourably pointed out what he considers to be a gross injustice under the proposed Bill. While it has been my privilege to sit in this

Parliament for ten years, I have not had an opportunity on many occasions of agreeing with the hon. gentleman, but perhaps that is because I am not so well posted on public questions and international differences as he may be. At the same time, I must express my gratification that we have at least two members in this House who have independence enough to frankly express their opinion on important public questions without fearing to risk their connection with the party they support. I do not for a moment exonerate either one party or the other as being free from excessive party allegiance, but I am sorry than we have not more men of the same stamp in this House. I admit that we all too much inclined to be absolutely attached to party, and until such time as we are prepared to act more in accord with what we believe to be the best interests of our country irrespective of party, I do not believe that the future prosperity of the country will be so well advanced. I trust that the example of the hon. gentlemen I referred to will be followed by many Canadians in this House and outside of it. The hon. member from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) stated that when the Reform party were in power they perpetrated the crime of gerrymander. I have no knowledge that when the Mackenzie Government was in office he brought in any measure that could be characterized as a gerrymander Act. There was one case where a gerrymander had been previously perpetrated and a motion was made to restore the township to the riding to which it properly belonged. That is the only occasion I ever heard of in which the Mackenzie Government made an attempt to perpetrate what might be called even by his opponents a gerrymander. From its inception down to the present time the gerrymander in this country is to be attributed to hon. gentlemen opposite. They imported the pup, if I may say so, from the United States and they have nurtured it until it has grown up to be a considerable size. The hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said that the Mackenzie Government had never done anything for the country. Let me remind him briefly that they gave us the elections throughout Canada all on one day, they gave us the ballot, because we never had a proper ballot in this country until the Mackenzie Government came into power, they gave us the appointment of returning officers by Act of Parliament; but hon. gentlemen opposite when they came into power repealed that Act, and took the returning officers under their own control, as the result of which we have had men sitting in this House who represented the minority instead of the majority of their constituents. The legislation I have referred to, as passed by the Mackenzie Government, has received the thanks and endorsation of the people of this country. The hon. gentlemen also complained that the Mowat Government had made a change in the constituency of Kingston, but I would like to ask him how it would be possible to add to the city of Kingston a sufficient number to entitle it to representation in the Local Legislature without making the addition which they did? They did not interfere with county boundaries but they added out of the county to which Kingston belongs for judicial purposes in order to give it the required population. I can tell the hon. gentleman also that the townships which were divided, were divided at the request of the people who live in them because there was a centre road which went through the townships and was a convenient boundary. They desired that one side should belong to one riding and one side to another, and in compliance with the unanimous request of the people, these lots were divided and put partly in one riding and partly in another. But let us take some of the changes which are proposed under the Bill we are now considering. Let us look, for instance, at the Province of Quebec. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that it is the intention of the Bill that when a readjustment is made it should be made with a view of equalizing population. Now, if the readjustment of population was the object, and if the object was not to gerrymander I would like to know how it is that he leaves Quebec West untouched with a population of 9,241; Soulanges, 9,612; Vaudreuil, 10,803; Montcalm, 12,132; Montmorency, 12,511; Brome, 14,711; L'Islet, 13,822; Beauce, 37,221; Drummond and Arthabaska, 43,927; Quebec East, 36,200; Rimouski, 33,436; Nicolet, 28,473. In the city of Quebec we find one constituency of 9,241, and another of 36,200, and a third of 17,649. Nothing could be easier than to rearrange the city so that each division would have a population of about 21,000. But the result might be a loss instead of a gain to the Government. The County of Ottawa, again, is divided so that one riding will have a population of 17,329, and the other a population of 44,000. On the other hand, where a party advantage could be gained the Government made changes which were not required for the purpose of equalizing population. The County of Bagot, according to the census, had a population of 21,965, so near the average that it was not worth while to interfere with it. But it was very extensively rearranged. The Liberal parishes, St. Dominique and St. Pie, were withdrawn from it; one parish, St. Marcel, was added from Richelieu, and two parishes, St. Guillaume and St. Bonaventure, from Drummond, making the population 21,665. This was a reduction of 40 in the population, but it had the effect of increasing the majority of 53, by which the sitting member held the seat, to 248. The population of Joliette is reduced from 22,921 to 21,436. It was really about right, but they had to reduce it to 21,436, a change which removes it farther from the unit instead of bringing it nearer. Then, the population of Montcalm is increased from 12,131 to 13,616, so that it still falls 9,000 short of the unit of 22,000. Now, such a redistribution of the population amongst the several constituencies of the Province of Quebec as that, is something which requires an hon. gentleman like the hon. Minister of Public Works to justify. He has said that after we got into committee—we are not there yet, and we are making very little progress in that direction—if there are any reasonable suggestions to be offered, he is willing to accept them. Well, Sir, that is the old fable of the spider and the fly. He would like to get us in that position, but we are not there yet. He has explained the changes in the Province of Quebec, and he has endeavoured to satisfy his conscience in regard to them. He has tried to show that after all it is the best arrangement that could be made. But if we ever reach the committee, we will ask the Minister of Public Works to point out how he considers it a desirable readjustment to reduce the population of one riding by 40 by taking out dis-

tricts that are Reform and putting in districts that are Conservative, and in that way obtaining a Conservative majority of 248. Now, as he says that he will listen to suggestions of improvement, I would like to suggest to him the advisability of letting that county remain as it was, and I will ask the hon. member for Albert to second me in that. That hon. gentleman says that no alterations should be made in the Province of Ontario, because the constituencies in that province have been in existence for ten years. Well, this county in its present form has been in existence much longer than that, and it has elected Conservatives as well as Reformers, and I will ask the hon. member for Albert to assist me in urging on the Government the propriety of leaving that county as it is. Now, coming to the Province of Ontario, if we look at the population of the different districts of that province, we must come to the conclusion that no reasonable and earnest effort has been made to redistribute the representation on the basis of population. The very reverse is the case. The Government started with the idea of a gerrymander in their eye, they kept that idea before them, and they have it still there, and they are going to press the Bill through on that line without any regard whatever to the population of each district. For instance, Brockville has 15,855, Cardwell 15,382, West Durham 15,375, Frontenac 13,445, Leeds and Grenville 13,523, Lennox 14,902, West Northumberland 14,947, West Peterborough 15,808, Peel 15,472, all several thousands below the unit. Then if we take those constituencies in which the population exceeds the unit, we have North Essex with 31,523, Kent with 31,434, East Simcoe with 35,801, East York with 35,152 and West York with 41,863. Not one of these constituencies has been disturbed; they are all left in their present position, and yet we are asked to accept this measure as a just one, on the ground that it does not disturb old lines.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 68) to revive and amend the Acts respecting the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ross, Dundas.)

Bill (No. 88) to amend an Act to incorporate the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. Davin.)

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. McMULLEN. When you left the Chair, Sir, at 6 o'clock, I was pointing out some of the objectionable features connected with the proposed readjustment. I pointed out the fact that while professedly it was the intention of the Government to comply with the statute in the matter of readjustment, which is supposed to take place at the end of every ten years, in the case of the Bill before us they have failed completely to carry out the spirit of that Act. I have shown that in many cases constituencies far below the unit of population are left untouched while others far in excess of the unit are equally not interfered with; and I have shown also that in the cases of those constituencies which have been interfered with, that was done evidently for a purpose. Even in the case of Russell County, it is patent to any person who will glance at the political complexion of the municipality intended to be removed from that county into the County of Prescott, that the change made there is made with a purpose. Now, I contend that it ought to be the intention of the Government to carry out the idea which was in the minds of those who framed our constitution, and that was that at the end of every ten years a properly constituted authority should readjust the representation. It is highly desirable that such a readjustment should take place. It is utterly futile to grant people the exercise of the franchise if you do not at the same time grant them the right to the full exercise of that franchise so that they will be properly represented in this House. There is no justification for giving one man in one constituency two and a half or three times as much voting power as you give another man in another constituency. For instance, take the riding of East Simcoe where you have a population of 35,000, and then take the riding of Frontenac with a population of something like 13,000. The man who exercises the franchise in Frontenac has virtually two and a half times the voting power of the one who votes in East Simcoe. The less the population in a riding, the greater power has each voter in sending men here. That is unjust. I cannot understand on what principle ridings far below the unit should have the same franchise as those whose population is far above it. I would draw the attention of the House to the very important statement made upon this point by the Right Hon. John Bright. At the time of the extension of the franchise in England, a letter was addressed to him drawing his attention to some features of that proposed change, and in his reply he clearly indicated what would be the result of the extension of the franchise, if the formations of constituencies remained as they were. He said:

"The franchise itself gives no real power, unless accompanied by the right on the part of all the possessors of it to elect something like an equal number of representatives. I could easily frame a Bill which would give 'universal suffrage' in its widest sense, and which would affirm more strongly than ever the supremacy of the English oligarchy over the English people. If your great city, with its great constituency, is only to send two men to Parliament, while an equal population and property in some other part of the Kingdom is to send twenty men to Parliament, then, I say, your franchise is of little avail."

These are statesman-like sentiments. These are the ideas of a man who occupied a very distinguished position in the English House of Commons and whose life is noted in the history of that country for fairness, patriotism and political honesty, and he clearly indicates what will be the result where the exercise of the franchise is virtually thwarted by an unjust redistribution of the constituencies. In that case, he says, the franchise is null or nearly so. Now, I hold that if we are to place the entire electorate of this Dominion on an equal footing, and that should be the intention of the Bill, the constituencies should be readjusted so as to give as nearly as possible the same number of electors to each constituency, and by so doing you would at least accomplish one intended feature of the Bill, even if you did not obtain a gerrymander. But we have not done that, and we

are not acting up at all to the spirit of the Act of Confederation in the Bill which has been introduced. This Bill has no doubt been introduced merely to comply with the intention of the Act as to a readjustment every ten years, and does not carry out by any means the spirit of the Act as originally intended. There have been some very discourteous and uncomplimentary remarks made with regard to the change in the views of the hon. member for North Simcoe. He has been characterized as having deserted to some extent his party in having refused to endorse the views which he held in 1882 when the last Gerrymander Act was passed. Well, as I have said before, such changes are desirable. We are glad to see men of independent mind prepared to take the stand the hon. gentleman has taken; and if you review the history of England, you will find that the greatest men in that country have been found on different sides on different occasions. You will find that Mr. Gladstone has not always been in accord with the party of which he is the great chief, nor yet has he always differed with the Conservative party, for sometimes his views were in unison with theirs on great questions; and it is right that men who are looking forward to the development and progress of their country, should hold themselves so loosely attached to party as to be able to sever that connection for a moment when they consider that the interests of their country and the progress and prosperity and well-being of the people demand such action on their part. Our hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) criticised the action of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in moving this resolution as being inconsistent, but it is not so many years ago that the hon. member for Victoria was himself a supporter of the Hon. Oliver Mowat, Attorney General of Ontario, whose actions he was criticising this afternoon. He himself has made a decided change. I do not know if it is simply for the sake of change, but he is not where he used to be. He is on the Conservative side now and he used to be a very loud-mouthed follower of the Attorney General of Ontario, and supported his gerrymander, as he calls it. The Minister of Public Works is not in his place, but I shall not on that account refuse to point out what, in my opinion, are the inconsistencies in his case. It is evident that he has made a persistent effort to gerrymander Quebec. That province has not been submitted to a gerrymander before. It has been under control of men who have refused to submit it to this wild-cat scheme ef gerrymander. I do not think Sir George Cartier ever proposed such a thing, or that he would tolerate it if he were alive to-day, or that any other prominent man from that province would have tolerated the ridiculous exhibition we have before us now. It is left to the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) to champion the gerrymander in the Province of Quebec. He is determined to protect himself. He has added to the strength of his own constituency. He has not forgotten No. 1. He realizes that his political career is now very important to him. There is an annuity added to it which has a very tempting aspect, and to secure for himself a perpetual seat for Laval he has added considerably to the political complexion of that riding, and counts upon being returned as long as he chooses to run there. We know that hon. gentlemen gerrymandered the ridings in Ontario for their own advantage, but the people were so indignant that they resented the attempts to carve out a home for themselves. Take the case of East Bruce. The then sitting member looked upon his position as secure for life. Mr. Shaw thought he would be returned with 500 or 600 majority, but the people were so indignant at the cowardly act he had been a party to in throwing out and putting in townships in order to make a home for himself, that they threw him out, and he never got back to this House. Many others were treated in the same way. If we go over the constituencies that were gerrymandered in order to keep them in shape for hon. gentlemen opposite, we find many that are not now represented here by friends of the Government. East Huron was gerrymandered for that purpose, but it sends a Reformer to this House. My own constituency was badly gerrymandered in order that it might send a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, but they have not had the pleasure of seeing one here for ten years past. North Perth was gerrymandered to secure the return of a Conservative, and is represented by a Reformer. South Grey was gerrymandered with the expectation that my esteemed friend here would be turned out, but the indignation and determination of those who made up their minds to resent the unsightly exhibition made of the constituency was so great that the other side have not had a shadow of a chance. Peel was gerrymandered and it is represented by a Reformer. North Brant was gerrymandered and it is now represented by a Reformer. North York was gerrymandered, but it is not now represented by a supporter of the Government. Kent was gerrymandered.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman tell us when Peel was gerrymandered?

Mr. McMULLEN. In 1882, and it was represented by a Conservative part of the time since, but not now.

Mr. WALLACE. There was not a solitary change made in Peel in 1882.

Mr. McMULLEN. There was a township deducted from Peel when Cardwell was formed. Cardwell was carved out in order to elect the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron, and two Reform townships were taken out of Peel for that purpose, but the result is that Peel is now represented by a Reformer.

Mr. WALLACE. Cardwell was one of the new constituencies formed at the time of Confederation with the consent of both political parties, and there has been no change in it since except under the infamous gerrymander of Oliver Mowat a few years ago.

Mr. McMULLEN. Cardwell was carved out in 1872 to make a seat for the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron.

Mr. WALLACE. It was formed at Confederation.

Mr. McMULLEN. It was carved out in 1872, and was made a safe constituency for any supporter of the Government. The Hon. Mr. White was elected to that constituency for which his son now sits, for whom I entertain the highest respect, I do not care on which side he may be. I do not say a word against the ability, standing and character of those men, but I find fault with the system. A Reform township was taken from Peel and put into Cardwell, and yet Mr. Fleming, a Reformer, sat for

Peel from 1882 to1887, from 1887 to 1892 it was represented by a Conservative, and now again it has a Reform member. Bothwell has been gerrymandered, but my hon. friend who sits to the right of our leader has held that seat for many years, and I have no doubt will continue to do so. Now, I contend that a gerrymander does not always accomplish the ends the hon. gentlemen have had in view. Sometimes they overdo it. The best way, the proper way, the honest way, is to make a fair and equitable division of the ridings as to population, as to community of interests and geographically. Take my riding, for instance. It is about 15 miles wide and 70 miles long. It is in three counties, the County of Perth, the County of Wellington and the County of Dufferin. I say it is a plain violation of justice and equity that ridings should be so shaped and so adjusted as to present the unsightly appearance that they do when you look at the map. Now, the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) drew attention to the course adopted in England with regard to the redistribution that took place in that country in 1884, and he pointed out that the Opposition had combined their forces to prevent the Bill passing, and owing to the result of that persistent effort on their part, the Government were compelled to meet the Opposition and to make their redistribution measure more acceptable to Lord Salisbury, and eventually it became law. I think the Minister of Justice in his remarks, rather indicated that that course was adopted as a result of the opposition that was presented to that Bill when it was first brought before the House. Well, that is an encouragement to us; it virtually says to us that if our opposition is continued, if we persist in demanding that this Bill shall be shorn of some of its objectionable features, we shall succeed in gaining our end. Now, I think the Government should accept the suggestion that has been made by the leader of the Opposition. There is no evidence that the present readjustment, as it relates to Ontario and Quebec, meets with the spirit of the Act. It is clear that if we are to have a law properly adjusting the representation, the Bill now before the House does not effect that end, and I contend that if the Government are disposed to do what is fair, and to do what is right, they should accept the proposition of the leader of the Opposition and come to something like a reasonable understanding. Now, with regard to the constitutional question that has been raised, I do not for a moment pretend to be able to grasp the legal difficulty that has been presented by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). Notwithstanding the laboured effort of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), who boxed the compass from all sides to find a loophole that would enable him to get out of the dilemma, I think it is quite clear there is more in this difficulty than hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed to admit. I have not the slightest doubt that if this legislation is pushed through the House, it will result in bringing the whole question before the courts, and that ultimately it will be found that the point raised and the principle laid down by the hon. member for Queen's, are correct. In face of all these things, I think the Government should willingly consider some of the propositions that have been presented, particularly that presented by the hon. member for North Simcoe, and recast this whole measure, eliminating the objectionable gerrymander features, and adjusting the whole measure in accordance with justice and fair-play. They ought to be willing to go before the country without shackling their opponents as they are trying to do by the provisions of this Bill. They occupy the Treasury benches, they have all the advantages that gives them; they have in their hands the expenditure of all public money, and they do not make any bones about making promises in all directions. We have evidences of that in the construction of post offices, in dredging improvements, in harbour improvements, and in railway bonuses. These things have all been held out as inducements to the people to support the Government during the recent bye-elections. Now, with all these advantages which they will enjoy when the general election comes, surely they ought to be satisfied with making a Redistribution Bill more in accordance with justice and fair-play. We know that some of the Government supporters are dissatisfied with this Bill, but notwithstanding its objectionable features I fear that the bulk of hon. gentlemen opposite are so closely allied to party that the probabilities are that, with the exception of one or two, they will all stay where they are. They have come to this conclusion, I presume, that if they do not hang together, they will hang separately, and I fancy that they are bound to hang together, because hanging together is the only possible hope of political life. Now, Sir, I have endeavoured to point out some of the objectionable features of this Bill which bear all the evidences of a gerrymander. I think if the Minister of Justice, when he presented it to the House, really believed that it was not intended to be a gerrymander, by this time, if his ears have been opened to the evidence presented, he must come to the conclusion that whoever led him into the idea that it is an honest and fair measure, and free from the characteristics of a gerrymander, must have misled and deceived him. Under these circumstances, and in justice to himself and the country and to the liberties and rights of the people of this Dominion, he should see now that this Bill ought to be withdrawn, and another measure presented showing more evidences of justice, one that would be submitted to a competent authority to carry out, and I think that course would be more in accord with the principles of free government and the rights of the people, than the measure which is now before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. In continuing this debate, I would like to say a few words with reference to some statements which have been made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who has just taken his seat; it is with regard to the veracity of a statement which, whether made from memory or otherwise, is calculated to leave a wrong impression upon this House and upon the country. When it is shown that the hon. gentleman is entirely astray in his contention in regard to the Counties of Cardwell and Peel, it will be understood then how much weight should be attached to the arguments which he addressed to the House from that standpoint. The hon. gentleman said that the County of Peel had been redistributed for the purpose of putting in a Conservative. It is true, he said, that they did elect a Conservative, but it was a Reformer who now

represented that riding. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) reminded him that no change had been made in the County of Peel since Confederation. The hon. member for North Wellington flatly contradicted that. I have before me the Confederation Act, in which I find that the County of Peel, as then laid down, consisted of the townships of Chinguacousy, Toronto, and the Gore of Toronto, and the villages of Brampton and Streetsville. I have here the returns of the election which was held under the redistribution of 1882, and I find there that the County of Peel consisted of Chinguacousy, Toronto township, Streetsville village, the Gore of Toronto, Grahamsville, Castlemore—exactly the same constituency as was laid down at Confederation, as the hon. member for West York said, there has been no change made. Surely the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Mc Mullen) should be manly enough to admit that he was wrong, or that he did not obtain the correct information, when he addressed his argument to the House. I next take Cardwell, and the hon. gentleman was equally emphatic with respect to that constituency. But Cardwell has remained for federal purposes as it was since Confederation. In the British North America Act I find the following :—

"The County of Cardwell to consist of the townships of Albion and Caledon (taken from the County of Peel) and the townships of Adjala and Monro (taken from the County of Simcoe)."

I find at the last election, which was held under the Redistribution Act of 1882, the constituency consisted of Albion, Caledon, Adjala and Monro, exactly the same municipalities that constituted the constituency at first. No change has been made, although the hon. member contended a change was made for Hon. John Hillyard Cameron before his election, and that was in 1872. Surely the hon. gentleman should be more careful in the data on which he based arguments addressed to this House and the country, especially when he condemned the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) because he did not agree with that hon. gentleman as to the accuracy of certain statements. I was rather amused at the eulogy passed on the hon. member for North Simcoe by the hon. member for North Wellington. I thought at the time of the very trenchant piece written by "Fanny Fern" on receiving some praise from a woman. She wrote : "Praise from a woman! What have I done to be treated thus? I will immediately go to a shooting gallery and commence practice." I thought after hearing the eulogies of the hon. member for Wellington, and after reading the very interesting letters in which he condemned him in very vigorous language a few years ago, not only with respect to his ability and honesty but also with regard to his political astuteness, and yet to-night, because he was able to obtain a grain of comfort from the hon. member from North Simcoe by his condemnation of the principle laid down by the Government in this Bill, he turned around and bespattered him with praise, the hon. member for North Simcoe would feel alarmed at the situation and naturally come to the conclusion that politics sometimes brings us strange bedfellows. The hon. member for North Wellington, as well as other hon. gentlemen, offered several reasons why the Bill should be condemned. I will refer to a few of these. The Bill is condemned, first, because it is drawn by the Government and the country is mapped out by the Government—the properly constituted authority, if I correctly interpret the British North America Act, and it will be the fourth time they have done this duty when the present Bill is passed. The leader of the Opposition stated that a committee of members of both sides of the House should be appointed to perform this work. But if we ask whether this would meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, we find that such would not be the case, and that a difference prevails. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) declares that a commission of judges should be appointed to map out the country, and if that were done the Opposition would accept it as a fair redistribution. But the leader of the Opposition entirely dissented from that view and said that Parliament was entitled to retain that power in its own hands. One would naturally be inclined to ask whether if a commission of judges were appointed, that body would give satisfaction. The judges have been engaged in trying controverted elections, but hon. gentlemen opposite have declared they were the creatures of the Government, and were incapable of doing right, and further, that members of the Opposition did not secure justice before the judges. Then again, we have had the judges acting as revising officers, and again they have been held to work into the hands of the Government and to be the creatures of the Government, because they happened to have been appointed by the Government. While a commission would be satisfactory to the hon. member for Middlesex, it would not satisfy the leader of the Opposition and other hon. gentlemen opposite, and had the Government seen fit to propose a commission to do this work, I am bound to say that as much objection would have been raised to them as was raised when they were appointed revising officers. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that when the country was mapped out in 1882, it was done simply for the purpose of strengthening the Conservative party, that there was displayed a total disregard for equality of population, for county boundaries, for community of interests and for everything else except for political advantage. He said the result was that after the last election there was a popular majority of over 7,000 votes with the Reform party in Ontario, and yet the Conservative party had over 26 majority of members. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) repeated the same argument. I asked the hon. gentleman if he had made the calculation with respect to the comparative strength of the political parties after the bye-elections or before, and he said the figures were taken from the census. The census was given to us before the bye-elections took place, and therefore his statement was that in Ontario, before the bye-elections, the Reformers had a popular majority of over 7,000, and they were yet in a minority of 26 members. How unfair such a statement is. The hon. gentleman knew that at that time the Conservatives had only a majority of 4 from Ontario, and it was by the "bye-elections" increased to 26. The popular vote was not the same after the bye-elections as before, and whatever was the popular vote before, the fact remained that after those elections the popular vote was in favour of the Conservative party. I have here a recapitulation of

the vote, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to show any error, for I have endeavoured to verify the statement. What does it prove? That instead of the popular majority being with the Reform party, the Reform party obtained aggregate majorities of 13,691, while the Conservative aggregate majority was 19,085; or, in other words, a popular majority of between 4,000 and 5,000 over the Reformers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What are you reading from?

Mr. SPROULE. I am reading from a compilation published in the Montreal *Gazette*. Before the hon. gentleman ventures to challenge the correctness of it, I may say I have endeavoured to verify it for myself, and so far as my investigation goes, it is absolutely correct, with the exception of East York and Perth, which will make a change of not over 100 votes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My majority is entered there as 21. My majority was 550, and if the whole vote recorded against the Government were put down, the majority is over 1,600.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Precisely the same argument would apply to the case of West Middlesex.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). West Middlesex was exactly the same. There was a great majority against the Government, but it was divided.

Mr. SPROULE. The other night the member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) made the startling statement that while the Middlesexes sent four representatives to this House, three of whom were Conservatives, yet there was a majority of over 1,100 for the Reformers. How did he make that out? I can tell him. In one constituency three members happened to run, and he took the vote polled for the one member representing the Government and the aggregate vote polled for the other two, and he counted these votes as opposed to the Government. Does not every one know that when three candidates contest a riding, each man will have his own individual friends although they may both belong to the one party? The influence of one of the candidates will draw some votes from the other party, although he may belong to the other side of politics. If it were a straight party fight betw en a supporter of the Government and a supporter of the Opposition the vote would be entirely different from what it is. The argument is unfair, and it surprised me coming as it did from the member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), because he always impressed me with the idea that he desired to be fair and just in his actions. I know that a candidate's personal popularity and his social standing will induce many voters to break their party allegiance and vote for him when there are three candidates in the field, as many of the electors may believe that the man of their choice will have a chance to get in. Although the man they support may profess to be an independent, yet many voters who support him are satisfied that he will support the Government just as well as the candi te who is represented as the Government nominee. Hon. gentlemen on the other side when making up the popular majority vote, where three or more candidates ran, counted the vote polled for the Government candidates on that side and then added the votes polled for all the other candidates together, and used them as the correct vote polled against the Government. That is not fair nor is it correct. Where two or more candidates run in opposition to the straight Government candidate, one or both may be independent, or announce themselves as independents, therefore they get a considerable vote which would otherwise be polled by the Government candidate, in the event of a straight run between a Government and an Opposition candidate. The argument of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is most unfair when he says that there are in this House a majority of 26 Conservatives from the Province of Ontario, although there were 7,000 more Reform votes cast than Conservative votes. The hon. gentleman takes the votes before the bye-elections took place, when there was a much smaller popular vote for the Conservatives and a much smaller Conservative majority in this House, but he takes the majority of the members in this House after the bye-elections while he still adheres to the popular majority before the bye-elections, which is entirely unfair and unjust.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. I took the figures submitted by Mr. Johnson the statistician and nothing else.

Mr. SPROULE. That is exactly what I said. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the figures given by Mr. Johnson were before the bye-elections took place, and that they do not refer at all to the popular majority in the country or to the majority of members in this House after the bye-elections? When I asked the hon. gentleman if he was not aware that this was the fact, he answered me in what I considered an offensive and childish way, and asked what seat does the member for East Grey occupy in the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman admit that these figures are correct as to the general election?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not. I do say that the hon. gentlemen are making an unfair and entirely inaccurate calculation in order to support their contention. They say they have a majority of the popular vote now, when they know that the reverse is the case. Hon. members opposite have drawn a comparison between the Redistribution Bill of Sir Oliver Mowat and the present Bill, and also between the Redistribution Bill of 1882 and the Bill of 1892. If I remember aright the arguments advanced by the Reformers on the Redistribution Bill of 1882, were largely to the effect that the Conservative party had gone all over the country and changed constituencies for the purpose of giving two or three more representatives to the Province of Ontario. If my memory is correct, the Hon. Mr. Blake, or Sir Richard Cartwright, then asked the Government: Why did you require to go all over the country to add two members, while I could do it without disturbing more than three or four constituencies at most, and make a fairer Bill than you have presented now. The hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House then asked why the Government disturbed the boundaries of counties which should be stable and which should not be changed? Well, the Government have carried out that idea to-day, and they have only disturbed the boundaries of a few counties. It is their evident intention now to make as few changes as possible

in Ontario, and to disturb the constituencies as little as possible. It was said that three elections had taken place since the last Redistribution Bill, that the people had become accustomed to the new arrangement of the counties, that they felt at home under the present condition of things, and that it would be unwise to make any more changes than were absolutely necessary. It is for that reason, I presume, that few changes are made by the Government in the Bill now before the House. It was evidently their intention to give equality of representation without disturbing boundaries except where absolutely necessary and at the same time to provide for the shifting population from one part of the country to another, as in the city of Toronto where the people from the rural districts are moving into the city and increasing the population to such an extent as to entitle them to increased representation, or where the people are moving to Muskoka or Algoma and thereby entitling that district to additional representation. To-day hon. gentlemen opposite blame the Government because they did not make more changes, and redistribute the whole country as they did in 1882, while in 1882 they blamed the Government for changing a number of constituencies. Is it not, therefore, plain that no act done by the Administration will satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite? Had the Government made more changes it undoubtedly would have been contended by hon. gentlemen opposite that every change which was made was not for the legitimate purpose of equalizing the population or giving representation where representation did not exist, but that it was for political purposes. It is quite clear, therefore, I repeat, that no matter what the Government may do, or no matter how fair they may act, hon. gentlemen opposite will still be ready to complain. I was surprised at the action of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in proposing the motion which he did, and I was equally surprised at the argument he used in favour of it. I was a member of the House when the Redistribution Bill was proposed in 1882; I was younger than I am to-day, and I had a very strong conviction that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was a very able and a very intelligent man, and a very astute politician, and when he laid down the premises upon which the Redistribution Bill of 1882 was based, I was quite willing to pin my faith on the reasons which he gave in favour of it. I regret to find that the hon. gentleman has now changed his views altogether. When have the scales fallen from the hon. gentleman's eyes that he now sees a different light? Had he not come to the years of maturity then? Was he unable to see then that the measure he supported so strongly and advocated so warmly as a fair measure, was only a gerrymander, as he describes it to-day? And yet he was one of the men who supported that gerrymander and helped to carry it out. I say it is a most humiliating position for the hon. gentleman to be found in to-day; because the country must come to one of two conclusions with regard to him—either that he was very defective in the intelligence necessary to make him a good representative of the people, or that he was defective in integrity, and came here to sanction a thing which he knew to be wrong. Which horn of the dilemma will he be placed on to-day? I say that the country will put him on one or the other. That is the unenviable position the hon. gentleman occupies to-day. I thought that an old parliamentarian like him, a man of high standing, of acknowledged ability, of great legal acumen, was almost impossible to be wrong; and when I found him defending the Redistribution Act of 1882, it was enough to satisfy me that it was right, and I defended it on the same ground. But I regret to find that he has changed his opinion, and he has given various reasons why he has changed. One is, that in framing a Redistribution Bill, we ought to be bound by some principle. I thought the Redistribution Bill of 1882 was framed on a principle, that of representation by population, as near as municipal and county boundaries would allow. But the hon. gentleman has undertaken to prove that that was not the case, and he goes on to give us what he calls his remedy for the inequalities that exist. I am not going into the details of his scheme, because he has not given us the advantage of them; but after he has worked out his scheme, what is the sum total of his conclusions? According to the Bill of 1882, which he says was an iniquitous Bill, he found that 21 constituencies were below the unit that should guide us in redistributing the constituencies, with the addition of 20 per cent, and there were 10 above the unit. But under the present Bill the constituencies below the unit are reduced from 21 to 16, so that there are now only 26 constituencies above or below the unit. Now, the hon. gentleman has rearranged these constituencies according to his own plan, and he finds that there would be 12 constituencies above and 12 below, making in all 24, or a difference of two between his scheme and that of the Government. Now, would he, for the purpose of changing two constituencies, be justified in keeping people here all summer while rearranging the constituencies all over the country, to suit the hon. gentleman's particular views, which we may fairly judge were as sound in 1882 as they are to-day? That is the only virtue which the hon. gentleman claims for his scheme, that it would make two constituencies a little nearer the unit than the present Bill; but surely the hon. gentleman does not contend that it is a sufficiently strong argument to justify us in changing the whole country. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that it was patent that the Bill of 1882 was proposed in the first place for political purposes, to strengthen the Conservative party, to send as many supporters of the Government to this House as possible; and then he said it was so nicely arranged that the whole country east of Toronto had sent only three representatives to this House to support the Opposition. Now, if every constituency east of Toronto except three has gone against the Opposition, surely no rearrangement, no matter even if made by hon. gentlemen themselves, could increase their number very much; and that is an evidence that the Bill of 1882 was not an unfair one. If we had found a large number of Reformers hived together here and there, and the two parties almost equal in other constituencies, we might come to the conclusion that the Bill was an unfair one; but what are the majorities of these three members One is 150, the other a little over 500, and it was not possible to tell what the majority of the third one was, because there were three candidates running. But the very fact that only three constituencies sent supporters of the

Opposition under the old plan is an evidence that that was not owing to the redistribution. After the Redistribution Bill of 1882 was passed, an election took place, and instead of the Opposition winning only three seats in Eastern Ontario, they carried Lennox, Prescott, Russell, South Ontario, North Victoria, East Hastings, West Durham and Addington. So that it was not a gerrymander which so reduced the numbers of the Opposition in the last election. There was no change in the constituencies between the first election and the second election; but there was an appeal to the people on the respective policies of the two parties; and on the strength of the policy of the Conservative party and the weakness of the policy of the Reform party, these men were left at home, until to-day there are in this House only three men representing the Opposition from the constituencies east of Toronto. That was due to the fact that the people had lost confidence in the Opposition and in their policy, which was not suited to the wants of the country. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) said the other night that when the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) divided the country to show that the population in the south-western part of Ontario was the same as that in the eastern part, and the number of representatives from the south-western part was the same as the number from the eastern part, he was not making a fair division, because he had run the dividing line between York and Peel and up to the Georgian Bay. The hon. member for South Oxford said he had taken the great and populous city of Toronto and added it to the east for the purpose of making up the population, and then he had gone and taken Algoma, which is not yet settled up, and added that to the eastern district also. Now, could anything be fairer? Having included the populous city of Toronto, surely the district that was short of population should also be included, because one would neutralize the other. If my hon. friend had taken Algoma and put it in the western district and had put Toronto in the east, there would have been ground for saying that he was unfair; but he did the reverse, showing his disposition to be fair, and having done that he found the number of representatives to be about the same. I think his argument was a sound one, and it will go a long way to convince the people of the Province of Ontario that there is nothing but a fair disposition on the part of the Government in redistributing the Province of Ontario as they have done. The hon. member for North Simcoe gives the reasons why he supports this new measure of his. First, he says, I want equality of numbers. This thing must be done on some principle, he says, and I am very anxious to have this principle of equality of numbers established. Then, he says, he wants community of interests, and he also wants the county boundaries retained. Further, he requires the various classes represented, and after that he wants equalization of the constituencies. But, is not the hon. gentleman aware that each one of these principles must necessarily destroy the other? If he will have equality of numbers, what is going to become of his county boundaries? If he will have county boundaries, he must destroy community of interests; and if he would have the various classes represented, he would destroy the equalization of the constituencies. In fact, the very thing he is suggesting is to root up the community of interests which has existed for the last ten years, under the present arrangement, and which the Government propose to continue in the future. Is it not plain that the hon. gentleman is entirely inconsistent, in trying to arrive at such contradictory results? Take his calculation with reference to equality of numbers, and what has he succeeded in doing? He has succeeded simply, according to his own figures, in arranging for twelve constituencies above and twelve below the unit of representation, making in all twenty-four, while the Government have made it twenty-six, or simply a difference of two between his scheme and that of the Government. Coming down to particulars, take, for example, my own riding in Grey, and the hon. gentleman's riding in Simcoe. Osprey and Collingwood townships, in the eastern part of my riding, do their business with the town of Collingwood in the hon. gentleman's riding. The two localities are united by community of interests, they are united in business, educational, church and social relations; and therefore if we are to observe community of interests, the hon. gentleman must cross the line and take part of my constituency and add it to his own, and on the same principle we would have to take out part of East Simcoe and hand it over to Muskoka. I could go over the different parts of Ontario which I know very well, and if the community of interests are to be the guide, I could start in and help the hon. gentleman to work out his plan, and he would see that it is impossible to do it without constantly crossing the county lines. Now, with regard to equality of population, let us see how that principle would work. The hon. gentleman gives us as the unit of representation 22,900 for each constituency. Take the County of Essex, which has only 14,000; what would the hon. gentleman do with that? He will not cross the county line, because he wants to retain the county boundary, and therefore he would have to give it one representative, but his principle of equality of population would not be carried out. Take the County of Dundas, with a population of 31,000. It has more than enough for one member but not enough for two. If he wants to carry out the principle of equality of population, he would have to take the excess over 22,900 and add it to another constituency, and thus destroy his county boundary, for the balance left, being only 7,000 or 8,000, would not be sufficient to entitle it to another representative. Take the County of Norfolk, which has 37,000 of a population, not enough for two but too many for one. Take Haldimand and its 16,000, that does not come up to the unit he would like to have, and yet if he is to keep within county boundaries he must give a representative to Haldimand. The County of Monck has only 15,000, and if he will not cross the county lines, he must give Monck a representative. And so in every instance, it is utterly impossible to carry out his principle. Take Bothwell with its 47,000, and Huron with its 58,000, too many for two and not enough for three, and he must cross the county lines or destroy the principle he has laid down of equality of numbers and county boundaries. Take Cardwell, which has only 15,000 of a population, but is entitled to a member. Peel has only 15,000, but as we must not cross the county lines, it must have a representative although it is far below the unit the hon. gentleman has given us.

Take the County of Ontario, which has too large a population for two but not enough for three members. Durham has 32,000, more than enough for one representative, but not enough for two. Northumberland has 36,000, more than enough for one, but not enough for two. Lennox has only 14,000, and if the hon. gentleman will not cross the county line, he must give it a member. I need not weary the House with all these particulars, but looking carefully over the census returns, showing the population of the various counties, in my opinion the discrepancy, as regards the representation by population or the unit of numbers, would be much greater if we carried out the principle enunciated by the hon. member for North Simcoe than the principle which obtains to-day. It would be utterly impossible to keep within county boundaries and at the same time preserve anything like equality of numbers. Then with regard to community of interests, I have given one or two illustrations quite sufficient to satisfy me that it is utterly impossible to preserve community of interest and county boundaries. It has always been a mystery to me why hon. gentlemen are so much wedded to county boundaries as regards representation in this House. If this were a Provincial Legislature, which had the making of laws to govern municipalities and townships and county councils and all the operations of municipal government, with regard to court houses, gaols, registrars, sheriffs, I could understand why we should insist on retaining county boundaries. But we have to deal, not with these subjects, but with another class of subjects altogether. We have to deal with navigation, trade and commerce, criminal law, the development of the country by the building of railways, and canals, and harbours, and other public works, and with everything that tends to the benefit of the country at large, and these matters have nothing whatever to do with county boundaries. There is nothing in the situation to justify the contention that we should keep as sacred the county boundaries. Why should not a man represent two or three counties as well as one? The interests with which he has to deal here are those which affect the country at large, and he is not sent here to attend to municipal interests. The hon. member for North Simcoe said he would go further and have class representation, and he gave us an illustration of this theory. He said: There is the Nipissing district, which is settled by miners, and we ought to have here a representative of the mining class. Toronto, he said, is growing rapidly, and there ought to be representation here of the various interests in the great cities as well as the rural districts of the country. When men change from one locality to another, when they leave the rural districts for the city, they belong to another class and ought to have another class of representatives. Well, that may be kept in view fairly, but it would be unwise to adopt it as a cardinal principle in the redistribution of seats in this country. That would be adopting class representation too early. There is not that condition of things in this country which would justify us in doing that. The hon. gentleman pointed to England, and said that there the county boundaries were always respected. But in England the counties are historic, they have had the same boundaries for centuries, whereas in this country our changing and shifting population necessitates changes every year, if we are to have anything like equality in representation. Such changes in population are not to be found in the old country. Then the hon. member for North Simcoe tells us that we ought to follow the precedent established by the English House of Commons and appoint a commission to redistribute our seats. But what did he tell us in the next breath? He told us that the commission made their arrangement upon a sliding scale of population, from 8,000 to 75,000, so that while some constituencies had only 8,000 of a population others had 75,000. Surely that is worse than the condition in Canada to-day; and although the redistribution of seats in England was arranged by both political parties, the equality of representation was not regarded as much as it is in the Redistribution Bill proposed by the Government. There is no argument in that to justify the contention that we should abandon the principle we have adopted in the past and adopt the English precedent because we want equality of numbers. They have not equality of numbers. In a great country like England, where they have their Birmingham and their Sheffield, and their universities represented, and their manufacturing class represented, and their labouring classes and artisans represented, no doubt that should weigh to some extent with the principle of representation, but that will not hold force to the same extent in this country. Our population is a common population. It represents perhaps to-day one class and to-morrow another class. There is not the same nice division between classes. We have not the manufacturing class so clearly defined, or the artisan class, or the literary class to the same extent or the divisions as clearly or sharply drawn as they are in England, Ireland and Scotland, so we would not be justified in following the precedent they have laid down for the redistribution of seats, and the argument of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) on that subject is unjust and unfair, and it is still more unfair on the part of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), because I should think he would be better posted in English practice than the other is, and it was most unjustifiable on his part to use such an argument. What are the merits of this Bill? It has the merits of stability which the hon. members opposite have always been pleading for. We have disturbed as few constituencies as possible having regard to the shifting population and to the increases which have taken place in the city of Toronto and Algoma and Muskoka. I speak of the Province of Ontario, which I know better than the other provinces, and I have heard very little said against the provisions for Manitoba, British Columbia or the Maritime Provinces, so that I suppose the Bill is unobjectionable in regard to them. We know that the varying changes of men's minds make them return Conservatives at one election where they returned Reformers in the previous election. It is largely owing to the action of the different parties, and it is not proper to say that because there are 26 more Conservatives from the Province of Ontario in this Parliament than there are Reformers, it is owing to the redistribution of seats, because in the last election there was not such a proportion. In the last Parliament many seats were represented by Reformers which are now represented by Conservatives and seats were represented by Conservatives which are now represented by Reformers.

Men have changed their minds as to the political parties and the principles they are carrying out. In the next place when changes are made, they are made for the purpose, as much as possible, of equalizing the population. Hon. gentlemen say that this has not equalized the population, but the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says it benefits at least six constituencies in that regard. That is a step in the right direction, and I think the Government and the party are entitled to credit for it, and it should not be said that their only object was to strengthen themselves in this House. Then the Bill provides for increased representation where the increased settlement demands it by the change in the population. Toronto has so much changed that it would be unfair not to say that she is entitled to more representation. I agree with some hon. gentlemen that cities should not have representation in proportion to their population as the rural constituencies have. The hon. member for North Simcoe says they should, and those who represent rural constituencies but live in Toronto are not representatives for the city. I think I have seen, where conflicting interests came up between the rural constituencies and the cities of Toronto and Montreal, these members taking the side of the city in which they live instead of the rural constituency they represented. I, therefore, say that the cities are not entitled to so many representatives in proportion as the rural constituencies are. Then the Bill provides increased representation for classes where people have changed their pursuits. They have left the country and come to the cities and, therefore, we have a city representative to represent a different class. That is carrying out the principle laid down by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and he ought to give the Government credit for doing it. View it from whatever standpoint you like, whether from the point of equality of population, community of interests, the classes which should be represented in this House and in this new country, I say an unbiased mind must admit that the Redistribution Bill submitted to us is a very fair one. There is another reason for not making a great change to-day. If the Government went all over the country and redistributed it according to the measures introduced in 1882, I would probably be representing a portion of the country I never represented before, and would have to appeal to that at the next election. If you change the representation of the whole of the country, you should have a dissolution of Parliament. Every redistribution that has taken place in Canada up to the present time has been followed by a dissolution and an appeal to the country. In the last two years we have been engaged in an election contest to a great extent, and the agitation over election contests has to a large degree prevented the business of the country being carried on in the same amicable manner it otherwise would be. The party in power to-day are fresh from the country with a large majority at their back showing that they have the confidence of the people. If the country were redistributed all over, there should in all fairness be a dissolution, but the Government would not be justified in dissolving the House at present. Hon. gentlemen will contend that under the British North America Act there would be no reason for a dissolution, but if we follow precedents, which are so dear to the legal mind, there is no other course open to us. If there was no dissolution, we would have a state of chaos all over the country amongst the members in regard to the constituencies they represent now and those they would represent in the future, the class of men who sent them to Parliament at the last election, and the class they would appeal to on the next occasion, which would create an amount of confusion which could neither be justified nor condoned. If the Government had taken such a course, I believe there is not a member of the Opposition who would not have condemned them in the most unmeasured terms. If they had made the distribution as hon. gentleman say they should, they would have held it up as an instance of confusion which should not have existed. I say the Government would have been to blame had they made the extensive changes that hon. gentlemen claim they should have made. I hold it would have been wrong for them to make those changes and appeal to the country. I say that in the present state of affairs, coming fresh from the country, and having the confidence of the people, it would be unwise to disturb the condition of things in the country by a dissolution of the House and an appeal to the country again. Now, in view of all these things, I must say that I am firmly convinced that the members of the Government have made the best possible redistribution they could make. They have made one that is fair and equitable to all parties in this House and country, one that can be justified both in this House and in the country. I do think, that if hon. gentlemen opposite were more disposed to be fair towards the Government, they would at least say that in these constituencies which have not been disturbed, the Government did at least one good thing, they did not create an agitation when there was no necessity for it; they did not change the alliances of the people where there was no necessity. I can see no reason for supporting the amendment of the member for North Simcoe, and I see every reason for supporting the Bill as presented by the Government. If the member for North Simcoe is consistent and intelligent now, he was inconsistent and not intelligent in 1882. I say if he is candid now, he was uncandid then. If he has changed his mind now, I would like to know upon what ground he has changed it. The flimsy ground he has given us does not justify the radical change he proposes. Taking everything into consideration, I feel perfectly satisfied to stand by the Government on this measure, as I believe it is a fair one with regard to the distribution of representation, with regard to the equalization of population, and it can be defended not only in this House, but on every hustings throughout the country; and I shall have great pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Before I enter upon a discussion of the question proper, I want to make a few remarks in regard to some speeches I have heard this afternoon. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) spoke for about an hour finding fault with the so-called gerrymander of the Local Government, and I thought that the speech was far better fitted for the Local Legislature than for the Parliament of Canada. If he has fault to find with the Local Government, he should seek election for the Local Legislature and make that speech there, and if in his opinion the

Hon. Oliver Mowat and his Government did wrong, it was there he should have expressed his condemnation. He presented to this House a plan showing the outlines of some of the constituencies that he said were gerrymandered by Mr. Mowat. I could not see the plan very distinctly, but I do not think the outlines were very distinctly marked on the map; in fact I thought that the outlines must have been made by coal oil. Now, Sir, there was a gentleman living in the city of Toronto a few years ago, by the name of Mr. Samuel Hughes. At that time, I understand, he was a supporter of the Hon. Oliver Mowat and his Government, and I am told that he was an applicant for a position under that Government, and had actually gone to several parties in the city of Toronto to get them to use their influence in his behalf on the grounds that he was a supporter of that Government. The position to which he aspired, I understand, was that of inspector of schools; and failing to obtain that position he had wandered away from the city of Toronto to another place. A few years ago there was a gentleman in the city of Toronto by the name of Mr. Samuel Hughes, and he rode a very spirited white charger on a certain day when they were bestowing honours on the Hon. Oliver Mowat, after returning from England where he had gained a victory over the late Premier of Canada in some contested question that was before the English Privy Council. I understand that this Mr. Samuel Hughes discharged his duty that day with great honour to himself, and led his section of the procession like a thorough military man. I understand that on account of disappointments Mr. Samuel Hughes wandered down east and north, and finally took up his abode in a place called North Victoria, He purchased a paper there which happened to be a Tory paper, and probably expecting more patronage from that side of politics than from the side he had formerly espoused, he turned over and forget his esteem and affection for the old leader he had followed upon the white charger in the city of Toronto, and went over to the enemy of that party. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that that gentleman supported the Hon. Oliver Mowat at the time that this so-called Gerrymander Act was passed by the Local Legislature, and, of course, he knew of all the iniquities which he now says were in that Act, but at that time he looked upon it, of course, as proper and just in the interest of the country. I do not know whether it was from conviction of soul that he looked upon it as being just, or with the expectation that by supporting it he could wield more influence on his own behalf. Now, I understand that a gentleman of that name—and some people are so hard-hearted as to say that it is the same individual—he who is now representing North Victoria and who performed those acrobatic manœuvres that I have described. However, the hon. member for North Victoria is here, and if I am wrong in my suggestion he has the opportunity of setting me right. Of course if I am right, he will, like a wise man, say nothing at all about it. Now, I want to say a few words with regard to the hon. gentleman who spoke last (Mr. Sproule). He started out with admonishing the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and said that a man like him who was always finding fault, should be very careful in regard to the figures and so-called facts that he placed before the House. He pointed out that he had made two or three mistakes. Well, we are all liable to mistakes, and I do not think that any hon. gentleman in this House is more liable to mistakes than that hon. gentleman who was uttering the warning. Indeed while he was speaking, I had no doubt in my own mind that before he sat down I should be able to detect in him some radical mistake. I have the facts here so patent that I am sure my good honest Tory friend, whom I had the honour the other day of calling a Tory, will acknowledge he made mistakes. What were the mistakes? He stated there were several counties whose population was so small that it was impossible to divide them upon county lines. The hon. gentleman started with Norfolk. He said: there is the County of Norfolk with a population of 37,180, and if you were to give two members to that county, the population would be vastly below the unit. Did not the hon. gentleman know he was not giving the County of Norfolk at all, that he was giving the population of the north and the south riding and calling them the County of Norfolk.

Mr. SPROULE. I gave the counties as given in the census returns.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No. The hon. gentleman must exercise more care than he is doing, especially when he is one of those who advises others to be be careful. People who are not always ready to give advice to others are sometimes excused for their mistakes, but those who are ready to find fault must be careful they do not commit errors themselves, otherwise they place themselves in an awkward position before this House. The hon. gentleman will find that the population of the County of Norfolk is 30,992. Then the hon. gentleman said: there is the County of Kent with a population of 31,434. Did not the hon. gentleman know that that was the population of the district or riding of Kent, and that the population of Kent was 58,701? Then again with respect to Haldimand, the hon. gentleman said the county had a population of only 16,308, so small that it was not entitled to one member. Did not the hon. gentleman know that he was giving the population of the district or riding? The population of the county was 23,401, which would just entitle it to one member. Then the hon. gentleman said the County of Monck had a population of 15,315.

Mr. SPROULE. I quoted from the census returns under the heading of counties. I will send the book over to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It does not give the counties. Does the hon. gentleman for one moment say that the population of Kent as a county is only 31,434?

Mr. SPROULE. I say it is 55,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It is 58,701.

Mr. SPROULE. I will send the book over and the hon. gentleman can see it for himself. Will the hon. gentleman read from the book and say if the column is not headed "counties."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is electoral divisions.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It is electoral districts. I am now going to point out a number of errors which the hon. gentleman has committed, and the only way the hon. gentleman can excuse

his errors is to admit them, express his regret and say he will not lecture any one else. The hon. gentleman can see plainly that 15,315 is the population of the district of Monck, and not of the county of Monck. Who ever heard of the County of Monck? There is no such county in existence in Ontario. It is a riding or district for representative purposes and has no municipal organization within its boundaries; and, therefore, if the County of Monck was placed in the book, it is evident that the person who so entered it did not understand. The hon. gentleman said the County of Bothwell had a population of 25,955. Whoever heard of the County of Bothwell? There is no such county in Ontario. The district is composed of part of Kent. Then, again, the hon. gentleman said the County of Cardwell had a population of 15,000. Cardwell is not a county; it is a district for representative purposes, and it has no municipal organization as a county. It thus appears that the hon. gentleman made seven consecutive mistakes one after the other, and these were made by an hon. member whose first sentence in his speech was a warning to others to avoid errors. I hope this will teach the hon. gentleman a lesson to be more careful in future, and to be more careful to understand these matters. The hon. gentleman attacked one of the leading supporters of the Government, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who is a man of good sterling judgment. We may not always see as he sees, but it is certain that he has displayed a good deal of independence lately when he declared that he was not in accord with the political principles of those with whom he generally votes, and when he told the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in this House that he would not degrade himself by recognizing him as his leader, that action shows independence. But the hon. gentleman who has just spoken said he had no confidence in a member who in 1882 did one thing and in 1892 another. Does the hon. gentleman remember what the late Sir John Macdonald said, in 1872, that the boundaries of counties should be preserved; and yet Sir John Macdonald when head of the Government in 1882, cut and carved the various counties in such a fashion that they could hardly be recognized by those who were best acquainted with them? If the hon. gentleman has no confidence in the representative for North Simcoe because he changes his views and becomes wiser and better as he grows older, how can he have had confidence in Sir John Macdonald because he changed his mind from one year to another? The hon. gentleman was mistaken also in regard to the majorities the respective parties obtained at the last general elections. I am afraid the hon. member is too apt to take up the *Gazette* or *Empire*, or some other Tory paper, and extract therefrom the figures along the lines of his own thought. I have gone to the trouble of compiling a statement from the records submitted to Parliament of the elections in Ontario. I ascertained the majorities contained in each particular election, and in order to correct them up to the present time, I went over them with the returns from the bye-elections, and changed the majorities so as to give them to the side deserving them. I am in possession of all the figures from the beginning to the end for each county, with the majorities given to the respective candidates. If the hon. gentleman thinks I am wrong, I will hand over the figures and allow him to examine them for himself.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

He is not very far astray in regard to the Liberal majority. He said that the aggregate Liberal majority is 13,238, and the result of my investigation from the original records makes it 13,614. We are not the same, however, in regard to the majorities of the Conservative party. He said the Conservative party had an aggregate majority of 19,000, whereas the aggregate majority of the Conservatives was 16,961, as worked out by myself, and there is no mistake in that, unless it happens to be in the addition of the figures, which I do not think is the case. That leaves a majority for the Conservative party of 4,367 according to the last returns, including the bye-elections. I also went over the records and found that the total vote in Ontario was not 44,000 for one party and 48,000 for the other, which was a mistake made by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), but I found that one party polled 186,000, and that the other party polled 182,000, in round numbers. Now, how do we stand in the House with 186,000 votes for the Conservatives as compared with 182,000 votes for the Liberals? We should be represented in the House in the same proportion, provided the Liberals had the same chance as the Conservatives of expressing their opinions at the polls. If that were the case the Liberals would be represented here by 45 members and a fraction over, and the Conservatives by 46 members and a little over. But what are the conditions now? The Liberals are represented in this House by 33 members and the Conservative members by 59, or a difference of 26 members on a majority of 4,000 votes in the Province of Ontario. Here the Liberal party is represented by 33 members with 182,000 votes, and the Conservative party has 26 members for 4,000 extra votes.

An hon. MEMBER. How do you make that out?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). For instance 186,000 votes give the Conservatives 59 members, and 182,000 votes give the Liberals 33 members. The difference between the two is 4,000 and you have 26 majority on that 4,000 votes. Mr. Speaker, will any gentleman in this House or in the country say that we are properly distributed in the various electoral districts in this country if such are the facts? I avow to you, and I believe it to be correct, that the principle of gerrymandering the country as was done in 1882, and as is sought to be done in 1892 is an infringement and violation of the representative system of our Government. It deprives the people of their rights, just exactly as much as if they never had the power of sending representatives to this Parliament, because it takes them from one section of a riding and hives them in, so that their votes are completely neutralized. The result is that a majority of 26 members are given to the Conservative party in this House from Ontario not by the vote or by the will of the people, but by an iniquitous gerrymander Act. The Conservative party in this House has a member for every 3,150 Conservative votes polled, while the Liberal party has only one representative for every 5,550 Liberal votes polled. In the face of these facts, on which I challenge contradiction, I ask the members of this House, and I ask the people of the country from my position in Parliament, if such a system is not iniquitous in the extreme, and if it is not such

a system as should be repealed and replaced by one more in the interests of the country ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I know the hon. gentleman does not want to be unfair? I would like to ask him how he deals with the figures in South Leeds where both the candidates declared themselves in favour of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And Mr. Turner in favour of the trade policy of the Opposition.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And got the Liberal vote on that score.

Mr. TAYLOR. I got a good deal myself.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The few votes which might go one way or the other in the County of Leeds would not change the general effect of the figures I have given. As one of the Simcoes sent a member here by acclamation, I was so fair as to allow a majority of 1,000 in order to arrive at the truth as nearly as I could. Without that 1,000 votes, the Conservative party would only have 3,300 majority instead of 4,300. The representation of figures which I have made on this occasion, and the inferences I have drawn, are as true as anything that has been said in this House for a month.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. gentleman give us the figures for the County of Carleton, Ontario ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I have three sheets of figures here and I will pass them over to the hon. gentleman. As they are so long I do not wish to read them, and I suppose they will not go in *Hansard.*

Mr. WALLACE. It will not be much trouble to read over two counties.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Make up the figures yourself and make a speech.

Mr. WALLACE. What about Carleton County ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman is very anxious to disturb me when he cannot contradict my statement.

Mr. WALLACE. I have asked a proper question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Sit down now, I have got the floor.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman is evidently afraid to answer the question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I will have to call the attention of the Speaker to a disturber, and probably he will call the Serjeant-at-arms to put you out.

Mr. WALLACE. If you are afraid to give the figures it is easy to understand the value of your argument.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It has been said by some of the speakers that a redistribution along the lines of preserving the county boundaries inviolate would not be so fair as the present system. Now, anything that is not so fair as the present system I would really like to see. The gerrymander of 1882 was conceived in iniquity and brought forth in sin, and was placed on the shoulders of the people of this country with the object of gaining for the Conservative party all the political strength possible. When I say that, I speak advisedly, for I know what took place in certain sections of the country. I know that the Government acted upon the suggestions of the Conservative party in the county in which I reside, with the view of securing as large a majority in the divisions of that county as they possibly could. Let me give you a history of that. When the Gerrymander Bill of 1882 was introduced, it divided our county into three ridings, the south, the centre and the north. The Conservatives in the county called a convention, which met in the town of Wingham for the purpose of considering whether that division was favourable to the Conservative party; and after due deliberation, in which the sense of every person who understood the condition of the municipalities constituting those ridings, they came to the conclusion that the hon. member who then represented the county, and was supposed to communicate suggestions to the leader of the Government for the framing of the Bill, did not understand the constituencies as well as some others. They there, in convention assembled, framed a division of the County of Huron; and a gentleman who had been at that convention came to me and told me that the convention had resolved to suggest to the leader of the Government a division of the county into a south riding, an east riding and a west riding and gave me the various municipalities that were to constitute each riding. A deputation was sent from the convention to interview the Government on the subject, and when the Bill was before the Committee of the Whole, they secured the change which they desired, the result of which was to give them, as they supposed, larger majorities in the east and west than they would have in the centre and north. Does not that circumstance show that that Bill was not a just and equitable division, but was framed to secure to the Conservative party as much political power as possible? The County of Huron at that time contained a population of about 70,000, which would entitle it to three members according to the unit; but what did the Government do? To assist the Conservatives in North Middlesex, they added to that constituency two municipalities from the County of Huron, which together gave a Conservative majority, and they took out another township which gave a Conservative majority and added it to South Perth. Was that done because the County of Perth had not sufficient population to constitute two ridings? Not at all. They took from the County of Perth the townships of North and South Easthope, which gave a Liberal majority of about 700, and put them in North Oxford, which had already a Liberal majority of about 1,000; and they contorted the shape of North Oxford in such a way as to make it like a chimney or a cupola built on a rectangular figure. Now, does any person here profess to be so blind or stupid as not to see a party object in the whole thing? From North Perth they took away Wallace Township, and who has not heard of it as one of the greatest Tory townships in that part of the country? Who has not heard of the Wallace lambs? It was a municipality into which a Reformer could hardly go with the certainty of getting out again with his head safe; and they put that in North Wellington in the hope of preventing a Reformer being returned there,

though of course they did not succeed. But in all this you can see plainly that the object of the Government was to secure power by legislation instead of by the voice of the people. Now, I want to give you the result that would follow from a redistribution preserving the county boundaries. I am going to give my own view of that, and I am going to show that it would produce a much more equitable distribution, in regard to equality of population, community of interest and permanence than any measure that has been put on the Statute-book of this country. The following gives the name of the county, the population, the number of members to which it would be entitled, and the unit of representation for the riding:—

Number.	County.	Population.	Number of members.	Unit of representation.
1	Brant	24,945	1	24,945
2	Bruce	64,594	3	21,531
3	Dufferin	20,138	1	20,138
4	Essex	55,545	2	27,773
5	Elgin	43,549	2	21,775
6	Grey	71,094	3	23,698
7	Huron	66,781	3	22,260
8	Halton	21,987	1	21,987
9	Haldimand	23,451	1	23,451
10	Kent	58,701	3	19,567
11	Lambton	57,918	3	19,306
12	Lincoln	30,079	1	30,079
13	Middlesex	64,458	3	21,486
14	Norfolk	30,992	1	30,992
15	Oxford	49,849	2	24,925
16	Peel	24,134	1	24,134
17	Perth	53,728	2	26,864
18	Simcoe	82,733	4	20,683
19	Wellington	59,568	3	19,856
20	Welland	30,610	1	30,610
21	Waterloo	50,279	2	25,189
22	Wentworth	29,869	1	29,869
23	York	82,713	4	20,678
		1,096,715	48	.....

Now, those 23 counties that I have already mentioned, which lie west of the city of Toronto, represent a population of 1,096,715. The total number of members would be 48, and the average unit of representation would be 22,848, and as the average unit for the whole Dominion is 22,461, you will see that the average in the counties west of Toronto should be so arranged as to make the unit nearer the uniform unit than it is at present. Now this is a fact to which I want particularly to draw attention, that the section of our country west of Toronto has not such a large representation, according to population, as the section east of Toronto. The unit west of Toronto is 23,085, including the cities, with the exception of Toronto, allowing it to stand between the two, and the unit of representation east of Toronto is 19,600, showing that the part west of Toronto is less highly represented than the part east of Toronto, and yet the Government, when giving the two additional members, one to Toronto and one to East Algoma, instead of taking them from the portion east of Toronto, as they should, have taken them from the western portion already insufficiently represented. This division I have given with regard to the counties west of the city of Toronto will take from the western portion one member. Now, I will give you the counties and the divisions east of Toronto:

Number.	Counties.	Population.	Number of members.	Unit of representation.
1	Carleton	37,512	2	18,756
2	Cornwall and Stormont	27,128	1	27,128
3	Durham	32,428	2	16,214
4	Dundas	20,132	1	20,132
5	Frontenac	26,746	1	26,746
6	Grenville	21,613	1	21,613
7	Glengarry	22,447	1	22,447
8	Hastings	58,386	3	19,462
9	Haliburton	5,000	.....	.....
10	Lanark	37,732	2	18,866
11	Lennox and Addington	24,952	1	24,952
12	Leeds	34,475	2	17,237
13	Northumberland	36,136	2	18,068
14	Ontario	44,678	2	22,339
15	Peterborough	36,410	2	18,205
16	Prescott	24,173	1	24,173
17	Prince Edward	18,892	1	18,892
18	Russell	18,289	1	18,289
19	Renfrew	46,702	2	23,351
20	Victoria	32,991	2	16,496
		606,823	30	.....

Now, it will be noticeable that the unit of representation east of Toronto is much smaller than that west of Toronto, and it will emphasize the fact which I have already mentioned that the Government actually took away two members from the portion west of Toronto notwithstanding their knowledge of that fact. Now, all these counties, thirty in number, represent a population of 606,823 and return thirty members, and therefore the average unit of representation east of Toronto is 20,227 as compared with 22,848 west of Toronto. The average east and west would be 21,537, which is very near the unit of the Dominion 22,461. I want to show you next how the cities, in my opinion, should be redistributed. Toronto contains a population of 181,228 and would be entitled to five members, because I think, considering the large population and the community of interests in that city, 36,244 is not too low as a unit of representation. Hamilton, with its population of 48,980, would have two reprentatives, or a unit of 24,490. London, whose population is 31,977, would be entitled to one member as at present, but would be differently bounded. Kingston, with 19,264, would have one member as now. Ottawa contains within its municipal boundaries 44,154, and would be entitled to two members, making a unit of representation of 22,077. Now, the total city population is 325,595, which would give a unit for the eleven city representatives of 29,599, as compared with 21,537, the unit of representation in the rural districts, and I think that would be a fair representation. Another argument has been made here on both sides of the House, and that is that cities send out men to represent rural constituencies, and therefore their influence is largely used on behalf of the cities in which they live. Now, if rural constituencies are desirous to send to cities to get representatives, and if these representatives look after the interests of the cities rather than of their own constituencies, it would be a lesson to the constituencies, to select their representatives

from among their own inhabitants. My experience has been that the members living in cities who represent county districts, do in fact represent the rural districts rather than the cities, and, therefore, I do not think there is any weight in the argument that these men drawn from the cities represent the cities as well as the rural districts. Now, Algoma and Nipissing have a population of 54,878, and are entitled to two members, which would give them a little over the unit, namely, 27,439. Muskoka has 26,515, and will be entitled to one, as it is now. Now, this makes a total of 92 members. east of Toronto loses two, and west of Toronto loses one, according to this division. Two of these I would give to the city of Toronto and one to East Algoma. Now we have taken two from the east and one from the west, which equalizes the population on both sides better than the present system. I have another comparison which I want to give you. I will give you the percentages of the high ridings under the method I have placed before the House. and under the present method. According to the present system we have 49 districts west of Toronto, and according to the plan which I have laid before you, we have 48 ridings west of Toronto. Now, I have selected all these that were above 25,000 in number in both cases, and those that are under 20,000 in both cases and compared them with this result. I find that according to the present method we have four districts west of Toronto under 16,000, or 8 per cent of the whole; while under the system that I have just laid before the House, we have none under 16,000. According to the present system we have seven districts under 18,000 west of Toronto, or 14 per cent, and according to the system that I have laid before you, we have none. We have 14 under the present method under 20,000, or 27 per cent of the whole, and under the system that I have placed before you, we have only 3, or 6 per cent of the whole. Under the present system we have 27 west of Toronto having over 23,000, or 55 per cent of the whole, and according to the system I have laid before you we have only 11 over 23,000, or 23 per cent. Under the present system we have 16 over 25,000, or 33 per cent of the whole, and under the system of preserving county boundaries, we have only 6 over 25,000, or 12 per cent. Now, take those east of Toronto. That division contains 32 districts under the present system. We have 8 counties under 16,000, or 25 per cent of the whole, and under the system of preserving county boundaries, we have none under 16,000 east of Toronto. We have 8 under 18,000 east of Toronto under the present system, or 25 per cent, but under the other system we have only 3 under 18,000, or 10 per cent of the whole. We have 17 under 20,000 according to the present system east of Toronto, or 52 per cent of the whole; under the system I have placed before the House we have only 10 under 20,000, or 33 per cent of the whole. Under the present system we have 6 over 23,000 east of Toronto, or 16 per cent of the whole, and under the other system we have only 5 over 23,000, or 15 per cent of the whole. West of Toronto, under the present system, we have two over 25,000 or 6 per cent of the whole, and in the east we have two over 25,000. Now, those figures certainly prove that in whatever way you consider the divisions by counties, we can make far more of an equitable distribution of the population, one that will enable them to express their opinion in an election, better and freer than they do under the present system. There is another advantage which I wish to point out under this system. There are 21 counties which require no division at all, which will not admit of gerrymandering, and therefore exclude the iniquitous transactions of a dishonest Government, whether that Government be Tory or Reform. If the county boundaries are preserved, then they cannot be touched, because they require no division, and only a great excess of population or a great reduction of population, will require a redistribution in that county. Therefore 22 counties may be said to be permanent. Then there are 17 counties that only require division, therefore the gerrymandering must be confined to one division, and when confined within the limits of the county boundaries, unjust carving can be easily discerned by the people living in the locality, and the dishonest transaction will be discovered much more easily than if the county boundaries are broken. Then there are eleven counties that require two or more representatives, and the whole dishonesty of a Government, let it be Liberal or Tory, will have to be exercised upon eleven counties only, and in that respect they are confined within a smaller limit in gerrymandering than under the present system. Now, looking at the matter from beginning to end it seems to me that the Government should withdraw their present Bill and make a general redistribution of the whole country, based upon the principle here submitted. I understand that an hon. gentleman from one of the eastern provinces here last night—I had not the honour of hearing him—said that he was opposed to the Gerrymander Bill passed in 1882, because he did not believe that it was just or right. But now that it has gone into effect, and has been in effect for 10 years, I think it is better not to disturb it. The hon. gentleman gets credit for being a philosopher, he is a constitutional lawyer, at least, and he cannot be a constitutional lawyer unless he is a good thinker, and accordingly he should come down to hard-pan and decide this case on its merits. He would not decide in this way if it were in a court of law. If an injury was done to a man ten years ago, and if it was not beyond the power of the court to take cognizance of it, he would declare that it did not matter whether the injury was done ten or twenty years ago, it should be removed at the earliest possible moment. And so if an injury was perpetrated in 1882 by the iniquitous Gerrymander Bill, the hon. gentleman should be one of those to say, not that he would have opposed the Bill if he had been in this House, but that now he was here he was responsible, not only to his constituents, but to his own judgment and conscience, and he would endeavour to strike from the Statute-book that law which he had acknowledged publicly was contrary to the interests of the people. That is the position the hon. gentleman should take. I am sure, on second thought, it will be considered that that is the position every honourable man should occupy, no matter to what political party he belongs, and seek to have this wrong remedied, especially by those who admitted that a wrong had been perpetrated. We, the Liberals, are not responsible for that wrong. We have suffered under that wrong, to a great extent, politically. The party who placed it on the Statute-book are responsible for it; they have that

wrong resting on their shoulders, and they feel it, even although they may not express their opinions. Hon. gentlemen opposite have now the power to remedy that wrong and place the Liberals in a fair position. Unless hon. gentlemen opposite do so, they are equally as unjust as the men who voted for the Bill of 1882, for they seek to continue that wrong on the people. It does not shield hon. gentlemen opposite to say that they are not responsible for the Act of 1882. They are responsible for the enactments of their party, and they now have an opportunity to remedy what is generally considered as an injustice on the Liberal party, and hon. gentlemen can bring influence to bear on the Government to make them withdraw this Bill and take proper steps to redistribute the various constituencies along the lines of justice which I have laid down. I desire now to refer to a few of the changes which the present Bill proposes. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said that we were complaining that there was no fundamental principle on which the Government were taking action. We did complain, and we have a right to complain of this, until the Government shall lay down some general principle on which the redistribution shall be carried out. In the present Bill the Government cut and carved the constituencies in every direction on the same ground as in 1882 without regard to any principle whatever, except that of gaining additional support. On what principle do they take Clarence from Russell and add it to Prescott? Can any hon. gentleman give any reason to justify that alteration? Can it be said that it is to equalize population? It will only do so to the extent of 100 people. The Government knew very well that if the proper boundaries were given to the city of Ottawa, and if New Edinburgh, which is a part of the city of Ottawa, were added to the city, the population of the city would not be increased beyond what was necessary to give it two members, and at the same time the population of Russell would be equalized more than it is equalized by the present measure. But the intention of the Government was to destroy Mr. Edwards in his campaign in Russell. Any boy who is ignorant of politics can see that is the Government's intention. What is the intention of the Government in taking Port Elgin from its present connection? Was it because they saw they had made an error in 1882? Was that the only error made in that year? It was simply for this reason. The hon. gentleman who now represents North Bruce had at the last election a majority of only 30 votes—he was coming very near to the edge of losing the constituency. He went to the Government and said: I have only a majority of 30, and it is not sufficiently large to make me secure in that constituency; there is the town of Port Elgin lying adjacent which gave a Grit majority of 88, and if you take that from its present connection and give it to West Bruce, which has a Liberal majority of 1,000, you do that riding no harm, but you do me great good. I ask any hon. gentleman with an ounce of a sense of justice, if you can justly come to the conclusion to perpetrate on the Liberal party a wrong and injustice. If this injustice goes much further, I warrant that the Liberal party will take some steps to vindicate their rights and secure fair representation in the Parliament of Canada. They are not to be trampled upon with impunity from year to year; the opponents of the Liberal party are not to continue to be legislated into this House, and let hon. gentlemen opposite rest assured that this measure, like a boomerang, will recoil on their own heads and destroy their power. What was the object in gerrymandering the Niagara Peninsula? Is it not apparent in every line of the Bill dealing with this matter that it was drawn to make political capital? Have not hon. gentlemen opposite "hived" a constituency which they knew they could not redeem? They knew that the hon. member to my left was so firmly entrenched in the affections of the people of Niagara and Lincoln that they could not defeat him, and the result was they determined to make Welland strong by taking part of it and "hiving" Lincoln and Niagara and adding a portion of Monck to Welland to strengthen that riding. The hon. gentleman who went up and down the country making political speeches of a questionable character on various platforms wanted his position made strong and a portion of Monck was added to Haldimand to make that hon. gentleman safe. Hon. gentlemen opposite thought he had spent sufficient money in running elections during the last five years, and so they said: Go out and do all you possibly can for us and we will strengthen your constituency and make you perfectly safe. Is it not as plain as the sun at noonday that this was the object? If hon. gentlemen opposite had any shame about them they should be abashed at the injustice perpetrated upon the people. Then the constituency of North Wentworth has been wiped out. What was the reason? A large portion of that constituency was added to one of the Brants, which already gives a majority to the Liberal candidate of over 1,200 votes, and the Conservative portion of the constituency has been added to South Wentworth, which now returned a Conservative by only one majority. Is not the object of the Government plain there again? I could go over one constituency after the other, and prove beyond a doubt to the judgment of any impartial man that the Bill has been a perpetrated iniquity from beginning to end, and, as I said before, it was conceived in iniquity and brought forth in sin. I tell these hon. gentlemen opposite that they will not gain in the long run from this gerrymander. Many of the Conservative voters of this country are honest men, and have large hearts in their breasts when they leave politics aside, and they will resent this iniquitous conduct on the part of the Government. The people are long-suffering, but they will not suffer much longer, and will heap judgment on the heads of those who are ashamed to defend this Bill. Was there any Government supporter to-night to defend the Bill? Did the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) seek to defend the Bill? No; but he sought to justify the Bill by quoting, as he supposed, the errors of another man not in this Parliament at all.

Mr. HUGHES. He did defend the Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). On what principle did you defend it? You could not defend it on the ground that it was intended to equalize population, you could not defend it on the ground that it was to preserve county boundaries and you did not venture to defend it on the ground that it was just. We see that some hon. members who always sup-

port the Government had to dissent on conscientious grounds from this Bill against the wishes of their party. What did the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), ever a Conservative, say with regard to this Bill and that of 1882? He points out his objections to them as expressed in his amendment, and it is a very good one, that these redistributions do not secure equality of population, that they ignore community of interests, that they disregard geographical compactness and render stability impossible, and that they afford an opportunity to arrange districts for party ends. There is the opinion of the most gifted man amongst you, and a man who has as much judgment and as much sense as any man who sits on the Treasury benches. I repeat that the Bill has been framed with the object of gaining party influence and party advantages, and, therefore, I have much satisfaction in supporting the amendment. I trust that many members on the other side of the House will rise to protest against this unjust and unfair measure, but I am afraid we will only find two or three gentlemen opposite who prefer the interests of their country to the interests of party.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a personal explanation. In my address this afternoon, I managed to pick up a wrong sheet and in stating the vote as given for the Liberal-Conservative party—I have the ridings here one by one of the total vote of the last general election—I made an error. I find the Liberal-Conservative party polled 180,357 votes in the Province of Ontario, while the Reform party in the Province of Ontario polled 178,332 votes, a majority of 2,035 for the Liberal-Conservative party on the basis I explained this afternoon.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I thank the hon. gentleman for corroborating me. Our figures are substantially the same now, so that the inferences and the argument I drew from the figures are perfectly correct.

Mr. HUGHES. During the course of the debate this afternoon I am informed that the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) took occasion to inform the House that I had at one time voted with the Reform party. That is true. He stated also, I believe, that I supported the gerrymander of the Mowat Government. That is not true. The gentleman from Huron (Mr. Macdonald)—I do not know whether I can call him an hon. gentleman, but I suppose under the rules of the House I am obliged to call him—the hon. gentleman from Huron, although I doubt if there is any gentleman in the House who would have accepted the priming—at all events this hon. gentleman has referred to me in the House this afternoon. I saw seated in the gallery a noted Fenian from Toronto, and I presume in keeping with the saying that we find certain persons in certain company, that this gentleman was priming the hon. gentleman from Huron.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Is it in order, Mr. Speaker, for him to say that he saw a Fenian in the gallery of this House? I think he ought to have called attention to it and have him put out.

Mr. HUGHES. I say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. HUGHES. He is a friend of the hon. member for Norfolk.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. HUGHES. This member for Huron——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would wish your ruling as to whether you consider this a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have waited to see what point the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) was coming to. I think the correction of the figures he gave this afternoon was certainly in order, but if the hon. gentleman continues the discussion on the line he is now proceeding on, I think he will not be in order.

Mr. WALLACE. I move the adjournment of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that is hardly necessary. I presume the hon. member will be at liberty to make a personal explanation touching the reference of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) to his political conduct.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is as follows:—

"No member may speak twice to a question except in explanation of a material part of his speech in which he may have been misconceived, but then he is not to introduce new matter."

Mr. WALLACE. Did not the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) speak in the same strain last night?

Mr. SPEAKER. The member for North Simcoe was speaking to the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. WALLACE. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HUGHES. In the address delivered to this House by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) that hon. gentleman stated that on the occasion of the Mowat procession in the city of Toronto, on the return of the Hon. Oliver Mowat from arguing the question of the boundaries of Ontario before the Privy Council, that I rode a white charger. I regret exceedingly to have to say that the statement made by the hon. gentleman is not true in any one particular. I never bestrode a white charger in the city of Toronto, nor any other kind of a charger. I neither directly nor indirectly took any part in that procession. In fact, on that day I was engaged in my occupation as the English master in the Collegiate Institute. I merely went out at noon to see the procession pass along the streets, where I saw a number of my friends. The hon. gentleman stated also that I had applied for a position to the Reform Government in the city of Toronto. I neither directly nor indirectly applied for a position to the Reform Government in the city of Toronto, nor to any other Reform Government. A number of my friends in the Reform party—and I have a large number of friends, and respectable friends, in that party, I would ask the hon. member for Huron to remember—did endeavour to get me to take a position in connection with the educational affairs of the province; and I may say here that the Minister of Education asked me to submit to him the names of a number of the principal educationists in the city in my favour; but I point blank refused to use any political influence. I said that if I accepted the position, I would accept it as a non-political position altogether. I may say that on nine different occasions I had educational positions offered to me

in Ontario by the Reform Government of that province.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). You should not be so hard upon them, then.

Mr. HUGHES. I am not hard upon the respectable members of the party. I may state that Dr. McLaughlin, the late Reform member in the Local House for West Durham, and H. W. Burk, my father-in-law, who occupied a seat in this House as a Reform member for a number of years, both requested me to apply for a position to the Reform Government; but they spoke for me. The Minister of Education then wrote to me asking me to submit those names; and I wrote a letter to him stating that in conformity with his wishes I submitted the names of the gentlemen referred to. Now, the hon. gentleman stated that I had left the Reform party for that reason. Sir, as far back as 1876 I severed my connection with the Reform party. The last vote I gave to that party was given in that year. I saw that the Reform party in the Province of Ontario, in place of adhering to the old Reform principles, which made the party an honour to the province had departed from those principles and sold themselves. I could tell the hon. gentleman of the contract that was made with the Irish Roman Catholic League of the Province of Ontario whereby certain offices, and judicial offices too, in that province were bartered away to certain members of the Irish Catholic League, in violation of the old principles of the Reform party. I as a young Canadian point blank refused to remain in such a party. When I found how Archbishop Lynch of the city of Toronto ran the education affairs of the province, not only those of the Roman Catholic schools, but also those of the public schools, I drew the line there, and dissented from any such doctrine. I withdrew from the Reform party when I saw that party led by such men as the present hon. member for South Oxford. In 1878, when he was defeated for Lennox, and when I read the message which came asking that the constituency of West Durham should be opened for that hon. gentleman, and when I saw that he was still to be foisted on the party as one of its leaders, whatever little friendship I had left for the party was taken away from that time. Now, if hon. gentlemen wish anything further, possibly we could give them the details of the sale by the Reform party of Ontario of the school book monopoly, and the intrigue between the Reform party and the Toronto *Globe* about the sale of the Nelson stock. If they want any more of these particulars, possibly they may get them. As a young Canadian, I felt bound to leave that party; and I tell the Conservative leaders to-day that just as soon as they depart from the principles, which form the planks of their platform, and which make that party the party of progress, as the Reform party deserted the old Reform principles just so soon shall I stand to my principles and sever my connection with them. When I saw such men as the Fenian who sat in the gallery to-night——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. HUGHES. When I saw such men as that leading and engineering the affairs of the Reform party in Ontario——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. HUGHES. You do not need the name. When I saw such men brought to the forefront in the Reform party of Ontario, then I thought it was time for honest men to get out of the crowd. It is true that I did purchase a paper in the town of Lindsay, and I am pleased to say that the result has been that the Liberal-Conservative party in the County of Victoria to-day stand firmly rooted there, having a majority of 228 in South Victoria and 239 in North Victoria, and that, too, in spite of the petty personal persecutions with which these men have followed me in that riding. If ever a man has been persecuted, I am that man. I have been slandered, shot at, waylaid, partly burned out, and threatened with almost every injury that these villains could threaten me with. But the vindication came on the 11th day of last February, when the loyal people of North Victoria returned me at the head of the poll with 239 majority; and if an election occurred again, that majority would be more than doubled. With these explanations I will take my seat.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). As the hon. gentleman has spent five or ten minutes in licking me, I may be allowed a few words in reply. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that I did not say that the Mr. Samuel Hughes of whom I spoke was the person who represented North Victoria in this House. I said that there was a gentleman in the city of Toronto of that name a few years ago who was a supporter of the Ontario Government, and who went to the friends of that Government with the view of getting a situation under it—not in the city of Toronto, but, according to the views he set forth, in a place which could be carved out of a part of Durham, where he thought he could be made an inspector of schools.

Mr. HUGHES. The Government has nothing to do with that. You are only showing your ignorance.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). And one of the parties to whom he went was the gentleman called the Fenian in the gallery. I am not required to give the name of the so-called Fenian; but he was the identical gentleman to whom that Mr. Samuel Hughes went and said: I would like to get this position. It is alleged that he said: You have a great deal of influence with the Government, and I have always been a supporter of the Mowat Government, and I think you might do me a good service in getting me that position. To-night he wants to point out to the House the iniquity of the *Globe*, but on this former occasion he went to one of the directors of the *Globe* in order to secure his influence to get a position, and having failed to get the position for him, both these gentlemen have become Fenians in his eyes. That is what Mr. Samuel Hughes of Toronto did, and some people are so cruel as to say that he is identical with the gentleman who has a seat in this House, and the hon. member has not denied that. Now, I do not think he has made anything at all out of calling a man in the gallery a Fenian, and I must say that to compare the so-called Fenian in the gallery with the hon. gentleman would be to cast a grave reflection on the former. That is my opinion; and I think it is out of order and entirely wrong for a member of this House to look up to the gallery and select any man in his mind out of it,

and then rise and publicly say to the Speaker that he sees a Fenian in the gallery.

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to make a personal explanation. There is not a word of truth in the statement of the hon. gentleman, for the reason that it is the county council and not the Government of Ontario which has anything to do with the appointing of school inspectors, and if the hon. gentleman knew anything of school boards in Ontario he would not have made the statement he did.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can endorse every word said by the hon. member for Huron. I have been informed myself that there was a gentleman in the city of Toronto of the name of Hughes who had been worrying and annoying certain influential persons in the Ontario Government to obtain for him a position there. The hon. gentleman has gone so far as to tell us that he was offered nine positions under the Ontario Government. I understand that one of the positions was that of chief doorkeeper, and he refused that ; the next position was that of first messenger, salary $250 a year, and he would not take that.

Mr. HUGHES. Too clever.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not know whether these are some of the positions the hon. gentleman says he was offered, but I may say that I have sat in this House ten years, and have never yet known of a member of this House honoured with the representation of a county to get up and openly insult the entire audience in the gallery by declaring there was a Fenian among them. In justice to those gentlemen who are seated in the gallery, the hon. gentleman ought to honestly and straightforwardly say to whom he refers. Why does he not get up like a man and say to whom he is calling the attention of the House as a Fenian in the gallery? Evidently he is full of spleen against some person who is in the gallery to-night ; and I dare say if he were outside he would not venture to say what he has said inside. If he were outside, he would not for a moment insinuate to any one that he was a Fenian, because had he the courage to do so, we would not now find him sheltering himself behind the protection given to members of this House. Running no risks, he does the cowardly act of stigmatizing a listener in the gallery as a Fenian.

Mr. HUGHES. What I said in the House I have said, and am prepared again to say outside ; and you and the Fenian both know it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I contend that he has neither done himself nor this House, in which he has now a seat, any credit by making such a gratuitous and insulting allusion to any of the audience in the gallery.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Had the hon. member for Huron been here last night, I do not think he would have referred to-day in the way he did to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon). I had the pleasure of listening to those remarks, and I am sure the hon. gentleman's comments on them were very unfair, because the hon. member for Albert based his support of the present position of the constituencies on the fact that if any wrong had been done, time had righted it, and that the constituencies, as they are, are fairly and reasonably well constituted. So far as I am personally concerned, I would like if possible to narrow down the scope of the debate. We have had the subject before us discussed in every aspect. We have travelled through every constituency, and have numbered, I think, all the people in all the constituencies from one end of Ontario to the other ; and I desire to confine the few remarks I purpose making more particularly to the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe and to the principles he laid down in support of that amendment. I must say that I am unable to agree with him in the principles he has enunciated. These principles were two in number, as far as redistribution was concerned. First, that our redistribution ought to be based on a unit of population, adopted regardless of all other features, and in the next place, that in fixing the territorial limits of constituencies we ought to be governed by the county and municipal boundaries, as they exist at present. I do not agree that we should take population entirely as a basis. No doubt that is, to a large extent, the basis given to us to work upon, and cannot be lost sight of in determining the number of representatives we should have in this House ; but at the same time I do not think—and I suppose in making this statement, I am treading on somewhat dangerous ground—that districts, such as the great cities, where population is so thickly centred, are entitled to the same representation, according to population, as the rural districts. We know that if the cities were to receive their fair share of representation based upon population, they would be over represented, while the rural constituencies would be rather under represented. I was a little surprised to find that the hon. gentleman, when moving his amendment, was not at all borne out in his unit of population by the analysis he made of the representation of the constituencies under the Redistribution Bill in Great Britain, because we find, according to that analysis, that some of the constituencies went down so low as 16,000 or thereabouts while others went up to about 80,000. So that while there may have been a unit of population taken as a model, at the same time that model was not strictly adhered to, and I do not think that is a good illustration of the principle he was trying to enunciate. There is no doubt that in fixing our representation so far as the number of representatives is concerned, we have to take into consideration the various interests that are involved. We have to take into consideration the population, the territorial limitations, the commercial interests, the agricultural interests ; and it appears to me that on a fair consideration of the argument of the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment, to take a unit of population and fix upon that arbitrarily in regulating the number of representatives, is entirely to overlook the other interests that are involved. I feel disposed to agree with my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) I think it was, who said that he did not feel it made so much difference how many persons there were in a constituency, so long as we have the different interests of the various constituencies fairly represented in this House. So far as the municipal boundaries are concerned, I do not feel disposed to agree with the mover of the amendment. It does not occur to me that, looking at the matter from a federal standpoint, we ought to endeavour to observe those

county limitations which in ordinary affairs and in municipal affairs, divide the different constituencies. We have to take into consideration, in fixing the limits of constituencies, not merely the township lines, not merely the concession lines, not merely the county lines; but I think we ought to endeavour to instil into the people of this country, so far as we can, in the division of the constituencies, the broad spirit of nationality which is so essential in the people of such a great country as ours. There are many of us who, in the exercise of our profession, have had to do with the numberless law-suits and difficulties which arise between municipal divisions, and that is one reason why we should try to adopt a broader basis of representation in the constituencies. There are difficulties arising between these municipal boundaries, the effect of which may be entirely done away with if we divide our federal constituencies upon a broader basis, overlooking, to a certain extent, municipal boundaries, if necessary. I think we ought to try to inculcate into the people of our country more of a cosmopolitan spirit than the idea that each man should be in his own township, not only for municipal and local purposes, but also for Dominion purposes. We should endeavour to teach the people that we are not to look at our federal affairs, from a municipal standpoint, and I think there is too much tendency to do that. If we teach the people of this country that their constituencies must be divided up according to townships and counties, we are perpetuating between the townships and the counties all the divisions and the local prejudices that have existed heretofore. Therefore, I think it is a mistake to lay down the principle of dividing up our constituencies according to township boundaries, or according to any municipal boundaries. I think the majority of the House will agree with me that it is better that we should divide them up in some cases. I was surprised to hear an hon. gentleman lay down the principle that there ought to be a concentration of interests in a constituency. Now, I agree with that in one sense; there should be a concentration of interests wherever it suits our interests that there should be; but wherever we are looking at the matter from a federal point of view, we want to follow a broader principle, we want in some cases to sever interests, and we want in other cases to unite interests that may be naturally severed. Now, one of the arguments brought forward in support of county, and city, and municipal boundaries, was this, and I think it is an illustration which might fairly be used to emphasize the point I want to bring out; the principle was laid down that a part of a county and a part of a city should not be united together. I may be wrong, but it strikes me that is a wrong principle to adopt. One of the difficulties we have to contend with at present is that our commercial interests are pulling against the agricultural interests, and the agricultural interests are pulling against the commercial interests. Now, what is the effect of uniting a portion of a city and a portion of a county? Is it not at once to bring these people into common sympathy with each other, in other words, to bring the commercial interests into sympathy with the agricultural interests and the agricultural into sympathy with the commercial? I use that merely as one illustration to show that it is advisable that certain interests, which may be naturally severed, had better be united together for federal purposes, with a view of promoting harmony between the different classes of the community. In regard to the fairness of the Bill before the House, I suppose I may be one of those who, if there was any ground of complaint, might fairly complain, because my constituency now has a population of over 43,000. Now, I have this to say, that in a constituency where we probably have as many active politicians as any other constituency in Canada——

Mr. COCKBURN. What's that?

Mr. COATSWORTH—unless I except Centre Toronto—I have not heard a solitary word of complaint from my constituents against this Bill, although if we adopted the principle of fixing the number of representatives according to the unit of population, we would, at least, have one or two more Conservative members from the city of Toronto. I think that is a strong argument to show that the Government was fair in drawing up this Bill, for if they had wanted to increase the number of Conservative members from Toronto, they had only to give another seat to my constituency: because I think we can guarantee them that as long as they continue their present trade policy, and as long as hon. gentlemen opposite persist in the policy they have pursued, we will always return Conservative members to this House. Now, an hon. member who spoke to-night made a great point of the fact that West Toronto was not divided into two constituencies. I may say, and I have the authority of the member for West Toronto for saying it, that so far as he is personally concerned it would make no difference whether the constituency were divided or not. Out of 86 polling divisions a Conservative majority is given in all of them excepting about six, so I do not think it makes any difference to the member for West Toronto whether the constituency is divided diagonally, lengthways or crossways, because there will be two Conservatives returned. Moreover, it can be of no advantage to the Government whether two members are given to the riding or whether it is divided into two ridings. A word or two in regard to the necessity of the changes proposed. It appears to me that the Government have proceeded on a very wise principle, not only in restraining from meddling with constituencies where it was not necessary they should be disturbed, but also in carrying out the changes made. From the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite I think any fair and reasonable person would be convinced that the Government have done the very best that could possibly be done under the circumstances in regard to this Redistribution Bill. It was essential that some changes should be made in Ontario. It was not necessary that very many changes should be made, and we find the Government have proceeded on the very wise and wholesome principle that where it was not necessary to make changes they have not made them, and they have only made such changes as are necessary in order to equalize the distribution to the extent necessary to provide for the proper representation in places that had to receive increased representation. Applying the principle of this amendment to the present state of affairs, what would be the effect of it? We would have to divide up the whole of Ontario, to redistribute the whole of the province. What would be the effect? Much has been said about stability of

constituencies, about retaining boundary lines, about preserving old traditions of constituencies, yet in the same breath hon. gentlemen brought forward a proposition to redivide the whole province within county lines, as if they were binding on us any more than any other lines. It would be the height of absurdity for the Government to undertake at the present time to redivide the constituencies according to county or municipal boundaries. The best evidence of that is this: The constituencies do not attach so much importance to their township or county boundaries as they attach to the boundaries of their constituencies; so that the policy of the Government always should be as far as possible to preserve constituencies intact, not to disturb the boundaries of the constituencies. Suppose the boundaries of the constituencies were disturbed, that the whole of Ontario were redistributed and for that matter if any other provinces were redistributed, we must bear in mind that this would have to be gone over every ten years as the population varied, and the stability which hon. gentlemen talk about, the traditions of boundary lines for which they are pleading and all the other traditions and hallucinations in connection with the boundaries would be entirely dissipated every ten years. Any constituency where the population filled up to any extent would have to be redivided at the end of that time. A constituency which might be decimated would have to be attached to or divided with other constituencies. So I believe the very policy to which the hon. gentlemen pretend to attach so much importance, that is as to the stability of boundary lines or constituencies, would entirely be lost sight of if the amendment were carried and constituencies were divided according to the county boundaries. It is an old principle of law and a principle of common sense that where there is no necessity for change we should let things remain as they are, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite have entirely failed to convince the House that there is any necessity for any change, beyond the provisions contained in the present Bill, and they have failed to convince us also that the changes proposed in the Bill are unnecessary. I do not suppose it would be possible for the Government to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. I have not been sufficiently long in Parliament to find them satisfied with any measure of importance brought in by the Government. I feel reasonably certain that if no Redistribution Bill had been brought in by the Government, those hon. gentlemen would have been as loud in their complaints as they are respecting the Bill brought forward. I feel reasonably certain also that if the Government had adopted county and municipal lines, and the stability of constituencies as they demand it had been observed, they would have attacked the measure as viciously as they now do. I do not suppose we can satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite; but I am free to say that the best evidence of the virtue of the Bill is that their own arguments go to prove that the Government have done nothing but what is right, and the Bill ought to pass. I trust therefore in the consideration of this question, which has been gone into so much in detail, we will be able to narrow the discussion down to the proper limit, and that is the basis on which redistribution ought to be made. Let us fight it out on that line. Let us leave out these calculations which were useful and proper but which we have obtained to the full now, and narrow ourselves down to the question, and I feel assured that any reasonable man will be convinced that we are proceeding upon the right basis and the Bill should be read a second time.

Mr. SEMPLE. The hon. member for East Simcoe and the hon. member for Assiniboia devoted considerable time last evening to the County of Wellington, and an attempt was made to show that Conservatives had been gerrymandered out of a member owing to the action of the Reform party in Ontario. The first named hon. gentleman was correct in his statement that a Conservative had been elected at one time there. Mr. Ferrier was elected on one occasion, on account of two Reformers running and one Conservative, and Mr. McGowan was elected on account of local jealousies arising from two villages endeavouring to secure the location of the county town. I desire to present to the House the facts and figures respecting the County of Wellington. I will take the figures of the last local election and the Dominion election, and I will show that if Wellington is erected into three electoral districts it will be impossible to return a Conservative for the county. I took the figures myself this morning in order that they should be correct and reliable, and I shall quote them to the House:

South Riding of Wellington—	
Guelph City	10,539
Guelph Township	2,464
Eramosa	3,118
Puslinch	3,615
Pilkington	1,664
	21,400
West Riding of Wellington—	
Harriston	1,687
Palmerston	2,007
Drayton	793
Arthur	1,206
Clifford	634
Peel	4,255
Maryborough	3,548
Minto	3,689
	17,839
East Riding of Wellington—	
Arthur	3,224
West Luther	2,112
West Garafraxa	3,045
Nicol	2,057
Erin	4,048
Mount Forest	3,689
Fergus	1,500
Elora	1,304
Erin Village	594
	21,622

That gives the population of South Wellington at 21,400, West Wellington 17,859 and East Wellington 21,622. The majority in South Wellington for the Liberal candidate was 652, the majority in East Wellington for the Liberal candidate 459, and the majority in West Wellington for the Liberal candidate 306, making a total Liberal majority in the County of Wellington of 1,417. This shows conclusively the composition of that county, and if we table it also in regard to the election for the House of Commons in the municipal boundaries, it would give, by the last election returns, Mr. Innes a majority of 376, Mr. McMullen a majority of 535, and a majority of 651 for myself, making in all a Reform majority of 1,562 in the municipal boundaries of the County of Wellington. It is apparent from the large majority for the Reformers that the Conser-

vatives were not gerrymandered out of any of their rights, nor did it hurt any Conservative candidate in that riding. More than that, when the redistribution took place in Wellington there were three Reform members for the county. The County of Wellington is a very irregular county in shape, and when it is divided into three it has still that irregular appearance, but from the figures I have given it appears at once that the population is very evenly proportioned. It was to be hoped from the speech of the Minister of Justice when he introduced this Bill, that the very reasonable proposal made by the leader of the Opposition would be acted upon. That hon. gentleman suggested that we should have a conference to see if there could not be an arrangement entered into in an amicable way which would give justice and satisfaction to all parties. Mr. Speaker, it appears from what we have heard that there has been no serious objection offered to the cities receiving increased representation. It was a fairly reasonable proposition on account of their increased population, and we know from experience that the cities have gone Conservative. In former years, before the National Policy was introduced, Toronto used to send sometimes a Liberal and sometimes a Conservative, but anybody who studies the National Policy knows that it benefits the cities and hurts the country districts. For that reason the cities have gone Conservative, while the agricultural portion of the country has gone Reform, and would go more Reform were it not for the gerrymander of Ontario in 1882. As I said before, there is not much fault to be found with parts of the Redistribution Bill, as far as Ontario is concerned, but there are other parts of the Bill which are very unjust. There are only two seats necessary to be taken from a certain part of the province in order to give an extra representative to Toronto and another to Algoma, and had the Government wished to act fairly, and taken away one member from the electoral district of Monck and another by putting North and South Grenville together, which have only a population of 26,000, no injustice would have been done. They need not have interfered with the County of Russell where there is a very unfair gerrymander, nor with the city of London which is also a peculiar transaction. If the suggestion I have made had been carried out the Government would have been acting in accordance with British precedents, and would have given fair-play to both parties. We have heard a good deal about redistribution in Great Britain, but one thing we know for a certainty is that there was a consultation on the matter between the leading men of the two great political parties, and that both sides were satisfied with the scheme of redistribution proposed. We have often heard of British fair-play, and British fair-play was illustrated in that case. I will now read, Mr. Speaker, an extract from the Toronto *Telegram*, an independent Conservative paper, which is important as bearing on the proposed redistribution which we are now considering, it says:

"Has the Dominion Government for the past year been such as to promote patriotism? Much might be overlooked in a ministry fighting for its life, but the dominant faction has saddened the heart of every true Canadian. Not the Opposition merely, but the whole country has been wronged by the Government's every crime. Will those London Grits who have been swindled out of one of the most sacred rights of British citizenship be likely to join hands with swindlers in honouring the country that is the mother of us all? Will the Grits who are to be outraged by one of the meanest gerrymanders on record, fall into line with their Conservative fellow-countrymen and shout for the nation in which partisan bigotry is making parliamentary government a farce?"

If the Liberals of this country are taxed as other citizens they should have an equal chance to send their representatives to this Parliament. It has been said that the present gerrymander is not as bad as the last, but to show the effects of the last gerrymander, let us take the Counties of Middlesex and Bruce. In Middlesex, so far as I can learn, the parties are nearly evenly divided. In Bruce there is a Reform majority of about 850; and yet from those counties there are five Conservative members and only two Liberals. We can see from that the reason why the Government have such strength in this House. Now, a suggestion that I would like to see carried out is that the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition should meet together and try to agree upon an amicable arrangement. It would save trouble, and would enable us to go home and attend to our own business instead of prolonging this discussion. As was said by a member of the English House of Commons, "I am proud to be an obstructionist to bad legislation," and I think a member of this House cannot more particularly serve the country than by obstructing wrong-doing. As the arrangement suggested has not been carried out, the next best thing is the motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe. The principle he proposes was carried out in the redistribution of 1872, satisfactorily to both parties. The then leader of the Government, Sir John Macdonald stated that where there was only population enough in a county for one member he allowed one member; where a county was sufficiently populous he allowed it two members, and if it had enough population for three members, he gave it three members; and in no case was this rule departed from, except in the cases of Cardwell and Monck. He gave good reasons for that policy. He said it often happened that some individual, with good executive ability, was put in the township council, and if he served the people well there, they made him one of the reeves in the county council, and after that advanced him still further and made him a member of Parliament. Now, there are indications that the decay of this country commenced after the introduction of the Gerrymander Bill of 1882. There is no doubt, when one takes up the report of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and the report of the census commissioner, that he finds signs that this young country, sad to say, is suffering decay. We learn from that report that 886,000 immigrants were brought into this country at a cost of nearly $3,000,000 in the last ten years, while the census reveals the alarming fact that the increase of the population in that time was only 504,000: so that there are 382,000 people less in the country now than there were in 1881, to say nothing of the natural increase. While the little children and those who are growing up are here, the men and women have left to swell the population of the United States. Every person who lives in the rural districts knows how many are going away. It is true, many go to Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and if that was all we have to complain of, the case would not be so bad; but when the people are not in this country, we know they must be somewhere else, and this state of things has been brought about

by the trade and unjust policy of the Government and by the injustice that has been practised upon the people. We are endeavouring to induce people to come to this country by spending large sums on immigration: but we can fancy an intelligent man in the old country, a man who reads in the papers of the doings here, meeting an immigration agent, and the man in the old country telling him: We do not want to go to such a place, where we understand, as the result of the Gerrymanders, Franchise Bills, Printing Bureaus, and in some cases the interposition of a judge, members are legislated into Parliament. Some of these people might say: We read in the history of old England how many people left England because they did not receive their just rights, and went to the United States to help to build up that country, and we do not want to be deprived of the freedom that should be accorded to every citizen. I think it is well that we should ponder over this question, and if we want to build up this country and make it a great and glorious nation, it must be built upon the foundation stones of justice; no other foundation will stand. The Fathers of Confederation, when they met, passed in review the history of this country, and they considered that it would make great progress in the future, but they have been disappointed. They considered the noble resources of our country, its rich agricultural lands, its fisheries, its minerals, and everything that can enrich a country, and concluded from these that very rapid progress would be made by Canada. But I have shown what progress it has made; and if the present state of things continues, it will go from bad to worse. Looking at the census, I find that the population of the county I represent increased by 1,280 from 1871 to 1881, while from 1881 to 1891 there was a decrease of 3,420. This shows, that the people are leaving the country, and if anything can be done to stop the exodus it will certainly be a blessing. With regard to this Redistribution Bill, or gerrymander, I am glad to see that the independent papers of the country are opposed to it. The hon. Minister of Justice told us that there was a great deal said about opposition, but that nothing was specified. I think if he had read carefully, he would have found that a good deal has been said and written on the subject. I have here an extract from the Hamilton *Spectator*, which is a warm supporter of the Government, and which says:

"We regret that Ministers have not seen their way to the adoption of a radical change in the appointment of representatives. There is but one absolutely just and fair way of managing this business, and when justice is attainable, anything short of it is unpardonable. When great interests are at stake it is more to make haste slowly and to be sure of one step before another is ventured upon. But in this matter there is no need to go cautiously, no interest would be disturbed, and no confusion caused by making constituencies substantially equal, and by having their boundaries defined by a bench of impartial judges. That could be done, justice would be secured by it, and the Government is so strong that it could well afford to adopt the measure. We believe that an equitable division of the county into districts as nearly equal as possible, would not lose a single Conservative seat, and it is better to be right than to gain a party advantage, even were party advantages gained by the periodical rearrangement of the constituencies."

No one doubts that the Hamilton *Spectator* is a Government organ.

Mr. McKAY. What is the date of that article?

Mr. SEMPLE. I did not take the date down, but I copied the article out of the paper in the library. Now, I wish to read another extract. It is from an address delivered in the month of February last by the venerable Mr. Douglas of Montreal, who is well known as a great moral reformer and bulwark in the Methodist church. He said further:

"We are in sympathy with all who would maintain the integrity of our Dominion. I want to live and die under the old flag, not because it is the ensign of royalties and feudal aristocracies, but because it is the most benign ensign that this night floats over the continents and isles of the sea. With one-sixteenth of the habitable globe for our heritage, I believe we have a national destiny; but, Sir, having said this much, we declare our antagonism to every outcome that threatens the high moral life and integrity of the land, that moral life and integrity by our constitution is entrusted to responsible advisers of the Crown, and I say that no calamity is greater than for a people to lose confidence in the character and leadership of those that hold high political office, since it threatens the foundation principles and life of the nation. Only a few days ago it was my lot to listen to Dr. Bourinot as he expounded the superiority of responsible government in Canada as contrasted with the federal constitution of the United States. I will own, Sir, as I thought of the men our responsible government had brought to the front that his argument was most unfortunate judging by the empirical results both in Ottawa and Quebec. Before the high morals of Harrison, Wanamaker, Tracey, and the late William Windom, what Canadian does not bow his head in humiliation and shame when he thinks of the specimens of leadership which our country at this hour presents."

Speaking of the Minister of Justice, he indeed said something in his praise, because last session that hon. gentleman introduced a Bill for the protection of those who have often been the victims of betrayers and seducers, but while the reverend gentleman said that he could not help alluding to the remarks made by the Minister of Justice at Almonte, with reference to which he said:

"Never did a statesman utter a more unworthy speech than that gentleman's Almonte address, when he condoned dishonesties by charging on the British Administration a deeper corruption, since he must have known that one of the greatest lawyers of his age when convicted of nepotism and fraud was frowned out of society and died self-exiled in a foreign land. Would that we could frown out of this Dominion all men of kindred criminalities."

He made another comparison. He also compared Chief Justice Dorion with Mr. Mercier. Well, the people in Quebec have judged Mr. Mercier, and have hurled him from the high position which he occupied. Dr. Douglas also made a comparison between the Hon. George Brown and the present Minister of Railways, and came to the conclusion that the public men in this country have undergone considerable decay. I am sorry to add that there is also decay in the electorate. There is not the least doubt, from the revelations of last session, that if the electorate had not been badly deceived, there would have been a great change in the representation of this House. We cannot say for certainty, but if we can judge the present by the past, the amount spent in the different constituencies must have been no inconsiderable one. We have reason to know that 30 or 40 canvassers, with their carpet bags in their hands, went into the different ridings, and we know that the bye-elections come off one by one so as to enable these men to concentrate themselves in each constituency in turn, and the effective way in which they did their work shows decay in public opinion. Some gentlemen here made unworthy remarks last evening about Sir Oliver Mowat. I am very glad he has not to come to this House to ask a cer-

tificate of character from those who were trying to traduce him. His character is well established, not only in this country but in the United States and Great Britain, and in every country where good government is known. His management of the Crown lands and public works is a sufficient guarantee of his honesty. We do not expect that any man should be perfect, and that everything should be done that ought to be done, but when we find an honest administration, and that justice is done, we can forgive a great deal. Mr. Meredith, the leader of the Local Opposition, no doubt did not like Mr. Mowat's Redistribution Bill, but he had before praised the Redistribution Bill of this Government in 1882, and had to submit to the Redistribution Bill of the Reform party. And besides, that measure of the Local Government kept within the county boundaries, as I understand it, and that being the case there could be no complaint; and, I am very sure, that if these boundaries were applied to the representation in this House, the people would be much more equitably represented than they are to-day. We will be willing to receive the verdict of the people on those lines. Now, with reference to the redistribution in the County of Russell. It is well known the hon. member that represents that county so ably was on one occasion defeated, but at the next election was again returned. The love the people have for him, on account of his known character, integrity and justice, has made the township of Clarence nearly solid for him, and the Government thought that the only way to drive him out of political life was to gerrymander him out of the riding. I hope that even now when we get into committee, this rule that has been laid down will not apply to Russell. Now, we have heard it said that it is a reproach for a man to change his opinion on a political question. I dissent from that view I think when a man is wrong, and has the moral courage to change, it is so much to his credit. Now, I consider that redistribution should be made without the slightest respect to politics. When we see St. John's and Iberville, with 24,000, brought together to make a county, and Three Rivers and St. Maurice, with 20,000 or 21,000, brought together to make a county, why not apply the same rule to Soulanges and Vaudreuil, which would have about 21,000? The hon. Minister of Public Works wished to justify his conduct in giving two members to Ottawa County. Who disputed that? Who said it was wrong? We find out what his idea of justice is when he divides Ottawa County in such a way that one member will represent 47,000 and the other about 15,000, so that one man in one part of the county is as good as three in the other part. These things might exist if there was no change, but when a change is made why not make the population as nearly as possible equal? Why did the Government not do justice to Northumberland West and Northumberland East? The one has a population of 22,000 and the other 14,000 or 15,000. Why did he not apply that rule to those counties if he wanted to do justice? In my humble opinion we ought to have a Redistribution Bill based upon honesty and justice, and I have come to the conclusion that no country that has not that foundation will be prosperous, and the sooner we come to understand that and act upon it, the better it will be for all concerned.

Mr. SEMPLE.

Mr. BOYLE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 9th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS

MUTUAL LOAN AND BUILDING SOCIETY.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL moved that the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, be referred back to the said committee for further consideration and report.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman explain?

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. Some time ago a Bill was introduced into this House and referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee, to incorporate a Mutual Loan and Building Society, having its principal office in the city of Montreal. It was an ordinary Bill for incorporation of a building society upon the mutual principle, and was referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. Yesterday that committee made a report to this House refusing to recommend the passage of the Bill, not on account of anything objectionable in the Bill itself, but because the committee was opposed to incorporating any building society on the mutual plan. The report is printed in the Votes and Proceedings of yesterday, and reads as follows:—

"The committee have under consideration Bill No. 55 to amalgamate the National Mutual Loan and Building Society of Montreal and the National Mutual Loan and Building Society of Hamilton under the name of 'The National Mutual Loan and Building Society,' and have agreed to report the preamble thereof not proven, because the committee is opposed to granting special incorporation to Mutual Loan and Building Societies."

If I am in order in referring to what took place in the committee, I may say that the discussion was not upon any of the details of the Bill. The Bill was presented to the committee in an amended form, and printed in an amended form, and was for the object simply of incorporating the Mutual Loan and Building Society of Canada, as it was named by the committee. The petition asked for two different things; first, for power to amalgamate with the National Society, and, in the second place, to obtain a Bill of incorporation giving Dominion rights under a Dominion charter. The first part of the Bill regarding the amalgamation, was struck out altogether, and did not form part of the printed Bill as proposed to be amended. The only thing before the committee was the incorporation of the Mutual Loan and Building Society, and the only reason why this Bill was not reported favourably to the House, was because the committee was opposed in principle to incorporating any mutual loan and building society. I may say that I do not think the question has been treated on its merits, and full opportunity was not

given to the promoters of the Bill to be heard in its defence. One of the officials of the Finance Department came before the committee, and made strong objections to the Bill, or rather to the prospectus of the company started in Montreal under the name of the Mutual Loan and Building Society. The document he presented was not communicated to the promoters of the Bill, it came upon them suddenly, and they were not in a position to refute the statements contained in that document; consequently the promoters of the Bill were taken by surprise, and were at a disadvantage in trying to show the committee the reasons why they wanted to be incorporated, and were not at the moment able to show that the statements contained in the document were not according to the facts. I make this motion to refer the Bill back to the committee in order that the promoters of the Bill may be heard in their defence, and may have an opportunity of confuting the statements contained in the document submitted by the officer in the Finance Department. I hope no objection will be raised to this motion, which will only be doing justice to the interested parties. The committee is not busy; there is only one other Bill before the committee, and there is plenty of opportunity and plenty of time to give the Bill full and fair consideration on its merits.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is asking the House to do what is, as a rule, an unusual thing, and an inconvenient thing. The Committee on Banking and Commerce is a carefully selected committee from both sides of the House, and is, in every way, I should think, capable of dealing with the matters which come before it. This Bill of which the hon. gentleman speaks, has been before that committee for several weeks, in one form or another, and at a meeting of which due notice had been given, the matter was brought up for final decision. I was not present at that meeting, but I am informed that the committee discussed the question for about two hours; the discussion was almost entirely with reference to the principle of the Bill, and the committee finally came to the conclusion to report adversely to the Bill. I do not think the hon. gentleman has given any strong or cogent reasons which should lead the House to send back to that committee a Bill upon which it has reported, and it would be manifestly a very great inconvenience if these battles had to be fought over again and again. I do not see how we can accept the hon. gentleman's motion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a great deal in what the Finance Minister says, no doubt. The Bill did come before the proper committee and received a certain amount of consideration, and I take it that if the committee had reported to the House adversely on any details of the Bill itself, perhaps the House would not be disposed to pursue the matter any further. But the hon. gentleman will see that the committee has not so reported; the committee have reported in favour of adopting a very important principle, and that is that no Bill of this character should receive approval at the hands of the committee—not that this particular Bill is bad in itself, or that its provisions should not be adopted, but that no Bill having for its object the incorporation of similar societies, should be passed. I wish to bring to the notice of the hon. gentleman the fact that the division was a close one, only 19 to 15, and the proportion of members present was very small; and it is just worthy of consideration whether the House should commit itself to the adoption of that very important principle, unless they are satisfied that the whole body of the Banking and Commerce Committee had a fair opportunity of passing an opinion upon it. I suppose that if the whole body of the Banking and Commerce Committee had so recommended, the House would perhaps not have felt disposed to interfere again, but the number present was not large. There is something to be said as to the fact that the committee were very largely influenced by a report made by the Inspector of Insurance; perhaps the committee were carried away for the time being by that report. It was a very strong report, and my hon. friend says if he had had further time he would have been able to present a better answer to it than on the spur of the moment he was able to present. For these reasons, I submit that his application is worthy of consideration.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I do not wish to enter into any lengthy discussion, but I can hardly accept what the last speaker has said with reference to the consideration given to this Bill. I think the number present in the committee was a very fair number, a full average attendance, and the Bill was very thoroughly and carefully considered. I noticed that the members present remained more quiet, and remained in the committee for a longer period than is usually the case; indeed, nearly the whole of the members present remained from the opening to the close, something over two hours. I have no objection to the Bill being discussed in committee again, but I consider the view taken by the Minister of Finance is the correct one, that it will establish a very bad precedent. It will be difficult to arrive at any final decision in matters of this kind if they are referred back for a second discussion, and I do not think they should be, unless for some very important reason, which I have not heard given on this occasion.

Mr. LAURIER. Every member of the House is aware that this motion is not without precedent; on the contrary, is has been adopted again and again. The practice may not be without inconvenience, but my hon. friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) has given a reason which should commend itself to the judgment of the House. It is manifest from the explanations given that the committee was strongly impressed by the report made by the officer of the department, it is apparent that the decision arrived at by the committee was largely based on that report. My hon. friend behind me states that the promoters of the Bill had no opportunity to discuss that document. A general rule is applied by that report, which may be a good rule or not, but if the promoters had no opportunity to discuss that document, it is important to them, without referring to the general principle, that they should have the privilege of again going before the committee and advancing what reasons they can in support of their views, as they might be able to show that this rule did not apply to their case. The promoters were not present and had no opportunity to be heard, and, without creating a precedent, it would be only fair they should be allowed to state the reasons why in their opinion the Bill should be adopted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Although it may not be without precedent, it is obvious that cause should be shown for the adoption of such a course as is suggested in any case, so that the House might not, merely on the application of a company based on dissatisfaction with a report of that committee, order the matter to be reinvestigated; and, in fact, unless some special reasons were assigned, I should suppose the Order of the House that the Bill be referred back would imply to the committee that the Bill ought to be passed. I think such a course should never be adopted unless some one is taken by surprise or has something new to urge. I was unfortunately not able to attend the meeting of the committee, but I am informed these are the facts: That the managers and promoters were there and were fully heard on the report, and made no request for any postponement. If these are the facts, I think it should be shown they have something new to urge, and the Bill should not be referred back to the committee, simply in order that they may be heard again.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think the House commits itself to the principle of the Bill by asking that it be referred back to the committee, unless the House gives instructions to the committee, and I do not understand the House was asked to give any instructions to the committee. There are two views from which the House may consider the question now before it. The one is the rights of the parties who are asking for a reference of this Bill to the committee, and the other is the extent to which the House shall commit itself to the policy upon which the committee acted, and which was to some extent embodied in the report of the inspector. The statement in that report, which I think largely influenced the majority of the committee was that the prospectuses issued by societies of this sort or companies of this kind represented to the public that very large profits were made on the moneys invested, and this statement enticed persons to become members of such societies who would not otherwise join. But this objection would lie against every society engaged in business by which very large profits were made or claimed to be possible. I think it would be well that the committee should consider more fully the principle embodied in that report and the policy upon which they acted, before the House commits itself to that view. There are two sides to the question, and it would be well if the subject were further considered before action was taken. I cannot very well see if a similar society were to come before us next year asking for an Act of incorporation, how we could grant it in face of the action taken now, and before we decide to exclude all companies of this sort from incorporation, the subject is deserving of more consideration than the hurried consideration the committee gave it yesterday upon this Bill. I do not see that the House commits itself one way or the other by referring this Bill back to the committee for further consideration. The subject requires the very fullest deliberation, because whatever is done upon this matter will largely influence the action of Parliament on all similar applications hereafter.

Mr. McKAY. I do not see any good can be accomplished by referring this Bill back to the committee. When it was before the committee yesterday it was discussed very fully. Several gentlemen interested in it placed their views before the committee very fully, and, not only so, but there was quite a large attendance at the meeting.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There were 34 members present out of 112.

Mr. McKAY. There were more than an average attendance. After the report of the Inspector of Insurance, no other conclusion could be arrived at than the one reached. The promoters of the Bill and the inspector of the company placed all matters fully before the committee, and, no matter how much it might be discussed further, no other conclusion could be arrived at. The Bill has been before the committee two months, every member of the committee knew it was coming up, and I fail to see that any other result could be arrived at by referring back the Bill to the committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It would be very unfair for the House to refuse the motion of my hon. friend for this reference. He has stated that the promoters were taken by surprise, and, further, the adoption of a definite principle with respect to these associations would not be fair. It is not accurate to say that there was an average attendance at the committee, or anything like it. I have seen more than three times the number at a meeting, and it would be very unfair under the circumstances and after the statement made by my hon. friend that the parties were taken by surprise, if the reference were refused. I think the custom is not fair, either to the committee or to the parties interested in legislation, that an officer should submit a report of this kind without giving notice to the parties interested. It is not customary in the case of any other matters which come before this House. It would be better that the practice should be that the report should go to the solicitor or person interested on the other side, and that he might have an opportunity of being prepared at least to answer the statement in it before the committee. It is not fair-play that, under the circumstances, the House should refuse to refer this report back to the committee. For myself personally, I would not say that I would support the principle of the Bill in committee, or the principle that has been reported against by the committee, but it is only fair that the parties interested should have an opportunity of explaining their views.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The promoters of this particular Bill have heard the report made by the officer of the Government to the committee. If the parties interested had not an opportunity of hearing the report, or being present at the committee, it would be quite a different thing.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. These gentlemen represent to the House that they were not properly prepared to discuss this question.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They could have asked for a postponement.

Mr. LAURIER. I would represent this to the hon. gentleman. It appears that this report had not been communicated to the parties interested beforehand, and it would occur to anybody that they were not in a position to discuss it as if they had received notice. Of course upon the spur of the moment they discussed it, believing it was in their interest to do so, but no doubt they would have acted more wisely if they had asked for delay.

It seems to me it would be only fair to give them the opportunity they ask for of considering the matter and preparing their views on it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They have a local charter in the meantime.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that the reason given by the committee does undoubtedly involve the admission of an unfortunate principle. They do not say that they disapprove of granting this charter by reason of any special objection they have to the National Mutual Loan and Building Society; but they say they have agreed to report the preamble thereof not proven, because the committee is opposed to granting special incorporation to mutual loan and building societies. If that report is accepted by this House, until it is formally reversed, it undoubtedly binds this House, I think, not to allow special incorporation to any mutual loan or building society. That may be right or it may be wrong, but, as the Minister of Justice will see, it very distinctly lays down a principle which is applicable to all this class of societies. Now, thirty-four individual members of this House—unless the matter has been specially delegated to them—cannot be said to be entitled to bind the House, nor is it prudent that they should deal with this class of questions without very special considerations, and without its being known that a special question of that kind is likely to come up. The hon. gentleman knows that very little more than one-third of the members were present on that occasion. It appears to me, Sir, that the report does clearly constitute an important rule, binding on the House.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I for one would be quite prepared to abide by that rule. At all events, I would be quite prepared to respect the report of the committee, to the extent that we would not reverse it here, as I think we would be practically doing if we were to send the report back for reconsideration. Perhaps I may not have heard the hon. gentleman distinctly, but I certainly have not heard any good or sufficient reason; I may say I have heard no reason at all, which would justify us in sending this report back to the committee for reconsideration. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) said that the committee were taken by surprise. That in itself might be a sufficient reason if he had stated the circumstances under which the committee were so taken by surprise, but if it were simply the quoting from the report of the inspector——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. member misunderstood me. I said the parties promoting the Bill were taken by surprise, and had no notice of this report until it was read before the committee.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Then they were not ready with their case, and yet it had been a long time before the committee. They should have been prepared there to meet any arguments that might be adduced in that report in opposition to the Bill itself. I submit to the House that we should follow the principle of not interfering with the reports of committees where the Bills in question, or the principles involved, had been carefully considered, because that would lay down a precedent which would enable every person disappointed with the report on a Bill from so important a committee as the Committee on Banking and Commerce, to move on every occasion to have it referred back to the committee. If you have no better reason to advance in support of such a motion as that now proposed, I cannot see for the life of me, how you can prevent any report of any committee from being sent back, on the mere motion of any member who wishes to have it sent back.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a very important distinction. If the committee had examined this Bill and disapproved of the Bill *per se*, I would hesitate a great deal about supporting a motion to refer it back. But that is not the case. They expressly state, by implication at least, that they do not care whether the Bill itself is good or bad, but they disapprove of the whole class of societies of which this forms one. It is an important question, and it would do very little harm to have it thoroughly threshed out. My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) stated that the promoters of the Bill had no expectation of being called upon to deal with the question raised, and all they expected to have to deal with were the individual circumstances pertinent to that particular charter.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It seems to me that the very first thing that would suggest itself to the promoters of the Bill would have been the question of jurisdiction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not a question of jurisdiction: it is a question of expediency.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Expediency, I should have said.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. If the Bill had been before the committee for a long time, it was not the fault of the promoters. They came twice to Ottawa before the Banking and Commerce Committee, but the committee was not prepared to hear them, and it was postponed for one reason or another; once because the House was going to adjourn, and another time because the committee were not ready. The interested parties were never informed that there would be any opposition to the Bill in its present shape. They were informed that if amalgamation was intended there would be opposition; but that part of the Bill was withdrawn. They were not expecting opposition on that point, and it was a surprise to everybody, to the members of the committee as well as to the promoters of the Bill, that one of the officers of the Finance Department should come before the committee with a long statement covering several pages of closely typewritten matter, with figures and considerations of which they never had heard anything, and spring it upon the committee, and have a vote taken upon the influence of that statement which we had no opportunity to see or discuss, and consequently no opportunity to refute. The parties interested in this Bill purpose to extend their operations all over the Dominion under a Dominion charter, and they are prepared to show that this report is not in accordance with the facts, and they wish an opportunity of going before the committee to do so. Therefore, as a member of this House, I would ask that the committee be requested further to consider the question of incorporating the National Mutual Loan and Building Society. To refuse to send the report back will be equivalent

to excluding this particular class of companies from coming before this Parliament for a Dominion charter; it will be a declaration by this Parliament that such companies will be prohibited in the Dominion of Canada. I do not believe this House is prepared to take that position, and I have heard no reason adduced why it should do so, or why at a moment's notice it should, on a recommendation of a minority of the committee, reject a Bill which is entitled to better consideration than it has received. I believe that perfectly satisfactory and sufficient reasons have been given why the House should send this Bill back to the committee for further consideration. It has not been examined in any of its clauses. None of the powers asked for are exorbitant or more than have been granted to other companies, and it is only fair and just that it should receive the ordinary courtesy and fair consideration which is always given by this House to any Bill presented to it.

Mr. DICKEY. In the committee I expressed myself in favour of giving this Bill a hearing, and I am still of that opinion. At the same time, I do not think this House should, except in very exceptional circumstances, review the action of a committee, and therefore I do not propose to support the motion to recommit the Bill. I say this, so that when the Bill comes up again next session, as I suppose it will, I shall not be held as having voted against the principle of the Bill.

Mr. SCRIVER. As one of those who voted with the majority, I may say that my position is somewhat similar to that of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. If it were proper to refer to what took place in the committee, I might say that the report on which the committee are said to have acted, is not strictly correct. It was brought forward as an amendment to the report as first written, and was passed when there was a good deal of confusion, and when a good many of those who had taken part in the deliberations of the committee had left the room. I myself was opposed to the adoption of the report in the form in which it came before the House.

House divided on motion of Mr. Beausoleil:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Girouard (Two Mountains),
Bain (Wentworth),	Godbout,
Beausoleil,	Grieve,
Béchard,	Guay,
Beith,	Landerkin,
Bernier,	Laurier,
Borden,	Lavergne,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Bowers,	Legris,
Brown,	Lister,
Bruneau,	Livingston,
Campbell,	Lowell,
Carroll,	Macdonald (Huron),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	McGregor,
Charlton,	McMillan (Huron),
Choquette,	McMullen,
Christie,	Mignault,
Colter,	Mills (Bothwell),
Davies,	Paterson (Brant),
Dawson,	Rider,
Devlin,	Rinfret,
Dupont,	Sanborn,
Featherston,	Semple,
Flint,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
Gibson,	Yeo.—53.
Gillmor,	

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Macdonald (King's),
Baird,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Bennett,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bergin,	Mackintosh,
Bowell,	McAlister,
Boyle,	McDougald (Pictou),
Burnham,	McKay,
Cameron,	McLean (King's),
Cargill,	McLennan,
Carignan,	McNeill,
Carling,	Madill,
Carpenter,	Mara,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Masson,
Cleveland,	Metcalfe,
Coatsworth,	Miller,
Cochrane,	Mills (Annapolis),
Cockburn,	Monerieff,
Corbould,	Montague,
Costigan,	Northrup,
Daly,	Patterson (Colchester),
Davin,	Patterson (Huron),
Davis,	Pridham,
Denison,	Putnam,
Desaulniers,	Reid,
Dewdney,	Robillard,
Dickey,	Roome,
Dugas,	Rosamond,
Dyer,	Rowan,
Earle,	Ryckman,
Fairbairn,	Simard,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Smith (Ontario),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Sproule,
Foster,	Stairs,
Fréchette,	Stevenson,
Gillies,	Taylor,
Grandbois,	Thompson (Sir John),
Guillet,	Tisdale,
Haggart,	Turcotte,
Hazen,	Tyrwhitt,
Hearn,	Wallace,
Henderson,	Weldon,
Hodgins,	Welsh,
Hughes,	White (Cardwell),
Ingram,	White (Shelburne),
Joncas,	Wilmot,
Kaulbach,	Wilson,
Kenny,	Wood (Brockville),
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (Westmoreland).—96.

Motion negatived.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. DENISON moved:

That the time for receiving reports from the Private Bills Committee be extended to Friday, the 17th June, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Motion agreed to.

ST. MAURICE PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether the Department of Public Works has been negotiating with any parties in Three Rivers, or elsewhere, for leasing or farming out the public works, booms, slides, &c., on the St. Maurice? If so, who are the parties, and what has been the decision arrived at?

Mr. OUIMET. Propositions have been made to the department for the lease of the property mentioned, but no decision has been arrived at.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who are the parties?

Mr. OUIMET. One is Mr. Gagnon and the other is Mr. Baptist.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That Government Orders have precedence next after "Questions put by Members," on Mondays during the remainder of this session.

He said: I think the House will agree with me that for many sessions past the opportunities for bringing forward private business have not been anything like so great as they have been this year. The Notices of Motion have been repeatedly gone through, the Public Bills and Orders have been gone through on two or three occasions, and in addition to that the Bills which are before the House on Government Orders are such as to require every moment the House can give to them if prorogation is to take place at anything like a reasonable time before midsummer. I think the diligence with which the House has proceeded with business this session justifies me in asking that Mondays shall be given for Government business for the remainder of the session.

Mr. LAURIER. I would have hoped that this motion would not have come up at this period. As the hon. gentleman is aware, there are still on the Order Paper for next Monday no less than three important measures which should receive the consideration of the House. Moreover, this is a motion which only comes at a time when prorogation is almost within sight, and I am sorry to say that the blessed day is not yet at all visible to the naked eye. I may say that I understood the hon. gentleman to have told us some few days ago that there were still measures to come from the Government. I do not deny that opportunities have been ample this session for members of the House generally to present their own measures and views, but the hon. gentleman will not deny that the Government have had as many opportunities to bring on their motions, and if I understood the hon. gentleman correctly some few days ago, the Government have still other measures to bring down.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not aware of any measures to be brought down except the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. LAURIER. I put the question the other day to the hon. gentleman with regard to the mission at Washington, and I understood him to say he had other measures to bring down.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said that a statement would be made and communications laid on the Table.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman will give us a day to consider the motion that I had the honour to move last Monday?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no power to give the hon. gentleman a day for that purpose. Even if next Monday were not taken, he could not except that it would be reached, because there are two important Bills, which will require very full consideration, standing before his motion, and in addition to that there is a motion which will certainly take more than one day, if it be reached, and that is the motion in regard to the North-West Territories.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before this motion is carried, I beg leave to state that I have on the Notice Paper a resolution which I will take the first opportunity of moving on some occasion when going into Supply, as I would like to have action taken on the subject. The resolution is to the effect that it is expedient the Government should provide an official inspection of cheese and butter.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand, then, from the hon. gentleman, that the Government have nothing more to bring except the Supplementary Estimates?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Nothing that I am aware of at present.

Mr. LAURIER. That applies to the question of railway subsidies? Nothing further in that line?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My colleague has just reminded me that there may be resolutions on that subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is very inexpedient.

Motion agreed to.

THE CENSUS RETURNS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he can inform me at what date the census bulletin giving the birthplaces of the people is likely to be laid before us?

Mr. CARLING. It is now in type and expected in a few days—early in the week, if not before.

BRITISH FARMER DELEGATES' REPORT.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if we are to have another opportunity to move for the production of the report of the British Farmer Delegates, Messrs. McQueen and Davey, on the Maritime Provinces?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman will make his motion to-morrow, when motions are called, I will ask the consent of the House to have it adopted in order that the papers may be laid on the Table.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir John Thompson: "That Bill (No. 76) to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons, be read a second time;" and the motion of Mr. McCarthy in amendment thereto.

Mr. BOYLE. I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the elaborate legal problem which was presented to this House the other day by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and which has received the very able consideration of the legal authorities in this House. Nor is it my intention to endeavour to prove that the scheme submitted by the Government is the best which could possibly be devised under any circumstances. It is my purpose to consider the scheme briefly, as I do not wish to occupy at any great length the time of this House, and also to compare it with the scheme propounded by the hon. member for North Simcoe in his amendment. The preamble of that amendment reads as follows:—

"That the said Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved, that the distribution of seats of the members of this House should, so far as practicable, be based on equality of population, due regard being had to the community of interests existing in localities, a full and fair expression of public opinion, and the permanence and stability of constituencies."

I may say that I agree *in toto* with every proposition propounded in that preamble. I agree that the distribution of seats of the members of this House should, so far as practicable, be based on equality of population, due regard being had to the

community of interests existing in localities, a full and fair expression of public opinion, and the permanence and stability of constituencies. I will go further and say that I am of the opinion that no Government, no Parliament, no body of men however powerful, would be justified in making use of their power and majority for the purpose of going outside these well defined limitations in the redistribution of the people's representation. But, Sir, after reciting the preamble, the hon. gentleman in his amendment, goes on to say:

"That the most effectual way of accomplishing these ends is to assume county and city boundaries as the natural limits of electoral districts, with equitable divisions thereof, constituted with compactness as regards geographical position, and based on well-known existing areas where the population entitles the city or county to two or more representatives."

If this is intended to be read as being in favour of allowing the cities their full quota of representation according to population, I am to the fullest extent also in favour of that proposition. I can see no reason why an elector residing within the bounds of a city should in any way be placed at a disadvantage or be considered to occupy an inferior position to one residing in a rural constituency. I say the recognition of the principle of inequality in that respect would work evil between our urban and rural populations. The organizations which exist so largely in cities, known as trade unions, bodies of artisans, and labouring men, would very quickly recognize this distinction, would very quickly realize that they were not placed in the same position with regard to electoral freedom as their neighbours who might reside outside city boundaries. I have listened with a great deal of attention and care to the observations which have been made, not only by gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, but also of gentlemen on this side of the House, regarding the present representation of cities. They have told us that, in consequence of the rural constituencies being represented in this House largely by gentlemen whose residences are in the cities, therefore the cities are indirectly represented now and it is not necessary to give them their full legal or nominal quota of representatives in this House. I can see no good sound argument in that, because, if that is conceded, the rural constituencies will on their behalf begin to think whether they are not deceived in the quality of their representatives, when they have given them a brief, so to speak, to represent them on the floor of this House, and find it implied by speeches made here that these gentlemen are not true to the obligation they have undertaken, but that, instead of representing the constituencies they are elected to represent, they allow them to fall into the background and give their attention to the cities where their property lies or where they may reside. The first result of that would be that the rural constituencies would reject the candidates who resided in the cities, and the effect would be injurious to the quality of this House, because we are prepared to admit that on both sides gentlemen sit in this House whose residence is in cities, but whose constituency is outside, and whose presence here is an honour, an advantage, and an ornament to the House, and a benefit to the country. It would be reactionary for us to curtail the power of the expression of public opinion in that direction on the floor of Parliament. We have always admitted the principle of non-residence. It is not necessary for the exercise of the franchise that the voter should reside in the constituency in which he votes. He may reside outside the country altogether, but, because he has a certain interest in the constituency, the laws of the country will allow him to exercise his franchise therein. Why should a stigma be put on those gentlemen who live in cities and represent rural constituencies? I think this Bill might have given to the cities their full quota of representation in this House. But, if reasons have been assigned by a few gentlemen on this side of the House for not giving cities the full representation, the greater burden of that argument has come from the other side. We heard the leader of the Opposition and other hon. gentlemen referring at length to this matter; but without being uncharitable or wishing to ascribe motives, I could not help thinking that those hon. gentlemen had other reasons than those they stated for not desiring the full representation of cities in this Parliament. During the recent election we know that the hon. gentleman went through the length and breadth of this land and addressed large audiences. The leader of the Opposition went to Montreal and Toronto, and spoke to immense audiences. He wooed them with honeyed words and specious arguments, and endeavoured to influence them with that charm of manner which is almost an argument in itself. But he did not get the city constituencies. They would have none of him. They rejected his candidates and the candidates of his party by large majorities, and now, if he proposes to put more power in the rural constituencies than in the cities as to their representation in Parliament, he may have more reasons than one for the course he is adopting. Having said this much, I have to draw a distinction. I am entirely opposed to the limitation of county and city boundaries. I say that such a restriction is absurd and useless, that there is no necessity whatever for interfering with the exercise of the cardinal principle laid down in the preamble, namely, equality of representation. We are told that is the English practice. That may be the case. The English people may see the reason for confining the representation to counties on the one hand and cities on the other, but, though yielding to no man in this House in my loyalty to Great Britain and to its institutions, I do not think I am called upon to follow slavishly every principle and every practice which is adopted there. This is one custom which, in this country, would be more honoured in the breach than in the observance. It may be advisable to do this in certain instances, but, if all the other circumstances which go to make up representation are involved, it will not stop there. You have one constituency with a population of 32,000 or 33,000, and another with a population of 18,000. As a nation, we are too much isolated now. We have our provincial isolation. We are known as British Columbians, and Manitobans, and Nova Scotians, and Ontarians, and Quebeckers, while we ought to be known simply as Canadians. The principle of the British North America Act, which is our constitution, may be responsible for that, but I do not think our differences stop there. Nationally we are known as Germans, Scotch, English, Irish, French, and almost everything but Canadians. Some people, with a little more sentiment or feeling than others, call themselves, English-

Canadians, or Irish-Canadians, or French-Canadians, as the case may be, but we have not yet arrived at the point where we call ourselves simply Canadians. I was surprised to hear that this province has apparently been divided again, and is now known as eastern Ontario and western Ontario. This sectional idea, if carried out, might be fatal to the life of this Dominion. We should endeavour to develop a broader sentiment than that. We should feel that we are not local or sectional but cosmopolitan, and that here we are laying the foundations of a nation, that we have interests interwoven with other provinces, that we here in Ontario are concerned for the interests of Manitoba or British Columbia, and they are concerned for our interests, and no good results can be expected from keeping up the boundaries which separate one province from another or one county from another. But there are other even more practicable objections to the scheme propounded by the member for North Simcoe. Hon. gentlemen will bear in mind that the representation of the different provinces is arbitrary; according to the Confederation Act the Province of Quebec is limited to 65 members, and that becomes the relative proportion of representation for all the other provinces; therefore the representation for the Province of Ontario is limited to 92. But with this arbitrary figure as the number which shall represent the Province of Ontario on the floor of this House, we have to enter into consideration with an intangible quantity, and we have to divide that uncertain sum by the figure of 92 to make it come out exactly equal. Granted that it is possible now in the Province of Ontario, and that a fairly equal basis of representation can be obtained by it, it does not follow that in ten years from now, when the representation will have to be readjusted again, the same effect might be produced. The representation from Ontario then might be 96, and the figure might not come out exactly equal. But this can be more fully emphasized by reference to the Province of Quebec, which has 65 representatives, and has had that number since the beginning of Confederation, and for almost time immemorial prior to that, and where this principle of confining the representation to county boundaries has had its fullest play and exercise. In that province, of the 65 representatives, 59 represent county constituencies, and 6 represent city constituencies. The hon. member for North Simcoe, in elaborating his scheme, said there would have to be some elasticity connected with it, and he said he would be willing to grant a margin of 20 per cent either way; that a constituency falling 20 per cent below the unit, might be entitled to its full representation, while, on the other hand, if it went 20 per cent above the unit, and no more, it could not obtain any additional representation. The effect of this, as stated by my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Masson) the other night, would be to make the minimum 18,400, I think, and the maximum 27,600, or a difference of 50 per cent, a pretty wide margin indeed. Now, to work this out as he stated it should be worked out to give it the fullest play, I find that additional representatives would have to be given in the Province of Quebec as follows: the County of Beauce, with 37,222 population, one new member; to the constituency of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, with 38,281 population, one new member; to the constituency of Drummond and Arthabaska, with a population of 43,923, one new member: to the County of Hochelaga, with a population of 80,988, two new members: to the County of Ottawa, with a population of 64,056, two new members; and to the city of Montreal, with a population of 216,650, six new members, making in all 13 new representatives in that province. But the representation is to remain as it is at present, with 65 members; therefore there are 54 counties in which these 13 are to be taken, leaving 41 counties which will have to be readjusted in order to secure these 13 new representatives. Now, I have gone over the map of the Province of Quebec with some care; I have also taken the census of the population of the different constituencies, and, irrespective of any party advantage—because I contend that should not have any play in this matter—for the purpose of working out that scheme honestly and fairly, I have endeavoured to see what result could be accomplished by it. I have added the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil together, with a population of 20,411, and that would give one representative to supply one of the vacancies which have been created. I would give one member to the Counties of Montcalm and L'Assomption, with a united population of 25,805, and that would leave another representative to fill a vacancy. Next, I would put Napierville and Laprairie, with a united population of 21,001, together and this would give one more representative for the purpose of filling a vacancy. Next, I would add Chambly and Verchères together, with a total population of 23,961, and another member would be set at large for the purpose of filling a vacancy. Then, I would add St. Maurice and Three Rivers together, with a total population of 21,401, and this would set at liberty another representative to fill another vacancy. Now, if I have added up the figures correctly, I find six members that could be taken out of the Province of Quebec for the purpose of filling 13 vacancies under the scheme propounded by the member for North Simcoe. But if we go a little further and make the margin still wider, giving more elasticity to the scheme, and say that a margin of 30 per cent be given instead of 20 per cent, which will make a difference between the minimum and maximum of nearly 100 per cent, still the scheme cannot be accomplished. Under that rule we could add the Counties of Chateauguay and Huntingdon, with a united population of 27,666, by which one more vacancy could be created. Then we could add the Counties of Napierville and Rouville, with a united population of 27,905, by which another vacancy could be filled; and the Counties of L'Islet and Montmagny, with a population of 28,548, by which another vacancy could be filled; making, in all, nine, and that is the most that could be accomplished in the Province of Quebec under the scheme proposed by the member for North Simcoe. So I say there is no possibility of working that out as applied to the Province of Quebec, and I am confident that the same difficulties would arise if we attempted to apply it to the other provinces as well. I now come to consider the political effect of the scheme submitted to the House by the leader of the Government, and the effect of the other scheme submitted by the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe. I must say that, after considering the scheme carefully, I am unable to see that there is any political advantage to be gained, or that any

has been sought, by the Government in the Bill now before us. It is true, that by a process of skilful argument, an apparent injustice may be shown to exist in certain localities, but the advocate who would put that forward and who would endeavour to show an injustice by that means, would carefully suppress the fact that in some other localities a disadvantage will be the result to the party. But if the advantages and disadvantages are put together, if the one is balanced against the other, it will be seen, I think, that no political advantage can accrue to the party in power in consequence of the scheme which has been propounded by the leader of the Government. The Minister of Public Works, the other night, in his able speech upon this question as regards the Province of Quebec, stated that in the last election in 1891, 38 Liberals were returned to this House and 27 Conservatives; notwithstanding the fact that 3,870 more votes were polled by the Conservatives than by the Liberal candidates. Although the Liberal party had a majority from the Province of Quebec of 11 in this House, yet the Conservatives had a majority of 3,870 in the popular vote. I want to stop right here, and suppose for a moment that the Liberal party were in power to-day and the responsibility devolved upon them of redistributing the constituencies in the Province of Quebec. According to the well-known tenets of the Reform party, according to the principles they have laid down in regard to representation, they would feel themselves bound to fully apply and give effect to the preponderating political sentiment in Quebec. It would be the duty of the leader of the Government, the present leader of the Opposition, and those behind him, to propound a scheme which would honestly and fairly carry out the views they advocated in opposition and give full effect to the preponderating sentiment in that province. In order to do that, they would have not only to bring the Conservative representation of Quebec up to a line which would put it on all-fours with the Liberal party in this House, but they would have to go even beyond that; they would have to extinguish the adventitious majority they now have from that province, amounting, on the basis of the last general election, to 11, and they would have to give full force and effect to the 3,870 majority which the Conservatives obtained in that election over and above the votes polled by the other party. The effect would be this: allowing a majority of 387 for those brought into political existence in consequence, there would be 10 members added to the Conservative side from the Province of Quebec. So that the position as it would stand after the Liberal party had got through redistribution would be, if they acted fairly and honestly according to their present views, that the Conservatives would have 10 majority in this House from Quebec instead of 11 minority as at present. Now, I will occupy a few moments in speaking of the political advantages that may accrue to the Province of Ontario, and I want to say a word right here in regard to the views expressed by the independent press. I have the greatest respect for the utterances of the press of this Dominion. On the whole I think it is a credit to us, and that the newspapers speak manly and fairly and exhibit a measure of independence and ability which are creditable to themselves and a great advantage to the people, and also furnish an important guide to the representatives of the people on the floor of this House. But I cannot but believe that the press called the independent press, newspapers which affect to belong to neither political party, but speak what they think right, have been greatly misled in the text which gave existence to the lectures which they have assumed to deliver to the representatives of the people in this House. A report has got into circulation, I do not know where, by whom or how, that the statistician, Mr. George Johnson, said, shortly after the general election, that, notwithstanding the majority which the Conservatives obtained in Parliament, the Liberals had a popular majority in Ontario to the extent of about 7,000 votes. Those newspapers took up that statement without going to the trouble, which I hold they were bound to do, to consider whether it was correct or not, whether there was any foundation for the statement or not. They assumed it was correct, and thereupon they read to the Conservatives a good many well-meant homilies on their duty to the people in consequence of this gross inequality between the popular vote and its representation on the floor of this House. And that was not all. The usually well-informed member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who led in the debate on the first reading of the Bill, repeated that statement. It was repeated further on by the members for North Norfolk, South Brant and North Wellington; in fact, that statement seemed to hold good in all the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite until the hon. member for East Huron gave the statement its quietus, because that hon. gentleman had honestly discharged his duty by going to the public returns and discovering for himself that, instead of the Reform party having a majority of 7,000 in the general elections, the Conservative party had, including the bye-elections, a majority of upwards of 4,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Your own side admitted that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all; I have all the figures here.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for East Huron admitted it.

Mr. BOYLE. I will leave the member for Bothwell and the member for East Huron to fight the matter out between themselves. I have my own figures, and I will not depend on another's statement.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I collected all the figures of the general election and corrected them by the results of the bye-elections, making the changes necessary.

Mr. BOYLE. I give credit to the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) for having of his own motion gone over the returns and prepared his own figures. I am bound to say they are on the whole fair, although they do not quite come up to the maximum of my figures, still the difference is not serious, and they show he was actuated by a fair and honest intention in collecting these figures. But if the hon. member for East Huron was on the whole fair in his calculation as to the aggregate

of the popular majority of the Conservative party at the general elections and the bye-elections, I wholly dissent from the conclusion he attempted to deduce from it. He told the House, if I remember rightly, that the Conservatives polled a gross vote in Ontario of 182,000 and the Liberals 178,000. Am I correct ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). 186,000 Conservatives and 182,000 Liberals, leaving out the odd numbers.

Mr. BOYLE. 186,000 votes polled by the Conservatives and 182,000 polled by the Liberals, gives a majority of 4,000 to the Conservatives. If that gross vote had received a proper expression on the floor of this House the Conservatives would have returned 46 and a half members and the Liberals 45 and a half.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You have a good many half members now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No quarters.

Mr. BOYLE. There were fractions in the hon. gentleman's figures. The hon. gentleman came to this remarkable conclusion : That the Government, in consequence of those figures, would be entitled to a majority of one in this House from Ontario, which he said was the result of the 1882 gerrymander. The absurdity of the calculation will be apparent when I state that this one member would have 4,000 majority at his back in consequence of this figuring by the hon. member for East Huron, or sufficient to give 28 members an average majority of between 150 and 160. That is to say, that the majority of the Conservative members would run on all fours with the majority of the Liberal members up to 32, which is the full number of the Liberal members from Ontario, and there would still remain an average majority for the additional 28 Conservative members from this province of between 150 and 160. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to look at the returns of the elections in Ontario from time to time, he will find that the popular majority has sometimes been less than 5 per cent, even less than 4 per cent, and yet, although the popular majority was so small, that majority was reflected on the floor of the Provincial Legislature to the extent of 35 per cent, or even 50 per cent, majority. That is the inevitable result of representation under our system of government. If the hon. gentleman were to take the result of any of the English elections and examine the returns in the same way, he would find in some cases that the dominant party did not carry the elections by more than 2 per cent majority, yet it was represented by 150 or 200 majority on the floor of the British Parliament. Mr. Speaker, a gentleman of distinction, who occupied a very prominent place on the floor of this House some years ago—I refer to the Hon. Mr. Blake—made a series of speeches shortly after the general election of 1874, when he was then occupying somewhat the position of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) now, a sort of governmental free lance. He made speeches in Aurora and in some other places, and he took occasion there to refer to the representation on the floor of Parliament as compared with the votes given by the respective political parties in the general elections. He stated that the country after the general election of 1874 was astounded at the overwhelming victory which the Reform party had achieved in this election, that the Conservative party was considered to have been almost annihilated, that the Mackenzie Government had been sustained with a majority of nearly 100 members, and that only about 60 Conservatives had been elected all over the Dominion, while the Liberals or Reformers, as they were called that day, had a representation of about 150 members. Then he undertook to dissect the figures, and he educed the remarkable fact that, notwithstanding the enormous majority the Mackenzie Government had on the floor of Parliament, yet out of every nineteen votes polled, only ten went to the Liberals while nine went to the Conservatives, and that if these had had their proper play, instead of a majority of nearly 100 on the floor of Parliament, the Mackenzie Government would only have had a majority of ten or twelve members and not a working majority at all. The Hon. Mr. Blake in his Aurora speech elaborated this remarkable circumstance in the result of the election still further. Speaking upon representation and upon the methods which prevailed in this country, he said, referring to the elections of 1867 in Nova Scotia :

"Coming nearer home, for perhaps our Tory friends will object to my taking illustrations from across the line, in Nova Scotia, in the year 1867, there was a bitterly fought contest on the question of union or anti-union. The result was that only Mr. Tupper was returned from the whole province, and that by a very narrow majority, as a representative of the union sentiment. I have analysed the statistics of that election, and I find that the real strength exhibited at the polls would have given, as nearly as I can estimate, seven to the union side instead of one, and only twelve to the small anti-unionists, instead of eighteen. Take Nova Scotia again in 1874, the returns gave nineteen to the Government, one Independent, and one Opposition—Mr. Tupper again. I will give him the independent man into the bargain, because I think he belongs to that quarter. The popular vote on that occasion would, as nearly as I can judge, have given eight out of the twenty-one to that side instead of two, and but thirteen to the Government instead of nineteen. Our principle of government is that the majority must decide."

Again, he says, later on :

"In the late election of 1874, the popular voice, although very strongly in favour of the Government, was by no means so decided as the returns showed. And besides this, 178 votes turned the other way would have changed eight seats, making a difference of sixteen on a division. Little more than double that number would have changed 16 seats, or 32 on a division, and this is a province where 200,000 votes would, if all the elections were contested, have been polled."

I have occupied more of the attention of the House than I intended, and I will not quote further in this direction. Some few weeks ago another of the independent papers, the Montreal *Star*, referred to the position of parties in the Province of Ontario and stated that there were eleven constituencies in the Province of Ontario with an aggregate Liberal majority as registered at the last general election of 11,000 votes. Now, Sir, that statement is not strictly correct. There are not eleven constituencies which will count up 11,000 majority, but even if it were true, and if that newspaper wished to be entirely fair, it should have stated also what were the aggregate majorities in eleven of the strongest constituencies in that province. That extract from the *Star* was copied into the rest of the so-called independent papers, and was made the foundation of reflections upon the course of the

Government in this Redistribution Bill. I have here, Sir, the figures of the eleven constituencies in the Province of Ontario which gave the highest Liberal majority, and I will compare them with the eleven constituencies which gave the largest Conservative majority. The following is the result of that comparison:—

Liberal Constituencies.	Majority	Conservative Constituencies.	Majority
North Oxford	1,531	West Toronto	1,757
North Brant	1,116	East Toronto	1,464
West Ontario	999	Carleton, 1887	1,085
West Bruce	930	South Simcoe	1,060
South Huron	855	West York	806
North Essex	849	South Lanark	630
South Oxford	734	East Lambton	596
West Elgin	682	East Middlesex	548
South Middlesex	624	Centre Toronto	502
West Lambton	598	Ottawa (as two)	1,083
Bothwell	550		
Total majority for 11 Liberal constituencies	9,471	Total majority for 11 Conservative constituencies	9,501

I have given the hon. gentleman for West Ontario the full benefit of his majority, although I understand there were two Liberals running. I also give the hon. member for Bothwell the full benefit of his majority. In Carleton there was no party election, and I took the figures for 1887, as also in South Simcoe, Ottawa I count for this purpose as one constituency, because it is one of the dual constituencies, and it would not be fair to take two majorities. I contend that the reflections which the Montreal *Star* and the other independent newspapers undertake to cast upon the Government, in consequence of treating the single undivided fact as to the Liberal majorities, altogether disappear when the Conservative majorities are placed alongside of it. But, Sir, it occurred to me that I might carry the analysis a little further, and I therefore took up the next eleven Liberal constituencies as represented in this House, and compared them with the majorities in the next eleven highest Conservative constituencies, with the following result:—

Liberal Constituencies.	Majority	Conservative Constituencies.	Majority
South Brant	542	East Elgin	495
Kent	476	South Renfrew	444
North Norfolk	468	Halton	440
Russell	413	Algoma	438
South Wellington	376	East Hastings	422
North York	363	South Norfolk	412
South Waterloo	312	West Middlesex	410
East Huron	308	West Hastings	360
Prescott	269	Glengarry	327
Welland	267	Hamilton (as two)	654
Lincoln	232		
Total majority for 11 Liberal constituencies	4,026	Total majority for 11 Conservative constituencies	4,412

But, Sir, I did not let the comparison stop there, but I thought I would run over the remaining 10 constituencies, comparing them with 10 Conservative constituencies, and the result was as follows:—

Liberal Constituencies.	Majority	Conservative Constituencies.	Majority
North Wentworth	200	North Lanark	430
West Durham	198	Monck	327
North Wellington	186	North Simcoe	296
Centre Wellington	156	Cardwell	248
Peel	132	North Ontario	254
North Perth	87	North Grey	247
North Waterloo	85	East York	240
South Essex	57	North Victoria	239
Addington	61	E. Northumberland	236
South Grey	3	West Peterborough	232
Total for 10	1,165	Total for 10	2,749

Now, comparing the 32 constituencies represented by Liberal members with the 32 represented by Conservative members, we find a total Liberal majority of 14,662, and a total Conservative majority of 16,652. We have besides 28 constituencies represented in this House by Conservative members by an aggregate majority of 2,629. The average majority of the Liberal members sent to this House from Ontario was 458, and the average majority of the Conservative members, 321. The argument which I wish to deduce from these figures is this: that whether the Act of 1882 redistributing the constituencies was intended to injure the Liberal party or not, it had not the effect, or the inflow and outflow of population in the constituencies tended to correct any effect which that Act might have had in that respect; so that when the electorate came to be appealed to in 1891 it was in a practically fair constituency as between the two parties. Now, a good deal of reference has been made in this House to the Ontario gerrymander. Whether the Ontario gerrymander was right or wrong does not concern this House. I would not defend the leaders of the Conservative party in this House in bringing in a Redistribution Bill which would be unfair to our opponents, because, forsooth, Sir Oliver Mowat and his friends treated the Conservatives of our province in that way. I say that is no argument at all. We should do right, be the result what it may. But it comes with poor grace from those gentlemen who have all along defended Sir Oliver Mowat's wrong-doing, to lecture us and the Government for the Bill now before us. I say, too, that the particular shape of the constituencies, whether they are regular or irregular, is a matter of minor consequence. I care not whether the constituency which I happen to represent is square, circular or oblong, or whether it is irregular in shape, if it meets the requirements of the parties and affords conveniences to the electorate, to register their votes, and if it is one in which an interchange of ideas can be obtained, and in which speakers can enlighten the electors on public questions. It is a matter of entire indifference to me what the peculiar shape of the constituency may be; I consider that of minor importance. Sir, in common with other representatives, I could not help being struck at the remarks made yesterday complimenting the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) upon the independent stand they have taken on this question,

and at the fulsome adulations they received. I do not know whether those hon. gentlemen felt more honoured or more grieved at those complimentary references; but, Sir, assuming that they are sincere and well meant, and that those honourable and independent gentlemen have taken them in the best spirit, I with them am disposed to rejoice for this reason, that those two hon. gentlemen, in common with myself and in common with other members on this side of the House, have been held up to the contumely and scorn and abusive epithets of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House for the stand we have taken on questions which have come before this Parliament this session and in previous sessions. We have been told, in consequence of certain votes which we have given, on the Judge Elliott charges and the Caron charges, that we were a servile majority and a brute force, that we had no independence, that we were all that members should not be and were nothing of what members should be. But it seems that forgiveness is easy to be obtained from hon. gentlemen opposite. We have only to be independent now and then, we have only occasionally to administer a stab to our party leaders, and all our past sins will be forgotten, open arms will be held out to us from the other side, and we shall be welcomed to their fold. I congratulate those hon. gentlemen on their forgiving spirit, and I hope that they will display it to us as well as to the hon. member for North Simcoe and the hon. member for Muskoka. In conclusion, I may say that I have not discussed the details of this measure. I am somewhat personally concerned in those details, as they affect the constituency which I have the honour to represent. I would be glad if it could be so arranged that the constituency of Monck, which has existed since Confederation, and which with the exception of two sessions has given an unswerving support to the Conservative party in this House, could be maintained as at present; but, Sir, if in the public interest it is necessary that that constituency should disappear from the representation in this House, and that the townships which now make it up should be divided between my hon. friend from Lincoln, who I am sure is not sorry to receive them, and my hon. friend from Haldimand, and if it should happen in consequence that I shall have to disappear from Parliament, it is a matter of minor consequence. I ask the House to pardon me for having spoken at such length on this occasion, which is the first on which I have addressed it this session.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Mr. Speaker, I can sympathize with the feeling of my hon. friend in his concluding remarks. If the Bill, as presented to the House by the hon. Minister of Justice is carried through in its entirety, as some hon. gentlemen say it will be, after the next general election my friend, the leader of the Ontario contingent will have his belt decorated with our political scalps, and the constituencies we represent will have ceased to exist. But there is this difference: The hon. member for Monck is led up to the political slaughter by his own friends; they have sacrificed him of their own free will and pleasure, and it remains to be seen how the Conservatives in the riding I formerly represented will appreciate the position in which they find themselves with regard to the political future of the new constituency of either Wentworth or Brant. But, aside from this personal question, the matter before us to-night is one of considerable importance to the electorate of the Dominion at large. These periodical difficulties in connection with the redistribution of constituences occur, under our system of administration, at regular intervals, once every ten years: but, I think, taking the history of our young Dominion in connection with redistribution, it does seem to me that there are features in this measure which must be exceedingly discouraging to every lover of Canada. I reciprocate the expressions of sympathy with regard to building up a Canadian nationality on this northern part of the continent, as expressed by my hon. friend from Monck. I believe the sooner we can consolidate ourselves into one great Dominion and forget our provincial and local associations, the better it will be for the future of this country. But we have certain local peculiarities and circumstances, which, while we are Canadians, we utterly refuse to ignore: and while I yield to no man in respect and regard for the mother country with which we are associated and for the Dominion we are striving to build up, I cannot forget that I owe certain allegiance also to my own province and county. Now, if you look back to 1872, when the first redistribution of constituencies was made, we find that in the Province of Nova Scotia the increase of population entitled it to two additional members. We find also that New Brunswick had increased in population, and was entitled to one additional member. Ontario likewise had grown to such an extent, on the basis furnished by the Province of Quebec as the unit of population, that she was entitled to six additional members, while the new territories of Manitoba and British Columbia, for which special provision was made when they were admitted into Confederation, had not as yet grown to that extent which would entitle them to any additional representation. From 1867 to 1872 was a period of substantial growth, although a short one. Coming down to 1882, when the next census was taken, we find that notwithstanding it was the period characterized as blue-ruin by our hon. friends opposite, notwithstanding it was the period of soup kitchens, notwithstanding it was the period when the people were fleeing from this country as if a plague followed them, as they declared, yet during that period the eastern provinces of this Dominion were able to retain their representation compared with the unit in Quebec, and the Province of Ontario had so far grown that she was entitled to four new members, and the Province of Manitoba gained one member—and that was in the period hon. gentlemen opposite are in the habit of describing as the gloomiest days of Canada's political existence. We come down then to the present census taken last year, on the basis of which the hon. leader of this House presents to us a Redistribution Bill, and for the first time in the history of the Dominion we find that Canada has not been able to hold her own. We find that the eastern provinces have lost four representatives, that Ontario simply holds her own, and that the great west, where we have spent money so freely to encourage settlement, is only entitled to two additional members, both for the Province of Manitoba. Now, I do not care what the political creed or complexion of the individual may be, who looks these facts in the face, I say it is a bitter condem-

nation of the policy pursued by the Government. They have failed utterly and dismally to fulfil the promises they held out to the people when they were entrusted with power in 1878; and for the first time in the history of this Dominion, and notwithstanding the fact that we have paid out in hard cash from the treasury of this Dominion $62,000,000 to build up that great continental railway and develop the resources of our great North-West, and notwithstanding that we have in addition given 46,500,000 acres of land free to that railway and to aid in the construction of branch lines to open up the country and induce settlers to make their homes in our virgin territories of the North-West,—notwithstanding all this, after ten years of this experience we have the humiliating result that only sufficient population has been directed to these broad and fertile prairies to warrant our giving two more representatives to the Province of Manitoba. I say that is not a satisfactory exhibit, and it goes to prove that these gentlemen have utterly failed to advance the interests of this Dominion by their policy as they proposed to do. It seems to me, with due respect to my hon. friend who has just preceded me, that instead of its being a fair and equitable distribution of representation, this Bill is an attempt to secure if possible a majority of representatives by means of a minority of votes. The hon. gentleman gave us long tables of figures to show the relative position of a certain portion of the constituencies at the last election. Sir, I point him to the one simple set of figures which he must admit to be correct, and which were presented by the hon. member for East Huron last evening. Now, stripped of all these extra decorations and embellishments, what do these figures indicate? Simply this, that taking into account all the bye-elections held since the general election of 1891 down to the present time in the Province of Ontario, in round numbers the Conservatives polled 186,000, and the Liberals 182,000 votes, or 4,000 less. The Conservatives, with a vote of 186,000, have 59 members in this House, while, with a vote cast of 182,000, the Liberals have just 33 members from the Province of Ontario. To put it in simple plain English, if these figures were equally distributed, one Conservative member in this House represents 3,150 votes, while the Liberals had to cast 5,550 votes before they got one representative here. Gentlemen opposite admit that this statement is substantially correct. That is a satisfactory and irrefutable reply to all the fancy figures which we have heard of, dealing with the representation of the Province of Ontario, and this includes all the cities and the large majorities in those cities which the Conservatives are so fond of boasting are so solidly with them. Under these circumstances, I ask any thinking man if the effort of the late great leader of the Conservative party was not fairly successful, as expressed by himself, when he said that the Act of 1882 was intended to hive the Grits. My friend says the distribution now is made on a fair and equitable basis, and is done with a purpose of securing a representation of the electors without regard to their political complexion. Sir, they may make this statement, but the moment they proceed to examine the details, their evidence will be refuted by the facts as presented by themselves. Now, with respect to the resolution presented to the House in amendment to the Bill introduced by the Minister of Justice, I want to say one word. These gentlemen have been all this time arguing as if the Opposition were the responsible parties for this resolution. I want to remind hon. gentlemen that that proposition does not emanate from our side of the House, but is presented by a member who is recognized to be a supporter of the Government, by a member whom my friend sneered at because he had independence enough to say that he thought the line of policy pursued by the Government was not correct. It was no statement made by an opponent of the Government in reciting that resolution, but it was by a supporter of the Government, who presented to the House this statement respecting the measure brought down by his own political leader:

"That the system now prevailing and proposed to be continued by the said Bill fails to secure equality of population, ignores community of interests, disregards geographical compactness, renders stability impossible, and is liable to gross abuse in affording opportunities in the arrangement of electoral districts for promoting party aims and obtaining party advantages regardless of the considerations which ought to determine the settlement of the representation of the people in this House."

Sir, that statement is not made by a member of the Opposition, but by a gentleman who is recognized as a supporter of the policy of the Government, and his seconder has never been recognized as belonging to this side of the House. Under these circumstances, where do all their statements come in when they have presented to us long statements showing the cruel injustice of the Mowat Act in Ontario? This indictment of their policy is made by one of themselves, and when they taunt him with supporting the Distribution Bill of 1882, and say he must have got new light on this question, I ask you if you can recall any member of any standing on that side of the House of prolonged political experience who has not in one form or another expressed his opinion that the Act of 1882 was not one that reflected any credit on the Government that introduced it? It was left to two new members of this House, with limited political experience—my friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) and my friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett)—neither of whom have had much experience in dealing with these issues, and one of whom at least appears occasionally to have been afflicted with visions of Fenians that have disturbed his rest, when he was on the high road to promotion and advancement. In substantiation of my position as to this motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), let me call attention to the words of the hon. member for Cumberland:

"I must say, although perhaps this is irrevelant, that the Act of 1882 does not commend itself very strongly to my judgment. I do not know, but I suppose I would have followed the hon. gentleman from Simcoe, if I had been here, in supporting the Act; but looking at it through the vista of years, it seems to me a very objectionable Act."

There is a statement of another supporter of the Government. When he had a vista of ten years to look back through, and when he took into account the circumstances in connection with the redistribution of the constituencies in the Province of Ontario, he thought it was a very objectionable Act. A little further on, I find that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) was discussing the same question; and how did it occur to him, after taking an impartial view of the question and ransacking

the map of Ontario, to find what had been done when he was absent from the House? He says:

"Although a lower province member, I deemed it my duty to look at the old statutes of old Canada, as well as the statutes of 1872 and 1882, and also at the election returns and the census, to take a map of Ontario in order to find out by patient study, and by the assistance of some experts, what the merits of the Bill of 1882 exactly were; and I am free to say here and now, after having reconstructed the old political map of 1867, and having gone over the counties of Ontario one by one as they were then defined by the British North America Act, and having compared the old map with the map of 1882—having found in some cases townships scattered like flocks of birds upon which the dogs had pounced, one being here and another one there, so that it was hard to find them and replace them in their old positions—after this study, I am free and frank in saying that I think the Redistribution Act of 1882 was one that reflected very little credit upon the Parliament of Canada that passed it."

These are not the words of an opponent of the Government but of a gentleman who, after a patient examination, was compelled to express himself in that way. These gentlemen recede from their position, when found to be untenable, by saying that they have had three elections since the extraordinary distribution of constituencies in Ontario, and that it would now be an additional aggravation to change those constituencies and bring them back to county boundaries. I commend to these gentlemen the unanswerable statement presented by my hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) last evening, when he reconstructed those counties on their municipal and judicial basis, when he brought the populations together into their relative positions, and in spite of the sharp criticisms of my hon. friends opposite who declared that he had wandered from the question, he was able to show incontrovertibly that there would be a much evener representation by taking the county boundaries as proposed by the hon. mover of this amendment. Now, let me draw the attention of the House to one or two more facts. I do not propose to present the House with long columns of figures, you have been overloaded with these already; but I want to draw your attention, at the risk of being called local and provincial in my sentiments, to the position of the eastern and western portions of Ontario as relatively represented. We find that including Toronto, York, and the districts east of that territory, that altogether 41 members have their unit of representation of about 22,700; while west of Toronto, giving that eastern district the advantage of the city of Toronto and the population centred in the County of York, we find that the unit of population for 51 members is 23,200, or 500 more on the average; and yet, with a view to equalize the population and to give Toronto and Algoma the additional representation that we all concede they should have, it is necessary to make that disproportion still greater by taking the two additional members out of the western portion of that territory instead of the eastern. Is there not a secret reason for this besides the representation of population, as presented by the hon. member for Monck? Is there not a strong reason in the fact that Toronto and that territory eastward sends here 35 members to support the Government and only six to support the Opposition? And does not this afford a strong reason why this redistribution was taken on the lines that were presented to this House, instead of taking it where the population was smallest and where the constituencies had less population? But we have been told that so far as the press of the country was concerned, they did not find very much fault with this arrangement, and as far as the unfavourable criticisms of the independent press is concerned, my hon. friend endeavoured to account for it by saying they were loaded up the wrong way by certain friendly connections and associations that led them to criticise the action of the Government unfairly. Now, with respect to the statements of the great organ of the Conservative party in Toronto, the *Empire*, I presume that no one in Canada looks to that journal for an expression of political sentiment, but people simply look to it as the mouthpiece of the Government of the day, and it speaks exactly as the Government tells it to speak, it was created for that purpose, and it simply, carefully, regularly and systematically fulfils that vocation. Let me draw your attention to the editorial utterances of one or two other Conservative journals who have never failed to stand by the Government on behalf of their policy, but journals who feel at the same time that this Redistribution Bill called for animadversion. I presume there is no gentleman here from the western part of Ontario who will dispute my word when I say that the Hamilton *Spectator* has been, above all other journals, the one that has always been found standing up manfully for the Government and its policy. Let me draw your attention to an editorial that appeared in that paper on the 2nd of May, three or four days after the Bill was presented to this House:

"We regret that Ministers have not seen their way to the adoption of a radical change in the appointment of representatives. There is but one absolutely just and fair way of managing this business, and when justice is attainable anything short of it is unpardonable. When great interests are at stake it is wise to make haste slowly and to be sure of one step before another is ventured upon. But in this matter there is no need to go cautiously. No interest would be disturbed and no confusion would be caused by making the constituencies substantially equal and by having their boundaries defined by a bench of impartial judges. That could be done, justice would be secured by it, and the Government is so strong that it could well afford to adopt the measure. We believe that an equitable division of the country into districts as nearly equal as possible would not lose a single Conservative seat, and it is better to be right than to gain a party advantage even if party advantage were gained by the periodical rearrangement of the constituencies."

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has read the other references in the *Spectator* to the Bill; and I would also like to ask him if he agrees with the proposition of the Hamilton *Spectator*?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). With respect to the further utterances of the *Spectator*, I will give him one more.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Give the balance of them.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Three or four days afterwards, speaking of an article that appeared in the Guelph *Mercury* that was substantially on the same line as those presented to the House by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with respect to the unequal representation of Ontario east and west of Toronto, the *Spectator* again took occasion to make these remarks:

"When our Government shall decide that all constituencies shall be as nearly equal in population as circumstances will permit, and shall authorize an impartial tribunal to fix the boundaries of constituencies, complaints like that refered to will no longer be posible."

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). My hon. friend asked me if I endorsed the *Spectator's* statements. I do not know that I am called upon to endorse the *Spectator's* statements, but I say that here is a journal that has never been known to stagger in its support of the Government, and yet this measure was so strong that the *Spectator* was not able to stomach it, and it gave utterance to these sentiments three or four days after the Bill was presented. I shall have occasion later on to refer to some of the local peculiarities that were immediately under the observation of that journal, that justified the action and the language that we express. In the meantime I quote it for the purpose of showing that even amongst the supporters of the Government there is an opinion that this thing was being run on lines that were not in the interest of good government in this country, that it was being run on lines that must inevitably, as the hon. member for North Simcoe said, continue a system that in itself was vicious, that must undermine our representative system, and that immediately leads down to the very worst possible position taken by American politicians in thus taking a political advantage of each other every time they get an opportunity to rearrange constituencies. But, turning to another journal in the immediate locality, though only a local journal, which has never wavered in its attachment to the Conservative party, I desire to make a quotation from the Conservative organ in Dundas, the *Star*. In its first issue after the Redistribution Bill was brought down, it published this statement:

"A plan, say of Ontario, might be prepared showing the present constituencies, their area, chief towns, population and number of voters by townships. Then after the next census the changes in population should be noted on the map, and the whole submitted to a committee of judges or some non-political body with instructions to show how in their judgment the representation might be most fairly distributed. Then Parliament could confirm this finding by an Act."

I do not quote these utterances as a specific remedy for the difficulty that exists, but I present them as the utterances of Conservative journals which feel that the present system is leading them where they do not want to follow. A good deal of criticism has been indulged in by some hon. members with reference to the fact that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) thought fit to change his position on this question as compared with his position ten years ago; and I think when he and the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) come to exercise that indulgence and forgiveness we have occasionally to exercise to others, the forgetfulness they will be called upon to exercise will have to be in a much higher degree towards their own political friends for the severe and bitter criticisms that have been indulged in with respect to their actions, rather than the criticisms of the Opposition towards their conduct on other questions on which we fail to agree. If men within the ranks of political party are not to be allowed sometimes to express their sentiments without being set upon by their own friends as we have seen in this Chamber, in a manner which was in the highest degree discreditable to the members who made those attacks, then the sooner Parliament is sent home and the Ministers are authorized to transact its business the better it will be for this country. If there is to be no independent thought or action inside of political lines, if hon. gentlemen seeing after experience of ten years of a certain line of conduct, that it was wrong, and rise in this House and present a remedy, are to be submitted to sneers, not administered to them privately, but across the floor of this Chamber, then the party lash is being administered in a fashion that is discreditable in the highest degree to the independent thought and action of the supporters of the Government. If, as the *Spectator* said, "the Government is strong enough to do right," why do their supporters visit such dire criticism upon their friends? But those criticisms do not fall alone on the hon. member for North Simcoe and the hon. member for Muskoka. Those hon. gentlemen are perfectly able to take care of themselves, and I do not intend to waste any time dealing with the position they have taken; but I want to read for the edification of hon. members a short extract from the speech delivered by their late political leader Sir John Macdonald when he brought down his Redistribution Bill in 1872. On that occasion he held the same views and feelings with respect to the nature of the representation as regards counties throughout the various provinces of the Dominion, as are held by the hon. member for North Simcoe. These are the words which the right hon. gentleman used in introducing his Bill:

"The desire of the Government has been to preserve the representation for counties and sub-divisions of counties as much as possible. It is considered objectionable to make representation a mere geographical term. It is desired as much as possible to kept the representation within the county, so that each county that is a municipality of Ontario should be represented, and if it becomes large enough divide it into two ridings. That principle is carried out in the suggestions I am about to make. Our municipal system gives an admirable opportunity to constituencies to select men for their deserts.

* * * * * *

The great advantage of selecting men whose ability has been tried in municipal matters is lost by cutting off a portion of two separate counties and adding them together for electoral purposes only. These portions so cut off have no common interest—they do not meet together—and they have no common feeling except that once in five years they go to the polls in their own township to vote for a man who may be known in one section and not in another."

Then the right hon. gentleman goes on to say that in the cases of only three counties, Bothwell, Monck and Cardwell, had that rule been broken in 1867, and he did not think on the whole the experiment had proved a successful one. As showing the view he held of the result of the present system now in operation, the right hon. gentleman's language uttered in advance of the present condition of things is interesting, and I desire to draw attention to one remark he made use of on 1st June, 1872, during the discussion of this question. In speaking of the distribution that set aside county boundaries and lines, he said:

"It lends to the introduction and development of the American system of caucuses by which wire-pullers take adventurers for their political ability only and not from any personal respect for them. So that as much as possible from any point of view it is advisable that counties should refuse men whom they do not know, and when the representation is increased it should be by subdividing the counties into ridings."

Those were the sentiments of the late leader of the great Conservative party, uttered in 1872. He saw fit, for reasons of his own, to change that policy ten years afterwards. But if there is any force in the slanders that have been hurled at the mover and seconder of this amendment, it applies with equal propriety to their great political leader whom they so much profess to honour and worship.

In the course of the discussion of this subject last evening, the member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) presented another line of argument in defence of the present system. This was, practically, that the population should not entirely be the basis of representation. I agree with the hon. member in that regard, and if I understood the mover of the amendment, in his opinion, uniform representation of the various constituencies, rural and city, was not desirable. I believe those hon. gentlemen who are now complaining because a movement has been made in favour of uniform representation by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), if they live for another ten years, and the exigencies of that political party require it, will find that if the population continues to leave the rural districts and go to the cities or, do worse, go to the great republic south of us, when the next gerrymander comes up, you will find them supporting uniform representation of the cities and the rural districts to enable the party to again secure additional representation in the section which they believe will be favourable to their views, and we shall have those hon. gentlemen forgetting all their criticisms of to-day and quietly swallowing themselves, if the people leave them as their representatives so long. The argument made by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) was that he believed that constituencies should have a mixed representation, that it was undesirable to put municipalities and counties together which had been accustomed to work together, because they were likely to get into lawsuits and get into trouble with each other, and that he thought it was desirable that they should be mixed. Well, I suppose to have two or three townships of a district, such, for example, as outside of Toronto, attached to the city of Toronto, so that the Conservative vote of Toronto could overbalance the Liberal vote in the townships, would be to the hon. gentleman a very satisfactory mode of representation. I submit that the difficulty that will be found to exist with the lack of a community of interest, as expressed by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), will prevent that class of constituencies from ever working harmoniously together, and I believe that unless where there are strong reasons why the Government should keep these connections together, such as in the city of London and in the outskirts of the city of Toronto, it will be found that all these constituencies will be ultimately separated. Why, the argument that has been presented in this House with respect to the small constituency of Quebec West was one that would have no force if that small minority was not allowed, in a certain degree, to rank by itself, without being swamped by a large majority of votes that could be attached to it from a population entirely different in feeling, and in language, and in associations. The same difficulty applies to the city of Montreal. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will dwell for a few moments on the question more particularly of the readjustment of constituencies in my own locality and district, the Peninsula of Niagara, where the Government in their wisdom have seen fit to blot out two constituencies, Monck and North Wentworth, for the purpose of securing one representative for the city of Toronto and one additional representative for Algoma. As I remarked before, if you look at the character of these constituencies and their former population, they certainly were not over-represented, compared with the eastern portion of the Province of Ontario. Lincoln and Niagara had 21,800 of a population under the old arrangement, and under the new adjustment it was increased to 25,700. Welland, which had a population of 25,000, is increased to nearly 27,000. Monck and Haldimand, one with a population of 15,300, and the other 16,300, under the new arrangement have 21,475. South Wentworth, which under the old arrangement had 16,770, and North Wentworth, which had 14,591, are redistributed, so that Brant is increased to 21,000, and South Wentworth, after taking off a population of between two and three thousand, added to the city of Hamilton, will probably aggregate a population of 24,500. Now, Sir, in so far as these adjustments are concerned, you will observe that at least three of them out of the five have been pushed away above the unit of representation, while a large proportion of the constituencies of eastern Ontario have been left far below that unit. I feel, under these circumstances, that this distribution has not been made for the purpose of equalizing the representation, but that it has been made for a different purpose. Turning to the statement with respect to the readjustment of my own county, allow me to quote from the local Conservative organ what its views on that question are. On the 5th May, the Dundas *Star* wrote:

"It seems that the present changes in Wentworth are genuine surprises and not pleasant ones to the leading Conservatives in the north riding. North Wentworth for many years before Confederation returned a member, now it is to be practically disfranchised. It seems hard that this old, wealthy and educated constituency should be blotted out, and it is to be hoped that better counsels will prevail. Beverly is to be virtually disfranchised, though they are Grits out there. This is not right. They are entitled to representation, and the advance of education should, no doubt, if they are fairly treated, lead them to modify their political views."

It goes on further to say:

"Some wire-pulling politicians have gotten up this game on the quiet and most certainly they will find they have made a mistake. * * * The north and south ridings even without Beverly will never work in real harmony."

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

After Recess.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Mr. Speaker, in discussing the Redistribution Act of 1882, the Hon. Mr. Blake made use of this language:

"You may by your Act transfer territory and men's bodies; you will not transfer their minds or opinions. They will vote in another locality, but they may vote in another way."

I think, Sir, the history of the redistribution affecting the County of Wentworth is a striking illustration of that remark. The history of that county reaches back into the early days when the municipal headquarters of the old Gore district occupied the present site of the county buildings of the County of Wentworth. It reaches back for a period of 75 years; and up to the time of the redistribution of 1882 the south riding of Wentworth had been continuously represented by a Liberal for at least 45 years. At that time it had a population of between 15,000 and 16,000. One large municipality, Ancaster, running down within a mile and-a-half of the site of the county building, was detached from the County of Wentworth and

attached, along with a municipality from the County of Oxford, to the north riding of Brant, with this result, that it extended across the country for forty or fifty miles in a north-westerly direction, with an average width of only one municipality, varying from eight to ten miles across. To counterbalance that change, two townships were taken from the County of Lincoln at the other end of the riding and attached to South Wentworth. The total result was simply an increase of a few hundreds in the population; but it was supposed to have materially changed the complexion of the riding—the riding which for so long a period had been held with varying majorities by the Liberal party, and which had historic associations reaching back to that early period when it had within it the town which competed with York for the location of the first public buildings of the Province of Upper Canada; and yet these associations were ruthlessly set aside, and this municipality was withdrawn from the centre of the riding, and removed with other municipalities to where it had no connection or association. What was the result? At the first general election immediately after that change, we found that the people felt so disgusted at these operations that they returned a Liberal as their representative, notwithstanding that the municipalities as put together showed a Conservative majority. The present Conservative representative has been since twice elected, the last time by a majority of only one. It became evident that the redistribution had not been a success from a political stand-point. But what were its results in the adjoining County of Brant. Let me refer to them just for a moment in passing. The two constituencies in that county had been closely contested from year to year; but the north riding of Brant was made, by the operation of the Gerrymander Act, what the late leader of this House called a Grit hive: and so hopelessly were the Grits hived there that in the three elections the Conservative candidate forfeited his deposit, not being able to get within statutory reach of the Liberal candidate. What was the result in the south riding? Sir, we remember that two townships having a Liberal majority of about 300, were taken from that riding, and a Conservative township with a large Conservative majority was added to it avowedly for the purpose of wiping out of political existence the present Liberal representative of South Brant. But, Sir, it did not accomplish that result. The people had their relative positions changed, but the Government were not able to enforce the idea of changing their votes, and the result was that their old representative was returned. Before the next general election came the Franchise Act was passed, and the Indian population were enfranchised, with the object of so readjusting South Brant as to make it a Conservative riding. Again they failed in their effort, and again the old representative for South Brant was returned to take his place in this House as of yore. Under these circumstances what has the present readjustment to recommend it? One leading township—Beverly—is detached from its old associations and attached to North Brant, and a Liberal majority of 350 is thus taken from North Wentworth and added to that constituency. As the editor of the Conservative journal in Dundas said, in speaking of this matter, these men were literally disfranchised because it was patent beforehand that their votes would not count, and it was a matter of no consequence whether they went to the polls or not. But what is the position of the remaining portion of the riding of North Wentworth? Turning back to the history of that riding we find that Wentworth became an independent county in 1853, and from the time of the first general election immediately succeeding for the last 35 years the north riding of Wentworth has been steadily and continuously Liberal, with majorities fluctuating all the way from two up to two hundred; but steadily the banner of Reform has been maintained in that riding, and the Conservative element, with a persistency which does them credit, have never flinched in the fight, and have never failed to come to the front under any and all circumstances. The leading Conservative element of that riding is centred in the town of Dundas. In 1875 that town was a thriving place, and was known as one of the leading manufacturing towns of the western portion of Ontario, with a population of over 4,000 and with over 20 manufacturing industries. Through all these years that town has steadily continued its attachment to the Conservative cause. As far back as I can remember that town has been popularly known as a Tory hole; and I can testify that from the time I came to take an interest in the politics of that riding it has thoroughly deserved that reputation. It has stood well and honestly by the political party which has so long administered the affairs of this country; and I say that to-day it deserves a better fate than to be used as a stop-gap to keep the Tory majority in South Wentworth. Sir, it is upon that town that this redistribution depends for its success in maintaining the Conservative cause in the south riding. I would have wished to see that town gain its full share of the blessings of the National Policy it has so steadily supported; but the misfortune is that, under the operation of that policy, its population has steadily decreased until from having been 4,000, it has gone down to 3,500, and the last municipal census shows that the decrease is still going on. Our cotton mills that gave the town a reputation at an early day—for who did not know of the Dundas cotton over the length and breadth of the country—are now under the control of a combine, and for the last fifteen months have been standing idle, and a large proportion of the machinery has been taken out of the mills and carried away. Our screw factory has gone, and we have lost the reputation we formerly sustained as a manufacturing centre for machinery and engines and heavy castings. But, Sir, we have still half a dozen energetic manufacturers in the town, we still get three meals a day, and we still propose to live under any and every circumstance. It is, however, solely due to the persistence and the quality of the men who administer those institutions, and their perseverance, that we are able still to maintain our existence; and I say I deeply regret that to-day the town should find itself placed in this position, as the political organ of the hon. gentlemen opposite stated, of being simply counted out of any chance to weigh in the counsels of the constituency. I agree in the sentiment of the journal representing the Government, that it is a matter of regret that a constituency with these historic associations,

with its manufacturing establishments, with its pluck and enterprise,—and I must say, although the manufacturers are my political opponents, I should scorn to do anything else than pay a just tribute to the courage they have displayed and their business capacity in the face of the heavy odds against them caused by the centralization which has grown up under the operations of the National Policy. I say it is a matter of regret to myself that the constituency should be so treated, and that these men, who deserve better at the hands of the Government, should be forced to that humiliating position. To come back to the amendment before the House, although it has not emanated from my political friends, although it has been presented by a supporter of the Government, yet I feel it contains a good deal which will commend itself to the consideration of every thinking citizen and of every one who wishes well for the people of this Dominion. With respect to the equality of population and of representation, I think that with the explanations which have been given by the mover of that amendment, I can endorse it to this extent, that it comes nearer to giving us equal representation than the scheme presented by the Government, and for that reason, while I am distinctly not in favour of making the unit of representation the same for the centres of population as for the more scattered rural districts, yet I believe it will commend itself to the community rather than the scheme presented to us by the Government. There can be no question that instead of tearing townships from one another, as the Bill of 1882 did and as the present Bill continues to do, the community of interest which is proposed in this amendment, by which constituencies are brought together that have mutual interests, is preferable to the scheme suggested by the leader of the House; and the preservation of the boundaries of the counties and cities for electoral purposes is also an object that must commend itself to every thinking individual as being in the direction of preventing systematic cutting and redistribution of municipalities, not with a view to the community of interest or the equitable distribution of population, but rather for the purpose of obtaining a political advantage for the party in power. Now, Sir, I do not care what political party controls the business of this country, it must be plain to every thinking man that no one political party can for ever be in control of the business of the country. It is a very long lane which has no turning, and if hon. gentlemen will insist on passing this Act they can only expect to provoke retaliation from their political opponents; and it is for those reasons, doubtless, that the organs of the Government in Hamilton and its vicinity, looking over the results of the redistribution of 1882, and looking at the Bill now before us, have expressed themselves in favour of some independent mode of redistribution which would take the matter out of the arena of active politics and secure to the constituencies an equitable distribution, without regard to political complexion. It is for these reasons that, although this amendment is moved by a supporter of the Government, I feel it is entitled to my support. One word as to the circumstances surrounding this question. Our hon. friends opposite are never tired of talking about the glorious old flag and British fair-play and justice and equity, but I have observed that they have never, in my political experience, appealed directly to the country on their policy without beforehand by some process or other, having endeavoured to take some advantage of their political opponents and having handicapped them by some of the various processes with which they are so familiar; and thus taken an unfair advantage, then invite their political opponents to take the field. I believe in British fair-play. I believe in a fair field and a clear contest, and let the men who can present the best arguments, let those who can appeal most fairly to the electorate, secure the confidence of the people, but a scheme like this which handicaps your opponents, a scheme which, while you fill your mouth with appeals about the old flag and British fair-play, is one of the meanest and smallest and most contemptible to be found in the American system of taking advantage of political opponents, is not British, and I hope it never will be Canadian fair-play.

Mr. COCKBURN. After the long, protracted debate which has been held, and so ably held, on this question of redistribution, I feel that in rising to address the House for a few moments, I can hope to bring but few facts of a novel character to your notice. However, in view of the statement made the other evening with reference to the city of Toronto, I feel that if I were to remain silent, my silence might be misconstrued, and therefore I venture to trespass for a few minutes upon the patience of the House. My fellow member who has the honour to represent East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) told us last evening that he had no complaint to make of the Redistribution Bill, and that, as far as he knew, the city of Toronto itself was satisfied. I have no doubt that he is correct in saying that, in as far as he is personally concerned, he has no complaint to make; but I may state, as representing one part of Toronto, that there have been complaints made to me on the ground that due representation has not been given to a city of such great growth and of such great importance in the Dominion as the city of Toronto. We have only to bear in mind that we are dealing with a city with nearly $20,000,000 of foreign commerce, and whose growth in population, whose growth in wealth, in commerce, in art and in everything which tends to mark a true growth, is a matter of marvel. I find, on looking at the figures in connection with the city of Toronto, that we are left there with one member for the east with a population of 43,564, one for the centre with a population of 26,632, and two members to represent a population of nearly 74,000 in the west. This is not the whole population of Toronto, which amounts, according to the census returns, to 181,220, and, if we are to be guided by numerical factors in determining the amount of representation to be granted to the various electoral divisions, I think I am right in claiming that Toronto should have at least eight members. Of course, I know that part of Toronto is joined to East York electorate to which the city has contributed 17,639, and part to West York to which the city gives 12,657. I know that the feeling of the people whom I represent is that it would be well to separate the city and its interests and to keep them altogether apart from the outlying district. It may be that an arrangement of that kind might involve the loss of a seat to the Conservative party, but I have no doubt that

an arrangement could be made by which every fairness would be shown to both parties in this House. The population of Toronto in fact is about one-twelfth of the whole population of Ontario, and with the three Yorks added amounts to 241,317, which would bring us up to a population which would entitle us to at least 10 members. We are told that, as there are six or seven members of Parliament resident in Toronto, who represent outside constituencies, this is a benefit which accrues to the city and ought to be considered. That may be so, but we are told by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that he is a resident of Toronto, but, so far as its political concerns are involved, he takes no more interest in Toronto than he does in Montreal, and I know that, during the whole of my career in Parliament, it has never occurred to myself or to any other member from Toronto to look to the member for North Simcoe, or to the member for East York, or to the member for West Ontario, or to any other member representing a rural constituency but residing in Toronto, to solicit his interest in any matter in which the city was concerned. In fact, we felt that we would be treading on delicate ground if we asked them to help us, and they might probably feel compelled to refrain from giving us the assistance we required if we asked for it. The growth of the cities during the last eight years has amounted to about 40 per cent, and the numerous and weighty interests which urged people to leave the country and take up their abode in the city of Toronto require consideration and due representation. I believe the whole increase during the last ten years in the population of the Dominion is only 11 per cent, and in Ontario, apart from the cities, it is only 8 per cent, but the increase in the cities is 40 per cent, and therefore, if we are going to take a numerical factor in determining the representation, it is clear that the cities are entitled to a corresponding largely increased representation. If I wanted anything to prove that the Government were not actuated by selfish party motives in this Bill, it would be the fact they have withheld the just amount of representation from the cities of Toronto and Montreal, for, if there were any two constituencies in which, by increasing the representation, they would have been able to increase the vote of the Conservative party, it would be in those two cities. I take it as clear, then, that the Government, in seeking to distribute the electoral voting power, have considered what was best for the whole country, for, if they had the desire to manipulate this matter for their own party benefit, they had before them these two cities to which they might have added six or seven or eight members and so have materially strengthened their hands. They have refrained from doing so. In the amendment which has been brought forward by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), strong representations have been made with reference to the necessity of preserving city and county boundaries, and equality of population. These two factors are of a conflicting character. It is impossible that the county should remain with the same amount of population. It must increase or decrease, and it is therefore impossible to gauge the representation by the mere population in the county. We have been pointed to England as the country from which we might draw our experience.

We have been told by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that there is no complaint there as to the redistribution that was made in 1885. We have been told that it was the deliberate combined action of the greatest men in each political party, and, if we find they have laid down rules which we know have given satisfaction, it is our duty to follow their example. If the principle would suit us, we are told that we should adopt it here. The great points mentioned were that this Act would secure equality of population, and with this object in view and looking to old England as a country from which I should receive some information, I have looked through Whitaker's Almanac in order to test the accuracy of the statement. We have been told that the unit of population for representation in all the cities in England is 52,700, and in the counties 52,800, so that we may consider the unit practically the same. This is intended to provide that the cities shall secure as many representatives in proportion as the counties. Let us look at the result. The hon. gentleman tells us that the House should appreciate the fact that the cities should be represented in no less proportion than the counties. We in this country have established in our minds 23,000 as a factor by which we are to determine the population to be allotted to each electoral district. Let us apply that principle to the House of Commons in England, and see how it would work. The whole population of the cities is added and then divided by 52,700, producing, therefore, so many electoral districts, and according to our theory each of those districts would approach as nearly as possible to that figure. I find, however, the greatest possible diversity in the representation in England. What we did was simply this: We determined the number of members for each province by dividing the number of inhabitants by the 23,000 factor, and after that we wished to go further and divide the provinces again into electoral districts according to this 23,000 factor. Now, in England they never went that length. They simply took the factor of 52,000 or 53,000, and found how many electoral districts were to be represented, and then they proceeded, not merely to count heads, but to consider how the interests of the various cities and counties could be best represented. It did not, apparently, enter into their minds to consider merely the number of persons who may be resident in a particular district; what they wanted above all things was to represent the interests of the various divisions. Accordingly, looking to the cities, we find the city of Boston with one member for 3,134 voters; London city, with two members for 32,000 voters, an average of 16,000 each; two for Blackburn, with 17,685, or an average of 8,800; one for the city of Cambridge, with 6,955; one for Colchester, with 4,596; one for Croydon, with 14,295; one for Deptford, with 12,053; one for Durham, with only 2,298 voters; and one for Kilkenny, with only 1,639 voters. Then if we turn to the Tower Hamlets and see how they have divided them in the County of Middlesex, we find Whitechapel, with 5,705 voters, —here are places all lying contiguous;—Stepney, 6,633; St. George, 3,613; Poplar, 10,013; Mile End, 5,759; Limehouse, 6,545; Bow and Bromley, 9,531. I think the figures I have read to the House will convince every member that there was no attempt on the part of this commis-

sion to divide the population of England, Scotland, Wales or Ireland in any such way as has been proposed in this House, namely, by taking the factor of 23,000 and applying it to the counties, or to the cities; all they used this factor for was to determine how many representatives should be given to the counties and how many should be given to the cities, just as we determine how many we shall allot to each province. They did for the counties what we do for the provinces, and after that they seem to have been given *carte blanche*, and they went on, not to represent numbers, but to represent mainly interests, and you will see from these figures how varied indeed are those interests, and how careful, apparently, they were to represent them. The average number of votes for each one of the 670 members of Parliament is, I think, 9,927, and still we find Kilkenny, with a member for 1,639 voters, and Durham with a member for 2,200. In the counties we find the same discrepancy. In the Ayr district we find 6,149 votes; in Ayrshire North, we have 11,880 votes, and in the southern division, 14,752 votes: in Berwickshire, only 5,633 votes; in Wiltshire, a little more than half, 3,159 votes; whereas, when we go to Dumbartonshire, we find 11,298 votes for one member, and in Peebles and Selkirk combined, only 3,423 votes. Well, Sir, I think these facts are sufficient to show that we need not go to England for a guide so long as we keep in our heads what we are going to have numerically in each county or in each city, and then divide it again according to that same number. It is interests which must be represented, not merely numbers. Now, when I apply this rule to the Bill before the House, I find, as was stated by the Minister of Railways, and also by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), that a line drawn between Peel and York north to the Georgian Bay, dividing our population into two parts, the one-half west of Toronto will have one-half the members, or 46 seats, and 26 of these seats are controlled by the Liberal party, and 20 by Conservatives. We find, too, that if we looked to the voting power simply, the Liberals would have 24 and the Conservatives 22. I say, if I were looking simply to the number of votes, or looking to the interests of the people there, I find that would be a fair division. Now, with reference to the other half, looking to the population which is there, it seems to be about as fair a division as we can make. I am not speaking at present of the various little manipulations, if we choose to call them so, that have taken place to bring about those changes; I am taking the matter as a whole. When we go into committee I am perfectly prepared to reserve to myself the right of dealing with these questions individually, and while I may approve of the Bill before the House on the whole, it does not follow that I do not reserve to myself, and I do reserve to myself, the right of judging each particular case. Apart from the disadvantages I have pointed out, of following the rule of the hon. member for North Simcoe, it must be noticed at the same time, that his amendment would make a change of some 74 out of 92 constituencies in Ontario, and of some 41 out of 65 in Quebec. He himself is conscious that this numerical ratio he wishes to establish is an impossibility; accordingly we find that he reserves to himself a sliding scale of some 9,200 voters to move up and down from the one side to the other, or some 40 per cent. It is a rather damaging comment on his new proposal, that he should find it necessary to reserve so broad a sliding scale. I think it would have been better, under the circumstances, if he had abandoned that scale and fallen more into the lines I have explained as those adopted in the representation for the House of Commons in England. Now, Sir, a proposal has been made that we should hold a conference in this matter. I cannot understand a Government so abdicating its powers as to hand over to the Opposition, or to others, a responsibility which must rest upon themselves, and which they must assume for themselves solely. Naturally enough, if we did have a committee composed of leading members of the Opposition and of the Government side, the result would be that, commanding as the Government do two-thirds of the members of this House, more or less, they would see that in the constitution of that committee they were properly represented, and I fear the inevitable result would be that at the end of the conference we should have the usual minority and majority reports, or the committee would report that they were unable to come to any conclusion and must refer the matter back to the House. While I do not at all consider the Bill a perfect Bill, I cannot help remembering that three elections have taken place since the supposed gerrymander of 1882 was made. With that gerrymander I had nothing to do, I have not even looked into it particularly to ascertain whether it was worthy of the execrations which have been hurled upon it; but all I know is this, that as a strong point has been made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) of the necessity of the continuity of the same bodies as electoral factors, and that inasmuch as for ten years, nearly one-half of the time we have been confederated together as a Dominion have elapsed, and during those years three elections have been conducted under this gerrymander, I think perhaps it would be in the interest of all that we should accept this as it is, and in committee see if we cannot do that which justice, good sense and fair-play on the part of the majority would dictate. I am fully conscious that it seems utterly impossible to lay down any clear, definite rule by which to carry out a redistribution. In the end we must depend on the good sense, the fairness, the British sense of fair-play to guide us, and I can only assure hon. gentlemen opposite that when we come to a discussion of this matter in committee they will find on this side of the House a disposition to deal fairly with them. I do not say that in the end they will admit they have been fairly dealt with; it is almost impossible, meeting as we are with political views opposed to each other, to come to anything like a greatly unanimous conclusion that fair-play has been meted out. There is an old Latin proverb, *Quod volumus jubemus*,—when we wish anything we unconsciously bring ourselves to believe it. But at the same time I think, in view of the circumstance that we have met together to try and settle a very difficult question, it would be well that we should introduce less of the personal element into the discussion. I am sorry to say that words have been thrown from the other side of the House addressed to members on this side to the effect that they must yield implicit obedience to commands no matter how unreasonable and dishonourable they may be. Only the other evening a leading member of the Opposition taunted the

hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) by stating that he was not free to give an opinion on this matter, that the only man who was free to give an opinion was the hon. member for North Simcoe, as he looked for no judgeship and no position under Government. It would be well that we should try and discuss these matters entirely on their merits and leave personal considerations entirely out of account, and while I ask both parties to unite in this feeling and to observe those ordinary courtesies that gentlemen should observe to one another, I at the same time would like to see it more fully felt on both sides of the House that members of both parties, while observing the lines within which party government is carried on, should be left free to express their opinions. Although I differ from the hon. members for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and from the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) in regard to the position they have taken, at the same time I am prepared to acknowledge they have done so in a manly way, they have done so after due deliberation and after they thought at all events they had consulted as fully as they could be expected to consult with those who are their leaders in this House. I think we should, especially in this matter above all others, where we must give and take, try to allow each other full latitude of opinion and expression. I believe both sides of the House are anxious to arrive at a fair and honourable conclusion. We have had from the leaders of both sides an example set of gentlemanly courtesy and a desire to say nothing that could arouse angry feelings. While it is necessary that both parties should hold freely and honourably to the expression of their views, there is no reason why we should not observe one towards another the courtesies which as gentlemen we are obliged to acknowledge. I do not think there is any other point on which I desire to trouble the House at this late stage of the debate. I wish particularly, however, to draw attention to the position in which I think the city of Toronto has been placed, and to express the hope that when we come into committee some means will be found of acknowledging in a fitting way, the great growth of that city and its great importance, the importance which must attach to it on account of its vast influence as a commercial, educational and manufacturing centre, so as to remove from the minds of the people any thought or feeling that because they happen to be residents of Toronto they should be discriminated against, and any one coming to Toronto from the outlying districts or any part of the Dominion should not feel that his franchise as a free man has been diminished by his admission as a citizen of Toronto, but, on the contrary, that higher opportunities have been given him of enjoying more fully the rights of citizenship in a common country.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). In rising to address the House, I must say at the outset that I agree with the sentiments that have fallen from the lips of the member from Centre Toronto to the effect that we ought to extend to each other common courtesies in conducting this debate. I disagree, however, with the hon. gentleman in his opinion that the Bill is a fairer redistribution than that proposed by adopting the amendment now before the House, in favour of county boundaries. The first question I will take up is one that really does not affect this debate, but as statements have been made with respect to the gerrymander that took place in Ontario by Sir Oliver Mowat, and as the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) specially mentioned the township in which I live, and the riding I represent, I want to put the matter straight. The hon. gentleman stated that if in the gerrymander the township of Hullett had not been divided but had been left in either East or West Huron, the Government of Ontario would have lost a seat. That is not correct. While I admit that the Ontario Government split up three townships of the riding, and I would rather have seen township lines followed, yet with the lines adopted, one of the neatest divisions possible was made. They cut the county from east to west by drawing a straight line along the old Huron road, leaving all south of the road in South Huron. They cut the remaining portion from north to south, following a leading gravel road right up the township of Hullett. It was stated that if the whole of the township of Hullett had been either in the east or west riding the Conservatives would have gained a representative, but let me point out that in the east riding of Huron there was a Liberal majority of 500 at the last election, and in the east part of Hullett there were 113 votes cast for the Conservative party and 265 for the Reform party; giving a majority of 152 Reform votes cast in the east part of the township of Hullett. Even if that 150 votes had been taken from the majority that the east riding of Huron gave to its representative, he would still have a majority of 348 votes. When we come to the west riding of Huron we find that in the west part of the township of Hullett, there were 70 Conservative votes polled and 112 Reform votes, giving a majority of 42 in favour of the Reform candidate. Now, the Reform candidate in the west riding had a majority of 112, so that if we take the 42 majority obtained by the Reformers in the west part of Hullett, it would still leave him a majority of 70 votes. Therefore, in the last election it would have been an impossibility to have affected the election to any extent. Lest one election should not give sufficient data, I have gone back to the elections of 1886, and I find that the representative for East Huron had a majority of 438. The west part of Hullett gave a majority of 45 for the Reform candidate, so that taking 45 from the 433, it would still leave a Reform majority of 388, independent of the township of Hullett. In the east part of the township of Hullett there were 115 Reform majority, so that that would have left something like 290 majority for Mr. Gibson in the election before the last. The statement is utterly unfounded that the gerrymander of the County of Huron by the Mowat Government secured them an extra member there. I believe that the redistribution by the Local Government in the County of Huron is as equal as it possible could be. The population of the east riding is 26,248, of the south riding, 26,478, and of the west riding, 25,234. The number of votes on the voters' lists in each of these ridings is as follows: In the east riding, 5,559; in the south riding, 6,190; and in the west riding, 6,029, so that whether you take Huron numerically or geographically, or according to the number of votes upon the voters' list, a fairer distribution could not have taken place. I think this will be sufficient once for all to show that the statement is

utterly without foundation, that had the township of Hullett been put either into West Huron or into East Huron it would have lost a seat for the Reform party. We have heard it stated here time and time again that the present proposed distribution of seats is as just and as equal as it is possible to make it, and that in the Province of Ontario at least we have very little to complain of. But, Mr. Speaker, I say that we have a great deal to complain of, and it has been admitted by some members on the other side, that the gerrymander which took place in 1882 was unjust to the Province of Ontario. I hold that it was unjust, and that it still continues to have its influence down to the present time, and I shall attempt to show in my own county, and in one or two counties adjoining my own county, what effect that gerrymander has had upon the representation of these counties. Take the vote that was cast in Bruce County in 1878, and we find that in North Bruce there was a Reform majority of 156, and in South Bruce there was a Conservative majority of 75; but when we come to the gerrymander of 1882, we find that they gave North Bruce a majority of 331, and although they did give that majority in 1882, it has been steadily decreasing down to the present time, until at last election it only gave a Conservative majority of 30. If it had been a Conservative majority of 88 instead of a Reform majority, the town of Port Elgin would not have been removed out of the north riding of Bruce and put into the west riding. There is not the least doubt in my mind that seeing that the majority for the member of North Bruce has steadily been decreasing, the present movement to take the village of Port Elgin with a Reform majority of 88, and place it in the west riding, was for the purpose of assisting the sitting member. A strong proof of that is, that in the Bill now before the House the Government cannot show where any such action has taken place to take a majority of Reformers from a Conservative riding and place them for the benefit of a Reformer who has a very small majority. It is very strange if this is an honest, just and an equal distribution, that the Government have not been able to show a single instance where they have assisted a member of the Reform party to retain his seat. In the distribution of 1882, East Bruce got a Conservative majority of 518 and North Bruce a Conservative majority of 331, while West Bruce got a Reform majority of 933. That left a total Reform majority of 84 votes in the County of Bruce, which is a sure proof that if the county had not been gerrymandered there would be two Reformers and only one Conservative in that county. But on account of the action of the Government there is not the least doubt that the County of Bruce has held two seats in this House down to the last general election, when that Reform majority of 518 in East Bruce was turned into a minority of 114. Let me say that if it had not been for the gerrymander, even the bye-election would not have returned the present sitting member for the east riding of Bruce. The County of Bruce at the present time has a population of 64,604, which would give something like 22,000 in each of the three ridings. The County of Huron has always given a large Reform majority, and from Confederation down to the present time in the Local House there has been only one Conservative member returned. In North Huron, in 1878, there was a Conservative majority of 84; in Centre Huron, a Reform majority of 361; and in South Huron, a Reform majority of 165. When we add these up, we find that the County of Huron had a total Reform majority of 452. But by means of the gerrymander of 1882 the Conservative majority in East Huron was increased from 84 to 152; Centre Huron was legislated out of existence altogether; West Huron was given a Conservative majority of 93; while South Huron was left with a majority of 677. That Act not only gerrymandered the County of Huron, but it took from it a number of municipalities which naturally belonged to that county. The township of Osborne, with a Conservative majority, was taken from Huron and put into South Perth. The township of Stephen and the town of Exeter, with a Conservative majority, were taken from South Huron and put into North Middlesex, thus, as Sir John Macdonald said, hiving the Grits in South Huron. I suppose I am the last man in the County of Huron who should find fault with that gerrymander, because it is to that I owe my position as a member of this House; but for that, in all likelihood I would not be here. But the reason I did not approve of the Act was that it did not do justice to the County of Huron as a whole. We know that the County of Middlesex, by means of that Act, was given four members, while the County of Huron was given only three. This was an injustice, because the County of Huron had a population, at that time, of 76,526, or 2,600 more than the County of Middlesex, so that if an extra member should have been given to either county, that extra member should have been given to Huron and not to Middlesex; but it did not suit the purpose of the Government to do that. But I find that the population of the County of Huron, in the 10 years from 1881 to 1891, has fallen from 76,526 to 66,781. I was somewhat astonished last night when I heard the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) state that the County of Huron had a population of 58,000, which was too many for two members and not enough for three; and he had to cross county lines and destroy the principle he himself laid down of securing equality of numbers and maintaining county boundaries. This was said in answer to my hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), who showed that the County of Huron would be entitled to three members. But the hon. member for East Grey, in dealing with the population of the different counties, was dealing with something of which he seemed to be perfectly ignorant, because the County of Huron, instead of having a population of only 58,000, has a population of 66,781. My hon. friend forgot that in the gerrymander of 1882, the Government saw fit to take away from the County of Huron the township of Stephen with a population of 4,271, the township of Osborne with a population of 2,529, and the town of Exeter with a population of 1,809, or in all 8,609. Under the present redistribution, if the County of Huron had received that justice to which it was entitled, these municipalities would have been brought back and placed within the county boundaries; and even then the population of the county would have been 1,100 less in 1891 than it was in 1881. When the redistribution of the County of Huron was taken up in 1882, it was first brought into the House on the 11th of May; but I suppose the Government in the meantime received some com-

munication from their friends in the county, and it was held over. As stated by my hon. friend from East Huron, a delegation came down from the county, with the county gerrymandered in the very best interest of the Conservative party; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that that was a just measure. I say that a more barefaced gerrymander, designed to give the Government an undue representation according to the population in the County of Huron, never was perpetrated. Now, let us look at the County of Perth. In 1878 North Perth had a Conservative majority of 83, while South Perth had a Reform majority of 77. But the Government took the township of Osborne, with a Conservative majority, out of Huron and put it in South Perth; and they took South Easthope, with a large Reform majority, away from South Perth and placed it in North Oxford, and in that way left South Perth with a Conservative majority of 154, whereas it ought to have had a Reform majority. If county lines had been maintained with regard to South Perth, if the township of South Easthope had been retained there, and the township of Osborne had been put back into the County of Huron, Mr. Trow would to-day be occupying his seat in this House by a handsome majority; and it was owing to that gerrymander that the Government were able to carry South Perth even in the bye-election. Now, with regard to North Perth, we find that they put the township of Wallace, with a Conservative majority of 64, into the County of Wellington. They passed over South Perth and took North Easthope, with a Reform majority of 289, and added it to North Oxford, which had a majority of 903; thus taking out of Perth, North Easthope and South Easthope with Reform majorities amounting to 482 and adding them to North Oxford where there was already about 1,000 of a majority. So that both North Perth and South Perth would have been represented by Reformers after the redistribution of 1882, if that had been based on the lines laid down by the amendment introduced by the hon. member for North Simcoe. Perth to-day has a population of 51,700, so that there would be something like 26,000 in each of the ridings of that county, provided a redistribution were made on the basis of boundary lines. But nothwithstanding the gerrymander, even in North Perth there was a Reform majority of 71 at the general election; and at the bye-election, in spite of all the Government could put forth in men, money and undue influences of every description, the north riding of Perth gave a Reform majority of 78. And let me say here, that had the bye-elections been held, as they ought to have been, according to the spirit of our election law, on the one day, the Government would not have come back with as many ridings in their favour as they have. Perth has a Reform majority of 508, so that it would be an impossibility, with a fair distribution, for the Government to elect a representative in Perth. Just let me apply this general principle which I have mentioned. Here are 88 of a Reform majority taken out of North Bruce and put into West Bruce without any apparent purpose except to assist a political supporter of the Government, because it does not in any way equalize the population, and I am perfectly positive that if the majority had been a Conservative one there would have been no question about removing it out of the county. Take London: they have put West London with a Conservative majority of 113 into the city of London, in order to help the Minister of Agriculture; and then, notwithstanding all that the Minister of Railways has said in defending the action of the Government in taking the township of Clarence, with its Liberal majority of 478, out of the County of Russell and putting it into the County of Prescott, there is not the least doubt that if Clarence had given a Conservative majority, it would have been allowed to remain where it is. I am perfectly convinced that the system embodied in the amendment, as has been explained beyond successful contradiction by the hon. member for East Huron, would give a greater equality of representation and likely to be a more permanent arrangement than the Bill before the House. The Government say that had they made a regular redistribution of the Dominion, they would have had to disturb over 70 seats in the Province of Ontario. The Minister of Justice, when he mentioned the Province of Quebec, said that there was a large number of voters on the one hand, and a small number of representatives on the other hand, and asked, should the Government not make a redistribution in order to remedy that. Well, let them apply the same principle to the Province of Ontario to-day, and then instead of having 53 members as they have, with 26 of them representing 4,000 voters in the Province of Ontario, they would have but a majority of two from that province, if justice were done and an equal distribution made. It is all very well to talk about the justice of the redistribution, but the Government know well that if they made a proper redistribution of Ontario, they would no longer be able to boast, notwithstanding all their other advantages, that they had carried the country and largely increased their majority. And I state fearlessly, if it had not been for money and other undue influences, it would have been an utter impossibility for the Government to have captured the country in the way they did in the bye-elections. Besides the Gerrymander Act, what has the Government at their control to aid them in carrying the elections? In the first place, they have the Franchise Act with the influence of the revising barristers in the strongly Conservative and equally balanced ridings in their favour. But let me say here I am happily situated myself as far as that is concerned, and have no cause of complaint, because I believe the revising barrister, the judge of the County of Huron, would not, even if placed in a Conservative riding, do anything not in accord with strict justice. I believe that every time he revised the list he saw that justice was done between the parties, and had every individual who he believed had a right to be placed on the voters' list, entered there. But I am sorry to say there are other ridings in Huron of whose revising officers I cannot make the same statement. The Government have the influence of railway subsidies. Why, there was a promise made, or at least it was put into the public prints in the west riding of Huron, that a subsidy would be given for a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway to go from Wingham down to Port Albert or perhaps to Goderich. There is no other means the Government have which is so effective in carrying elections as the promising of public improvements and railway subsidies,

which is a more wholesale system of bribery and corruption than the mere purchase of a few votes at $5 or $10 apiece. Then there are the harbours and other public works. They promised in the west riding of Huron that both the Goderich harbour and the Port Albert harbour would undergo repairs, and this promise no doubt had influence to a certain extent in the riding, although I believe to a very small extent. Then there are the public buildings, post offices and custom houses, which the Government have been in the habit of promising to the different constituencies, and which promises they have carried out in some instances and in other instances they have not. Still all this is done on the eve of elections with the view of influencing the election in those ridings. Then they have the influence of large railway corporations getting subsidies from the Government, and of large manufacturing establishments receiving heavy benefits from the National Policy, and we know they have the influence of the wealthy contractors who are in the habit of getting Government contracts. A good deal has been said about the public press. Let me state that the Government has a powerful press at their back, what we may call a subsidized press. Let me go over just a few of the items of payments to that press last year by the Government for advertising and printing. Take the Halifax *Herald*, which gets an income of $10,637 from this source. The Calgary *Herald* gets $2,650, the Montreal *Gazette* $7,163, the Moncton *Times* $13,581, the Quebec *Chronicle* $3,174, the Toronto *Empire* $4,726, the Toronto *World* $1,083, and the Regina *Leader* $6,672. Yet, notwithstanding all those advantages, the Government are afraid to allow a fair redistribution of the seats lest it should weaken their position; and I believe they know well that if a fair redistribution were made in the Province of Ontario and in the Province of Quebec and in the other provinces, and if a fair Franchise Bill were before the people, which would not give the Government all the advantages they have at present, the Government would come back to this House with a very small majority, when the opportunity presented itself to the people to pronounce their verdict, if it did not actually suffer a severe defeat. The Minister of Justice told us that when the Bill came before the House, it would be taken up clause by clause and fairly considered; but the Minister of Railways and Canals came out bald-headed and told us they were prepared to defend the Bill in every particular, that it was a just Bill in every particular, and I believe in saying this he spoke the true sentiments of his party. Some of the hon. gentlemen opposite have admitted that injustice has been done Ontario. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) admitted that Ontario had been badly treated by the Government in the Redistribution Bill of 1882, but he said he believed that time had remedied the evil. I have lived in Ontario for the last forty-eight years, and I say the gerrymander of 1882 has not been remedied, as the Government well know. In that province there is a large number of seats that could not be held by the Government but for the infamous gerrymander of 1882. We have been told to-night that the members upon each side of the House ought to have full liberty to express their opinions as to the redistribution without having the finger of scorn pointed at them or any slur of disapproval being thrown at them, but, when the Minister of Railways and Canals was addressing the House, he stated it was enough for the Opposition to be finding fault, but that supporters of the Government ought not to be finding fault with a Government Bill, which amounted to saying that the independent Conservative members ought not to express their opinion. I am glad to find that there are life-long Conservatives, who, I believe, will remain Conservatives, who have sufficient honesty and independence to show their disapproval of the action of the Government, and who, I believe, will record their votes accordingly. I believe we have far too much on both sides of following party for party's sake. I believe that we should only support the party as our conscience will direct us and the interests of the country will warrant, and when the Government or the Opposition take a step beyond that, it is our duty to give our reasons for not following the party to which we have given our adhesion. I have been very much astonished at the remarks of the hon. member for Toronto East (Mr. Coatsworth). He lays down a principle I have never heard laid down before, the principle that where there is a part of a city and a part of a county united for electoral purposes they ought to continue united because their interests are pulling against one another, and their continued union may assimilate them. He says:

"There should be a concentration of interests wherever it suits our interests that there should be."

What interests does he mean by "our interests"? He means the Conservative interests; but wherever it suits the Reform interest, it is a different thing. That is the argument of the hon. gentleman, and he goes on to say:

"Wherever we are looking at the matter from a federal point of view, we want to follow a broader principle, we want in some cases to sever interests, and we want in other cases to unite interests that may be naturally severed. Now, one of the arguments brought forward in support of county, and city, and municipal boundaries, was this, and I think it an illustration which might fairly be used to emphasize the point I want to bring out; the principle was laid down that a part of a county and a part of a city should not be united together. I may be wrong, but it strikes me that is a wrong principle to adopt. One of the difficulties we have to contend with at present is that our commercial interests are pulling against the agricultural interests, and the agricultural interests are pulling against the commercial interests. Now, what is the effect of uniting a portion of a city and a portion of a county? Is it not at once to bring these people into common sympathy with each other, in other words, to bring the commercial interests into sympathy with agricultural interests?"

The effect of such a system in the Province of Ontario has been that wherever there is a part of a county in which there is a majority of Reformers united with a part of a city, as a rule the city returns a Conservative member and the Reformers lose their votes, and I suppose that is what the hon. gentleman would like to see. No good will ever come out of keeping county municipalities and city divisions united in one. They should be always separate. Even in municipal affairs, I have always found, and I have many years' experience of municipal affairs in the Province of Ontario, that, when a township and a village are united, there is never peace until the village becomes incorporated and is separated from the township, and I believe it is the same with respect to cities and to parts of counties. In Ontario we have nothing to fear if the Government would make a fair redistribution, and I hold this is not a fair position for the Government to take. They have had two

opportunities to deal fairly with this matter. The member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) stated that a committee composed of members from both sides of the House might meet and disagree, and so the matter would be referred back to the House. It is seldom that a committee of that kind disagrees so far, and I have full confidence that a committee would have come to a satisfactory conclusion. However, I believe the true system is adopted in the motion now before the House—to preserve the county and city boundaries. Had county boundaries been adopted ten years ago scarcely any change would have been necessary now. It would have been only in isolated cases. I think the resolution before the House will commend itself to the judgment of every fair-minded, honest man who gives it a fair, unbiassed examination. Let them look carefully over the array of figures given by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), and if those are taken up in an unprejudiced manner I believe even the Government themselves would admit that it is a fair proposition to respect the city and county limits all over the Province of Ontario, and I believe that will also be true in regard to the Province of Quebec. The member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) tried to show in his own way that the redistribution on county lines would be very unjust, but he admitted that my hon. friend's argument was correct, because he did not take county lines but polling districts to make his calculations upon. I hold that the redistribution ought to be made permanent as far as possible, and there is no other system on which a permanent redistribution can take place than the observance of county and city boundaries. All over the Province of Ontario there is no sympathy in a riding, part of which is in a city and part in a county, between the electors who are inside and those who are outside the city limits. I ask any member of the Government to show where in this Bill any action has taken place to assist a member of the Reform party when he has been in a tight place, as they tried to knock out the member for Russell, to assist the member for London and to assist the member for North Bruce. It is strange, if fair-play is all that is intended, that all the advantage should be on one side. It shows conclusively that the intention was to assist the Government party. I hold that the gerrymander of 1882 is intensified as far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, by the present measure, because all the evils we have suffered under since 1882 are continued and they are aggravated by the distribution in the Bill now before the House.

Mr. McNEILL. I had not intended to make any remarks during the course of this debate; I was with held somewhat from doing so by a feeling of delicacy, inasmuch as the Bill affects my own constituency. But one or two matters have occurred during the course of the debate which lead me to think that it would be scarcely right if I did not say a word or two. So far as my hon. friend is concerned who has just addressed the House (Mr. McMillan, Huron) I must say that I have received a good deal of instruction from his remarks. I have learned from him for the first time that the majority in the North Riding of Bruce in the Dominion elections of 1882, was 331. He draws a conclusion from that; he tells us that that majority has been reduced to 30. Well, that would be a startling reduction, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately for the hon. gentleman's facts, and for the argument which he has founded upon them, the majority was not 331, but it was under 90. When he says that the majority has steadily decreased ever since, I must say again that he is mistaken in his facts, because at the next election the majority had not decreased below the figures in 1882, but had increased from under 90 to 113. So if we are to judge of the hon. gentleman's speech by these samples of his alleged facts, I am afraid we cannot pay very much respect to the conclusions at which he has arrived. When my hon. friend speaks of a gerrymander in the County of Bruce made by the Dominion authorities in 1882, I think he speaks of something which, with one exception, it is impossible for him or for any one else to substantiate. I defy any hon. member of this House, or any reasonable man, to take a map of the County of Bruce and suggest to me a division of that county which, so far as geographical distributions and population are concerned, would be more admirable than the division which was made in 1882.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Will the hon. member allow me to make a correction? In the election of 1878, there was a majority of 331 in North Bruce.

Mr. McNEILL. I am astonished at the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman knows that the riding of North Bruce to which he refers now, is not the riding of North Bruce to-day at all. The riding of North Bruce then included the townships of Bruce and Saugeen, and they are not in that riding to-day. Yet the hon. gentleman has the audacity to get up in this House and make a comparison between the old riding and the present riding, and the majorities in the two ridings, in an endeavour to mislead this House—I do not wish to say that, but at all events, the hon. gentleman has made a comparison which is altogether misleading; I presume he would not have made it had he been better acquainted with the facts. But, Mr. Speaker, I was about saying, when the hon. gentleman interrupted me, that I defied the hon. gentleman or any one else to suggest a division of the County of Bruce which, either as to geographical distribution or as to population, could be a more admirable division than the one which was made in 1882. When the hon. gentleman talks of a gerrymander, I think he is confusing the action of Sir Oliver Mowat with the action of the Dominion authorities in 1882. If you want to find a gerrymander of a county, you may look at the division of the County of Bruce which was made by Mr. Mowat a short time ago, and there you will see a county gerrymandered. I was not in the House the other day, and had not the privilege of hearing the brilliant speech of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), but I believe he showed the House something about that gerrymander. Now, what was done by the Dominion authorities in the arrangement that was made of the County of Bruce? The lake townships were left by the lake altogether; the northern townships were left together, and the eastern townships were left together. It so happens that the townships by the lake, Saugeen, Bruce, Kincardine and Huron, are Reform townships; the Reformers happen to dwell together there en masse, and they

were left there. Now, it is said they were hived. I say they were not hived; you cannot make use of such an expression where the existing condition of things is not altered. They were not hived, they hived themselves there. But what Sir Oliver Mowat did was not to hive the Grits, but to swarm the Grits over the county—if you choose to use the expression "Grit." Sir Oliver Mowat took a township from the west and put it along with other townships which were not connected with it in any way—picked up a township here and there over the county so as to swarm his friends and enable their votes to tell where, geographically, they ought not to have told at all. Now, that is what I call gerrymandering. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much struck with one matter in connection with this discussion. I am quite sure that hon. gentlemen on either side of the House are, on the whole, desirous of arriving at some arrangement which is fair. The more one listens to the discussion that is proceeding in this House, the more one is forced to the conclusion that neither political party, if they have the control of this matter in their own hands entirely, will ever do what is fair. As soon as our friends on the opposite side of the House come into power, they will say they have been horribly ill-treated by their opponents, and they will proceed to do what they think is fair, and what we will think is very unfair. Then, after that has been done, as soon as the Conservative party come into power again, they will say: We will be even with our friends, and we will do what we think is fair. So the thing will go on as it has been going on, and each party will have a grievance against the other party with reference to this matter. Now, so long as the existing condition of things continues, each party will be actuated by political motives in the division of the constituencies. I think it is far better for us to look this thing squarely in the face and not deceive ourselves. I am quite sure that neither party when in power leaves out of view entirely the political consideration in redistributing the representation, and I think it would be very unreasonable, under the existing condition of things to expect them to do so. If they have got the redistribution of seats in their own hands, and if there be two divisions which are each of them fairly good, it is only natural, it is only reasonable, to expect that the party in power will choose that one which suits themselves best; and so long as they do not go beyond what is right and fair, I think they are not blameworthy in so doing. But who is to decide what is right and fair? It is the party in power at the time, and is it according to human nature, and is it according to political nature, that they should be the best judges of what is right and fair? I think not; and, therefore, so far as I am concerned, it seems to me that we are forced to the conclusion that some kind of tribunal ought to be found which would take this matter out of the hands of the political parties of the day. I recollect very well what occurred in my own constituency many years ago, when I was a very young hand in politics, and I dare say it is within the recollection of some hon. members in this House. There were at the time that this distribution of Bruce, of which I have been speaking, was made, two possible arrangements of the north riding. We might easily have had the township of Saugeen in the north riding or it might have been left out; it might have been placed either in the west or the north. I recollect very well at that time that we, Conservatives, in that constituency, thought it right to call the attention of our friends at Ottawa to the fact that the leaving of the township of Saugeen in North Bruce would have a political influence injurious to the Conservative party in that constituency. I think that in doing so we were perfectly justified. I thought then, and I think still, that, irrespective of political considerations altogether, the placing of the township of Saugeen in the west riding was the proper course to pursue; but I think that in addition, we were perfectly justified in calling the attention of the Government to the fact that, from a political point of view, it would be beneficial. Such considerations will always have force and always operate on the minds of politicians when such distributions are made. As to the proposal of the leader of the Opposition, however favourably one might be inclined to regard it, and for my part, so far as my humble ability was concerned I turned the matter over in my mind as carefully and thoughtfully as I could, I have failed to come to the conclusion that the course proposed would help us much out of our difficulty. It seemed to me that the party in power would have the majority, and we would be face to face with such a condition of things as we had in this Parliament during last session, when we had a committee of partisans, so to speak, although I believe both sides were trying to do what was right and to the best of their ability to arrive at what was fair and just, still we had the report of the committee argued on both sides with heat, and it was simply the report of the majority which prevailed.

Mr. LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman contend that we cannot do what they have done in England?

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman asks if we cannot do what they have done in England. I do not think they have done in England exactly as the hon. gentleman proposed, and it is not quite a sound position he has taken up on this occasion. I think we are not situated here quite as they are in England. They have never been in the habit in England of dealing with the constituencies as friends of the hon. gentleman's friends, Sir Oliver Mowat and his Government, dealt with the constituencies in Ontario. I will not refer to my friends; I will not say they have ever done anything wrong in this matter—they may have done so. But, at all events, a different system has prevailed in this country from anything that ever prevailed in England, and political parties have got into the habit here of dealing with these matters in a way perfectly distinct from anything which obtained in England, and, therefore, I do not think we can expect to apply the English system to a condition of things altogether different from that which obtained there. I think we require to get a tribunal which is independent of politics; we want a tribunal which will take this matter up and deal with it in such a manner that both the public and members of this House will have confidence in its decision. I was not in the House when the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) dealt with this matter, but he told me afterwards what he had said with respect to it. I had some conver-

sation with him, in which I suggested the appointment of a commission composed of our judges; but he was opposed to that suggestion and brought forward a very formidable and strong objection, namely, that as our judges have so much political work thrown on them at present, a danger would arise if more work were thrown upon them lest, however fairly they might discharge their duties, they might be discredited in the eyes of the public. That is undoubtedly a grave and serious objection, but whether it is sufficiently grave and serious to overweigh the objections to any other scheme that may be proposed, I am not prepared to say. Johnson was in the habit of saying that objection might be taken to a vacuum and to a plenum, but one or other must be true. It is not sufficient to take objection, but it must be shown that there is more serious objection to one proposal than to another proposal submitted. But if it be that we are afraid to trust our judges or that we are afraid of discrediting them, then let us secure the services of judges from some other part of the Empire, who would not be in any way under suspicion in the minds of the people in regard to this matter. Let us, at all events, secure such a tribunal as will remove the difficulties that at present exist and command the confidence of the people. I do not wish to offer further remarks on that part of the subject: but I should like, as we have been referring to English precedents, to refer to a remark which fell from the leader of the Opposition, and which has been taken up by one or two hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to the precedent I quoted here some time ago. When the hon. gentleman based his proposal on the assumption that Mr. Gladstone had acted with great generosity, and the Liberal party in England had acted generously, I called his attention to the fact that was not so, and that they had been forced to adopt the course they did adopt by reason of the action of the House of Lords. It has been said—the hon. gentleman I think said something of the kind himself, and some other hon. gentlemen have quoted it—that perhaps that would afford some precedent for obstruction on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, and for an attempt on their part to prevent the passage of this Bill through this House.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." The hon. gentleman will surely not say that any precedent is established there for such a course. The minority of the House of Commons did not strain their constitutional authority in any way, but the minority, as under the British constitution the minority must do if Government is to be possible, bowed to the decision of the majority, and the Bill passed through the House. The Bill went up to the House of Lords and the minority in that House bowed to the decision of the majority, as they ought to do. The House of Lords had a constitutional right to say: We will not allow this Bill to pass: we believe it to be a Bill not in the interests of the country: and they exercise their constitutional right. That is no precedent for the minority endeavouring to exercise the constitutional right of the majority. Allowing the minority full credit for the most patriotic motives, still it is quite clear, that if they determine that whenever they think a measure is not in the best interests of the country they will obstruct that measure; parliamentary government must come to an end at once. If they can do that in one case they can do it in another case. What would the result of that be? The result would be that the proceedings of this House would be made ridiculous, and that the House would be condemned by public opinion just as it was in 1885. I recollect very well when I returned home in 1885 hearing an outcry about the conduct of this House, because of the obstruction that occurred here. I am not speaking of an outcry by Conservatives on account of what was done by Reformers in this House, but I am speaking of an outcry by independent men who were not party men at all, and who said that the House of Commons should be able to conduct its business better than it had done. If such intentional obstruction were resorted to, and if it was decided not to allow public business to be transacted, the result would be that whichever party was in power would be compelled to resort to the cloture, and for my part that is a mode of procedure that I should be very sorry to see introduced in this House. Not that the cloture has worked ill in England, for I was told the other day by a Radical member of the Imperial Parliament who was over here, that he believed the cloture worked well in the English House of Commons, but as my hon. friend knows, the condition of parties in England is different from what it is here, as party lines are not so hard drawn there. I would be exceedingly sorry for my part that whichever party were in power it should be forced to adopt the cloture, but, of course, if the minority of either party make up their mind to obstruct business, and make up their minds that they and not the majority will rule contrary to the constitution, then it is the only thing that can be done. Otherwise public business must come to a standstill, and the government of the country would be an impossibility. However, I have no doubt that my hon. friend has no such idea in his mind as unconstitutional obstruction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Unconstitutional legislation is quite proper, however.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend cannot say that any one thinks that unconstitutional legislation is proper. Unconstitutional legislation must always be improper as my hon. friend knows, and if the party in power adopts unconstitutional methods they must be punished for it by their masters, the people. That is the only resort and that is all we can hope for.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose you take away from the people the power of punishing, and that is what you propose to do.

Mr. McNEILL. I am just coming to that matter. My hon. friend is referring to the Redistribution Bill, and I have just been proposing something which, at all events, would put that objection of my hon. friend altogether to one side, but I do not see that my hon. friend seemed to fall in with that at all. I cannot help having a little suspicion in my mind that my hon. friend the hon. member for Bothwell is looking forward to the time when he will get a chance to do something, and that he does not want a tribunal which will take it altogether out of his power to do so. I hope that is not the case, but I am a little afraid that he thinks himself hardly conscious of it perhaps. These fellows have had the opportunity too long, and our

time will come, but if they give the power to an independent tribunal our time will never come.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the hon. gentleman, whether he proposes to constitute a tribunal under section 51 ?

Mr. McNEILL. I am not prepared to bandy legal phrases with my hon. friend. I do not say anything about section 51 at all. I will leave that to those who are better able to discuss it than I am. I am speaking on broader issues than the construction of section 51 or section 52 either. Before passing away altogether from this matter I would like to make one remark with regard to this village of Port Elgin, of which we have heard so much, and which my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) seemed to think it was such an improper thing to interfere with. That, I do think, is another example of how hard it is for men who are influenced by party considerations to take a fair view of any political question. The facts with regard to the village of Port Elgin are these : Port Elgin is in the township of Saugeen, and is miles away from the north riding of Bruce, entirely surrounded by foreign territory, and the riding of North Bruce has the larger population of the two ridings. I quite admit—and I do not conceal the matter for a moment—that I am very glad to get rid of Port Elgin, very largely because there is a majority against me there. I ask my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who is a fair-minded man, whether it is right and proper that I should be forced to go five miles out of my constituency into a foreign territory and take a village belonging to my friend from the west riding of Bruce to give a majority of 88 against me. I do not think it is fair, and I think that any hon. gentleman who argues in favour of Port Elgin being left in North Bruce is arguing in favour of a gerrymander.

Mr. LAURIER. Let us wipe out all the blemishes of the Act of 1882.

Mr. McNEILL. We will do it by degrees.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let us leave the hon. gentleman's case to the last then, and perhaps he will be more anxious to act upon his promise.

Mr. McNEILL. We will take it as it stands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What a villainy it must have been in 1882 to put Port Elgin where it is now ?

Mr. McNEILL. I think my hon. friend had better have a consultation with his hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) about that. I think he was the author of that iniquity. It was he who made the proposal, I believe.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It was upon my motion I believe it was put in there, but my motion was immediately followed as the House knows, with another motion to put the township of Saugeen, in which it is, into the north riding of Bruce, but the hon. gentleman's friends said "no, no," and would not do that.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman moved for the village of Port Elgin by itself.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And immediately followed it by moving in reference to the township it was in. The hon. gentleman's friends consented to Port Elgin, and the motion was followed by one in regard to the township of Saugeen in which it was, but they refused to consent to that.

Mr. McNEILL. What I want to call my hon. friend's attention to is, that he moved the village of Port Elgin should be put in North Bruce, irrespective of the township of Saugeen.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My motion was followed by that.

Mr. McNEILL. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman moved that the village of Port Elgin should be put in, in order that afterwards he might move that the township of Saugeen might be put in ?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Precisely.

Mr. McNEILL. Well, I wonder at the innocence of my hon. friend that he should think that Sir John Macdonald was such a foolish bird as to be caught with a little pinch of salt on his tail in that way. I hardly expected that from my hon. friend. As our friends on the other side of the line would say, I think that is altogether too thin.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is the fact as the records will show.

Mr. McNEILL. I will pass away from that particular subject Mr. Speaker, and I just wish to say now that during the course of this debate I personally have been very much pained by one or two observations that I have heard let fall from members on my own side of the House, for whom I have the greatest respect. I think that it cannot be altogether charged against hon. members on either side of the House that they err very much in the direction of too much independence. I do not think that is a charge that can very fairly be laid against the members of the Canadian House of Commons on either side. I do not think it can be fairly alleged against them that they are not sufficiently amenable to party discipline on the one side or the other. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that it seems to me very often that hon. members on both sides are expected, when they come down here, to merge their individuality altogether in their party. Hon. members are expected, it would seem, to abandon their liberty of conscience and their right of private judgment, to give up their rights as free men—as soon as they enter the legislative halls of their country. Now, for my part I do not believe that that is a good or a wholesome thing. I think we should be the better of a little more independence ; and I think it would be well for the country if we had a little more independence on both sides of this House. When I came down here it was not my intention to give up my independent liberty of action and of judgment. I am as strongly impressed with the absolute necessity of party discipline as any man can be—party discipline within reasonable bounds ; but party discipline is one thing and party slavery is another thing ; and for my part I have not come down here to be the slave of any man or of any party. I feel that it is necessary that I should waive my own personal opinion in very many cases, and I am willing to do that ; but there are cases when I feel that I cannot do so properly, and in those cases I do not intend to do so. I was brought out by a convention in 1891, and I took occasion at the time of my nomination to say to my friends that I would either come down here as a free man or not at all, and that is the position in which I stand here to-night. Now, I think I am as good a Conservative as any

man in Canada. I am perhaps a little more than a Conservative ; I rather think I am a Tory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We all think that.

Mr. McNEILL. And the worst or the best of it is the older I grow the more of a Tory I get. But I do not think that Conservative principles consist simply in registering the decrees of any man or any body of men, whether they be a Government or a caucus. If it were so, hon. gentlemen opposite would be as good Conservatives as I am. I do not believe that it is a Conservative principle to be prepared to vote to-day that Louis Riel should be hanged and to-morrow that he should not be hanged ; but that is what party discipline in this country sometimes leads to. Now, if men are expected to do this down here, they are not expected to do it by the people of Canada ; I am sure they are not by the people of Ontario. I am quite sure that the people of Ontario do not want their representatives to do that, and if they did I should not want to become one of their representatives, however highly I value and esteem the honour they have conferred on me by appointing me as one. I am sure, furthermore, that such a condition of things is far from being in the interest of the Dominion of Canada, and I am also sure that it is far from being in the interest of either party. If there is one thing more than another which is destructive of a party it is that the members of that party should abjectly follow their leaders without venturing to express an opinion of their own different from the opinions of those whom they follow. Now, I have heard a good deal of discussion inside of the House and outside of the House with regard to this matter, and perhaps I have spoken rather strongly upon the subject myself. I want, with the permission of this House, to support what I have said by an authority. I want to show this House that there are men who are considered not very bad party men who have at times taken a course somewhat different from the course of their leaders. I am going to read from the English *Hansard* from a debate which took place on Mr. Disraeli's Reform Bill in 1867. The gentleman whose words I am about to read was a leading member of the House of Commons at that time on the Conservative side. He says that he understands that it was supposed by the Government that he and his friends were going to divide the House on the third reading, and he says he will not do so, but he asks why ? Not, he says, because he is unwilling to move against the third reading, to move what would be considered here as a vote of want of confidence in the Government, or because he was in any way abandoning his opposition to the Bill ; he says :

"I certainly shall not press the House to divide upon the question whether the Bill shall be read a third time ; I hope that in so saying I shall not for one moment be supposed to shrink from the opposition which I have offered to this Bill, but that it will be understood that I simply wished to consult the convenience of the House."

Because he said that the House had made up its mind, and it would be a mere waste of time. Then he goes on to say :

"I, for one, deeply regret that the Conservative party should have committed themselves to such a course ; I regret that I should be precluded from following any line of policy which they may pursue. Against that course, however, on which they have now entered I deem it my duty to protest, because I wish, whatever may happen in the future, to record my own deep and strong feeling on this subject. I desire to protest, in the most earnest language which I am capable of using, against the political morality on which the manœuvres of this year have been based. If you borrow your political ethics from the ethics of the political adventures, you may depend upon it the whole of your representative institutions will crumble beneath your feet. * * * I entreat hon. gentlemen opposite not to believe that my feelings on this subject are dictated simply by my hostility to this particular measure, though I object to it most strongly, as the House is aware. But, even if I took a contrary view, if I deemed it to be most advantageous, I still should deeply regret that the position of the Executive should have been so degraded as it has been in the present session ; I should deeply regret to find that the House of Commons has applauded a policy of legerdemain ; and I should, above all things, regret that this great gift to the people, if gift you think it, should have been purchased at the cost of a political betrayal which has no parallel in our parliamentary annals, which strikes at the root of all that mutual confidence which is the very soul of our party government, and on which only the strength and freedom of our representative institutions can be sustained."

I think that this is a pretty strong criticism on the actions of his friends by that hon. member of the House of Commons, and that hon. member is now Prime Minister of England.

Mr. LISTER. I shall ask the attention of the House only for a few moments while I proceed to controvert certain statements made by hon. gentlemen on the other side in this debate. Many of these hon. gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe, and availed themselves of the opportunity to criticise what they are pleased to term Mr. Mowat's Gerrymander Act of 1885. Sir, notwithstanding the fact that in 1882 the Conservative party, led by Sir John Macdonald, passed the most infamous Act for the purpose of perpetuating his party in power that was ever passed by any party—not even excepting the Gerrymander Acts of the United States—notwithstanding that fact, during the elections of 1887, when the Conservative party was reproached with that legislation, they retorted on every occasion that bad as that Act was, what they were pleased to term "the Mowat Gerrymander" in 1885 was infinitely worse. And whenever the question of redistribution has arisen in this House hon. gentlemen have been found on the other side ready to urge the excuse that no matter how bad the actions of this Government may be, Sir Oliver Mowat's Act of 1885 was worse than anything the Conservative party in this House has ever attempted to do. Now I do not propose to discuss at all the constitutionality of the measure under discussion. I will content myself with saying that upon the reading of the British North America Act there can be, in my view, no two opinions that this House had no power to pass the Bill in its present shape. I do not pretend to criticise at all the constitution of the counties as proposed in this Bill. Sir, that has been criticised by hon. members on this side, and it has been defended by hon. gentlemen upon the other side ; but what I want to point out is the grossly inaccurate statement, to put it no stronger, made by hon. gentlemen who have thought proper to assail the legislation of Sir Oliver Mowat in 1885 ; and after hearing those statements. I can only conclude that the hon. gentlemen who made them were either entirely ignorant of what they were talking about or else they made them wilfully with intent to deceive this House and the country. Sir, no doubt when the elections come on again, no doubt when this House is again dissolved and we can again appeal to the people, the matter we are discussing

here to-night, and which we have been discussing for so many days, will be an active factor in those elections. No doubt the Government will be assailed again, and no doubt the Government supporters will seek to defend this legislation by saying that although it may not be perfect, although it may be bad in some respects, still Sir Oliver Mowat and his Government and Parliament were infinitely greater sinners. For the purpose, therefore, our enabling our friends, who may not have given this matter any consideration, I conceive it my duty to the party to lay fairly and fully before this Legislature and the country the true facts concerning the alleged Gerrymander Act, an Act which was instead a real redistribution of Ontario in 1885. I will call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that out of all the Ontario constituencies there were 39 reconstructed in 1885. I would call the attention also of the House to the fact that that Bill was introduced in March, 1885, that it passed through the various stages without any apparent discussion, as far as I can gather from the record, or, at all events, without any lengthy discussion, and that it became law on the 27th of March 1885.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There were a number of amendments proposed.

Mr. LISTER. There were a large number of amendments on the third reading. The Bill was introduced, read the first time, and referred to a committee, and some amendments were made in committee. The amendments were concurred in, and the Bill was read a second time on the 23rd of March. So that, as far as I have been able to ascertain, there was very little discussion on the matter, the Opposition having been content with offering certain amendments which were voted down, one after the other, and the Bill became law on the day of its third reading.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You cannot have read the discussion.

Mr. LISTER. I have read the discussion. There was very little discussion indeed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There was a very great deal of discussion, and a very great deal of bitter discussion.

Mr. LISTER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. How could there possibly have been very much discussed in one sitting and with eighty odd members in the House? Now, what was this Bill, and what were its principles? The framers of the Bill introduced in the Ontario Legislature in 1885 had four objects in view. First, to increase the aggregate membership as little as possible; second, in no case to break down county boundaries; third, to equalize population, and in the fourth place, it was so drawn as not to destroy the seats of leading members of the Opposition.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Hear, hear,

Mr. LISTER. So as not to destroy the seats of leading members of the Opposition. By this Bill but two members were placed in a minority, Mr. Ermatinger of West Elgin, by St. Thomas being removed from the east to the west riding, and Col. Gray of West York, who was placed in a minority of three votes. That was the effect of Mr. Mowat's Bill of 1885, that it placed only two of his opponents in a minority. The unit of representation laid down by the Bill was 21,366 persons. Now, having stated that the purpose of the Bill was to increase the aggregate membership as little as possible, in no case to break down county boundaries, and it was in the direction of equalizing the population, I will point out how these particular 39 constituencies stood up to the passing of the Redistribution Act of 1885. There was Algoma which showed a population in 1871 of 5,007; South Bruce, 39,803; North Bruce, 25,536; Cornwall, 9,904; Stormont, 13,294; South Leeds, 18,325; Leeds and Grenville, 12,929; Grenville, 13,526; Brockville, 16,395; West Simcoe, 26,120; East Simcoe, 24,118; South Simcoe, 17,355; Cardwell, 17,993; Peel, 16,387; South Brant, 21,975; North Brant, 11,894; Dufferin, 20,536; Addington, 23,470; Frontenac, 14,993; Kingston, 14,091; West Wellington, 24,978; Centre Wellington, 19,640; South Wellington, 20,279; East Grey, 23,781; North Grey, 25,631; South Grey, 21,127; East Elgin, 27,473; West Elgin, 14,888; East York, 23,312; West York, 18,884; North Essex, 25,659; South Essex, 21,303; North Ontario, 28,434; South Ontario, 20,378; South Victoria, 20,813; North Victoria, 13,799; London City, 19,746; Middlesex East, 30,600; North Perth, 32,915; South Perth, 20,778. I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that Cornwall was wiped out and South Leeds was wiped out under the Bill of 1885.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. gentleman is mistaken in regard to South Leeds. Does he mean South Grenville?

Mr. LISTER. No; South Leeds. According to the new Bill, and upon the basis of the census of 1881, the population would be as follows: Algoma was divided into east and west with a population of 20,320; South Bruce had a population of 23,394; North Bruce, 20,196; Centre Bruce, 21,628; Stormont, including Cornwall, 23,198; Leeds, 20,759; Grenville, 22,741; Brockville, that is the electoral district including part of the County of Leeds, 17,724; West Simcoe, 20,134; East Simcoe, 20,382; Centre Simcoe, South Simcoe being wiped out, 17,406; Cardwell, 22,357; Peel, 21,697; South Brant, 19,084; North Brant, 14,785; Dufferin, 22,086; Addington, 16,605; Frontenac, 16,385; Kingston City, with Portsmouth and Kingston Township, forming the electoral district of Kingston, 19,564; West Wellington, 18,892; Centre Wellington, 22,218; South Wellington, 22,237; East Grey, 24,522; North Grey, 21,488; South Grey, 24,529; East Elgin, 19,848; West Elgin, 22,580; East York, 15,996; West York, 15,762.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. What are you "hear-hearing" about?

Mr. WALLACE. It was 3,000 below the unit before, and Mr. Mowat makes it 6,000 less than the unit.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. gentleman understands, as no doubt he does, what was done in the Yorks, he might explain it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Explain it yourself.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am only asking a question.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Are you leading the Government now?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am very far below the leaders of the Government.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We all know that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But I am far above the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and I believe I have the right to ask a question in the House.

Mr. LISTER. No doubt, but it is sometimes impertinent to ask questions.

Mr. SPEAKER. Hon. gentlemen must address the Chair.

Mr. LISTER. Those two hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think it their duty to interrupt. I think there can be no two opinions about it; on almost every occasion that hon. gentlemen have spoken on this side, you interrupted them by asking questions.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I rise to a question of privilege. I have not interrupted this House, and the hon. gentleman has stated, if it is parliamentary to say so, what is absolutely untrue, as hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will testify.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. If I may be permitted to make a suggestion, I would say that I think it is competent for a member to ask a question, but the member who has the floor need not answer it, the interruption certainly ought not to be continued if the hon. member who has the floor does not desire to answer the question.

Mr. WALLACE. I call your attention to the fact that there was no interruption further than the words "hear, hear" by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). Then the member for Lambton asked, "what is 'hear, hear' about?" and when the member for Haldimand got up and told him, that put him in a worse corner than ever.

Mr. LISTER. That very cultured individual from West York (Mr. Wallace)——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. This is the rule: "When a member is speaking no member shall interrupt him except to order."

Mr. LISTER. The rule appears to be very clear, although I have been in order, and the hon. gentleman has not. I think now he ought to take back his statement, it was entirely unparliamentary.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I rise to call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman who rose to tell us all about Mr. Mowat's gerrymander, refused to answer a simple question.

Mr. LISTER. I made a statement charging the hon. gentleman with having interrupted hon. gentlemen on this side of the House on various occasions during the debate, and I think that charge can be testified to by any hon. gentleman here. During the whole debate the hon. gentleman has taken opportunities of interrupting by asking what he calls questions.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I rise again to a question of privilege. I think the hon. gentlemen who are on the other side of the House, from his leader down, will say that I have not interrupted. They will rise, if I am stating what is untrue.

Mr. LISTER. Now, I was going on to say when I was interrupted, entirely contrary to the rules of this House, without any justification at all, by a gentleman who, evidently, has the facts in his possession that he professes to want to get from me—I was going to say that North Essex had a population of 23,653; South Essex, 23,303; North Ontario, 20,917; South Ontario, 27,895; West Ontario, 18,289; East Victoria, 16,323. The Victorias were changed from South Victoria, which has 20,813, to West Victoria, with 18,218; and from North Victoria, with 13,799, to East Victoria, with 16,323. London City, 23,636; East Middlesex, 26,710; North Perth, 29,500; South Perth, 24,123. Now, Mr. Speaker, these 39 constituencies were affected by Mr. Mowat's Act of 1885, and I say here, that in not one of these constituencies have the county boundaries been departed from. Mr. Mowat did just what is proposed to be done in this House, namely, he decided that the boundaries of the constituencies should remain inviolate, and that the representation should be by ridings within those county boundaries. Not only that, but by looking over the statement of the population I have given as the counties existed up to the time this redistribution took place, hon. gentlemen will recognize that it was only for the purpose of equalizing the population in the several constituencies that a redistribution was made, and they cannot fail to see that under the Bill passed in 1885 the population of these constituencies was equalized. Hon. gentlemen may say, for example, that North Ontario had only a population of 20,917; while South Ontario was given a population of 27,895. But it must not be forgotten that South Ontario, the constituency as it was, was only about twelve or thirteen miles deep, it was densely populated, and certain villages in that vicinity made a more compact riding by placing them in the south; while the north riding of Ontario was something like sixty miles in length, with more than a probability that by the next ten years, when the next census shall be taken, there would be a population equal to, if not more than, the population given by the Bill for the south riding of Ontario. Then one hon. gentleman talked about the County of Waterloo. He pointed out that by the Bill of Mr. Mowat the County of Waterloo was cut up so as to put particular lots that had Liberals living on them, into the south riding, and place other lots that had Conservatives living upon them, into the north riding. What nonsense, what utter ignorance of facts the hon. gentleman displayed when he made that statement! Does he not know that the County of Waterloo has not been changed for years and years, that it was just as it is now at Confederation, and that the identical ridings of the Waterloos for this House are the same as they are for the Local Legislature? Yet they will have the temerity, the audacity, to get up in this House and blazon it forth to the country, that the Local Legislature have, for vile party purposes, for the purpose of securing a majority, as the hon. gentlemen are now trying to do in this House, legislated so as to continue themselves in power.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the hon. gentleman misunderstood my hon. friend. It was one of the Hurons that was divided.

Mr. LISTER. It is Waterloo in the report.

Mr. TISDALE. I mean to say that one of the Hurons was divided.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) was speaking of the Waterloos, and he read a description of the pro-

perty, he gave it as an extract, it is placed in the report as an extract, and I say here that Waterloo has not been changed for forty years. I say, moreover, that the ridings are the same for the Dominion as they are for the Local, and if it was wrong in the one case it was wrong in the other.

Mr. TISDALE. I say that Huron was so divided.

Mr. LISTER. I am not speaking of Huron, I am speaking of Waterloo. In answer to the hon. gentleman I say that so far as Huron is concerned, the county lines were never disturbed.

Mr. TISDALE. But the lots were divided.

Mr. LISTER. County boundaries were never disturbed. What do you do? You take pieces out of two or three counties which vote adversely to you and place them in one section and call it a county, and in that way you secure two or three seats. Can you point out in the Act of the Local Legistature of Ontario respecting the redistribution of seats anything so monstrous, outrageous and improper as the Gerrymander Bill you have before this House to-day, mild as it is?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. But this is nothing compared with the Bill of 1882. It is, however, a gerrymander; members of your own party stigmatize it as a gerrymander.

An hon. MEMBER. When?

Mr. LISTER. In this debate, and hon. gentlemen are particularly careful to say that they reserve to themselves to do what is right in committee. That is an admission on their part that the Bill as presented is not right and is not fair.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not quite understand what reference the hon. gentleman made to South Leeds.

Mr. LISTER. Did you hear Mr. Speaker read the rule?

Mr. TAYLOR. I know the hon. gentleman does not want to be unfair. I think he made a mistake in regard to South Leeds. I have known it during the last 30 years, and it has never been gerrymandered either by the Dominion Parliament or the Provincial Legislature.

Mr. LISTER. There is no South Leeds, but there is the County of Leeds and Leeds and Grenville.

Mr. TAYLOR. Leeds has been a constituency for 30 years to my knowledge.

Mr. LISTER. South Leeds is not a constituency in the Local House; it is Leeds. If you look at the Revised Statutes of 1887, you will find there is no South Leeds, but there is the County of Leeds, the electoral district of Brockville, and the County of Grenville. It was formerly South Leeds, the County of Leeds and Grenville, County of Grenville and County of Brockville, previous to 1885. I stated, when I commenced, that I intended to call the attention of the House to the statute passed by Mr. Mowat in 1885, that I did not intend to enter into a discussion as to the constitutionality of this Bill, that I did not intend to criticise its details, but I desired to answer the charge made against the Local Legislature so far as gerrymandering the province was concerned, and to show that the charge was not true in fact. I stated at the outset that Mr. Mowat laid down well-defined principles on introducing his measure, namely, that county boundaries should be strictly observed, that the increase in the aggregate membership should be as small as possible, that it should be taken in the direction of equalizing the population. I have shown all these facts. I have sought to point out to hon. gentlemen that, in order to equalize population in some places, it was necessary to divide townships; but in no case was a township made part of a riding to which it was not adjacent. I defy any hon. gentleman to go over the whole of the Mowat Act and find such cases as can be found in the Act of 1882 of this House, where the framers of the Bill went outside of the ridings into other municipalities and took towns and municipalities and made them parts of ridings to which they did not naturally belong. No case can be brought forward of violation of boundary lines. The whole legislation was in the direction of equalizing the population, and it was a measure that was fair to the Opposition in the Local House. Moreover, the independent press of that day, whose good-will the Minister of Justice is so anxious to secure, declared the measure to be a fair one in every respect and fair to the Opposition. The fact that the Bill was not discussed at length, that the only amendments moved were amendments for the purpose of taking out one township and placing it here or there, cannot be construed as arguments against the Bill. The result of the legislation shows that the population was nearly equalized, that county boundaries were not disturbed, that it was a fair measure, as fair a measure probably as any set of men could pass, fair to the Government and to the Opposition and approved by the independent press of the country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not rise for the purpose of making a speech. Unfortunately I seem to have brought down upon myself the wrath of the exceedingly heroic and brave member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), who rose with considerable assurance for the purpose of defending, as the champion of Mr. Mowat, the legislation of which Mr. Mowat was guilty—I use the word advisedly—in the Legislature of Ontario. The hon. gentleman has declared that the measure was a fair one, justifiable in every particular, and such a one as any honest man could not criticise either in this Legislature or in the Legislature of Ontario. I do not intend to deal to-night with the iniquities of that Bill *in extenso*; but if the hon. gentleman who rose to defend the Bill knows anything about it and desires to give the House information and to deal fairly with the House and the country and as between man and man, I submit that he should not refuse to answer me two or three questions, posing as he did as the brave and heroic defender of Mr. Mowat in this Parliament. All I ask him to do—and the House, I am sure, will give him the opportunity of answering—is to give explanations and justification for two or three instances I will give him. If he cannot justify Mr. Mowat's action, he either must admit he rose here for the purpose of misleading the House, or that he rose here without the information which he should possess when he said he was able and willing to defend Mr. Mowat's act in the Ontario Legislature. I asked the hon. gentleman a question about the Yorks, and the hon. gentleman said I had the information and I had no right to ask him for it, and he hid behind a rule of the House, just as a hero hides behind a

haystack when some one arrives with a shotgun—in order to avoid answering he hid behind your ruling, Mr. Speaker, which, of course, was a just one—that I had no right to interrupt an hon. gentleman in this House. I gave the hon. gentleman the figures, and I asked him for an answer. I ask him for a reason. Was it either for the purpose of equalizing the population, or for the preservation of county lines, or for the purpose of dealing fairly between the parties? Was it upon one or other, or all of these grounds Mr. Mowat interfered with the constituency of West York? The population of West York under the old regime was 17,984.

Mr. LISTER. You are wrong.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not wrong, except perhaps by two or three units. I am right as regards the hundreds or thousands. The population of East York was 23,312. The average constituency of Toronto was about 28,000, supposing that Mr. Mowat's third member, under the minority representation, had a right to be classed as a member for Toronto in the Ontario Legislature. What did Mr. Mowat do? Does the hon. member for Lambton know? I pause for an answer.

Mr. LISTER. Do not play theatrical.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman rose without possessing a proper knowledge of the facts to justify Mr. Mowat. What Mr. Mowat did was this: he found, unfortunately, that the constituency of West York had persisted in giving a small majority to the Conservatives in the general election which preceded the Gerrymander Act. He found that it had given in the last general election a majority of 19 for Col. Grey, and what did he do? He of course acted according to the rules of justice and fair-play which have been laid down by my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister)! No, Sir, he did the very opposite to equalizing population, but he did equalize politics. He took away the growing town of Parkdale with a population of 1,170 and he added it to the city of Toronto whose average was already 28,000, while the population of West York was less than 18,000. He took away part of the majority of the Conservative party of West York, but that did not suffice. He took away also the village of Richmond Hill and he added it to East York whose population was already 23,000. He left the constituency of West York with a population of 15,974, but he made it Grit in the Legislature of Ontario by equalizing it from 17,000 to 15,000, while the city of Toronto had a very large average and while the constituency of East York had a population of about 24,000 or 25,000 when he had done his equalization. I ask now upon what ground will the member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) justify this, and I pause for an answer. If the hon. gentleman answers that, I trust, Sir, you will give me an opportunity of asking him to justify several other similar instances. My friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says "oh, oh." That is very well. My friend from Bothwell does not like to hear these facts, because my friend from Bothwell said sometime ago, that it was nonsense to say that Mr. Mowat's Act was a gerrymander. I ask my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) how he justifies that division of the Yorks?

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. LISTER. Do not go on playing the theatrical. You have got the figures there, have you not?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman must admit that he has misrepresented matters to the House.

Mr. LISTER. I have done nothing of the kind.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Thank you. The hon. gentleman is now the esteemed and polite gentleman from West Lambton, while I am the uncultured interrupter who deserves your condemnation. Mr. Speaker, I rose with that one instance, but I will give the hon. gentleman half a dozen more if he will explain that one. He rose to explain that Mr. Mowat had redistributed the constituencies in the Province of Ontario for the purpose of equalizing population. Is York redistributed on the basis of equalization of population?

Mr. LISTER. Yes, Sir.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman says yes. Then, Mr. Speaker, having reduced a constituency which had 18,000, and added what had been taken from that to a constituency that had already 23,000 population, if the hon. gentleman calls that equalization, and says that that was the basis upon which Mr. Mowat did it, I leave the hon. gentleman and Mr. Mowat to the intelligence of this House on both sides, because there is no answer for one or the other.

Mr. LISTER. Nineteen of a majority; that is all that he has against Mowat's Bill.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is that the answer of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister)?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is what you say in your speech.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not rise for the purpose of making a speech, and I shall not do so. The member for Bothwell with all his philosophy, the member for Lambton with all his heroism, have both failed to offer any justification of the act to which I have referred. If they will attempt it, I will give them a dozen more just as difficult.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may be allowed now, as the hon. gentlemen have settled their differences, to offer a few remarks to the House for the first time this session. I have listened with great interest throughout this long debate, which I hope will terminate to-night, to the various speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. It appears now that we are going to enter into Ontario politics, and as my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) has introduced that question, I shall before I close my remarks refer to the fact that instead of the hon. gentleman dealing with the question of Mr. Mowat's gerrymander of Ontario in 1885, he should have commenced with the gerrymander of 1874, and not have passed over the record of ten years. I rise more particularly to speak of the adjacent County of Russell, and my connection with it as a candidate in one election. I was not in the House when the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) spoke the other night, but my attention was called to the report of his speech in the Official Debates and I find that on the 1st of June he stated:

"The statement was made in the bye-election of 1888 by my opponents that if they could not beat me in any other way they would beat me by placing the township of Clarence in the County of Prescott."

I observe my hon. friend is present, and will ask him the question now; whether directly or indirectly he ever heard me stating this, or whether I ever addressed any such language to the electors of Russell or to him personally?

Mr. EDWARDS. I am credibly informed by highly respected citizens of Ottawa that the hon. member for the City of Ottawa immediately after the bye-election in 1888, made the statement openly in the Russell House in Ottawa.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Is that the evidence upon which my hon. friend stands up in this House and condemns me, in my absence? Is that the evidence he has to bring to convince this House of the truth of this statement, when I now give it a flat denial, and state that I never on any occasion used such language? I heard it mentioned frequently; and as my hon. friend was known to be hot-tempered and a thin-skinned man, a great many electors used to say it, in order to tease him during the election of 1888. I do not wonder at the hon. gentleman making such a charge against me, because it is on a par with the treatment I received from him in the County of Russell during the election. In one of his townships, it appeared a man named McIntosh had been there and swindled the electors out of some hay, and an elector told me that he waited on the hon. member for Russell and he asked him if I was the man. What was the ungenerous answer of the hon. member? This: I do not think so, but it might have been his brother. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) laughs, but I tell him it is no laughing matter, and I regret that he does so. That is the treatment I received in the County of Russell so far as the hon. gentleman was concerned. Now, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of stating that neither directly nor indirectly have I addressed a member of Parliament or any of the Ministers with reference to the change made in the County of Russell. The hon. gentleman knows himself that he is the one who did more to gerrymander that county than any man in this House. He knows that he got the municipality of Rockland incorporated by the Government Act; that he formed his own official machinery there, and that he sent his representative to Prescott who assisted in strengthening the municipalities which bound Clarence and Rockland to the united Counties of Russell and Prescott. Then the hon. gentleman turns about in this House and insinuates that I in 1888, four years ago, said to some one in Ottawa, that I would have this done; while at the same time I can now appeal to any Minister of the Crown, and ask that Minister whoever he may be, whether directly or indirectly I mentioned the subject to him. The hon. member for Russell went on to say:

"The township of Clarence is one of the townships of the municipality of Russell."

The hon. gentleman knows that Clarence is in the judicial district of the County of Prescott. He knows that Rockland is there, and yet the hon. gentleman comes to this House and endeavours to make hon. members believe that I had assisted in doing a great wrong, whereas he has no proof whatever of the fact. To-night, instead of standing up like an hon. gentleman should and saying that he is satisfied with my statement, he claims that a man in Ottawa said so. The hon. gentleman can always get a man in Ottawa to say whatever he pleases. No doubt the hon. gentleman would be quite willing to see the townships of Osgoode and Gloucester placed in another county; but those townships are where they were 45 years ago when the gentleman who was afterwards Chief Justice Draper represented it; they have always been in the County of Russell. Neither directly nor indirectly have I attempted to have any change made in that county; but I have perfect faith in my leader's judgment and in the general policy of the Government, and I say that I ought not to withdraw my support from the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches because they have taken the township of Clarence from one constituency and included it in another. Now, we have heard a great deal about the redistribution, and hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to the honest redistribution of 1872. Why, these hon. gentlemen never ceased to denounce that redistribution. The Toronto *Globe* at that time said:

"Our own convictions are that the intense feeling of indignation at the recent proceedings of Sir John Macdonald's Government, the disgust that this endeavour to defraud the country of an effective representation will excite, will give enormous strength to our cause; defeat this gerrymandering and cause the arts and craft of a too cunning schemer to recoil on himself."

Yet a few years afterwards, on the occasion of the Redistribution Bill of 1882, Mr. Blake, then leader of the Reform party, moved an amendment, in which occurred these words:

"That on the occasion of the readjustment of 1872 the soundness of the said plan of observing the municipal council organization and the evil consequences of a departure therefrom, were recognized by Parliament."

And at that very time, after condemning the Government in 1872, hon. gentlemen opposite turned around, and were perfectly willing to adopt the policy then carried out. On that subject, in 1882, Sir John Macdonald said:

"The same objections were taken to the Bill in 1872 as were taken to the Bill in 1882 and with just as little reason. The same charges were brought ten years ago as now, but, notwithstanding the fact, hon. gentlemen opposite are so convinced that we acted justly in that readjustment that they are anxious to adhere to it."

Now, my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has introduced the subject of the Ontario redistribution. He sees nothing wrong in it, but suppressed the fact that there was a gerrymander in Ontario in 1874, to which Sir John Macdonald called the attention of the House. He said that the Liberals of Ontario had virtually sacrificed the great principle of representation by population, and that they must bear the responsibility of having done so. These were the words of the great leader of the Conservative party:

"I did not hear his (the leader of the Opposition's) indignant tones ringing either on the stump or platform or elsewhere against the legislation in that province, and if the principle which I laid down in 1872 is to be destroyed, the blame rests there and not with us."

Hon. gentlemen opposite know that their party in Ontario who are defended by the hon. member for West Lambton, were the first to introduce the gerrymandering system; and yet they turn around and skip ten or eleven years for the purpose of deceiving members of this House who are not

thoroughly acquainted with the facts. Now, I have always held, and still hold, with regard to the Ontario gerrymander, that it is intimately connected with the Dominion Parliament. The Local Government were inimical to the Dominion Government, while at the same time the Liberal party laid down the principle that there should be neither hostility nor alliance between the Federal Government and the Local Government; and yet we have seen the local Ministers on the stump opposing the Conservative candidates and doing all they could to put the Dominion Liberal party into power. When it comes to the question of fact, I can show by indubitable evidence, that from the time hon. gentlemen opposite occupied the Treasury benches, they connived with Mr. Mowat, and did everything in their power to assist their friends in the Local Legislature to keep themselves in power. Why, look at the record. In 1874 the gerrymander took place in Ontario. Was Mr. Mowat then allowed to do as he wanted? The Hon. D. A. Macdonald, who sat on the Treasury benches in Ottawa, and who was a friend of the member for Bothwell and of other members whom I see present, wrote Mr. Mowat:

"We are all doing the very best we can for you."

Mr. Grant, then supporting Mr. Mowat, wrote to the Hon. D. A. Macdonald—with reference to the Redistribution Bill:

"The measure would have been brought down before the House, before we would have known the intention of the Government, had you not interfered."

And yet with that evidence before the country hon. gentlemen tell us that we have no right to try to justify what has been done here by referring to what has been done in the Province of Ontario; and in the last stage of the debate the hon. member for West Lambton enters upon an elaborate defence of Mr. Mowat. I further desire to call the attention of the House to what I consider a gerrymander, and I will connect hon. gentlemen opposite directly with it. I will show that notwithstanding the protest of Sir John Macdonald, and while a case was pending in court, they were willing to defeat justice and put a man who was guilty of corrupt practices beyond the reach of justice by adding 260 Reform votes to his county. The hon. member for Bothwell no doubt remembers the case of Mr. Cameron, who formerly represented South Huron in this House. In 1874 Mr. Cameron introduced a Bill to amend the Act 35 Victoria, chapter 13, by detaching the township of Tuckersmith from the centre riding and annexing it to the south riding of the County of Huron. The population of Huron in 1872 was 66,000. The population of North Huron was 21,862, Centre Huron 22,791, and South Huron 21,512. Mr. Cameron ran for the south riding and was elected by 36. The election was protested. He then brought in the Bill taking Tuckersmith from the Centre, and adding it to South Huron, making the redistribution as follows: North Huron 21,862, South Huron 25,211, and Centre Huron 19,000. The writ had been postponed in 1874, so that the Centre Huron Reformers might have a hand in; but the Senate threw out the Tuckersmith Bill. Mr. Rymal at that time said:

"I will vote for the Bill, for I want to give Mr. Cameron a chance to come back to Parliament again if unseated."

And yet these hon. gentlemen opposite to-day denounce the Government because they bring in a Redistribution Bill, while they themselves did not hesitate to endorse a dark and dangerous innovation on the constitution than was ever offered by a Conservative Government in this House. What was the result? That Bill passed this House almost unanimously, the Opposition being very weak at that time. Sir John Macdonald protested. He said:

"By the British North America Act of 1867 there was to be a readjustment of representation, once in ten years. That principle should be carried out rigidly, and the time of Parliament ought not to be taken up by bills of individual members, whenever the bounds of their constituencies did not happen to suit them. It would be a very unfortunate thing, if this practice was going to obtain. All parties were interested in the maintenance of the constitution and this innovation should be resisted."

Mr. Dorion, the late lamented chief justice, then Minister of Justice, said:

"We approve of the measure, we do not resist it."

And Sir John Macdonald replied:

"I am very sorry to hear it, because I think the principle of readjustment every ten years is one which will commend itself to the majority of members in this House. The spirit of fair-play to the constitution demands that this principle should be rigidly adhered to."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, when the redistribution took place in 1872, if Mr. Cameron and others did not complain of Tuckersmith being taken into the centre of the riding, and did not Mr. Rymal produce in the House a map showing that that was altogether out of its proper place, and destroyed the symmetry of the riding, and did not Mr. Cameron in 1874 propose the very thing that he proposed in 1872, and proposed it to correct the gerrymander that was made?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman, I believe, is strictly correct. But at the same time he was perfectly willing that an unconstitutional thing should be done, and sat in his seat without protesting. Mr. Cameron did not mind the symmetry of his constituency. It was his own symmetry he was after. He knew perfectly well, and the hon. gentleman knows, that when the Senate threw that Bill out, he dare not go back, and the present Premier of Manitoba was elected by acclamation. Although the Minister of Justice approved of the Bill, Justices Hagarty, Gwynne and Galt, in giving judgment in the case against Mr. Cameron, said:

"There are strong grounds for thinking that the respondent (Malcolm Colin Cameron, ex-M.P. for South Huron) was guilty of personal bribery, and had the learned judge who tried the case and who unseated him, found the respondent guilty of personal bribery, we should have sustained the judgment."

And yet hon. gentlemen opposite plead to-night that because the resolution was introduced by Mr. Cameron in 1872, and because redistribution had taken place and an election had taken place, they were perfectly justified in trying to save their supporter by passing an illegal Bill. Now, my hon. friend from Lambton endeavoured to show that by the redistribution of 1885 there was equalization of population. I am endeavouring to show that the hon. gentleman has glossed over the facts, and has skipped nine or ten years for the purpose of establishing that Sir John Macdonald was the first to introduce a Gerrymander Bill. What do I find? Look at that very gerrymander in 1874. We have:

Muskoka	5,000
Cornwall	7,000
Algoma	3,000
Brockville	13,000
Elgin, West	12,000
Stormont	11,000
Brant, North	11,000
Monck	15,000

Total, 77,000 for eight members, or one member for every 9,655 voters, of these hon. gentlemen representing those constituencies supporting Mr. Mowat. Let us see what was done, under Mr. Mowat's redistribution, to the unfortunate Conservatives who represented twice the number of votes. Here is how the Conservative constituencies were treated:—

Toronto, East	31,000
Toronto, West	25,000
Ottawa	25,000
Russell	20,000
Carleton	21,000
London	16,000
Dufferin	16,000

Total, 154,000 for the seven members, or each Conservative member represented 22,000 votes. The Bill was therefore evidently framed on the principle that one Reformer was entitled to more representation than two Conservatives; yet my hon. friend perfectly justified that because it was done by a Liberal Government. What have they done to the Island of Prince Edward? Why, they have introduced a Bill there, where they have a majority of one and perhaps not even one, making it necessary to have a two-thirds majority to change the gerrymander they have introduced.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, the Bill the hon. gentleman speaks of is a Bill for the abolition of the Legislative Council, and the council made the stipulation, which the hon. gentleman knows well is only morally and not legally binding, that the qualification of voters cannot be changed except by a two-thirds majority.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I am quite aware it is morally and not legally binding, but at the same time the hon. gentleman knows it occurred.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It has nothing to do with gerrymander.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. There can be no change without a two-thirds vote of the House, never mind whether the Legislative Council is abolished or not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It has nothing to do with gerrymander.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. It has not only to do with gerrymander, but is straining the constitution to perpetuate something they have no right to do, for the reservation may be considered applicable to the Redistribution Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is a mere matter of abolishing the upper House.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I heard the hon. member for South Huron to-night grieving over the fact that there had been a gerrymander in 1882; he wound up by telling the House that he would never have been in Parliament had it not occurred. I think it was very ungrateful of him. He not only got a seat, but he overlooked informing the House that, although elected as a farmer, he handed the seat over to the ex-Finance Minister, the present member for South Oxford, who, after utilizing, surrendered it again to the present member. The hon. member for South Oxford, who never permits an opportunity to pass which enables him to insult supporters of the Government, in his speech recently says:

"But I do believe that it is possible to produce a system of proportionate representation which will go very far indeed to get rid of the two-fold evil that I have pointed out; the evil of direct corruption of a large proportion of the electorate, and the evil of legislative fraud either carried out through the medium of Franchise Bills or of Gerrymander Acts such as the present. I am sorry to have to say, but every hon. member here if he would speak the truth as he knows the facts to exist, must admit that I am stating a most lamentable but at the same time a most certain truth, when I say that, as regards the 215 constituencies, with the exception of a very small percentage, the balance of power under our system is practically placed in the hands of the most corrupt section of the community. I make this statement advisedly."

The hon. gentleman was in power once himself and has a record in the chronicles of the country, and when the hon. gentleman makes charges of corruption in constituencies, he forgets that some seventy Liberal seats were protested throughout the Dominion after the election of 1891, and that in nearly every instance, where the cases came to trial, the Grit scalp of which the hon. member for South Huron spoke was at the belt of the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman knows that we came here last year with a majority of 25 or 27, and he knows that the great electorate, after having heard his policy explained to them for twelve months, repudiated that policy, and despite the fact that we had lost our great leader, sustained the Government by an increased majority of about 30; giving the present Administration fully 60 majority. That is a pretty good evidence of the faith the people have in this Government, and of their appreciation of the charges of hon. gentlemen opposite. When the hon. gentleman talks of corruption, he seems to forget that there was once a Liberal party in power. On every opportunity he condemns the Conservative party in unstinted terms. He never has a generous word to say of them. He is never guilty of a generous action towards them; he continually belittles the country and bewails its condition, and has never a patriotic word to say for it, so long as he is out of office. Now, I want to call attention to the fact that I have shown that the Liberal party, when in power, were as willing to pass Gerrymander Bills as they now are to apologize for Sir Oliver Mowat's Gerrymander Bill. I will show now that they used the money of the Crown and of the people to carry elections, instead of dealing with contractors, although perhaps a bank president might be considered a contractor. Hon. gentlemen will remember the celebrated case of South Ontario where a bank president was put in the witness-box and the Finance Minister of Canada was called upon to give his evidence. The bank president had to admit that he entered into a corrupt bargain with the Finance Minister who promised him large sums of money, the deposits of the Dominion of Canada, if he would use the influence of the bank to carry certain elections. When the trial took place, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) examined the bank president as follows:—

"Q. Had you an interview with the Finance Minister before that circular was written?—A. I had an interview on the 8th December, 1873."

Before even the Governor General knew that there was to be a dissolution, the Finance Minister approached the bank president and discussed this matter.—

"Q. Are you in the habit of issuing untruthful circulars to influence the electors: or do you try to keep within the bounds of truth?—A. I am not conscious of issuing an untruthful circular.

"Q. In this circular you say: Because if the Government is sustained, I will be able through them to get justice for our party in needful appointments and otherwise. Because if they are sustained our bank and other Ontario banks (throughout the country) will have the use of the Government surplus until required. You had some warrant for saying that, of course?—A. I believed we would have justice done us.

"Q. You see what you say here. If you had not believed it you would not have said so?—A. I had reason for saying what I said.

"Q. That if the Government were sustained you would have the Government deposits?—A. More equally divided.

"Q. From whom did you get that?—A. From a number of gentlemen. I went to Mr. Cartwright, and he swore.

"Q. Never mind what he swore. Swear for yourself and not for Mr. Cartwright?—A. Well, I swear I was told by Mr. Cartwright.

"Q. By whom?—A. By Mr. Cartwright.

"Q. What did he tell you?—A. He told me that if the Government was sustained the banks would get a fair quota of the surplus, if they were sustained."

I believe the Mr. Cartwright here referred to is the same gentleman who was afterwards knighted for his financial services to the country. The evidence was that this bank president was to use the influence of this bank in North and South Ontario and East and West Durham, and he used that influence so effectually that he carried the four counties for the Government. We will see what the result was and where the reptile fund came in. The bank president was asked:

"Q. You don't remember bragging of that when they came to congratulate you, and that you got over thirty from the other side?—A. I think there were more than that.

"Q. How many?—A. One hundred.

"Where?—A. In South Ontario. I think I was the means of getting gentlemen who had sufficient influence to secure 100 votes that night.

"Q. What was the influence you brought to bear upon them? Are you an eloquent man?—No.

"Q. You are not eloquent: then what influence did you bring to bear?—A. It was not money, anyway.

"Q. Well, what was it?—A. Oh, a sort of mesmerism."

Let us see what the mesmeric influence was, and what followed. The deposits in the banks in the Province of Ontario and the deposits in the Ontario Bank were as follows in the years specified:—

	Deposits in Banks in Ontario.	Deposits in Ontario Bank.
1873—31st December.	$ 797,000	$180,500
1874—30th June.....	801,000	396,800
1874—31st December..	1,024,000	507,400
1875—30th June	821,000	411,000
1875—31st December.	981,000	428,000
1876—30th June.....	738,000	395,000
1876—31st December.	518,000	209,500

The Ontario Bank had a capital of $3,000,000. The other banks in Ontario had at that period, a capital of $13,000,000. So that the Ontario Bank's share of the Government deposits would have been in a legitimate division, about 20 per cent of the whole. It was 22 per cent on the 31st December, 1873, but in compliance with the agreement it rose to 48 per cent on the 30th June, 1874, and touched nearly 50 per cent on the 31st December, slightly exceeding 50 per cent on the 30th June, 1875, and reached nearly 54 per cent on the 30th June, 1876. Here we have evidence sworn to in a court of law, that the Finance Minister entered into a corrupt bargain with a bank president and used the deposits of the people, at a time when the country was suffering tribulation, and depositing that money without interest, and managing to obtain four members to support his Government as a consequence; yet that hon. gentleman rises here and charges the Conservative party with having been guilty of every species of corruption, though such a large number of the supporters of the Opposition were found guilty of corruption after the last election, and they stand here to-day a dishonoured and disgruntled party; while behind the Minister of Justice is a phalanx of members who, while willing to express their independent opinion when occasion calls for it, have confidence in the policy which they are endeavouring to work out and which Sir John Macdonald, our lamented leader, bequeathed to us. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) figured out the Province of Ontario in groups. I am glad that hon. gentlemen opposite do not look so much to the equalization of population as to the representation of all classes, and furthermore feel that the area of territory should be taken into consideration. If you take from the Niagara peninsula to Essex, you find a very large territory running north as far as Huron returning 31 members. Then if you take the district from Kingston to Prescott and north to Renfrew up the line of Nipissing, you find a much larger area represented by 21 members, having a total population of 426,000, giving each constituency an average of 21,000 people. Therefore, I say, as far as this district is concerned, it is the evident desire to reduce the strength of the Conservative party which makes hon. gentlemen so anxious to sacrifice hon. members in eastern Ontario under the guise of the interests of the country; they should say at once it is for the interests of the Liberal party. We have Kingston, with 1 member; Ottawa, 2; Cornwall, 1; Prescott, 1; Glengarry, 1; Russell, 1; Dundas, 1; Carleton, 1; Leeds and Grenville, 1; Grenville, 1; Lanark, 2; Leeds South, 1; Renfrew, 2; Frontenac, 1; Addington, 1; Lennox, 1; and Brockville, 1; or a total of 21 seats with an area of about one-fifth larger than the district in Western Ontario that has 31 members. There we have the County of Essex, with 2 members; Kent, 1; Bothwell, 1; Lambton, 2; Elgin, 2; London and Middlesex, 4; Norfolk, 2, Haldimand, 1; Monck, 1; Lincoln, 1; Wentworth, 2; Brant, 2; Oxford, 2; Perth, 2; Huron, 3; Waterloo, 2; Welland, 1; or a total of 31 members. I submit, so far as Eastern Ontario is concerned, while it was deprived of one member at the last census, it would be most unfair at this time, to ask that seats should be taken away from hon. members who have sat here so long while the population shows an average of 21,000 to every seat. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), after the subject of redistribution had been discussed for twenty years, appears as a Columbus, having made a new discovery in the constitution. I do not think it will amount to much, because I think the common sense of the House, and even the hon. gentlemen opposite, are perfectly satisfied with the interpretation of the constitution that has prevailed in the past. I promised to refrain from making a speech. I arose to make certain statements, and I have made them. I say that this scheme of gerrymandering counties was first originated by the Liberal party, because their own leader moved in 1882 that the principle of the redistribution of 1872 should be adopted by this House; hence, they must take the onus of originating this gerrymander principle, and we can judge, were it in their power, what would be done to-night. The hon

gentleman opposite (Mr. Mills) shakes his head. He has a logical mind, and when he comes down to hard facts he will admit that I am right. He knows that Sir John Macdonald stated in this House: The Liberals of Ontario have broken the principle, and if my followers wish to do the same, the Liberals must take the consequences. The hon. gentleman heard Sir John A. Macdonald say that, and he knows it to be a fact. Now, so fas as the County of Russell is concerned, I want to say this, that I desire no friend of mine, in this House or out of it, to imagine for a moment that I ever interfered with that matter before that Government. The city of Ottawa was changed, and if I never spoke another syllable I can say this: Not alone in the matter of Russell, but in the city of Ottawa, I was not aware what the constituency was going to be, how it was to be formed or what changes made. I did not ask the Government their intentions; I was just as indifferent as to what kind of a redistribution they were about to make in those constituencies as I am now whether I remain in Parliament or not. Therefore I felt keenly when I heard my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) make a personal attack upon me. He might at least have come to me personally and asked if what he had heard was true. The hon. gentleman could at least have shown me the courtesy that I have always manifested towards him during the election contests that we have fought. The hon. gentleman at least should have obtained evidence upon which to base his charge before getting up in this House and making it. The hon. gentleman said in his speech that he heard that his opponents boasted in 1888. I asked him where he got his information. He says: A man told me the other day. I challenge the hon. gentleman to prove that I have had anything to do with the County of Russell except being defeated there. As far as I am concerned in the city of Ottawa, although several thousand people have been added to the constituency, from districts in which I have never addressed meetings, yet I would be just as willing to submit my claims there as I would be to-morrow in the County of Russell. But when I see a township gerrymandered by the influence of the sitting member, when I see a township yielding one vote for every three of population, counting men, women and children, when I know the methods adopted by him in that township, does the hon. gentleman expect me to get up and shed crocodile tears over what has happened? The hon. gentleman says he has great sympathy for the people in the county. Then why does he complain? He will have a smaller county. He will have the opportunity of selecting either Prescott or Russell; he will have two counties to bow down at this shrine as a representative statesman. So far as the redistribution itself is concerned, hon. gentlemen opposite declare that it is going to be disastrous to the Liberal party, and in the next breath they say it is going to help the Liberals.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We do not propose to do evil that good may come.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Then if you had not done that, if that had not been your policy, you would have been in power now. You did not do evil, that good might come, but you were perfectly willing to do it in order that good to your party might come. The hon. member for South Oxford said the other night that they have never had a fair election. I think the election of 1874 was a pretty fair one, when they had bank presidents helping them, and a provincial treasury at their backs, and the result of 1878 should teach him that electors in Canada vote according to their consciences. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) came into the Government late, or perhaps the Government might not have fallen so quickly. At any rate, they kept the member for South Oxford there, and the only thing they got was a miserable and undone country, and he got a title. I shall say nothing more. I only desire to express the hope that the hon. member for Russell, after hearing my statement, will accept it as the gospel truth that it is.

Mr. EDWARDS. In the course of the few remarks I intended to address to the House on the amendment now before it, I did not intend to deal with any personal matter I have had the honour of a seat in the House for six sessions, during which time I have never had a controversy with any member of it. But it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the two defeats which the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) suffered in the County of Russell, still rankle in his heart, and to-night he has taken occasion to get up and make a personal attack upon myself. Well, Sir, I have no scrap book. Perhaps if I had a lot of scraps to read to the House, I might speak at as great a length as he has done. In the course of his speech he referred to some case that was in court a few years ago.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. What case? I never referred to a case in court at all.

Mr. EDWARDS. But he was reading evidence.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. When, to-night?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes, to-night.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I was referring to a case in South Ontario. I was not referring to the 18 men that were disqualified.

Mr. EDWARDS. Never mind, I am speaking now. Before I get through I will refer to two other cases which came into court in which my hon. friend did not figure handsomely. In the beginning of his remarks he spoke of some man by the name of Mackintosh who had bought wood and hay in the township of Clarence.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I did not say a word about wood.

Mr. EDWARDS. Never mind, Mr. Speaker, that is part of his campaign speech in the County of Russell. The whole thing is a manufacture of his own. I never heard of a purchaser of the name of Mackintosh in the County of Russell, until the hon. gentleman came there. But he is one of those gentlemen who is always being stabbed in the back and is always looking for sympathy, and he is doing it now. I never heard of the case except from himself.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I accept the apology.

Mr. EDWARDS. But I heard it from himself a great many times during the contest in Russell. In the next place, the hon. gentleman stated that through my instrumentality the County of Russell was now being gerrymandered for the very great offence that the village of Rockland became incorporated. Is that any offence? The hon. gentleman

further stated that it was incorporated by the Mowat Government. If it was incorporated by that Government, was it a crime? It was incorporated under the general Act by the county council, and in no other way. We have heard several excuses for gerrymandering Russell, but this is the latest excuse, and it is a very trivial excuse indeed. The hon. gentleman also referred to the fact that Prescott and Russell were united for judicial purposes. That is true. It is also true that we have a united county council. That does not militate against the fact that Russell is a perfectly independent county by itself. We have a county town, we have our agricultural society and all other matters perfectly independent of the County of Prescott, and it was simply a question of economy in the matter of our county buildings and so forth that we have continued in our present position. Is that not the case in several other counties? For example: Dundas, Stormont and Glengarry are united for municipal affairs, but are separate and distinct counties. Later on the hon. gentleman made the statement that I would be perfectly willing to see Osgoode and Gloucester joined to Carleton. I never made that statement, and I would not be willing that they should be united to that county. It is true that Russell as it is to-day, if this Act does not go into effect, will still remain as it was when Chief Justice Draper represented it in Parliament. In the course of the few remarks I addressed to the House the other day, I stated what I believed would be the right course to pursue. I did not refer at any time to a desire on my part that Gloucester or Osgoode should be removed from the County of Russell. On the contrary, I should be opposed to any such scheme. I am very strongly opposed to Clarence being placed in the County of Prescott. When the leader of the House introduced this measure he gave two reasons for placing Clarence in Prescott: one was that it would equalize the population; and the second was that the people of Clarence would be more in harmony with the people of Prescott than with the people of Russell. During the course of the speech delivered by the Minister of Railways a few days ago he showed, just as I have shown, that equalization does not take place; but in order to make another excuse, he said the vote of Prescott was very much smaller than the vote of Russell, and there were fewer voters on the voters' lists. Is it the fault of the people of Russell if the people of Prescott do not place their names on the voters' lists? I have always understood that representation by population was the basis of the present system, and that the vote was not to be taken into account, but the population. This was simply another very flimsy excuse put forward. But we have heard the crowning statement to-night, that because the people of Rockland choose to have the village incorporated, it should be gerrymandered out of Russell into Prescott. I went to Rockland twenty years ago when there was only one house in the place. To-day, there is a population of 1,700 with 200 to 300 houses, and a very large business is carried on. In the estimation of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) that is a crime, and the people should be punished for building up a large industry there. It is true that the other night I said that my opponent in 1888 made a statement that if they could not beat me in Russell in any other way, they would put Clarence into Prescott. The hon. gentleman has denied it to-night.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Will you accept it?

Mr. EDWARDS. I am obliged to accept any apology made; but I will just say this, that after that memorable fight, the hon. gentleman's paper for a whole week abused the people of Clarence, and I thoroughly and honestly believe that the hon. gentleman was in such a state of mind that he does not recollect any statement he made about that at time.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Does the hon. gentleman accept my statement, that I did not say anything of the kind to which he refers?

Mr. EDWARDS. I am obliged to accept the statement.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. No, he is not obliged to do so; this is not the stump, but Parliament, and we are among gentlemen.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am afraid the evidence is too strong. That statement was made not only by one person but by several persons, and I thoroughly believe to-day that it alone is the foundation for the attempted gerrymander of the township of Clarence into Prescott. I do not desire for one moment that Osgoode or Gloucester should be placed in Carleton, and I know that would be the effect if this amendment were carried, but I believe we should have some definite principle on which readjustment should take place, and that it should not be left to any political party. This is a fair and equitable way in which it can be done, and even if in carrying it out I should be injured, I would accept the injury without complaining. During the course of the speech of the mover of this amendment I understood him to say that if this gerrymander went into effect, that he would not blame the Liberal party when their time came if they resented by imposing a very much more severe gerrymander upon the people of this country. To that statement, and that statement alone in his speech, do I take exception. No matter how infamous an Act is perpetrated upon the people of this country by hon. gentlemen opposite, it is no justification for a wrong from this side of the House. I have had the honour of a seat in this House for six years, and during the course of that time the answer to almost every attack that is made here is, that some one else did the same thing many years ago. We hear a great deal of ancient history in this House. Such is no answer; two wrongs do not make a right; and to a practical business man who has been accustomed to do business in a business way, I must say that I consider it a great wrong to offer such nonsensical arguments as are used in this House on very many occasions, and by which the time of Parliament is taken up and the money of the people wasted. This question has been dealt with in a general way by several hon. gentlemen, and I shall not enter into that discussion, but I must repeat that I do think the Government made a very great flight when they soared all the way from the Niagara district down to the County of Russell to gerrymander the township of Clarence. I firmly and honestly believe that was done for one reason and one reason alone, namely, that some years ago the people of that township were strongly Conservative, but to-day they are strongly Liberal. Are

these people to be punished now because they claim the right to exercise their honest convictions? If that is the system what would be the effect? Let the people change their convictions as they may, yet the Government in power has it within its jurisdiction to say that the opinions of the people of this country shall have no effect, and that they shall maintain themselves in power contrary to the wishes of the people. We all cherish and love responsible government. But out of responsible government at least one evil springs, and that is the evil of the antagonism of party. We have altogether too much partyism for the good of the country. If hon. gentlemen came here with the sole and only motive of legislating in the best interests of the country and not in the interests of party, it would be very much better for our welfare and prosperity. I believe firmly and honestly that the best thing that could occur for this country in order to wipe out the political evils that have been perpetrated for many years past, would be a reasonably frequent succession of changes of Government. If hon. gentlemen came here with but one motive, and that to legislate in the interests of the country and never mind those who are running after them for favoritism and so forth, it would be a grand thing. Let us have everything fairly and squarely done, and I believe that under the present condition of this country, no political party could remain in power for any length of time. To-night the question of redistribution in Ontario has been referred to. Is that any of our business in this House?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Ask the member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), he introduced it.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not care whether it comes from this side or that side, we have nothing to do with that question. This is the Dominion Parliament, and our business is to legislate for the Dominion, and if Sir Oliver Mowat, in introducing his redistribution, pretends for one moment to perpetrate such an injustice as is suggested on this occasion, I say that Mr. Mowat should receive the condemnation of Ontario. I wish now to briefly refer to the proposed division of the County of Ottawa, with which county I am acquainted. So far as that county is concerned, I do not know, nor would I pretend to say, that any political advantage will result from the position in which the two ridings of Ottawa County would be placed. I do think, however, that the proposed division would be very inconvenient and unfair, and I will give you my reasons for so saying. The County of Ottawa is a large county, it extends about 100 miles north; there are three large rivers running northward through that county, and between each of these rivers there is a height of land which is not populated. There are no roads running east and west, the communication between the people being all from north to south in the northern portion of the county. I take this opportunity of suggesting to the Government that the proposed division would be most inconvenient in every respect. For instance if a man living in the north-east portion of the county wanted to see his member who might live in the north-west section, he would have to travel 100 miles to the front, and fifty or sixty miles along the river, and a hundred miles north. It would be inconvenient in every respect, and I think the division is one that will never be satisfactory to the people of the county. I do not speak as to the political aspect of the case, but when the matter comes up in committee I may refer to it again. Mr. Speaker, I will not take up the time of the House any longer, and possibly I would not have spoken at all but for the remarks of my hon. friend from the city of Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh). I have not referred as I might have to the case in court in which he figured, nor have I referred to the high-kicking to which he gave testimony himself.

Mr. CHRISTIE. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention at this late hour to occupy the time of the House more than a few moments, but I cannot allow this measure to pass without a word of condemnation. I simply desire very briefly to record my protest against this odious gerrymander. I must say that I regret somewhat to be obliged to use a strong expression, but I feel that it is scarcely possible to use language too strong to denounce the iniquity of this measure. I have examined this Bill with some care, and I have failed to discover in it any regard to justice or fair-play, any regard to representation by population, or to the preservation of county lines, or any regard to the convenience, the interests or the wishes of the people. It appears to me that the only aim has been to serve party interests, to wipe out as many Liberal constituencies as possible. The whole measure appears to me to be a gross violation of all the principles which should govern a Redistribution Bill. It is true, we have been told again and again that this is a fair and honest measure. I should like to accept these statements as made in good faith; but actions speak louder than words; and if we examine the details of this Bill, we shall be forced to come to the conclusion that these kind words have been spoken either in jest or in irony. Let us look just for a moment at the adjoining County of Russell, to which the previous speaker has been referring. We see a Liberal township lopped off there, and thrown into the adjoining county; and by that simple operation a Liberal constituency is converted into a Conservative one, and an hon. member is decapitated. We know that that is done contrary to the wishes and the remonstrances of the people, and the only effect of it is to transfer the excess of population from Russell to Prescott. Again, if we look at the adjoining County of Ottawa, we find that that county is divided into two divisions, one with a population of 17,000 and the other with a population of 47,000. There is no regard there to representation by population. But that is not all; the division is made from east to west, contrary to the wishes, the interest or the convenience of the people. The people have remonstrated by public meeting, by resolution and by their representatives in this House; but their representations have been ignored and trampled under foot. I think it is scarcely possible to find a more glaring violation of the principles that should govern a fair and honest Redistribution Bill. Let us look a little further east. We see the Counties of Vaudreuil and Soulanges, with a population of about 20,000, left intact and undisturbed. Now, I have no fault to find with that, for I have no wish to see the representation of the rural constituencies diminished. But what I find fault with is that the same rule is not applied to St. John's and Iberville, two Liberal constituencies, which are

united, one member being wiped out. My contention is that the same rule should be applied to Liberal constituencies as to Conservative constituencies; there should not be one rule for one and another rule for the other. Again, if we turn to Chambly and Verchères, we shall find greater iniquities and greater abominations still. The County of Verchères is wiped out as with a besom of destruction. The hon. member who has long represented that county and has been an honour to this House, is to be decapitated. Chambly, another Liberal constituency, has had patch after patch added to it. One patch was not sufficient to make it a safe Conservative seat, so three or four were added. It is not surprising that one of our city papers should suggest that the map of that constituency should be sent to Chicago as an exhibition of Canadian political infamy. Now, I do not intend to refer to any others. I have mentioned only two or three to prove the statement with which I began. I do feel that the rural constituencies have been unfairly and hardly dealt with. For many years they have been robbed and fleeced by the operation of the National Policy for the benefit of combines and monopolies in the cities; their population has been diminished; their property has depreciated in value; population has been driven away, some to the cities and manufacturing centres and others to the United States; and now, to cap the climax, they are to be deprived and robbed of their political rights. Representation of the country is to be reduced, and representation of the manufacturing centres, where the combines and monopolies have full sway, is to be increased. Now, this measure is, I think, enough to arouse the indignation of every fair-minded man on either side of this House. The injustice is so obvious that not only the Liberal press, but the independent press have unanimously condemned this measure; and not only the press, but we see gentlemen on the Government side of the House rising in their places and expressing their disapproval of it. Their sense of justice and of British fair-play was so great that they were forced not only to condemn the measure, but to suggest a remedy, which would present such gross injustice being done. Now, I do hope that those gentlemen in the manly, noble stand they have taken, will be followed by others. But be that as it may, I for one shall have pleasure in recording my vote for once in favour of a motion brought forward by a supporter of the Government, because while I would not like to pledge myself to all its details, I believe that it is a good one. I only regret that we do not often have good measures brought forward from the other side of the House. If we had I for one would have pleasure in supporting them. I will not further trespass on the time of the House, but will close by thanking the House for its patient hearing.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The hon. member for North Bruce said that if all my arguments were as false as the statement I made with respect to the gerrymander which took place in 1882, they were not much to be depended on. The statement I made was this, that according to the gerrymander of North Bruce in 1882, based on the election returns of 1878, there was a Conservative majority of 331. I have gone over the figures and verified them since I made the statement, and wish to put myself right before the House.

Mr. CHRISTIE.

House divided on amendment of Mr. McCarthy:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Innes,
Bain (Wentworth),	Landerkin,
Beausoleil,	Langelier,
Béchard,	Laurier,
Beith,	Lavergne,
Bernier,	Leduc,
Borden,	Legris,
Bourassa,	Lister,
Bowers,	Livingston,
Brown,	Lowell,
Bruneau,	Macdonald (Huron),
Carroll,	McCarthy,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	McGregor,
Casey,	McMillan (Huron),
Charlton,	McMullen,
Choquette,	Mignault,
Christie,	Mills (Bothwell),
Colter,	Mulock,
Davies,	O'Brien,
Dawson,	Paterson (Brant),
Devlin,	Perry,
Edgar,	Proulx,
Edwards,	Rider,
Featherston,	Rinfret,
Flint,	Rowand,
Geoffrion,	Sanborn,
Gibson,	Scriver,
Gillmor,	Semple,
Godbout,	Somerville,
Grieve,	Sutherland,
Guay,	Yeo.—62.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Kenny,
Amyot,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bain (Soulanges),	Lippé,
Baird,	Macdonald (King's),
Baker,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Bennett,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bergeron,	Mackintosh,
Bergin,	McAlister,
Bowell,	McDougald (Pictou),
Boyle,	McKay,
Burnham,	McLean (King's),
Burns,	McLennan,
Cameron,	McLeod,
Cargill,	McNeill,
Carignan,	Madill,
Carling,	Mara,
Carpenter,	Masson,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Metcalfe,
Chapleau,	Miller,
Cleveland,	Mills (Annapolis),
Coatsworth,	Monerieff,
Cockburn,	Montague,
Corbould,	Northrup,
Costigan,	Ouimet,
Curran,	Patterson (Colchester),
Daly,	Patterson (Huron),
Davin,	Pelletier,
Davis,	Pridham,
Denison,	Putnam,
Desaulniers,	Reid,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Robillard,
Dewdney,	Roome,
Dickey,	Rosamond,
Dugas,	Ross (Dundas),
Dupont,	Ross (Lisgar),
Dyer,	Ryckman,
Earle,	Simard,
Fairbairn,	Smith (Ontario),
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Sproule,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Stairs,
Foster,	Stevenson,
Fréchette,	Taylor,
Gillies,	Temple,
Grandbois,	Thompson (Sir John),
Guillet,	Tisdale,
Haggart,	Turcotte,
Hazen,	Tyrwhitt,
Hearn,	Wallace,
Henderson,	Weldon,
Hodgins,	White (Cardwell),
Hughes,	White (Shelburne),
Hutchins,	Wilmot,
Ingram,	Wilson,
Jouças,	Wood (Brockville).—109.
Kaulbach,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Tupper,	Mr. Fraser.
Mr. McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Mr. Brodeur,
Mr. Girouard (Two Mount.),	Mr. Frémont,
Mr. McDougall (C. Breton),	Mr. Forbes,
Mr. Wood (Westmoreland),	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. Cochrane,	Mr. Bowman,
Mr. Gordon,	Mr. Campbell,
Mr. Craig,	Mr. Vaillancourt,
Mr. Lépine,	Mr. Delisle,
Mr. Desjardins (L'Islet),	Mr. Monet,
Mr. Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mr. Préfontaine,
Mr. Corby,	Mr. Armstrong,

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has not voted.

Mr. GIROUARD. I have paired with the hon. member for Chambly.

Mr. SOMERVILLE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.10 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 10th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS OF BRITISH FARM DELEGATES.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) moved for:

Copies of the reports of the British farm delegates, Messrs. McQueen and Davey, respecting the Maritime Provinces.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Under the circumstances, the hon. gentleman having postponed his motion, I ask the House to adopt it.

Motion agreed to.

CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law and (No. 21) for the suppression of obscene literature and to provide for the punishment of certain immoral and criminal practices.

On section 423,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think this section has been very well considered. I fail to appreciate the reason for the distinctions in the punishments awarded. For instance, take sub-section (*c*) which was amended by leaving out the word "accountable;" the man who forges "any accountable receipt or acknowledgment of the deposit, receipt or delivery of money or goods," is liable to imprisonment for life, whereas for somewhat similar offences he is liable to 14 years' imprisonment or to 7 years' imprisonment, although at first blush the latter offences appear to be just as deserving of great punishment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a theory for it all, and that is, that the heavier punishment for life shall attach specially to the forgery of those documents which are likely to be used fraudulently in commerce; as for instance, bills of lading, bills of exchange, bank bills, transfer of stocks and company stocks, exchange bills, and everything of that kind pertaining to money; and it is on that principle an accountable receipt, being a thing that is transferable, and likely to be transferred, has a special penalty attached to it. I think we ought either to restore the word "accountable" or else put the offence in the other list.

On section 428,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). An alarm may be a very proper thing in some cases.

Mr. MASSON. Several members of the committee expressed very strong opinions that some punishment should be provided for the sending of these false telegrams, even where the intention was to alarm only. At present there seems to be no means of reaching criminally persons who do so, and if no financial injury is done there is no civil remedy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the word "letter" ought to be put in there after the word "telegram." I cannot see any difference between sending a false alarm in a letter and in a telegram.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Very well; make it so.

On section 429,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is a very serious section and likely to give rise to trouble. During an experience of many years' practising at the bar I have heard hundreds of people allege that they signed documents understanding them to be different from what they turned out to be, and even going further and saying they were misrepresented. For instance, a man comes to a lawyer's office and the lawyer reads perhaps a lengthy document to him, and he is so impatient to sign that he signs it, but he afterwards says he understood it to be different from what it really was. This is a serious section and might be the means of ruining a man.

Mr. MASSON. The intention was to provide for cases where these fraudulent agents go to the country and induce people to sign documents which may perhaps turn out afterwards to be a promissory note or an order for goods, or something different from what the person supposed he was signing. It is very difficult to meet that class of cases.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is a change in the law, and I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that it is a little dangerous. I feel inclined to drop the section.

Section dropped.

On section 433,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are we not importing phrases which apply in England but do not apply here? Do we make any special paper here for exchequer bills and so forth?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We issue exchequer bills in London now for temporary loans. It is very likely that from time to time exchequer bill paper will be used here for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I take it that the object of this section is to prevent a special kind of paper being used for other purposes, and that special kind of paper is not made here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Our exchequer bills are made on paper expressly prepared for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, but you do not make a special kind of paper such as they do for Bank of England notes, the manufacture of which is prohibited.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The paper is prepared expressly in England for that purpose. We do not use exchequer bills much, it is true, but we want that same protection here that they have in England.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Until you manufacture or use that special class of paper here, you are making this an offence by anticipation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will let sections 433 and 434 stand.

Sections postponed.

On section 436,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are two distinct offences here. It seems to me that imprisonment for life is a very severe penalty for merely injuring a register.

Mr. MASSON. That may be a very serious matter. There was an important case in Ontario not long ago, which hinged on the proof that a certain party was married at a certain time. The register was produced but there was an erasure in it, and it was claimed that it was the names of the parties married had been erased.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I doubt if this section covers that.

Mr. MASSON. Yes, it says: defaces or injures.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it would be better to make provision for the erasure to meet such cases as the hon. gentleman has pointed out, but it seems to me the punishment for a mere injury is excessive.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is the wording of the present section and the same penalty.

Mr. MASSON. I would suggest that the words be inserted in clause *a*: "or makes any erasure therein."

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 456,

Mr. MULOCK. Would the Minister say what precedent there is for imposing such an extreme penalty as imprisonment for life for the personation of any person with a fraudulent intent to obtain property?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The authority for it is a similar provision in the draft code of 1880, from which this was taken.

Mr. MULOCK. It startles one at first.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Is it not right?

Mr. MULOCK. The only case of the kind I can think of at present is the Tichborne case, in which the accused was sentenced to fourteen years imprisonment, and I cannot conceive of an offence of this character more serious than that was.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If you think the penalty too great, I have no objection to making it fourteen years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are words in the code as reported by the commissioners which are omitted here. It says: "who falsely and deceitfully personates."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the Bill of 1880 those words do not appear: and the committee generally followed the Bill of 1880 in preference to the original draft, because it was the second thought on the subject.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 91) for the relief of James Wright.—(Mr. Tisdale.)—(On a division.)

Bill (No. 92) for the relief of Hattie Adele Harrison.)—(Mr. Tisdale.)—(On a division.)

CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law, &c.

On section 484,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This section has to be read, of course, in connection with 480, but I see this difficulty. Supposing two men have an interest in some wood, and one of them burns his share. Afterwards he has a dispute with his partner, who prosecutes him for the burning. The third paragraph of 480 says:

"Where the offence consists in an injury to anything in which the offender has an interest, the existence of such interest, if partial, shall not prevent his act being an offence."

Under this, the fact that the burning was not done with intent to defraud could not be pleaded.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. But you must read in connection with this the second paragraph of clause 480, which says:

"Nothing shall be an offence under any provision contained in this part unless it is done without legal justification or excuse, and without colour of right."

On section 486,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does municipal cover civic?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, by the definition, municipality includes city, town or village.

On section 491,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The question is whether this is sound in principle and whether you should not apply it to any carrier by land or water. For instance, if I send a quantity of goods to the Maritime Provinces by steamboat, they ought at least to be in the same position as if sent by rail. I would suggest that the clause be broad enough to cover any common carrier. I know that in England they have constantly legislated in reference to the docks in order to punish those who break into packages. In Montreal and in our large rising cities the offence is more likely to be committed when loading goods on a steamboat

than when on a train. I would suggest that the section be made to cover any common carrier, railway or ship.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will insert after the word "railway" the words, "or in any warehouse, ship or vessel."

On section 504,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A year or two ago, I was present at a prosecution brought against a mortgagor, who after the term had expired and the mortgage had been foreclosed, and just before he was ejected, moved the building off the premises. The building constituted the chief part of the value, being worth about $2,000, while the land alone was not worth more than $1,000. The mortgagee prosecuted him under this section, but the judge, the late Judge Peters, who was a very eminent judge in our part of the country, ruled that the section did not apply, and the man got clear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suppose because it was not a case of tenancy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The judge held that the man was not a tenant according to this section; so that according to his ruling, a man might give a mortgage on a house and premises of which the house was the chief part of the value, and just before the jury gave a verdict against him, he might move the house off, and there would be no way of punishing him criminally.

Mr. MASSON. Was the house attached to the soil?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is hard to say when a house is attached to the soil in this country.

Mr. MASSON. We generally have a clause in our mortgages creating the mortgagor a tenant at will in case of default.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We have the same, but the judge held that that was put in merely for the purpose of the mortgage, and that the man was not a tenant in the ordinary sense. It seems to me that this clause ought to apply to mortgagors holding over after the mortgage is foreclosed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see why there should be any difference made between a mortgage which has not run out and one that has. It seems to me that the offence is the same, no matter when the building is removed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Until there is default made in the principal or interest, the mortgagee has no right to enter; but after default is made he is the owner. It may take him some time to obtain possession, and in the meantime while he is getting a writ of ejectment, the mortgagor may move the building off.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The mortgagee is the owner all along. He has the legal estate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) While he has the legal estate it is limited by the proviso that until default is made he shall not have the right of possession.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I cannot see any difference between a mortgage that has not run out and one that has; the legal estate is in the mortgagee. The question is whether the offence is serious enough to justify punishing it criminally, or whether the parties should not look for a remedy to the civil law.

Mr. MASSON. They would have a civil remedy by an injunction, but while that is being obtained the man may move out.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We might let the clause stand.

Section postponed.

On section 507,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think this section ought to pass in its present form.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It provides punishment for destroying a boundary fence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In my experience, men are constantly disputing about their fences. A man says: Your fence is encroaching on me 10 feet, and he throws it off. That is a civil offence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is only an offence under this section when he does it without colour of right. The question is whether there ought not to be a punishment for wilfully destroying the fence of another without any colour of right.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not read it in that way.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it contended that when a man undertakes to put up a boundary fence between his property and another, but places it not upon the line, but upon another's property, that he shall have the right to keep that fence up until by some legal proceeding it is removed? I think that would be putting the man against whom the wrong has been done to unnecessary trouble. If he undertakes to remove the fence it seems to me that he does so or ought to do so at the peril of being liable in case the fence is found upon the boundary because if it were found upon his property he ought not to be liable. If "A" erects a fence purporting to be a boundary between himself and "B," and erects it upon the property of "B," "B" ought to be at liberty to take it down without committing an offence. But if he has placed it in the proper position, and "B" tears it down, "B" commits an offence and ought to be made liable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Is not that the effect of it when you take into consideration section 480?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My trouble lies in the construction of section 480. If he pulls down a fence, &c., under *bonâ fide* colour of right, whether it turns out in the long run that he was justified or not, he should not be liable to criminal prosecution. I think we are all agreed on that. I think that subsection 2 is so worded that he must have legal justification, or he his liable criminally whether he has colour of right or not, because the word "and" is used instead of "or."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the word "or" were used he would be liable if he failed to have both. But this is an excepting section. Legal justification and colour of right must both be absent in order to make him liable.

On section 508,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you mean by this to imply that a stipendiary or other magistrate has the power to award $5, plus the injury?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a great difference of opinion about that. When you add the fine and the amount and the man is sued again he pays the

same judgment twice. Why should you limit the amount to $5 when a man destroys a tree on the street? I have known of a case where a man deliberately cut a valuable tree down where it had been planted by the city, and my recollection of the statute was that the limit was $20.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The statute says $5.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to see that put up to $25.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection at all.

On section 509,

Mr. CASEY. I think you are far too severe Here you punish a man who destroys or damages, with intent to destroy, any vegetable production growing in any garden, Suppose a man destroys a cucumber, don't you think you are punishing him too severely? I think this is a little too much of a good thing.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it is too much cucumber.

Mr. CASEY. It is not right that the clause should be expressed in these words—that a man destroying any vegetable production, anything at all growing in a garden, must be fined. It might be a blade of grass. Suppose you stepped on a blade of grass, would that be destroying a vegetable production?

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 13th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. BERGIN moved the adoption of the Eighth Report of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have to ask that this shall stand. It involves an increase of salary, and I think a change in the grade of a clerk, and it is not of that class of reports which are usually adopted on the recommendation of a committee.

LT. COL. WORSLEY AND LT. COL. MURRAY.

Mr. FLINT asked, Whether any report or recommendation has been made by the Major General Commanding as to the dismissal from, or the retention in office, of Lt. Col. Worsley and Lt. Col. Murray? If so, what is the nature of such report or recommendation, and is it the intention of the Government to act upon it?

Mr. BOWELL. The Major General Commanding did make a report setting forth the result of his investigation, but made no recommendation as to the dismissal from or retention in office of Lt. Col. Worsley and Lt. Col. Murray. The final discussion of this report is still under the consideration of the Government.

SAVINGS BANK AT ST. JOHN.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, 1. Whether James Robinson, of the Dominion Savings Bank, St. John, has been superannuated? If so, what allowance is made him? 2. Has H. D. McLeod been appointed to a position in the savings bank at St. John? If so, at what salary? 3. What is Mr. McLeod's age, and has he passed the Civil Service examination as required by law?

Mr. FOSTER. James Robinson, of the Dominion Savings Bank, St. John, has been superannuated. His allowance is $418 a year. Mr. McLeod has been appointed to a position in the St. John Savings Bank at a salary of $1,100. I don't know Mr. McLeod's age. He has not passed the Civil Service examination. The hon. gentleman is not quite correct in stating the fact in the latter part of the third question.

SESSION OF THE QUEBEC LEGISLATURE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, 1. Whether the Government is aware that, contrary to clause 86 of the British North America Act of 1867, no session of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec was held between the 30th December, 1890, and the 26th April last (1892), *i.e.*, that more than twelve months have intervened between the last sitting of the Quebec Legislature in 1890 and the first sitting of the session now in progress? Whether the Government have had any correspondence with the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec on the subject? If so, whether the Government are ready to lay the correspondence before Parliament?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand that some twelve months did elapse, but there has been no communication between the two Governments on the subject.

CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law and Bill (No. 21) for the suppression of obscene literature and to provide for the suppression of certain immoral and criminal practices.

(In the Committee.)

On section 516,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I) There is no definition of conspiracy in restraint of trade in the English code?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of course, it is very hard to give a definition which would carry out what every one desires, and what would not involve restrictions upon trades unions. This definition seems to be rather fair on its face, but after all I question whether it would not be better to leave the matter to the common law. The existing law lays it down that the purposes of any trade union shall not, by reason merely that they are in restraint of trade, be deemed to be unlawful, which practically protects them from being prosecuted; but for that we substitute the next section which provides that

the purposes of a trade union are not, by reason merely that they are in restraint of trade, unlawful.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand the effect of that to be the same. It does not make lawful what may be done by a trade union in other respects; for example, conspiracy to commit such an offence as doing bodily harm. It seems to me that so little is included in the definition that it is harmless, and it is convenient to retain it. It only defines what conspiracy in restraint of trade is, and the next section, instead of saying that this shall not extend to trades unions, provides that the purposes of a trade union are not unlawful within the meaning of the definition.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is not that an improper term to use? Because a trade union is not a permanent body. It may exist to-day, and cease to exist to-morrow. It would be better to use a phrase which would define bodies which would exist for all time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps that is so. I think the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) wishes to move to change the law, and we had better allow some of these sections to stand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose the provisions of the Trades Unions Act have been incorporated into the present criminal code?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 534,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is this section necessary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. The latest practice is to suspend the civil remedy until the criminal case is heard.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The rule is perfectly intelligible in England where the one Legislature deals with civil and criminal matters. Here, however, where the Local Legislature may deal with civil matters and the Federal Parliament with criminal matters, I think we cannot insert such a clause except it refers to civil rights arising out of Dominion legislation, such as bills of exchange, &c.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it may require legislation by both the Federal and Provincial Legislatures. At any rate we had better pass it and let the Local Legislatures supplement it. It will be giving our assent to such legislation.

On section 540,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may explain briefly that an attempt was made very earnestly by the committee to ascertain exactly what the jurisdiction of the quarter session is, and to adhere to that, except in the line which I will now mention. The committee thought it well to make it clear that that court has not and a county court judge has not jurisdiction, and therefore only Superior Court judges shall try the following offences:—Treason, sedition, libel, murder and attempt to murder, piracy, judicial corruption, official corruption, frauds on the Government, selling of offices, escape and rescues, rape and attempt at rape, trade combinations, and conspiracies to accomplish these crimes. These offences are nearly all outside of that jurisdiction now, in some of the provinces completely so; but the others mentioned, such as selling offices, frauds on the Government, official corruption and trade combinations, we thought should be removed from that jurisdiction on principle. The sessions of the peace, although presided over by County Court judges, only had jurisdiction originally, under the Statute of Edward III., in matters relating to breaches of the peace: but their jurisdiction gradually became enlarged by statute. But we removed from it some of these minor offences, because they partake to some extent of a political character, and they certainly have not to do with the preservation of the peace. On these lines, the conclusion arrived at by the committee seemed to satisfy the gentlemen from all the provinces.

On section 544,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is not this changing the law to some extent? We may proceed against a judge at present either by address of the two Houses of Parliament to the Governor General, or institute criminal proceedings by writ of *scire facias*. In the latter case, why should the intervention of the Attorney General of Canada be necessary? You do not ask his intervention in ordinary criminal cases.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In many of the cases we make the intervention of the Provincial Attorney General necessary as between subject and subject; and I think, as regards an officer of this kind, it is our duty to protect him from vindictive prosecution, and we should have something to say as to whether the prosecution shall be carried on.

Mr. LAURIER. This applies to judges appointed by this Government?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. What about judges appointed by provincial judgments, such as city recorders?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He could not be prosecuted for the crime of judicial corruption without leave of the Attorney General of Canada.

On section 546,

Mr. LAURIER. What Attorney General?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Attorney General of the provinces. It is so stated in definitions at beginning of Bill.

On section 547,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Prosecutions in England are very often carried on vexatiously by single seamen or some other irresponsible parties, which delay the sailing of the vessels, and that is a matter of vast importance, for the purpose of making the prosecution. in England the consent of the Board of Trade is required. As the officers of the Minister of Marine examine into the seaworthiness of vessels, it is but fair they should be notified before any such prosecution is taken.

On section 552,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This section proposes a very extraordinary change in what has hitherto been considered the law. I thought certain particular crimes had been selected and authority given to any one to arrest a person charged with committing any of those crimes, because of their serious character, and also because the parties might have the opportunity to escape. I find, how-

ever, in this section nearly every crime in the calendar is inserted, and we are now committing authority to any one to arrest a man without a warrant. Strangers under these circumstances might be very seriously injured. I might be passing through Montreal, and a man might come to me and say: I arrest you for such and such a crime,—although he had no warrant. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow the section to stand, until I have an opportunity to read the report of the commissioners that prepared the section, and ascertain the reasons why the commissioners recommended such a serious alteration in the existing criminal law practice. It strikes me at first blush, as entirely opposed to my ideas of British liberty, and opposed to every conception I had of the rights of the citizen that he could not be arrested for any odious crime unless a warrant were issued after information properly taken, or unless caught *in flagrante delicto*. I would be very sorry to vote for the section as it stands without a little more research or information. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to press it now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course I cannot refuse that request, but I may explain at the outset that we understand this to be the existing law, not as laid down in any statute, but the grave offences which are laid down for which an arrest may be made are felonies now, and inasmuch as we are abolishing the distinction between felonies and misdemeanours, we must mention all these things which we intend to have the characteristics of felonies as regards arrest. That is the reason they are stated here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think it is the duty of the citizen to arrest another for an offence unless the felony is committed in his presence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The fact of a felony having been committed is justification, and under other clauses of the Bill we have provided for protection in case there was good reason for believing that a felony had been committed. You will find on examination that there is the right to arrest.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is not that confounding the power of an officer and the power of a private citizen?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. We will let the clause stand for the present.

Section postponed.

On sections 555, 556, 557,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) These sections we are now coming to are of a very important character, as they allow magistrates to open up preliminary enquiries. I have a memorandum prepared here from a magistrate of experience in my own province in which with respect to these sections, he says:

"I fear it will prove an engine of much wrong to many innocent people. With such a power any ignorant designing magistrate can at any moment destroy the character of the most virtuous man in the land. Without his knowledge and without one of the many safeguards protecting him from malicious prosecution, any person may forever be placed under possibly the vilest suspicion, as the result of such an investigation ending in nothing. I see no use in it. No sensible man to-day expects that at magisterial examinations information is obtained; that is gotten before, by detectives and intelligent constables; only put in shape before the magistrates. If this is to be law, guard its exercise somewhat. At least require that the Provincial Attorney General shall alone have power to authorize such an investigation; for, if the Provincial Treasury has to bear the expense of the enquiry, the Crown Law Officer in the province should surely be consulted before they are incurred."

This is the suggestion of a stipendiary magistrate who has great experience, and who has been for twenty years trying these cases, and I thought I would read his memorandum to the Minister.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think he is referring to some other clause.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He is referring to preliminary enquiries, and I believe he refers to section 557 especially.

On section 560,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is the section to which my hon. friend's correspondent refers; but his objection is to the Bill as it was introduced last session.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was written in March last.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In this Bill we have required the assent of the Attorney General to be given.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I must say that this clause does not commend itself to my judgment. It enables every magistrate in the country to constitute himself an inquisitorial tribunal, with powers not only at variance with those we have heretofore thought fit to confer upon magistrates, but in direct violation of what we consider is a safeguard which should be thrown around incriminated persons. Of course there is a safeguard in the first part of the section, namely, that the inquisition cannot be started without the consent of the Attorney General, but in times of excitement that consent may be obtained without sufficient cause, and a man subjected to an inquiry as to whether he committed a crime without any affidavit having been made by any one that there was good cause for suspicion. He is put upon oath and examined in the same way as in Paris, and if he neglects to appear or refuses to take the oath put to him he is to be punished. Heretofore we have acted on the assumption that a man is innocent until proved guilty. I acknowledge that that idea has been stretched very far, perhaps too far in the interests of criminals, but it is a very great safeguard against men being tortured to death by being dragged before these tribunals and subjected to these cross-examinations. The only safeguard is the necessity of acquiring the Attorney General's consent, but that consent may be given hastily against political foes or in fifty different ways, and an honest man, with good reputation, and his family too, may be subjected to the most excruciating torture by being dragged before a tribunal and questioned regarding any crime. I question whether the evil sure to follow will not be greater than any possible good to be derived from introducing the section. It is obnoxious to me, as a student of British law, and unless it can be shown that there are certain circumstances existing in our population, either civic or rural, which requires more stringent measures than the present law, I should be opposed to the extension of magisterial powers.

Mr. CURRAN. At present in the Province of Quebec, the Fire Commissioners issue summons to any person they please in connection with any inquiry into any fire, and this is done under special

Act. The first party summoned is generally the person suspected, and he has to give full detail without any consent from the Attorney General.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The safety of the people is the supreme law, and you may justify this power given to the Fire Commissioners under that maxim, but how can you justify the application of that principle to every conceivable crime? There are many offences a man would shrink from being charged with even, and the notoriety of the charge in small communities would leave a perpetual stain on his character.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will drop that section.

Section dropped.

On section 561,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island suggests whether Prince Edward Island is not land beyond the seas. Under the Treaty of Paris, there was a distinction made between rights and liberties, and the question of fishing in the Gulf of St. Lawrence was treated as a right.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Our territory goes outside Prince Edward Island. All inside the Straits of Northumberland is in our jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In the correspondence between John Quincy Adams and the British Minister, the British Minister points out that what is within the jurisdiction is treated as a liberty and what is outside is treated as a right, and the matter of fishing in the gulf is a right and not a liberty, which would make the gulf a part of the high seas.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON, Not the Straits of Northumberland where you can shoot across and float across.

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

After Recess.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of Hiram A. Calvin, Esq., for the Electoral District of Frontenac.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir John Thompson: That Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, be read a second time.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Before the motion is put to the House, I desire to say a few words on the Bill. It has been my lot to represent one of the hives which was created by the Gerrymander Bill of 1882. I remember well going to bed one night in the township of Ancaster, a portion of the old Reform riding of South Wentworth, and waking up next morning in the north riding of Brant, owing to the passing of that Act. By that Act South Wentworth was intended to be made a Conservative constituency. That constituency had been represented continuously by a Reformer for over forty years, although closely contested elections had been held there on every occasion when an appeal had been made to the electors. It was what might properly be called a fighting riding, the Conservatives having an equal chance with the Liberals to return a representative. But by the Gerrymander Act of 1882, it was created into what the Government and the Conservatives of that section supposed would be a Conservative constituency by removing the township of Ancaster, which gave Reform majorities of from 350 to 400 from that riding, and placing it in North Brant. Now, North Brant, as constituted by that Act, and as it exists at the present time, is composed of portions of three electoral districts—the township of Ancaster from South Wentworth, the townships of Dumfries and East Brantford from the County of Brant, and the township of Blenheim from the County of Oxford. It also takes in a portion of the city of Brantford, because during the past two years a portion of the township of Brantford has been taken into the city limits. The intention no doubt was to secure a supporter of the Government from South Wentworth. In the election of 1882 this was not accomplished; but since that time the feeling which was engendered by the passing of the Act of 1882 has somewhat died out, and in the last two Parliaments that constituency has been represented by a Conservative. Now, it is well known that when the Conservatives in 1882 passed that Act, they forgot all the pledges and promises and protestations which had been made by their leader in 1872, who at that time declared himself to be in favour of maintaining the county boundaries, for reasons which he then gave, and which I do not need to refer to at any length now. I will just say that to my mind his reasons were conclusive. By maintaining the county lines, the young men growing up in the counties and taking part in municipal politics, gradually worked themselves to the front, until they were selected to represent their counties in the Local and Dominion Parliaments, and I think that is a good thing to encourage. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle) spoke the other night about there being Conservative hives as well as Grit hives, and he gave a long list showing that certain Conservative constituencies returned their members by very large majorities, in some cases by larger majorities than the Reformers received in Grit hives. This is true, but it is not true in the sense in which the hon. member for Monck would lead this House to take it; because the Grit hives were created for a certain purpose. They were created not only for the purpose of preventing the election of Liberals in certain constituencies from which Liberal votes were taken, but for the purpose of creating dissension in the ranks of the Liberal party. No doubt the leader of the Conservative party thought that if he could hive the Grits in constituencies with majorities running from 600 to 1,500, there would be found ambitious men in those ridings, so that three or four Liberals would run, and it might be possible to squeeze in a Conservative between them. But the Conservative hives were not created by Act of Parliament. Who can say that the County of Carleton, where there is a Conservative majority of probably 800 or 900, was created by Act of Parliament? I ask any member of this House, I do not care who he is, to point to a single Conservative constituency

in this Dominion which was created by taking parts from other constituencies in order to hive the Conservatives together. Therefore the whole argument of the hon. member for Monck falls to the ground, having no substantial foundation. Now, I had the pleasure of voting for the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It is not often that I have had occasion to agree with propositions made by that hon. gentleman in this House, but on this occasion I entirely agreed with his amendment. I think it would be in the interest of the people of this country, and in the interest of common justice that this Parliament should pass an Act bringing the constituencies of the Province of Ontario within county bounds as they formerly were, and for that reason I supported the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe. Now, a great deal of fault has been found by some supporters of the Government with the course pursued by that hon. member, but I fancy that if there were more independent-minded men in this House than are to be found here at present, we should probably be found passing legislation of greater benefit to the people of this country than what has been passed during the last twelve or fourteen years, much of which has been forced through, not because the members supporting the Government agreed that it was devised in the interests of the people, but because they were supporting the Government, and were forced to come to the assistance of their masters and vote those measures through. Time and again, during the last ten years, since I have had the honour of a seat here, Conservative members have spoken to me privately, and have said that they agreed with the members of the Opposition in denouncing such legislation, but that they must support the Government, which they were sent here to support, and that they would not be fulfilling their pledges if they did not do so. I say this is carrying party spirit too far altogether, and the Dominion of Canada ought to hail with pleasure the appearance in this House of some independent men who will dare to do right even though they have been elected to support the Government. Besides the hon. member for North Simcoe, we had the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) showing an independent spirit; but he was placed under the lash by some of the supporters of the Government for having taken the course he did; and even the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), in the speech which he delivered here the other night, could not find any justification for the gerrymander of 1882; and it is a remarkable fact that throughout this debate, which has extended over a good many days, not a single member of the Government, not a single supporter of the Government of any importance has ventured, in any way whatever, to endeavour to justify the gerrymander of 1882. It is true there are two new members who came in during this session, who made that attempt and declared it was all right; but I fancy, after they have a little more parliamentary experience, they will find that it is not always judicious to make such rash statements. I refer to the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) and the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). The hon. member for North Victoria ought to hesitate and weigh more carefully what he is going to say before setting up as a censor of the legal ability of the Opposition. He showed a great deal of rashness, not only rashness, but a great deal of indecency, in referring as he did to the legal ability of the members of the Opposition. He settled the whole constitutional question in one sentence, and I will quote what he said:

"I do not wish to say anything adverse to the legal learning of this House, but I do say that if the legal ability shown in the elucidation of constitutional law, as exhibited by members of the Opposition, is to be taken as a type of the legal knowledge of this House as a whole, then I think the House should be pitied rather than congratulated. Statements have fallen from the speeches upon the constitutional points under discussion that are certainly very wide of the mark, and do not call for any comment on my part."

This is the mature judgment of the gentleman who has been sent here to set right the Opposition in their legal opinion. Furthermore, he set himself up to put right a legal gentleman of the well-known ability and talents of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He told that hon. gentleman that he did not know anything about law, and that if he wished to learn anything on that subject he would have to take a seat at the desk of the Victoria *Warder*; and I might add, to show the character of this gentleman who edits that paper and represents North Victoria, that whenever, in the columns of his paper, he has occasion to speak of Roman Catholics—who, as an important, and influential, and intelligent class of people, are entitled to the respect of their fellow-citizens—he refuses to give them the capital letter, but prints Roman Catholics in lower case—*r* and *c*. And this is the gentleman who comes here to teach law to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the legal gentlemen who occupy seats in the Opposition. With regard to the legal point raised by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) I wish to refer to a statement made in one of our city papers last Friday. The point raised by the hon. member for Queen's is admitted to be an important one. I am not going to offer any opinion with regard to it myself, because I do not consider that is within my competence, but I wish to quote a letter published in one of our city papers on that subject by one of the fathers of Confederation, one who is a living witness of what took place at the forming of Confederation, and who therefore is the best authority as to the intentions of the framers of the British North America Act with regard to this question of representation. This gentleman says:

"Can the Canadian Parliament assume and exercise a power which is expressly conferred upon another and different authority?

"Is not the Canadian Parliament a statutory body whose powers and functions are limited by the terms and conditions specified in the statute?

"Assuming the affirmative as to this point, let us examine textually the words of the section:

"Sec. 51. On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such manner, and from such time, as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules.

"These 'rules' are five in number and need not be considered in construing the principal clause.

"Your correspondent submits that the obvious meaning and purpose of the framers of the British North America Act, 1867, was to provide a special 'authority' outside of Parliament, for the decennial readjustment of the representation. They had heard of the detestable fraud, the 'gerrymander,' and desired to exclude it if possible from our new Dominion. The pretense that the framers of section 51 intended by the words, 'shall be readjusted by such authority, in such manner, and from such time, as

the Parliament of Canada provides' meant or can be construed to mean, that Parliament need not provide any 'authority,' nor specify the 'manner,' nor limit the 'time,' but may ignore the fundamental law and usurp the function for itself, is an insult to their intelligence and a dishonour to their memory.

"Neither the language nor the obvious purpose of clause 51 inhibits members of Parliament, either alone or associated with eminent citizens, from composing such authority.

"Parliament is authorized to provide the 'authority' but not to usurp the function itself."

Then, the editor of the *Free Press*, speaking of an interview he had with the writer of the letter I have just quoted, says that the writer intimated to him as follows:—

"I can now recall with perfect clearness the discussion which took place between the delegates about this matter when we were in London. We desired to prevent the importation of the odious and anti-British gerrymandering system into the Dominion from the United States, and to prevent a parliamentary majority from strengthening itself by cutting and carving constituencies. Sir John Macdonald thought the restriction unnecessary, but others believed otherwise. Of course the question as to what our intentions were is of little account if the words of the statute do not mean what we intended they should, but my opinion is that we accomplished what we intended, and that Parliament cannot override or ignore a plain provision of the statute, even if such a proceeding has been acquiesced in before."

As I have said, I do not propose to discuss this question, but wish to place on record the opinion of this gentleman who took part in the conference held in London and is a living witness as to the intention of the framers of the British North America Act. Now, the Minister of Justice, when introducing his Bill, claimed it was not a gerrymander. I think the discussion which has taken place since then must have convinced the House that it is indeed a gerrymander. It is true that, so far as Ontario is concerned, the gerrymander of 1892, if it should become law, will not be as bad as the gerrymander of 1882, because then the Government cut and carved up some fifty-four constituencies in order that they might secure a larger representation than they otherwise could have obtained. In this gerrymander they have not done so badly by Ontario for the simple reason that they had not power to do it, because the gerrymander of 1882 had effectually stopped them from doing as much injury as they could have done if that gerrymander had not been passed; and it has been correctly stated that the best that can be said for this measure is that it is not as bad as it might have been. Sir, the Government have passed over Ontario with a slight gerrymander this year, and they have confined their attention principly to the Province of Quebec. They have done for the Province of Quebec just what they did for the Province of Ontario in 1882. Now, the Minister of Railways gave us a statement of the plan on which the redistribution which has been introduced by the Government, was based when the Bill was brought in. He said:

"But instead of dividing the Province of Ontario into three sections, we divided it into two sections, making the division line between York and Peel, moving the line northward to the Georgian Bay. In that division the eastern part of Ontario has 46 members as at present, and the western part has also 46 members as at present. The population of western Ontario is 1,018,695, the population of eastern Ontario, according to that division, is 1,097,844. We divided it on a line between Peel and York, following up the Georgian Bay, and leaving Algoma in eastern Ontario, each side of that line having 46 members. In that division the east has over 80,000 more population than the west. In order to give to the populous city of Toronto, to Algoma which has increased so largely in population, and to Nipissing which sent no representative to this House, we decided to give those sections two additional members. Where were those two members to be taken so that we might make a fair redistribution under the Bill? Were they not to be taken from the western portion of Ontario? As the eastern portion exceeded the western portion by over 80,000, we gave one of the two members to Toronto, and the other to a portion of Algoma, along with the Nipissing district, which had 15,000 people and was unrepresented."

Now, it has already been pointed out that in making this division the Minister of Railways had to travel all the way from the boundary line between the County of York and the County of Peel, up through the Georgian Bay until he reached Rat Portage, 700 miles west of the line which he struck between the County of Peel and the County of York; and he declared that in dealing out justice to the people of Ontario he must place Rat Portage, which is within a few hundred miles of the city of Winnipeg, and 700 miles west of the city of Toronto, in the eastern division of the Province of Ontario. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask any sensible man how it is possible for the Minister of Railways to justify any such proceeding as this? How can he justify the statement he made that in making his division he took in Rat Portage, the whole district of Algoma, the populous city of Toronto and the County of York, in order to strike a line between eastern and western Ontario? I think that line was made, not for the purpose of equalizing the population and to give representation as it ought to be given, but that line was struck in order that he might have a pretense to justify him in blotting out a constituency in western Ontario so as to give an extra member for the city of Toronto. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the division which was made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was an honest division, and one which commends itself fairly to the members of this House and to the country. He divided Ontario in this way: He stated that Ontario is naturally divided into three groups: first, west of the County of York, with a population of 1,184,865, which group is represented by 51 members, just about the number they are entitled to on the basis of population; the central group, comprising the three ridings of Toronto and the three ridings of York, containing a population of 241,327. This group has six members, which is admitted to be too small a representation. The third group comprises eastern Ontario, lying east of the County of York, with a total population of 688,283, having 35 members, being nearly 20 per cent more than they are entitled to on the basis of population. Why, then, should the Government, by this account, go to western Ontario and blot out a constituency to get an extra member for the central group? The unit of representation for the Dominion is 22,900. The total population of the eastern group is 688,283, total average barely 19,700 for the 35 seats, that is 3,500 below the average unit, and 3,500 below the average of the 51 western constituencies. This shows, when worked out, that eastern Ontario is really entitled to only 30 instead of 35. Take some of the figures as shown by the last census. Brockville has a population of 15,850, and is therefore 7,045 below the unit; Carleton has a population of 21,746, and is 1,151 below the unit; Dundas, with a population of 20,132, is 2,768 below the unit; East Durham, population 17,053, is 5,847 below the

unit ; West Durham, 15,375, is 7,525 below the unit ; Frontenac, 13,495, is 9,455 below the unit ; Glengarry, 22,447, and is 453 below the unit ; South Grenville, 12,931, is 9,969 below the unit ; East Hastings, with 18,053, is 4,847 below ; West Hastings, with 18,963, is 3,937 below the unit ; Kingston, with 19,264, is 3,636 below ; North Lanark, with 19,265, is 3,635 below ; South Lanark, with 19,864, is 3,036 below ; North Leeds and Grenville, with 13,523, is 9,377 below ; Lennox, with 14,902, is 7,998 below ; West Northumberland, with a population of 14,947, is 7,953 below ; North Ontario, with 21,380, is below the unit 1,620 ; South Ontario, with 18,371, is 4,529 below. The two ridings of Ottawa are 8,519 below the number required for two members. West Peterborough, with 15,808, is 7,092 below the unit. Prince Edward, with a population of 18,892, is 4,008 below. North Victoria, with 16,849, is 6,051 below ; and South Victoria, with 20,455, is 2,455 below the unit. Now, this shows conclusively that if the Government desired to do justice to the eastern and western sections of the Province of Ontario, they should have taken this extra member which they wish to give to the city of Toronto out of the eastern section, instead of the western section ; and the only reason I can imagine that actuated them was their desire not to disturb those constituencies east of Toronto, because by so doing they would interfere with the Conservative representation which they have from those ridings in this House ; and they thought if they could work up the constituencies in the Niagara Peninsula to suit their purposes better, they would do so, and by this Bill they have done so. Now, while it is a fact that no hon. gentleman on that side of the House has offered any justification whatever for the gerrymander of 1882, still they have claimed that they are no worse in this matter than was the Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat in introducing his gerrymander Bill into the Local House. Now, I think after the speech which was made in this House by the member for West Lambton (Mr Lister) the other night, it must be concluded by those who are desirous of arriving at an honest conclusion, that when the Hon. Oliver Mowat redistributed the constituencies in the Province of Ontario, he did not commit a gerrymander ; he did not invade a single county boundary. He never interfered with a single county line. It is true that in readjusting the representation he was compelled to place two Conservatives in a minority, Mr. Ermatinger of one of the Elgins and Col. Grey of West York, who was put in a minority of three. This is the extent of the so-called gerrymander of which Mr. Mowat was guilty, and the members who supported this Government have based their whole argument on the statement that as Mr. Mowat did this thing, therefore this Government is justified in doing likewise. That is a nice argument to present. Are we sent here for the purpose of following the example of any members of a Local Legislature ? We are sent here for the purpose of doing justice to the electors of the whole Dominion, not to follow the example of any of the Local Legislatures. I was rather amused at the conduct of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), who persisted in interrupting the member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) when he was making a speech on this question. I do not wonder at the irritability displayed by the hon. member for Haldimand—I am sorry he is not here, but he can afterwards see the remarks I make—I do not wonder that that hon. gentleman felt a little annoyed that the hon. member for Lambton knocked the props from under the feet of those who were advancing this theory in order to justify the gerrymander now being enacted by this House, and also the gerrymander of 1882. The hon. member for Haldimand no doubt had something to do with the creation of that portion of this Bill which gerrymanders the Niagara district, and in criticising the hon. member for West Lambton, he addressed him in ironical terms as the heroic and brave member for Lambton, and he said he had hidden behind a rule of the House, just as a hero hides behind a haystack when some one arrives with a shotgun. Now, where has the hon. member for Haldimand been found in past times? He has been found hiding behind a grant which was made by this House, and which cannot be justified by any member in it, for the erection of a bridge over the Grand River. He got a vote of $10,000 for the construction of a local work in order that he might be able to secure his return for that constituency. The gallant and heroic and brave member for Haldimand hid behind the abutments of the York bridge when the electors came up with their little shotguns at the election which succeeded the vote of money. There was something else he hid behind. He obtained a post office for the village of Cayuga, and he hid behind the post office. These are the influences which are brought to bear by the hon. member for Haldimand for the purpose of securing his election. Then there was another little incident which may be referred to in the history of the political career of that hon. gentleman. He is the author of a very remarkable document, and I should like to place it on the records of the House. It was used to assist in securing the Indian votes after the passage of the Franchise Act in 1885. This was the circular issued :

"To the Indians,—The Queen has always loved her dear, loyal subjects, the Indians. She wants them to be good men and women, and she wants them to live on the land they have, and she expects in a little while, if her great chief, John A., gets into Government again, to be very kind to the Indians, and to make them very happy. She wants them to go and vote, and all vote for Dr. Montague, who is the Queen's agent. He is their friend, and by voting for him every one of the Indians will please Queen Victoria."

This very brave member for Haldimand got behind a woman's petticoat, got behind the petticoat of Queen Victoria—and if this is not a forgery I want to know what a forgery is. It may be said that the hon. gentleman was not the author of this proclamation to the Indians. An enquiry was made before the courts as to the authenticity of this remarkable proclamation which was printed and circulated among the Indians, when this evidence was placed on record :

"Dr. Montague sworn : I recognize circular ; think I saw it the first time the day before the elections, and can almost swear it was the first time I saw it."

He was not quite sure, but he would almost swear it was the first time he saw it. Under cross-examination his memory was refreshed and he said :

"It was on the Sunday before the polling day that circular was written."

He began to see a little more light. Then, under more severe cross-examination, he said :

"I wrote part of the circular: I do not think I wrote more than half of it. I was aware on election day that they were distributed."

This is the evidence given in a court of justice as to the conduct of this man who criticised the conduct of the member for West Lambton and told him he got behind a straw stack when a shotgun was pointed at him. Then further on during the trial R. W. Mutchmor was sworn, and he said:

"Dr. Montague wrote it and I dictated it."

Now, I think the hon. member for Haldimand was the last man in this House to accuse a member of getting behind a straw stack when a shotgun was pointed at him. With respect to the gerrymander of the Niagara Peninsula, this Bill has cut and carved no less than eight constituencies and placed the fragments where they will do the most good to the Tory party. Let us look at the figures as furnished by the last election returns and compare them with the new constituencies formed under this gerrymander. Welland at the last election gave 447 Reform majority; under the new Act it will give 367 Reform majority. Lincoln and Niagara at the last election gave 48 Reform majority; the Grits are now "hived" there, and there will be 670 Reform majority. Haldimand and Monck gave 78 Conservative majority, and now the brave member for Haldimand, if he happens to be the candidate of the Conservative party, will secure, or he thinks he will secure by this gerrymander, a Conservative majority of 325. South Norfolk, which was Tory before, has been made more Tory still, in order to make the seat safe for the present member, who will have an increased majority by the addition of a township which gives a Conservative majority. The constituencies of North Wentworth and Monck are wiped out. North Brant at the last election gave a Reform majority of 1,116, and under this Act by the addition of the township of Beverley the Reform majority will be 1,466. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that there can be no doubt whatever that the motives which actuated the Government in the formation of this Bill were such as were dictated by a desire to promote the welfare of their own supporters, but I must say that in some of the constituencies the Conservatives are not at all pleased with this readjustment which is proposed by the Bill. I was home not long ago, and I had a conversation with a gentleman who was the Conservative candidate in North Wentworth in the last election, and he told me that he did not know a man in the Conservative party in old North Wentworth who was satisfied with this gerrymander. He condemned it in outspoken terms, and he said he had not been consulted, and he did not know of any Conservative in that constituency who had been consulted, about it. The Conservative organ of the town of Dundas, which is situated in that constituency, declared against the gerrymander, so that the Government have done this work in North Wentworth without consulting their friends, and their friends are very much dissatisfied with it. I do not wish to pity the Conservatives of the portion of North Wentworth which is added on to North Brant, —I refer to the good old township of Beverley, which always gives a handsome Reform majority —but the Conservatives in that township are certainly placed in a pitiable position by this gerrymander. They have no power at all in elections, for the simple reason that their vote will not count, as they are placed in a constituency which is overwhelmingly Liberal. I have some respect for the good old Tories of the township of Beverley where I worked in election campaigns for 25 years, and I know that they will feel sorely grieved at this gerrymander of their constituency. Then the Conservatives in Dundas and in East and West Flamborough are undoubtedly displeased by this Act which the Government are seeking to place upon the Statute-book. Furthermore, I would just say with reference to the member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), who has represented that constituency so well and so ably for the last twenty years in this Parliament, a gentleman who has done justice to his constituents, no matter what the complexion of their politics may be, a gentleman who is respected by Conservatives and Liberals alike, throughout the whole length and breadth of North Wentworth; I say that the Government ought to have shown more respect for that well-tried public servant than to seek to legislate him out of his seat by this Act of Parliament. Why, Mr. Speaker, did the Government resort to this? The hon. member has fought many a valiant fight in North Wentworth, and he has triumphed in every case, sometimes with a very small majority—I remember one time he was elected by only two majority—North Wentworth has always been a fighting constituency, and the Conservatives there have always had the idea that they would succeed in winning that constituency for the Government. They have fought persistently and well, and they deserve credit for doing so, because undoubtedly many of them are actuated by the principle which they believe to be correct. But in order to get rid of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain), a useful and industrious member of this House, the Government now propose to pass an Act of Parliament to get rid of him, and to wipe out his constituency. I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no justice in this. Allow me to present to this House a map of the new constituency as proposed by this gerrymander. Here is South Wentworth as the Bill provides for it, and here is the part of the riding, the townships of East and West Flamborough and the town of Dundas which they propose to annex to old South Wentworth. You will observe that the city of Hamilton intervenes between the part which is now joined on to the old portion of the south riding of Wentworth; and the townships of East and West Flamborough and the town of Dundas are now, according to this Bill, made to belong to South Wentworth, so that you cannot get from one portion of the riding to the other without passing through the city of Hamilton, or the township of Ancaster, which is a portion of the north riding of Brant. The riding is disconnected altogether, and I do not think ridings ought to be formed in that shape so that there is really no community of interest existing between the different parts of the constituency, as has been referred to by several hon. gentlemen during this debate.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They would have to cross the bay.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Yes, they would have to cross the bay or go around by the lake to get from one part of the constituency to the other. Now, I do not think there can be any justification what-

ever for the conduct of the Government in dealing with the city of London as they have done. They have taken a portion of another constituency altogether and gerrymandered it into the electoral district of the city of London, while they have refused to take in certain wards which belong to the city of London. There can be no justification for this kind of conduct at all, nor can there be any justification for the gerrymander proposed to be perpetrated in the County of Russell. I believe that every fair-minded man will condemn the taking of the township of Clarence from the County of Russell and placing it in Prescott. It is evident to me, and it must be evident to every man in this House, that these additions have been made to the city of London, and that this gerrymander has been perpetrated in the County of Russell for the purpose of benefiting the supporters of the Government. As to the effect of the gerrymander in Quebec, I have not much to say. I take the figures of the respected leader of the Opposition, who affirms that if passed, the Bill will cause a clear gain of seven seats for the Government. It is proposed, in the Province of Quebec, as was done in 1882 in the Province of Ontario, to hive the Grits and to make Conservative constituencies more solid for the Government. I have a couple of maps here which will show the shapes of the counties after the gerrymander in Quebec, and which I think may be interesting to hon. gentlemen. Here is a map of the electoral district of Bagot. Now, that is a beauty.

Mr. FOSTER. It is an anchor.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is the anchor by which the Government have tried to keep hold of that constituency and to make it sure for the Conservatives. Bagot is slightly Tory now, but by this gerrymander it is made strong Tory, and as any one will observe by looking at this map it is certainly a beautiful and picturesque constituency. This section here which I point to, is a horn 14 miles long and 5 miles wide, and here is another horn three miles long and three wide.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a hard horn.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Yes, it is a very hard horn. Now, here is the constituency of Rouville. This is of all the gerrymanders the most extraordinary, and I would like the Minister of Finance to tell me what that looks like.

Mr. FOSTER. The Unicorn and Lion.

An hon. MEMBER. It's a grasshopper.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You can see a horn here 22 miles long and 4 miles wide, and right in the centre is the constituency of St. Hyacinthe with an opening of 5 miles wide at the top. I think, Mr. Speaker, I can very truly say in this House as was said with regard to a similar map which was produced in 1882, that it would be no sin for any one to fall down and worship it, because it bears not the likeness of anything in the heavens above, nor on the earth beneath, nor in the waters under the earth. I think that this would made a splendid tombstone or crown of glory for the Minister of Public Works. I think he ought to have something constructed for himself in that shape, so that he might perpetuate his memory as the most efficient and most accomplished gerrymanderer that this country ever produced. Now, that constituency was put into that shape for the purpose of making it a Grit hive, and there is now there a supposed majority of about 1,000 in favour of the Liberal party. Now, I think the exhibitions which I have given showing the construction of these constituencies, will satisfy any member of this House that the gentlemen engaged in constructing this gerrymander had no regard for decency when they cut and carved the counties in the Province of Quebec into such shapes. But the present attempt on the part of the Government to benefit themselves by readjustment of the constituencies of the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec is just another exhibition of the methods which they have put into force ever since they came into power in 1878. They secured power in 1878 by deceiving the electors of the entire Dominion. They invented the celebrated N. P. They told the manufacturers that they were going to make them rich; they told the artisans and mechanics that they were going to increase their wages and give them steady employment; they told the farmers that they were going to create a home market for all the products of the farm and the garden. But this policy has been a lamentable failure. The census recently taken shows that the N. P. has utterly failed to fulfil the promises made by the Government. Wages have not been increased, but have been almost everywhere reduced; mechanics have been idle. In the city of Hamilton, for the last four months, there has been a strike of the moulders, and scores of families have been compelled to leave that city because the master founders reduced their wages, and the men would not submit to it. The same thing has been going on all over the country. In the town of Dundas, where I live, wages have been reduced time and again, and as the hon. member for North Wentworth said, many factories there have been either closed up or have moved away. Our great cotton factory in 1878 employed 500 hands, and had orders ahead for six months, and was paying high wages; but when the N. P. came into force, competition entered the field and a large amount of capital was put into other cotton mills, and wages had to be cut down and the men's time reduced, until in time the mill was obliged to close down altogether. The consequence was that this factory, which had cost $800,000, was sold last fall for $152,000.

Mr. McKAY. Can the hon. gentleman name any particular trade or occupation in which wages have been reduced in past years?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The foundrymen in Hamilton. The strike going on there now is in consequence of a reduction in wages which the bosses proposed to make. Before the N. P. was introduced, there were five or six sewing machine factories in operation in Hamilton, and they were sending machines to all parts of the civilized world, as well as occupying the market here. What is the case to-day? There is not a sewing machine factory in operation in Hamilton. Then there was a clock factory in Hamilton, and lots of other establishments, which have been closed up; so that the N. P. has not been a blessing to the mechanics and labourers of that city. The Ontario cotton mill had to go into liquidation and has been sold out to the combine which controls nearly all the cotton mills of the Dominion of Canada. The N. P. has been disastrous to the workingmen, and has been the means of establishing combines all over the country. We

have the sugar combine, the salt combine, the coal oil combine, the binder twine combine and the cotton combine. When a child comes into the world, its swaddling clothes are under the control of the combine, and when he departs this life he is also subjected to the combine. A man cannot even be buried in this country without being subject to the taxation put upon him by these combines, which have been built up and fostered by the N. P.; and what makes the matter all the more lamentable, is the fact that during the past ten or twelve years we have been paying out hundreds of thousands of dollars to bring immigrants from the continent of Europe to settle up our country; while the census returns show conclusively that we have not retained one single immigrant, so far as numbers are concerned, and have not held one-half of the natural increase of population. Why, I should think the Minister of Finance and every supporter of his would refuse to lay claim to any credit for the N. P. in time to come. The Government have never fought a fair fight since they deceived the people in 1878. They have always tried to legislate themselves into power. They have on every occasion acted like the gambler who plays with loaded dice or marked cards. What did they do in 1882? They were not satisfied themselves with the N. P., and Sir Leonard Tilley told the country that if the Government were only sustained in the election, there were $2,000,000 of foreign capital waiting to come into the country to be invested in manufactures. At the same time, losing faith, as they did to some extent, in the N. P., they passed their infamous Gerrymander Act. They put their hands at the throats of some of the most important members of the Opposition in this House. They did not fight fair. They tied the hands and feet of the leader of the Opposition; they gerrymandered such constituencies as South Brant, Bothwell, Norfolk—54 altogether. Was that done in the interests of the people of this country? No Sir, it was done for the purpose of securing for the Government of the day an undue advantage over the Liberals of this country, and they did in some cases succeed in securing this advantage; and it is no wonder that at this day no man can be found on the Government side of the House to justify the gerrymander of 1882. But that was not enough to satisfy them. They changed the method of appointing returning officers, and took it into their own hands, so that they might appoint partisans of their own. We found the celebrated Jim Stephens appointed returning officer for Bothwell and returning John J. Hawkins to represent the seat in this House for a session and a half, although he had no more right to be here than the doorkeeper of the House, and preventing the present member for Bothwell occupying the seat to which he was entitled. This was one of the results of taking the appointment of returning officers into their own hands. Then we had another case, that of a gentleman who sat in this House for Queen's, N. B. by the grace of his returning officer. And these are not the only cases in which the Government obtained an advantage by taking the power into their own hands of appointing returning officers. In 1885 they obtained another unfair and unjust advantage over the Liberals, by passing their infamous Franchise Act. That Act has been condemned, not only by the Liberals but by scores of gentlemen who sit on the Government benches. Take the opinion of these gentleman privately, and they will tell you they would be glad if this Franchise Act were repealed, for the simple reason that it is too expensive. Why is it that at the last elections we had no revision but held the elections on the revised lists of two years previously? The reason is the Government came to the conclusion that the Act was too expensive to operate continuously, and they set aside its operation so that the expense might be reduced. But the Franchise Bill introduced in 1885 was amended and improved immensely during the long session which took place, when the Liberals on this side of the House fought a gallant battle in favour of liberty in this country. Why, under that Bill as introduced, all the savages of the western plains, Piapot and his braves, Slap-him-on-the-back, and all the cutthroat heroes of the Minnesota massacres were to be given the right to vote; yet the Government sought to pass such a measure, and would have passed it but for the determined opposition we made. Then there was the revising barrister clause which gave him absolute power, although he need not be a judge, to declare who should or should not be on the voters' list. We all remember the scenes which took place during the passage of the Act. We can all remember the long sitting from Thursday at 3 o'clock until midnight the following Saturday. I fancy the Finance Minister remembers well when the order went forth from the Prime Minister that there was to be no speaking on that side, and they sought to wear out the members of the Opposition who where fighting for the freedom of the people. I remember well seeing the Finance Minister coming into this House with his pillow and placing it in his chair in order that he might lie back and sleep while the Liberals were fighting for the cause of freedom; and I remember well other members of the House following his example. This was just another exhibition of a desire on the part of the Government to take an undue advantage of their opponents. Then in 1891 what did they do? Did they go fairly before the people and stand or fall upon their policy? Not a bit of it. They had no special legislation introduced the preceding session like the Gerrymander Act or the Franchise Act, but instead they adopted the Liberal platform to a certain extent, and declared themselves in favour of reciprocity with the United States in order to deceive the electorate. By so doing they got back into power, and we all know the result of their negotiations. We know that they were not sincere when they made those professions and had no intention whatever of seeking to obtain reciprocity. Then they had other means of securing support. All the legislation which has been enacted by them since they came into power in 1878 has been with the object solely of strengthening themselves. In 1884 they established one of the most pernicious systems ever brought into effect in any country, namely, the granting of bonuses for the building of local railways. It is beyond question that every other man almost who sat upon the Government benches had some interest, directly or indirectly, in some railway charter granted by this House. We all remember that one of the members for Toronto declared in the Railway Committee that in manipulating a railway charter he took care to see that there was something left for "the boy,

and I have no doubt that all the boys who were interested in similar charters got something out of them. In 1884, the number of railways subsidized by this Government amounted to 66 and the subsidies voted amounted to $11,053,807. This does not include the special subsidies granted to the Canada Central, the Canadian Pacific Railway main line, the Esquimalt Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway extension to Quebec, the Quebec Government line (the North Shore line) from Ottawa to Quebec, the Atlantic and North-Western Railway, the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway, the Western Counties Railway (Annapolis to Digby). The total amount contracted for was $11,053,807, and the amount paid on these subsidies up to latest date of official Government return, 30th June, 1891, was $9,536,692.34. The subsidies to railways subsidized by the Dominion Government and not yet placed under contract amount to $3,365,900, and the total amount of subsidies voted for railways since 1884 amounts to $14,419,707. The land subsidies are as follows:—Total number of acres granted, 53,036,333; deduct land grant to Canadian Pacific Railway, 25,000,000 acres, showing a total number of acres granted to other railways 28,036,333 since 1884. I contend that the influence exercised by the Government in granting charters to members of this House was a pernicious influence. It was not a method of legislation which would commend itself to any one, because the Government thereby controlled the members of this House who expected to profit by these railway charters, and I could point out instances where members have profited by them to an enormous extent. I say, therefore, that this was an undue, an unfair, and an unjust influence. Then another method the Government have extensively used is the erection of public buildings.

Mr. SPEAKER. I should like to ascertain what bearing this discussion has upon the Redistribution Bill.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I say that this motion ought not to carry, that the Governement ought to be defeated, and I have, therefore, I think, a right to refer to these matters. I will not detain the House much longer.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will endeavour to confine himself as closely as possible to the subject before the House. If the statement he is making has any bearing on the question, I would be glad to know it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am trying to show the influence the Government has exercised in order to secure their position in this House. Here is a statement which I will read:

EXPENDED ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

1880	$ 442,394
1881	507,949
1882	544,032
1883	675,260
1884	1,291,963
1885	1,030,988
1886	117,346
1887	1,029,859
1888	969,263
1889	1,072,312
1890	808,509
	$8,489,875

Now, I will point to only two instances in which this money has not been expended in the interest of the public, but in order to maintain this Government in place and in power; I refer in the first place to the case of Peterborough. It is well known, and has not been disputed, that the Government, when they decided to purchase a lot upon which to erect the public buildings in the town of Peterborough, rather than create any division in the ranks of the Conservative party in that town, when they found they could not get them to agree upon one site, they actually bought two sites, and erected two public buildings within a stone's throw of each other. This is the way public money has been squandered in order to consolidate the Conservative party. Then we had a discussion with regard to the Laprairie post office the other night.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot refer to a former discussion.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I will not refer to that debate; I will just say that in the county which I represent, there are eight or ten villages which afford a post office revenue of from $600 to $1,000, and that are better entitled to a post office than the town of Laprairie, which has got a $16,000 post office. You can take any county in western Ontario represented by a Liberal, and I will guarantee you can find from ten to twelve towns and villages in each county that give twice, in some cases four times, and even thirty times, more post office revenue, than the village of Laprairie, and still they do not get a post office. The reason is that these public buildings have been erected, not in the interest of the people, but in order to sustain the Government in their places on the Treasury benches. Now, before I close I wish to refer to the revelations which took place during the last session, in which it was shown that an enormous amount of corruption prevailed in the administration of the Public Works Department of this country, and that public money had been used to buy up constituencies in order that the Government might retain their places on the Treasury benches. We know the revelations which took place in the Tarte-McGreevy investigation; and then we had a Minister of the Crown, the then Secretary of State, declaring in the Public Accounts Committee that he believed it was right that contractors with the Government should make donations to the party in power in order to help them carry the elections. The Government have not only had an opportunity of drawing upon these contractors for money out of which this country has been defrauded, but they have had hundreds of thousands of dollars to work their elections which they obtained from the manufacturers and the monopolists of this country. I will also call attention to the fact that during this session of Parliament a motion was made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), asking that an investigation should take place into certain charges against the Postmaster General. He said he was prepared to prove that a large amount of money had been expended in certain sections of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that he cannot refer to a former discussion that has taken place this session. Surely it is enough to travel back to 1882, and over the record since then, without violating the rule by referring to discussions that have taken place this session.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not think I was transgressing the rules when I referred to these matters; of course I am desirous of abiding by your ruling. But I would just say, that taking into consideration all the influences which have been brought to bear by the Government of the day in the elections which have taken place since 1887, I have often wondered how it is that the Liberal leader in this House could possibly have even the following he has at the present time, when we consider the influences which have been brought to bear in order to secure the return of supporters to the Government, influences which I do not think can be justified before the people of this country. I sometimes begin to wonder if we really have responsible government in this country; if we have responsible government at all, we have had the worst form of it administered in this country for the last fourteen years. The Government may possibly carry this Bill. No doubt it has been introduced for the purpose of strengthening themselves, as I have indicated that they have attempted by legislation to strengthen themselves during the last twelve or fourteen years. I believe that the time must come when the people of this country will awake to a sense of their duty, when they will call for a greater exercise of political honesty and morality than has been exhibited for the last twelve years, and then I am satisfied that the rule of the present Government will come to a sudden termination. Now, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the House has decided that they will not return to the old county boundary lines by voting down the motion of the member for North Simcoe, and acting on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread, I beg to move:

That the said Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be resolved, that in the opinion of this House the readjustment of the representation of the people in Parliament should for the present be confined to those provinces where it is rendered necessary by the recent census.

Mr. ALLAN. I have no desire to occupy the time of the House at any length, but as the question is one of great importance, involving changes in the representation of this House, and contemplating changes in the position of the parties in this country, I think it my duty to say at least a few words. I think it is a matter of great regret that the Government has seen fit, at what should have been a late period in the session, to bring down a Bill of this important character. This Bill was not introduced until we were nearing the end of three months of session. Business men have been kept two or three weeks in this House discussing a measure that should have been presented at an earlier period of this session. No reason whatever has been given by the Government for not bringing down this measure at an earlier day, unless it is the reason given by the Minister of Public Works, which was simply no reason at all, that the census returns were not down. We all know that the returns showing the population of the various electoral districts were before this House at the close of last session. I think the Government, in withholding this Bill from the consideration of the House until the twelfth week of the session, are highly censurable. They surely could not have expected that a Bill of this importance, one that has evoked so much discussion throughout this country in the public press, one that had evoked so much opposition everywhere, would not meet with the strongest possible opposition in this House, and that the Opposition here would hurry over it and refuse to discuss every detail. It is the bounden duty of the Opposition to discuss it fully, even at the expense of very great convenience and loss to members, and it is their bounden duty to offer all possible opposition to every objectionable feature of the scheme proposed. The object of this Bill cannot be disguised. It is true that Parliament has to make a rearrangement every ten years, it is mandatory as regards the respective rights of the provinces, and the changes in our population on this occasion require that additional representation be given to one or two of the cities. But this matter might have been brought before the House and discussed at a much earlier period, and members would have been enabled to have returned to their homes in reasonable season, for most of the members are either professional or business men and very serious loss is incurred by them from being detained here at this late period. It was intimated some time ago that this Bill would be very simple in its provisions, that it would not be a Gerrymander Bill, but that it would be one acceptable to both parties. The Minister of Public Works stated in his speech that the Opposition should be thankful for this Bill, that the Government had done everything in their power to make it equitable and just. What is the opinion of the public press, and the independent press without exception? The Toronto *Mail* characterizes the Bill as an outrage, and says that if this proposition was submitted to the British Parliament it would not be allowed to pass, that the Opposition would use every weapon within their reach to defeat it, that public meetings would be held throughout England and the Government, no matter how strong, would be forced to withdraw the measure. The Toronto *Telegram*, Ottawa *Journal*, Montreal *Star*, Toronto *News*, and every newspaper in this country of independent proclivities has denounced this Bill. It is unnecessary to enter into the details of this outrageous measure; sufficient time has been occupied in discussing those details and pointing out the iniquitous character of the Bill, and those criticisms have not been answered by hon. gentlemen opposite. No defence whatever has been made to the readjustment of the Counties of Russell and Prescott. The readjustment proposed makes very little advance in equalizing the population, and the very fact that no counties are touched from Russell to Toronto shows that the Government had one object, and one object only, in view, to secure a seat by the redistribution of Russell. Other outrages could be pointed out in Ontario. Take the city of London. Surely this House has been degraded far enough in order to give a seat to the Minister of Agriculture. He has had every check and safeguard thrown around him in order to secure that seat, and it is now proposed to rearrange the city on the pretense of equalizing the population, when, on looking at the neighbouring Counties of South and East Middlesex, it is apparent that a greater disparity exists than between the city of London and the division proposed to be taken in. An equalization in that matter is a perfect absurdity. The intention is to make, if possible, that seat secure for the Minister of Agriculture, and the Government, if they intend to carry on that sort of thing, might as well bring down a measure appointing

that hon. gentleman to his seat for ten years, instead of going through the farce of elections. A majority was given against that hon. gentleman, as every one knows, and he owes his seat to the action of a revising barrister. Not satisfied with that, he comes to this House and asks that the constituency be rearranged in order to secure him his seat when he goes back again. Reference has been made to other portions of Ontario: but it is not necessary that I should occupy the time in pointing out the iniquitous changes. As to the Province of Quebec, it is admitted on every hand that the object of this Bill is to take from the Liberal party at least eight or ten seats. That is the general feature of the Bill. Its purpose cannot be concealed: every person fully understands it: the independent press of the country have spoken out in no uncertain tone respecting it. To enter further into details is not my intention. My principal purpose on rising is to answer some of the statements made with reference to a redistribution which was proposed elsewhere. I refer to the Ontario Legislature. Hon. gentlemen opposite have failed to justify the Bill now before the House, in any way. They simply have showed that it is not based on any lines or any policy, but they have gone to the Province of Ontario, and have declared that the Bill passed there was of a more iniquitous character than that proposed to be passed in this House. I wish to allude to some of the statements made in that respect. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), speaking of the Redistribution Bill in Ontario, said:

"I have here a statement made officially in the Ontario Legislature on the 11th of March, 1891, which shows that although the Government of Sir Oliver Mowat has a majority on the floor of the House of 28 or 30, it is not due to the votes of the people, but to the gerrymander of the Government. We find, summarizing the official figures, that the total vote cast against the Reform Government in the Province of Ontario last election amounted to 168,445, and the total vote for the Government 162,893, scattered votes 1,474, or a total majority against the Reform Government of the popular vote of upwards of 5,600. Therefore, Sir Oliver Mowat and his Government hold office in the Province of Ontario to-day, although there is a popular vote of upwards of 5,000 against them, and they hold office only on account of the gerrymander of the constituencies in that province. These figures were given on the floor of the Ontario Legislature, and they were not contradicted. No figures were adduced to disprove them and they are here in public prints to-day, and they cannot be very well denied. This statement also gives the total vote for Toronto, and deducting Mr. Clarke's and Mr. Bell's vote from the one side and Mr. Macdonald's vote from the other, that is to say, the second candidate in each case, the figures stand for the Province of Ontario: Total vote for the Conservative Government, 158,902: total vote for the Reform party in the province, 157,454, or still a popular majority against the Reform Government of the Province of Ontario of 1,458, and yet they occupy the Treasury benches and have a majority of upwards of twenty members on account of their infamous gerrymander."

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is a distinct and positive declaration. It is surrounded by such circumstances that I have no doubt the hon. gentleman did make most of the members of this House believe that his statement was correct, when he claimed that the Government of Mr. Mowat was largely in the minority in that province, and when he stated that the assertion was made in the Parliament of Ontario, giving these figures officially, as he said, that no one was able to deny it, that it never had been denied, and that it could not be contradicted. These statements are of a very positive character, and if they were true it would look very much like as if the Ontario Government were guilty of the charges made. I knew something of the result in the Province of Ontario, and when I heard the hon. gentleman make these statements I was quite satisfied that they were in every particular inaccurate. Since then I have taken occasion to look into the matter. As to the official statement which he says was made, I think I am correct in saying that there never has been any such official statement made to the Ontario Legislature. It was hinted by one hon. member of that body that he had such a statement showing that the Government were in the minority of the vote in that province, and in a jeering way the gentleman was brought to give some of his figures, but he did not finish them and no complete statement was ever submitted to that House. I will read you the report of the discussion that took place at that time. The report of the *Globe* of the 12th of March says:

"Mr. Clarke seemed about to conclude, when the Commissioner of Public Works, amid laughter from the Ministerialists, called for the figures about the popular vote. The member for Toronto, returning to that subject, said he could not understand how the Commissioner of Public Works could make out that the Government had received a majority of the votes cast of 15,000. Taking Toronto, there was a popular majority for the Conservatives of 5,642. He was proceeding to explain how he arrived at these figures, and had said, if you deduct the vote cast for myself, the vote cast for my colleague, Mr. E. F. Clarke, and if you deduct the vote cast for Mr. Armour,—he had arrived at this point in his explanation when he was disconcerted by ironical laughter from the Hon. Mr. Fraser and members of the House. It was not given for the hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Clarke declared, and Mr. Fraser retorted that Mr. Armour's vote had not been given for the Opposition. If you take it that way, Mr. Fraser continued, there is the whole of East Durham for you.

"Mr. CLARKE resumed: In Ontario, there had been 158,902 votes cast for the Opposition, and 157,444 for the Government, so that there had been a popular majority against the Government of 1,458. (Opposition applause.)

"Hon. Mr. FRASER. Where did you put East Durham? I suppose you claim the whole vote.

"Mr. MEREDITH. It was all against the Government.

"Mr. CLARKE. Was it given for the Government?

"Hon. Mr. FRASER. We want to know where you put it.

"Mr. CLARKE. I will tell you more than you want to know.

"Hon. Mr. FRASER. Ask the hon. member for East Durham. (Opposition cries of Order.)

"Hon. Mr. FRASER (persisting in being heard). Will the hon. member for Toronto answer me a question?

"Mr. CLARKE said he would not, but he would tell the hon. Commissioner of Public Works about East Durham. In that constituency there had been 2,600 votes cast against the Government.

"Hon. Mr. FRASER. That is the total vote cast, is it?

"Mr. CLARKE. Yes. (Ironical laughter from the Ministerial benches, and Opposition applause.)

"Hon. Mr. FRASER. Where did you put Grenville?

"Mr. CLARKE. I will leave to the hon. member for Grenville to answer for himself.

"Hon. Mr. FRASER. The hon. member for Grenville will say that he got the entire vote of the Liberal party.

"Mr. CLARKE. He did not get it.

"Hon. Mr. FRASER. Well, ask the hon. member himself.

"Mr. CLARKE said that he would not proceed further with the figures he had prepared, but would give the statement to the public press.

"Hon. Mr. FRASER. And let the public press laugh at it.

"Mr. CLARKE repeated his contention that the Government have not a popular majority, and although the Opposition could not say they had received a popular majority, yet it was true, he said, that a popular majority had been cast against the Government."

Now, that is the so-called official statement to which reference has been made, and yet we have the statement of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) that an official statement giving these facts and figures had been submitted to the Ontario Legislature and that they had not been denied. The statement was never submitted, a few figures were given and the whole thing was laughed out of the House. Now, Sir, I have taken the pains to look into the question of the popular vote in Ontario, and I think I will be able to inform the House as to the truth on the matter. They claim in this statement that there are no Liberals in Cardwell, that there are no Liberals in the County of Carleton, that there are no Liberals in the County of Durham, that there are no Liberals in the County of Grenville; and we give the Opposition in Ontario the majority vote in those ridings amounting to 5,724, while we would certainly on any fair calculation be entitled to a minority vote. But giving them that vote, and deducting it from the popular vote received by the Liberal party which was 172,076, as I will soon show, it still leaves the Liberal Government in Ontario a majority of over 8,000. If we were to take the minority vote in these ridings I have mentioned, and to which we are fairly entitled, the popular majority of the Liberal party at the last election was 12,944, and in that calculation we make no allowance for the difference of the majority of the County of Oxford over that of the city of London. In the return published in the *Empire* both the elections of the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Government, which were by acclamation, were treated as an even vote, and, for the purpose of this statement, I have treated it in the same way, although by taking the preceding election the actual difference in the majority of the two constituencies is between 500 and 600 in favour of Mr. Mowat. Therefore, on a fair calculation, the Government of Ontario had a popular majority of over 13,000 people. But giving the Conservatives their contention that there are no Reformers in East Durham, we know that the Conservative member who represents that constituency in the Commons—and the party for the Commons is much stronger usually than in the Local—only obtained his seat by about 100 majority, or Cardwell or East Durham or Grenville the Government had a popular majority of over 8,000. Now, Sir, the statement of the *Empire* was never submitted to the Local Legislature. As I have shown from the debate which I have read, it was simply laughed out of the House as being utterly ridiculous. The hon. member was asked: What did you do with the vote in East Durham? It was well known that the member there was returned principally by Liberal votes; and in Grenville, where two Conservatives ran, the one supported by the Liberals was elected. In all these constituencies the minority vote amounted to 4,777. Now, that statement omits the leaders on both side, who were elected by acclamation; assumes the total vote cast in the four Counties of Cardwell, Carleton, East Durham and Grenville to be Conservative, and counts the total vote for them; takes the vote at the previous election cast in North Hastings for Mr. Wood, who was elected by acclamation; in Toronto counts the votes cast for E. F. Clarke, H. E. Clarke, Bell and Moses to the Conservative side, just as the *Empire* stated, while the votes cast for Tait, McDougall and Armour are counted for the Liberal side. But even on that one-sided aspect, the result when the respective columns of figures are added, does not sustain the hon. member's statement. Taking the figures in detail as presented by Mr. Clarke, crediting the Opposition with the majority vote as cast in the four constituencies:

—	Majority Vote.	Minority Vote.
Cardwell	1,183	1,138
Carleton	1,145	1,136
Durham, East	1,784	1,304
Grenville	1,611	1,199
In all	5,724	4,777

Not counting the minority vote at all, which certainly ought to be credited to the Government, and adding the vote cast in 1886 in London and North Oxford in the contest of the two leaders the net result is:

Total vote cast for the Government	170,736
do against do	162,569
	8,167
With the minority vote above of	4,777
	12,944

In the statment of the *Empire* the vote cast for Moses, the temperance candidate, is put down to the Conservatives. The Government would be entitled to part of the votes cast for Moses in Toronto, but in this calculation we take no account of that. And yet in the face of this statement, an hon. member of this House will state, and perhaps members from the other provinces believed it, that Mowat was guilty of a gross gerrymander, that he is in power to-day through that gerrymander, and that although he has a large majority of the representatives he is in the minority in the country, and to back his statement he says that an official statement was made to the Legislature of Ontario and was not denied. That was the position he took; certainly he made a very plausible story; and I thought that about the best thing I could do would be to look this matter up and answer the statement. If the discussion had gone on in the Legislature of Ontario it would have been answered; but it was not discussed, because it was not thought worth while, it was only laughed at. Now, I think I have disposed of the question of the popular majority in the Province of Ontario. Mr. Mowat simply swept that province, and there have been no arguments adduced to show that in arranging the constituencies, in which he confined himself entirely to county lines, that he gerrymandered the constituencies. To show that that is the case I have only to advert to the statements various hon. gentlemen have made. If there were good grounds for making those statements, it would not be necessary for any hon. gentleman to make statements to this House which are untrue. Dealing with this question, the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) says:

"In that province, from which all the wisdom of the Reform party is supposed to come, and to which all Reformers point, there is instance after instance in which county boundaries overlap, and where the rule laid down by the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition has not been observed."

He does not say that Mr. Mowat cut up those constituencies, but I think he intended the House to believe that Mr. Mowat did so. What we say is that in no instance has the Government of the Hon. Oliver Mowat departed from county lines, and that is met by the hon. member for North Victoria saying that there were many instances in which county lines overlapped, clearly intending the House to believe that Mr. Mowat had cut up those constituencies. He says further:

"Take the Counties of Lincoln, Haldimand and Bothwell, which is represented here by a member who has a good deal to say on these matters."

In the County of Lincoln there has been no interference with county lines. In Haldimand we know that at the time of Confederation there was a township taken from that county by Sir John Macdonald and added to Monck, but that was done with the consent of all parties. The intention of the hon. gentleman was to lead the House to believe that the instances he gave were instances in which Mr. Mowat had cut and carved the constituencies. Then, the riding of Bothwell was created at the time of Confederation, and it has been abolished by Mr. Mowat. There is no riding of Bothwell for local purposes, and yet the hon. gentleman would have the House believe that Mr. Mowat had gerrymandered it. He dealt with the County of Waterloo, and even went on to read the Act. I do not know, I have not examined that Act, but I presume that in the introduction of a new Act it is necessary, perhaps, to give a description of the county bounds, whether it is an old or a new Act. I do not know. Waterloo has not been interfered with, and yet he devoted a large portion of his speech to the County of Waterloo, and was cheered vociferously by hon. members opposite. What does he say:

"The hon. gentleman can also see that the House may properly appreciate how South Waterloo is doctored up and to what extreme these purists of the Liberal party will go to gerrymander a county. I shall read you a description of the County of Waterloo from the Revised Statutes of Ontario, and you will notice that, not content with dividing the municipalities, they even divide lots, and in some places where there is a good old Tory with four or five sons, they drew a line around his lot and hedged him off into another riding in order that he may not do any injury by his vote to the Reform party."

He reads you the Act. Certainly, under those circumstances, every one would be inclined to believe him. But when I tell you that the county bounds of Waterloo have not been interfered with but are the same, and that there has been no such cutting and carving, leaving out a Tory here and a Reformer there, as the hon. gentleman described, I would like to know what credence is to be given his statements. One might presume that he has fallen into error, but it is not only one statement, but one statement he makes after another, every one of which is wrong. In his references to all these counties, North Brant, Haldimand, Lincoln and Bothwell, he was wrong. Even if the Government had made those boundaries of Waterleo, what did it mean? Simply that the Grand River cuts through, and forms the boundary of Waterloo. I have answered almost every statement of the hon. gentleman with reference to the so-called gerrymander of the Hon. Mr. Mowat, taking my figures from the *Empire*. They have (Clark's statement) juggled with the large vote in the city of Toronto, taking 5,000 from one side and putting it on to the other, and have made other extraordinary calculations. Why, on the same basis I could show that the Mowat Administration was returned by a popular majority of 30,000. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) also dealt with the question of the Mowat gerrymander, only he was not quite so positive or extravagant in his statements as the hon. member for North Victoria. He, however, made some very sweeping assertions which were cheered by hon. gentlemen opposite. He said:

"I will take a list of ten counties, namely, Algoma West, North Brant, Nipissing, West Simcoe, Carleton, Cardwell, Frontenac, West Northumberland, South Lanark, and North Wentworth, which together polled in the last election a total number of 21,576 votes. Then in the ridings of Hamilton, West Kent, Ottawa, North Perth, East Middlesex, West Lambton, South Essex, Lennox, South Ontario and Weliand there were polled 53,238 votes. Now, taking ten as a divisor, that being the number of counties, we find in the first batch there is an average number of 2,157 votes polled, and in the latter lot the average vote polled was 5,323. Now, if the hon, gentlemen are honest, if they are consistent, do they think it is right that ten ridings in the Province of Ontario should have an average number of electors of 5,323, while the other ten should only have 2,157? I am bound to say not one of those hon. gentlemen has ever denounced on the public platform the scheme of Sir Oliver Mowat in the readjustment of the constituencies in Ontario."

No other inference can be placed on that statement than that he intended this House to believe that the Government of the Hon. Mr. Mowat had grossly gerrymandered those ten constituencies. Well, just examine into his complaint and see what it amounts to. He has taken some constituencies that polled the largest Liberal vote, Hamilton, Ottawa, also South Essex and South Ontario. He does not state the population of these places. Perhaps some may have returned their members by acclamation, and in that case he may think there were no votes, judging by the way he reasons out other questions; but his complaint is that these Liberal constituencies have cast more votes, double the number, than those Conservative constituencies in the other group. He placed that argument to the House in such a way as to lead this House to believe that it was a gross gerrymander. Why, if there was any wrong done in those Liberal constituencies, it was not to the Conservatives but to the Liberals. It was not pretended in the Ontario House that an equilibrium, or anything approaching it, could be secured in the constituencies, but their contention was that when they moved in the direction of changing the constituencies, it should be in the direction of equalizing them, and I want to point out further the tactics to which the hon. gentleman resorted. He takes the district of Nipissing, a new district, which a few years ago had a small number of votes, but which is rapidly increasing and has now a large population, and he puts that down to the discredit of Mr. Mowat. I can tell him that Nipissing was given a representative in the House by the unanimous consent of the Local Legislature, both parties supporting the proposition. I can say the same of Algoma when it was given two members, and also of Muskoka, the three others he has in this list and in which he sought to prove that a gross gerrymander was perpetrated by the Hon. Mr. Mowat. He alluded further in his speech to townships in West Huron and in East Huron. That matter I have looked up and it has been fully answered by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald). In the division of these constituencies there was no gerrymander, because their political complexion

was not altered, and the result after the elections was just the same as in the previous elections. That can be proved, I think it is in *Hansard*, if not, it can be put there. I say, that taking the votes of those constituencies previously and since, their political complexion has not been altered. The other night, when the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) brought up this matter, the only thing we heard from the other side was the case of West York; the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) came forward and propounded what he called the infamous gerrymander of West York, by the Hon. Oliver Mowat. Now, what are the facts? He said that Parkdale was taken from West York and added to East York; so it was; but it equalized the population of those two constituencies. The hon. gentleman spoke of it as an iniquitous device on the part of Mr. Mowat to secure an advantage in West York, yet there was not a single objection made to it in the Local Legislature. The only amendment proposed was as to the village of Richmond Hill. That change in West York did equalize the population of the two constituencies. He stated that the unit of representation had been reduced. Why, if there were to be any small constituencies at all—and they were not so very small—it is quite reasonable to leave the constituencies near the city of Toronto, that was likely to receive the overflow from the population of that city in a few years. By the changing of those two constituencies Col. Grey, the member for West York, was only left in a minority of three votes; and yet that change was put forward in this House as an infamous gerrymander and a set-off to the scheme before this House—such cases as Clarence and others. When the hon. member for Lambton was speaking with reference to Waterloo, they felt that some terrible mistake had been made. They had made extravagant statements about Waterloo. The member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) saw the difficulty, and he said that they had gerrymandered Huron. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) has answered that statement very fully. I think I have touched upon every item in reference to the Mowat gerrymander that has so far been raised in this House. It is impossible, of course, to rearrange constituencies in such a way that no possible objection can be made, we do not expect that; but if the Government would bring down a scheme such as the Hon. Mr. Mowat has brought down twice, the Opposition here would do as the Conservative Opposition did in the Local Legislature; we put the whole thing through without rising as they did there. But the Opposition in this House knowing that the Government are seeking the political death of some of our friends, desire to show their friends from the Lower Provinces that the Government of the Hon. Oliver Mowat "the sanctified Mowat," in the sneering language of some hon. members opposite, did not commit a gerrymander. Whoever says he did, says that which is untrue. It cannot be expected that in a rearrangement of the constituencies, the Government in power would not in some cases have the advantage, but I can show that in the redistribution of 1874 by Mr. Mowat, he actually gave the advantage to the Conservatives. That question was raised by the member for Ottawa City (Mr. Mackintosh) the other night. He took up Cornwall and said there was a Conservative riding which this Government left untouched—as if it were an injustice to the Conservatives. He said:

"What do I find? Look at the gerrymander of 1874. We have Muskoka, 5,000; Cornwall, 7,000; Algoma, 3,000; Brockville, 13,000; Elgin West, 12,000; Stormont, 11,000; North Brant, 11,000; and Monck, 15,000."

Then he compares Toronto with these small constituencies of 1874, and says that was the gerrymander of Hon. Oliver Mowat. Why, Sir, the Hon. Oliver Mowat did not touch Cornwall in 1874. That had been one of the oldest constituencies in the country, and it was not until Cornwall was abolished in this House that Mr. Mowat interfered with Cornwall, and when he did interfere he was strenuously opposed by the Opposition. Yet the hon. member for the city of Ottawa brings that up as a serious charge against Mr. Mowat. Then in Muskoka, the representative of that county is a Conservative, as is also the representative of West Elgin, to which was added St. Thomas. In 1885 he changed that constituency by adding St. Thomas to West Elgin, and I can show by the utterances of the member for that constituency that he predicted they would lose West Elgin, who protested against it, as giving a political advantage to the Conservative party. But St. Thomas was added to West Elgin, and it is now represented in that House by a Conservative. Nipissing is represented as polling a very small vote, but Nipissing was given a representative by the united support of two parties in the Local Legislature, yet a Conservative member rises up in this House and says that the Government of Mr. Mowat gave a representative to a constituency having only 1,500 votes. I say that when the Mowat Government gave them that representative he was supported by the whole House. Then Algoma is put down here. Does any one pretend to say that a country equal almost in size to a province, was not entitled to one representative? Mr. Mowat recognizing the growth of Port Arthur, Kaministiquia and other places, gave Algoma a representative, and he was supported unanimously in the Local Legislature; yet hon. gentlemen oppposite complain that Algoma is represented, while Toronto City is unrepresented. My opinion in reference to cities is, that the representation should be much greater than that of rural constituencies. In connection with city representation, I may mention one other matter that occurs to me at the present time. The member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) made an invidious comparison between the city of Hamilton and some other ridings. It was represented to this House as an injury to the Conservative party. I desire to read the speech delivered by Mr. Gibson, now the Provincial Secretary of the Ontario Government, in regard to this matter. It was as follows:—

"Mr. Gibson thought cities were deserving of their full share of representation. While the hon. member for London (Mr. Meredith) spoke in favour of urban population generally he did not call attention particularly to the treatment which Hamilton was receiving by this Bill. The population of that city was now in excess of 40,000 and it must be borne in mind that, while rural constituencies were growing slowly, Hamilton was growing rapidly. The representation it had might be sufficient now, but in ten years hence it would have 50,000 or 60,000 of a population and it would be unjust to give it only one representative. He did not object to the additional members given in Algoma and the other constituencies, but he did complain that a place like Hamilton should be represented by a single representative. He had a right to complain and he did complain. A city which had returned a supporter of a Liberal Government from the time of Confederation as

Hamilton had done ought, on political grounds, to have had an additional member. He simply rose to give notice that at another stage of the Bill he would move an amendment proposing another representative.

"The Bill was all right so far as it went, and in support of this he referred to the shock which the Ottawa gerrymander had caused, while this Bill had been favourably received in the country.

"Once more he expressed regret that he had been called upon to speak as he had, but he certainly could not have done otherwise than enter a plea for another member for Hamilton."

Yet the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) stated in his place in this House, and, by arrangement of the figures with other ridings, represented this as a grievance from which the Conservative party suffered. It was a fair question for argument whether Hamilton should have another representative or not; but, at all events, no injustice was done the Conservative party, and all the cheers given to the hon. gentleman when he made those utterances were due, I think, to the belief that he had made out a case that the Mowat Administration had gerrymandered the constituencies. I have touched on every point that so far has been alluded to in regard to the gerrymander of Ontario. I have pointed out that instead of the Liberals being in a minority of 5,000, as alleged by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), on any fair and reasonable calculation the majority is 12,900, making a difference between the two calculations of 17,000. I have pointed out the manner in which the calculation which appeared in the Toronto *Empire* of 11th March, 1890, was made up, so that hon. gentlemen can see at once the fraudulent character of that statement. A number of counties were given, and their entire vote put down to the credit of the Conservative party, and the vote of Toronto was juggled with in such a way as to make a very great difference there. I have no doubt, whatever, that the figures I have given are correct. If any one will go over the additions of the *Empire's* figures they will find that the figures do not add, and that they are simply a mass of figures put together for the purpose of deceiving the people. As regards the discussion in the Local Legislature: I read the report of the debate from which hon. members can see that the matter referred to was actually laughed out of the House. My object in rising was simply to answer some of the statements that have been made in regard to this so-called infamous gerrymander of Ontario. Whether I have succeeded or not, I will leave the House to judge. My figures I think cannot be disputed. I am prepared to give them more fully on another occasion, and set them out in detail. I will take the figures as given in the *Empire*, but I count the minority votes in the constituencies to make 12,900, but giving them the minority vote there can be no question that, even according to the *Empire's* statement, Mr. Mowat's Government was returned by over 8,000 popular majority.

Mr. DAWSON. So much has been said during this debate respecting the unit of population, I think it is about time to ascertain what the unit of population really is, for I understand the unit of population is found by taking the number of members to which the Province of Quebec is entitled, that number being fixed at 65 by the British North America Act, and dividing the population of Quebec by it and the result is the unit of representation. The unit is then used for the purpose of determining the number of members to which the other provinces are entitled. I do not think it was intended that the population of the electoral district should be exactly equal to this unit of representation. Had that been the intention, I think the framers of the British North America Act would have seen to it that the electoral districts were laid out at that time having an equal population. It was not so, and therefore I do not believe that it is necessary that each electoral district should be equal in population. The principle underlying the laying out of the electoral districts was community of interests. Under our system of self-government our counties are really little commonwealths within themselves, perfect in a large degree, having their own county courts, county school system, and county municipal organization. They have community of interests, they have intimate trade relations with each other, municipal affairs drawing them together, and a resident of a county is able more intelligently to represent the interest of that county than he could a district composed of parts of different counties. It might of course be necessary to divide a county so as to form two or more ridings. When such division is necessary, each riding I believe should be as equal as may be in population; but no county should be divided unless it is necessary for the purpose of redistributing the representation so that the province should have its full complement of members, and certainly no township should be taken from a county and attached to an adjoining riding simply for the purpose of equalizing the population in the different districts. I think a member in this House could represent his county more intelligently, although it might be a populous county, than a very much smaller district composed of townships culled from the surrounding counties. I do not wish it to be understood, however, that I advocate the exclusion from this House of those who might find it impossible to win a seat in Parliament for the electoral district in which they happen to reside. The principle of residence in his riding of the representative of the riding would exclude from this House many men whose services to the country have proved most valuable, and indeed if this principle were adopted, this House would lose its most brilliant lights. But a non-resident can more intelligently represent a district composed of a county than one composed of parts of several counties, because he will be able through his associations to obtain more accurate information respecting the county than he could obtain if the electoral district were composed of parts of several counties; he will be more likely to harmonize with the judgment of his constituents as he would be possessed of information on which to base his opinion of the needs of the riding. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Allan) has spoken with respect to the representation of cities. I do not think cities such as Toronto or Montreal are entitled to have as many representatives as the unit of population would give them. Those cities are highly organized communities. They have influential boards of trade existing for the purpose of ascertaining the wants of those cities, and in meeting those wants. They have an influential press which is also able to ascertain the wants of those cities and press them on public notice. The press can influence public opinion to such a degree as to force the Government to recognize the

wants of these cities. Rural constituencies have none of these means of impressing this House: they are not in possession of such means, and therefore the representation of rural constituencies I think should be larger in proportion than that of such cities as Toronto and Montreal. In the subdivision of counties, however, I think that the ridings into which a county is divided should be as nearly as possible equal in population, and this was the principle underlying the Redistribution Bill of Sir Oliver Mowat of which we have heard so much during this debate. As to Sir Oliver Mowat personally he needs no person here to stand up for him. Wherever his name is mentioned it is recognized as that of an honest man and as a man who is in fact a christian statesman. It is in this House, however, that we have to listen to taunts and to hear him sneered at as "a christian statesman," and brandedas a follower of the infamous "Gerry." The press,—I won't say controlled by the Government, but supporting the Government in this city—alludes to Sir Oliver Mowat in this strain. Speaking of his Redistribution Bill on the 25th of March last, the editor of that paper says:

"A bolder outrage was never committed upon representative institutions than this shameless larceny; nor is it much consolation to reflect that it was the work of a christian statesman, in all probability engaged at the same time in 'an under-study of Paley.'"

Such taunts as these fall very lightly upon Sir Oliver Mowat's shoulders. He is a man whose reputation in the country is too well founded to be effected by such silly attacks as these. His administration of affairs of the Province of Ontario sufficiently testifies to his worth and ability as a statesman. His unsullied public life, his uprightness of character, and his absolute integrity, give the lie to these slanderers who would fain have you believe that he is as they are. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) in his speech the other evening made some very vague charges with reference to the Redistribution Bill of Sir Oliver Mowat. If his statements in reference to the western portion of the Province of Ontario are as inaccurate as his statements were in reference to the redistribution of the seats in Kingston, Frontenac and Addington, then he did not make a single correct statement in the whole of his speech. He said that Frontenac was irredeemably Conservative, that Kingston was to be captured by adding townships taken from Frontenac, and that Addington was to be redeemed by relieving it of several townships with a Conservative majority and adding them to the County of Frontenac. The hon. gentleman did not tell the House that the riding of Addington embraces thirteen of the townships of the County of Frontenac, and that the three townships which were to be taken from the district of Addington, belong to Frontenac, and were simply to be taken from one electoral division and placed in another. The old district of Frontenac, Lennox and Addington, with Kingston, had been divided into four electoral districts, having a population, in 1881, as follows:—Kingston, 14,091; Frontenac, 14,993; Lennox, 16,314; Addington, 23,470. The proposition was to equalize the population of these districts as nearly as possible, and, at the same time, somewhat reduce the enormous area of the riding of Addington. Addington had eighteen townships, and it was proposed to take three of these off, adding them to Frontenac, and making eight townships in the riding of Frontenac. Kingston had a population of 14,091, and it was proposed to add Kingston township with a population of 3,739, and Portsmouth village with a population of 1,734, making the population of the district, 19,564. Frontenac, after losing Kingston and Portsmouth village, had its population reduced to 9,520, and to this it was proposed to add Portland, Loughborough and Bedford, three townships belonging to the county, and that increased the population of Frontenac to 16,385. The population of Addington, amounting to 23,470, it was proposed to reduce by relieving it of three townships, having a population of 6,865, leaving the population of Addington 16,605, and after this redistribution or so-called gerrymander the population stood: Lennox, 16,314; Frontenac, 16,385; Addington, 16,605; Kingston, 19,564. Now that was equalizing the population as near as may be, and giving the city of Kingston rather a larger population than the rural constituencies. As to the political effect of these changes, it is said that Frontenac was irredeemably Conservative, and that the hope was to capture Kingston and redeem Addington. I find that in 1891, Mr. Smith the sitting member for the County of Frontenac, had a majority of 98. The three townships of Portland, Loughborough and Bedford, which had been added, gave him 89 of this majority, leaving him a majority of 9 only, with the Township of Kingston and the village of Portsmouth to hear from, and the later two gave a Liberal majority of 41, showing that the county as it was before the redistribution, polled in the last election 32 of a Liberal majority. Had it not been for this redistribution of seats which has been so condemned here, Sir Oliver Mowat would have had a supporter from Frontenac to-day, and Mr. H. T. Shibley would have been the representative instead of Mr. Hugh Smith. So much for the Ontario Redistribution Bill. In the Redistribution Bill passed in this House in 1882, I believe that this Parliament abandoned principle and sought only party interests. That fact has been conceded by so many hon. members on the other side of the House that it is hardly necessary to reiterate it. That measure respected neither county lines nor community of interests, nor did it seek to equalize population. It is a Bill which certainly cannot be justified. It was a bad Bill: and this House, having placed upon the Statute-book a bad law which ought to be repealed, if this House neglects now to repeal it, it is equally guilty with the Parliament of 1882 for having placed that law upon the Statute-book. I will speak with reference to the St. Lawrence and Ottawa group of counties, as they lie more in my own neighbourhood, and with them I am much more familiar than with other parts of the province. I find that Smith's Falls was taken out of the County of Lanark and added to the County of Leeds and Grenville, which county was divided into four electoral districts—Leeds South, Brockville, Leeds and Grenville, and Grenville South—and by a very curious coincidence, of course, returning Conservative members to this House. Lanark, to make up for the loss of Smith's Falls, had two townships taken out of the County of Carleton and added to it. The county so formed was then divided, and under this arrangement they succeeded in returning two Conservatives. To Russell County they added part of the city of Ottawa and two townships from

Carleton in the vain hope of swamping the Liberal majority in Russell. As that was not accomplished, it is now proposed to relieve the County of Russell of the township of Clarence, one of the four township divisions of the original County of Russel, and place it in the adjoining County of Prescott, leaving part of the city of Ottawa and the two townships of Carleton still attached. This is a proposal which meets with scant commendation from the supporters of the Government. We have yet to hear any person on the opposite side of the House who says that it is one based upon principles of justice or fair-play. It is certainly not for the purpose of equalizing the population, because we find that Russell has now a population of 31,643, and Prescott a population of 24,173, and after the proposed rearrangement, Prescott will have 30,417, and Russell 25,399. The group of counties of which I am speaking are not nearly equal in population, nor has any attempt been made either in previous Acts or in the present one to make them so. The present population of these districts is as follows: Russell, 31,643; Cornwall and Stormont, 27,158; Prescott, 24,173; Addington, 24,151; South Renfrew, 23,972; North Renfrew, 23,005; Glengarry, 22,477; Leeds South, 22,451; Carleton, 21,749; Dundas, 20,132; South Lanark, 19,864; North Lanark, 19,265; Kingston, 19,264; Ottawa, 37,281, with two members each representing 18,640; Brockville, 15,855; Lennox, 14,902; Leeds and Grenville, 13,523; Frontenac, 13,445; Grenville South, 12,931. Now, the application of the principle of the non-disturbance of county lines might cost some of us our seats. I am one of those whose seat might be disturbed, and my dawning ambition nipped in the bud, and I might be left without a seat. But so it be, if it is in the public interest, and I believe it is in the public interest. The riding which I represent is formed of 13 townships of Frontenac and 8 townships of Lennox and Addington. By all means let the principle of county boundaries prevail, and I will take my chances, if my ambition lead me to seek a seat in this House for one or other of the constituencies then formed. I would certainly not stand in the way of a reform which I believe to be for the public interest. I will show that by adopting this righteous principle we would come much nearer the unit of population in this district than we are at the present time. The difference, instead of being 12,000 and 31,000 as at present, would be very much less. By adding the townships in Addington to the townships forming Lennox, the district of Lennox and Addington would have 24,752. Restoring to Frontenac the townships now in Addington, the population of Frontenac would be 27,746, from which might be taken the village of Portsmouth, really a suburb of Kingston, 1,974, leaving 25,772 in Frontenac. Kingston with its Portsmouth suburb added would have 21,238. The County of Leeds, by taking away Yonge and Escott Front, would have a population of 19,594. Brockville, by adding South Elmsley, now in Leeds and Grenville, and Yonge and Escott Front, now in Leeds, would have 19,689. Grenville South, by restoring to it the townships of Wolford, Oxford and South Gower, now in Leeds and Grenville would have 21,613; Dundas, as at present, would have 20,132; Cornwall and Stormont, as at present, would have 27,158; Glengarry as at present, would have 22,447; Prescott, as at present, would have 24,173; Russell, relieved of New Edinburgh, and the townships of Gloucester and Osgoode, would have 18,289; the city of Ottawa, with the addition of the part of the city now in Russell, would have 38,954, which should be divided into two ridings averaging a population of 19,477 each; Carleton, with the townships of Gloucester, Osgoode, Fitzroy and Huntley restored to it, would have 38,692, which divided as equally as possible would give Carleton two ridings with an average population of 19,346 each; South Lanark, with Smith's Falls, now in Leeds and Grenville, restored, and North Lanark relieved of Fitzroy and Huntley would together have 37,731, which divided as equally as possible would give two ridings with an average population of 18,865. North Renfrew undisturbed would have 23,005; and South Renfrew undisturbed would have 23,972. In the St. Lawrence and Ottawa group, if the principle of forming electoral districts without disturbing county lines were carried out, the population would be as follows: Cornwall and Stormont, 27,158; Frontenac, 25,772; Lennox and Addington, 24,752; Prescott, 24,173; South Renfrew, 23,972; North Renfrew, 23,005; Glengarry, 22,447; Grenville, 21,613; Kingston, 21,238; Dundas, 20,132; Brockville, 19,689; Leeds, 19,594; Ottawa, 38,954, giving two ridings with an average population in each of 19,477; Carleton, 38,692, giving two ridings with an average population in each of 19,346; Lanark, 37,731, giving two ridings with an average population in each of 18,865; Russell, 18,289. The difference in population would be from 27,000 to 18,000 as against a difference at present of 31,600 to 12,900. The hon. members for the Province of Quebec who have spoken so far, have ably dealt with the redistribution in so far as it affects that province. I will not take up the time of the House by dwelling on the iniquities of that part of the measure. They have been ably set forth by the hon. member for South Brant. A more absurd carving of the counties has never been perpetrated, not even in the Act of 1882. The absurd shape of many of the constituencies must surely show even the most unthinking of the electors, if there are any such, that something is intended by this redistribution of seats, apart from the alleged desire of the Government to equalize the population or to deal out even-handed justice between the two great parties of this country. I will not dwell upon the Bill so far as it affects the Province of Quebec. Then the little sea-girt Isle has able advocates in this House, who will be able to show the gross iniquity contemplated by it there, how the people there are to be cheated out of their rights and out of their power to express their convictions as to how this country ought to be governed. The county lines have been violated there, and the constituencies thrown into a shape utterly unrecognizable and like to nothing that is in the heavens above or the earth beneath. The western portion of Ontario has been spoken of by many members here better acquainted with that section than I am, and I am sure that the redistribution, so far as it affects the Niagara peninsula, has been shown to be iniquitous and intended solely in the interest of party. I think we are justified in alluding to the Redistribution Act of 1882. If that measure was

a bad one, if it was an unjustifiable one, if, having become law, it is not in the interest of the people, it ought to be repealed; and if we neglect to repeal it we are as guilty as those who are responsible for passing it. But if it is the determination of the House not to disturb the work that was done in 1882, if it is their determination not to form electoral districts in accordance with county boundaries and community of interests—and the other evening we were told by a large majority that it was not the intention of the Government to adopt that principle—then I believe we should leave the seats as they are at present in Ontario and Quebec, and that the Bill should only touch those provinces in which the recent census shows it to be necessary to redistribute the seats. I, therefore, support the amendment now before the House, and believe that, should it carry, the session will be considerably shortened, and we will, before many weeks, be able to return to our duties; but if it is the determination of the Government to press this Bill at all hazards, all we can do is to stand up here for the interests of the people. We believe that legislation should be in the interests of the people as a whole, and not of any one party, and that it is a wanton misuse of power to pass legislation introduced and pressed by the Government for the sole purpose of keeping themselves in office. Let them re-form the constituencies in a more equitable way, so that this scheme of legislating themselves into office may be done away with; let them then go to the people, and if their policy be approved we must bow to the will of the people. But as it is, the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite are in power is no proof that they are in accord with the will of the people. I believe that defective legislation should be remedied; I believe that the law, as it stands now, should be repealed, and a measure introduced in accord with the spirit of fair-play and equal justice to all, but if the Government are determined not to introduce such a measure, let them leave the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario alone, and for that reason I support the amendment before the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 14th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from Mr. Justice Taschereau and Mr. Justice Gill, two of the judges appointed for the trial of election petitions, a certificate and report relating to the election for the electoral district of Laprairie, by which the election petition is dismissed and the sitting member declared duly elected.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir John Thompson: That Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, be read a second time; and the motion of Mr. Somerville in amendment thereto.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, the House has not yet adopted the principle of the Bill before us, and I again invite the attention of hon. gentlemen who have heretofore been disposed to give their support to this measure, to the consideration of some of its provisions. Before I proceed to refer to what I consider the objectionable features of the Bill, permit me to say a word or two with regard to the observations addressed to the House by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in reference to the amendment which my hon. friend proposed at an earlier period of this discussion. The hon. member for North Simcoe stated that he opposed the motion for a conference because he did not think that it was a matter that ought to originate with the minority in Parliament, stating that the conference which took place in England in 1884 had its origin with the majority, and that it was not possible for a majority to force such a conference upon the minority, much less for a minority to force such a conference upon the majority in the House. In that, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. If adopted at all, it must be a matter of mutual arrangement, to ascertain, by conversation and discussion in an unofficial and informal way, whether it is possible to find a common basis of agreement; and whether the proposition originates on this side of the House or on that is a matter of no consequence. What the House was called upon to consider, when that motion was before it, was whether it was a proper thing about which a conference should be had. In my opinion it was, and it did not matter with which side of the House the conference originated. The character of the conference, its propriety or importance, did not depend upon whether it originated with the Government or with the Opposition. It depended upon the principle itself. Sir, under the English parliamentary system there are two important functions performed by Parliament, which I have observed, in the discussion which has taken place in this House on this measure, have been frequently confused with each other. The one is the function which the Parliament of the United Kingdom has to perform as a constituent body; the other is the function which it has to perform as a legislative body. Now, these are wholly distinct. In some countries, under their constitutions, it is the practice to confer the powers of a constituent assembly on one body and the powers of a legislative assembly on another; but under the English parliamentary system, both functions are performed by Parliament. Nevertheless, they are distinct in their character, and it is important in the consideration of a measure of this kind, which pertains rather to the constituent than to the legislative functions of Parliament, that this distinction should be observed. There is a difference, too, to some extent in the procedure. If you look at the historical growth of the English constitutional system, you will find,

as M. Boutmy has observed in his admirable work on English constitutional law, that the constitution is made up of documents of four distinct characters, derived from four different sources. The one class may be denominated treaties, such as the understandings which took place between England and Scotland with a view of bringing about a union between the two countries; and the Acts passed by the Legislatures of both are in the nature of treaties. Then again, in the case of the union between England and Ireland, the Acts of Parliament passed in the respective Legislatures by which that union was consummated, are in the nature of treaties. They do not differ, except in their form, from the treaty obligations which are entered into between independent states, which remain separate after those obligations are perfected. Then there are treaty provisions, such as the Statute of Rutland passed after the conquest of Wales. It is true, Wales had not a voice, as an independent country would have, in entering into engagements with the Kings of England, yet that statute, which formed a permanent part of a plan of government and marked out the policy to be pursued by the Government of England in dealing with Wales, as an integral part of that country, was in the nature of a treaty. It was a condition imposed upon the conquered by the conquering party, and marked the limits within which the conqueror was to exercise the rights pertaining to him as such. Then there is another class of provisions in the English constitutional system, which may be designated as compacts. These have arisen from time to time for the enforcement of the customary law of the constitution; disputes have arisen between different departments of Government, and between the sovereign and the Parliament, and these compacts are the result or settlement of these disputes; and they determine the rights and the powers under the constitution as they are to be understood by both parties from that time forward. They are usually limitations upon the Royal power. The Great Charter is one, the Petition of Right is another, the Declaration of Rights, the Act of Settlement—all these are acts which may be regarded as compacts between the sovereign on one side or one department of Government, and the two Houses of Parliament upon the other. Then there are besides these, compacts between the parent state and dependencies, as for instance when the Parliament of England has declared it will not in the future impose a tax upon the colonies. These are compacts or solemn promises made by the superior body, but which the superior body is obliged to observe and the failure to observe which will morally—ethically, as Lord Salisbury would say—release the colony, as a matter of right, from its obligation to obey the superior authority of the parent state. Whatever it may do in that way afterwards is a matter of prudence rather than a matter of moral obligation. There are other compacts, as for instance the establishment of parliamentary government in the colonies. These may not be in the form of an Act of Parliament at all. They may be by an Order in Council, they may result from the regulation or policy of a particular department of Government; but when they are once recognized, they become a part of the constitutional law of the Empire, and are as much to be regarded as if they had been enacted by a body superior to all those which are to be bound by them. Now, that is a rule, I think, which is well recognized, and it is because the English system is in a large degree a system of government by understandings and by forbearance, that respect is due to all those provisions, which might, as a mere matter of technical law, be repealed or abrogated or amended or changed by the Imperial Parliament itself. But there are, besides the legal powers possessed by Parliament, the conventional regulations, which are as much entitled to respect, and which are as binding upon the Imperial Parliament as if they had been enacted by some convention of the nation at large, and placed beyond the control of the Imperial authority. There are in the English constitutional system a great many things which ought not to be disregarded. Any one who will look at the history of English parliamentary government in the United Kingdom will be struck with the very great and salutary influence which the two great universities of England have exercised over public life. Those institutions, in which men of different parties, men holding widely diverse public opinions are trained, where the men who are to lead rival parties are in their youth associated, have done not a little to hold the people of England together, and have controlled the acerbity which would otherwise grow up between parties in the heat of party conflict. They tend not a little to keep men together, who would otherwise be perhaps arrayed, not simply in political, but in military hostility. I am in favour of the English parliamentary system. I am in favour of that, not simply in form, but in spirit; and it is because I see that this measure is intended to depart widely from the spirit of the English parliamentary system and from what you may consider as English parliamentary life, that I deprecate it and ask the members of this House to reconsider what has been said in opposition to the measure before undertaking to give it their support. We departed very widely from this system in 1882. We radically changed the constitution and the political life of one province, an important province of this Dominion, the largest province of Confederation, and now you are about to intensify the wrong that was done ten years ago in that province, and you are proposing to extend that wrong to the next most important and most influential province in this Confederation. I say that it is impossible such a thing can be done without doing serious mischief. This is an act not simply of legislation, not simply of mistaken politics, but it is, in my opinion, an act of hostility to the English system of parliamentary government, and I ask the House, before it takes the serious step of approving of this measure by reading it the second time, to consider whither we are drifting in this proposed legislation. There are legitimate spheres of party warfare, there are legitimate matters on which parties may be divided, but when parties divide upon measures vitally affecting the constitution, it is not merely a difference of party or policy, it is a matter of revolution. We are entering upon a phase of revolution here. I do not know, if this measure is adopted, what may be the consequences; but I ask hon. gentlemen who are disposed to support it, seriously to consider its provisions, and I tell them that in my opinion it will be absolutely impossible to maintain this union if this policy of hostility, if this attempt on the part of one great party in the state to make war on the other party in the state be persevered in. While you may begin the con-

test by an intellectual fight in Parliament, it is very likely to grow to something far more serious than what the hon. gentlemen suppose it will when they seek to establish the permanent supremacy of one party over the other in the Government of the country. That is what is proposed. Now, let me say this, that when you look at questions of party government, I admit that in everything affecting departmental administration it is the function of Ministers of the Crown to propose to this House such legislation as they deem necessary to improve the efficiency of the various departments of the Government of which they are in charge, but in everything outside of that, in the ordinary sphere of legislation, the matter is in the hands of the House. The questions, under a healthy system of parliamentary government are open questions, and it is not only for every gentleman, whether he belongs to one party or to the other, to adopt such a line as his judgment approves of, but it is for every gentleman on the Treasury benches to take whatever line he may think necessary in regard to these measures. But there are a class of measures that do not fall within the lines of party policy or party divisions at all, and those are questions affecting the constitution itself. This is not a measure of governmental policy, constitutionally speaking. The law imposes a duty on Parliament after every decennial census; that duty devolves upon the House to equalize the representation; it is not a question which the Government may bring forward or may withhold; it is a duty not devolving upon the Administration, but upon Parliament, and it is for Parliament to say what legislation shall be had in accordance with the principles and the spirit of the constitution, and in accordance with the spirit and principles of the English parliamentary system. We have at the very forefront of our British North America Act, a declaration that it is desirable to establish a federal union of the provinces that will be, in principle, similar to the Government of the United Kingdom. That alludes, not to the character of the union, because the union is altogether different, it is radically different, but it alludes to the constitution of the Executive, it alludes to all those modes of procedure which are recognized as proper under the English parliamentary system. What is it that you adopt as the law of Parliament, as the rights and privileges of this House and the members of this House? You adopt the *lex parliamentii* of the Parliament at Westminster. That is what you have done, and you have so far introduced the law of Parliament of the United Kingdom as the law of Parliament in this country. Do you stop there? No, in every change of your constitution, in every act that belongs to a constituent assembly as distinct from a legislative assembly, you are supposed to follow out the practice principles, and the spirit of the system which prevails in the mother country, and, unless you do that, you do not preserve the life of parliamentary government here and you cannot preserve the life of parliamentary government in this country. Let me say a word or two in regard to an observation which has been made in reference to the representation in cities. I do not myself think that large cities are entitled to full representation according to population, for reasons which have been recognized by public men and by public writers in the United Kingdom, and, although I supported the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I am not supposed to adopt every minute detail which that motion embraced. Its large and general features I accept, and I recognize, subject to other considerations which I shall mention, the propriety of making the electoral districts approximately equal. But with regard to large cities the rule is somewhat different. The larger cities of this Dominion, like the larger cities in other countries where there are no legal impediments put in the way, not only elect those who are residents of the city to represent themselves, but supply a large number of representatives to outlying districts. It has been said here that in this matter these representatives in no sense represent the city, that the outlying districts are not obliged to have them, that they might elect other representatives, and that they leave to the members for the cities everything pertaining to the special interest of the cities. I do not accept that statement. I have no doubt that those who make it make it with unquestioned sincerity, but I beg to say that, whenever a special measure is introduced affecting the interests of the city, while those who are its special representatives are supposed to be the foremost in promoting that measure, every member who is a resident of the city, although he may represent another constituency on the floor of this House, is not indifferent to the interests of that constituency, but on the contrary feels a lively interest in everything which concerns it. Thus the city has on the floor of Parliament a strength and influence beyond that which its own representatives proper could give it. Let me read a sentence or two from a speech made by Mr. Gladstone in 1884 in which he refers to this subject:

"I am certainly disposed to admit that very large and closely concentrated populations need not have quite so high a proportional share in the representation of the country as rural and dispersed populations, because the actual political power in these concentrated masses is sharper, quicker and more vehement."

I take that to be a sound proposition. Any one's observation will convince him that it is true, and, that being so, if you undertake to give representation to every city to the full in proportion to its population, if it be a large city you will unduly increase its influence beyond that of any other section of equal population in the country. Suppose Montreal were represented by nine members and Toronto by eight, seventeen in all, is it not obvious that these cities would have under ordinary circumstances absolute control, if they chose to combine, over any Administration that it was possible or probable could be established? That being so, I think you unduly represent those cities if you represent them to the full measure to which they would be entitled according to population. This feature was observed in England. It is true, as was stated by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that there was taken into consideration there the aggregate population of the boroughs, that the same unit was used in determining the representation of the boroughs as the representation of the rural districts. That unit was something like 54,000 people. But there were a great many borough constituencies between the population of 15,000 and 54,000. All that were over 15,000 were allowed to remain, so that you have in the United Kingdom a large number of borough constituencies with a population between 15,000 and 54,000, and the result is that, having given them a member through having a population below the average

unit, you will find that, when the larger city constituencies are dealt with, they are as much above the unit which was taken as the average for a borough constituency. My hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), in discussing the question, said that the measure of 1882 was a very bad measure. I agree with him in that, and I thank him for his candid admission. But I was disappointed that, after he made that admission, he expressed himself as being unwilling to undo the wrong that had been done. A wrong had been done, there is no question about that. The whole principle of historical continuity was broken in upon was invaded. Constituencies were cut adrift from their moorings, and in fact anything like a permanent relation beyond ten years between the member and the constituency, could not well be established. My hon. friend admitted that the principle was vicious, that it was unjustifiable, but he was not willing to follow up his convictions by the logical consequence which flows from them, that is, to undo the mischief that had been done, to retrace our steps, and to get back again to a proper and healthful basis. Then there was the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey); he said that he disapproved of the Bill, that he had examined it, and there was nothing in it that he could approve of. He admitted that it was bad, he admitted that the principle on which Parliament had proceeded was vicious, and yet he declared that were he in the House at the time in all probability he would have supported the measure—bad as it was, that he would have preferred his fealty to his party under those circumstances to fidelity to his convictions. Well, Sir, I very much regret that observation; I very much regret that the hon. gentleman, after admitting that the measure is bad, is not prepared to undo the wrong that has been done, that he is not prepared to insist that justice shall be paramount to every other consideration, and that justice shall be done to the Province of Ontario and to the electors of Ontario in dealing with the subject of redistribution. Then, Sir, there was the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). The hon. member said that a wrong had been done in 1882, but he thought that while we were not to go further in that wrong direction, we ought to stand upon that as a foundation, and that for the future we should treat the Act of 1882 as permanent.

Mr. COCKBURN. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me till I put him right? I did not say that a gross wrong had been done in 1882; but I took the ground that if a wrong had been done in 1882, that as the hon. member for Bothwell was so anxious to have continuity in public life, and as we had had this continuity in public life during the last three general elections, being during one-half of our national existence since Confederation, I thought under the circumstances it was better to accept that platform as it has existed for ten years, and not to disturb this continuity of which my hon. friend was so much enamoured; and that if there were any blunders in the measure we could rectify them in committee. Nay, more; I said that I held myself perfectly free to act on each case as it came up; but I never took the ground that a gross outrage had been perpetrated in 1882, as the member for Bothwell has now misrepresented.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, the hon. member is further afield than I supposed him. The hon. member, however, still contends that the principle of historic continuity is an important principle in parliamentary government. The hon. gentleman will have to make a motion to have that portion of his speech struck out of the Debates before he can lay down any other doctrine now. The hon. gentleman said just what I have attributed to him, that we must start from the measure of 1882 as a basis for permanency. The hon. gentleman says there have been ten years of this. What is the hon. gentleman's notion of the life of a state? Is the life of a state to be measured by ten, or twenty, or by fifty years? Why, Sir, I suppose that if we were to adopt the principle of continuity and permanency we must have something approaching to permanency in the constituencies, and we cannot have permanency in the constituencies where you do an injustice so gross that it would justify resistance. The hon. gentleman says that the English parliamentary system is representative of interests. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. Interests are, perhaps, incidentally represented, but the basis of English representation is the division into borough and rural constituencies. The permanency of county divisions, in so far as the growth of cities will permit them to be permanent, is sought to be maintained, because the county is the unit, and the county always must be the unit if any regard is to be had to the proper principles of historical continuity. When it was contended, during the passage of the Reform Bill in 1832, that the principle of the representation of interests should be regarded, there was a declaration made then by a very distinguished member of the House of Commons that if you were to have representation of interests, care should be taken that no interest should be sufficiently powerful to control the action of Parliament. Now, every one will see that where the great mass of our population are a rural population engaged in the pursuit of agriculture, there can be no such a division of Parliament by a representation of interests as to prevent the agricultural interest, if it chooses, to assert its supremacy and to maintain that supremacy in Parliament, and there can be nothing approaching a representation of interests as the hon. gentleman has delineated. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), in the speech which he addressed to the House on this subject, complained that there was a disposition shown on this side not to submit to government by majority. The hon. gentleman said that the majority ought to govern, and that we were seeking to render parliamentary government impossible by the course we were pursuing with regard to this measure. What the hon. gentleman said with regard to government by majority, is right and proper as it applies to ordinary legislation; but there are circumstances when a minority cannot yield to a majority. Everything depends upon the object that the majority have in view, whether it is in accord with the original compact which lies at the very foundation of the state, upon which the state itself reposes, and without regard to which the state cannot possibly exist. When these principles are invaded and disregarded, then the observations of the hon. gentleman on that subject can have no meaning. Let me read, for the information of the

hon. gentleman, an extract from a speech made by Lord Salisbury on the 6th May last, and addressed to the Primrose League. I do not at all agree with the application of these observations that were made by Lord Salisbury in that speech ; I think they were altogether misapplied ; but as to the soundness of the abstract propositions themselves, as to the force of the constitutional doctrine which he enunciated, I think that the hon. gentleman will not be disposed to question it. Now, Lord Salisbury in that speech said this :

"I am a Tory, yet I cannot accept in all their width these doctrines of unrestricted passive obedience. I believe that the title both of Kings and of Parliaments to the obedience of their subjects is that these Kings and Parliaments should observe the fundamental laws and fundamental understandings of the compact by which they rule. Parliament has the right to govern the people of Ulster. It has not a right to sell them into slavery; and I do not believe in the unlimited, the unrestricted power of Parliament, any more than I do in the unrestricted power of Kings. Parliaments, like Kings, may take a course which, while it is technically within the legal limits of their attribution, yet is entirely at variance and in conflict with the understanding of the institutions by which they rule. James II forgot that law. He stepped outside his attributions. He stepped outside the limits of the spirit of the constitution, and we know how the people of Ulster met him. If a similar abuse of power, be it on the part of a Parliament, or on the part of a King, should ever occur at any future time, I do not believe that the people of Ulster have lost their sturdy love of freedom or their detestation of arbitrary power. But these things are decided, not on ethical considerations, which are difficult to apply to such a question. They are usually decided by the consideration whether the resistance is likely to succeed."

This is the doctrine of revolution as reserved by the principles of the constitution, reaffirmed and clearly set out by the Prime Minister of England. Does the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) repudiate these doctrines? Does the hon. gentleman undertake to say that they are not sound, that these are revolutionary principles, that this is a speech emanating from one who is sowing the seeds of discord and propagating principles of treason amongst the people of the United Kingdom? My hon. friend will not go that far. He may entirely agree with Lord Salisbury ; I do not. I think his doctrines altogether misapplied ; but as to the soundness of the constitutional doctrine, and as to the propriety of the doctrine when a fitting case arises, when Parliament disregards its powers and instead of using them for the public good undertakes to employ them for the purpose of establishing the ascendancy of a party, when it is using those powers for an altogether improper purpose there can be no two opinions ; and so the hon. gentleman will see that whether we ought to listen to the doctrine he preached to us the other day depends wholly on the character of the measure we have before us. When that is not a measure of legislation, but when it is a measure of injustice, introduced as in this Bill by the leaders of a majority for the purpose of tying hand and foot not only the minority in this House, but tying hand and foot the electors of this country and preventing the expression of public opinion except in one way, then there is such gross abuse that it is not only our right, but it is our duty, to avail ourselves of all means which the constitution has placed at our disposal for the purpose of preventing so improper a measure ever becoming a portion of the law of this country. That is my contention, and those are the doctrines which have been laid down in the speech from which I have read an extract delivered by Lord Salisbury. It is quite true that Lord Salisbury overlooked the fact that Ireland at one time had an independent Parliament ; that it had delegated away its authority to the United Kingdom without giving the people an opportunity of saying whether they approved of it or not ; and if his doctrines were applied to the Union Act of 1800 between Ireland and the United Kingdom it would scatter its provisions to the fourwinds of Heaven. There is no question as to that. The revolutionary rule laid down is a proper rule of law ; the only question is as to the propriety of its application. Sir, the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) addressed to this House a very extraordinary speech. He said we have recommended to us here the propriety of adopting the counties as permanent divisions of the territories of the various provinces, and the hon. gentleman said we had nothing to do with the counties or as regards the minor municipalities, that they are provincial divisions, and it is very well for the Local Legislatures to take those into consideration when they are dividing up the provinces for provincial objects, but the Parliament of Canada has only to deal with the provinces as a unit. I do not admit this doctrine at all. Under the English parliamentary system, as Mr. Palgraves says in his work, "The English Commonwealth," the municipal divisions are older than the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom is not itself a unit subdivided into municipalities, but it is an aggregation of those municipalities which previously existed, combined into a state. There is such a thing as the organic life of a state ; and what I am pressing on the attention of this House is the propriety of preserving that organic life in that state with which we have to deal, Canada. There are the minor municipalities, there are county municipalities, there are the provinces. The provinces are built up by an aggregation of those minor municipalities, and the Dominion of Canada is a state resulting from the union of these provinces, and you can never carry out your constitutional system satisfactorily if you undertake to divide this Dominion on any other lines than those by which it is subdivided under our constitutional system. You have the provinces, and the counties, and the cities, and then the minor municipalities, and all these must be respected, if you are to get anything like historical continuity, if you are to preserve the political organism of that state designated Canada. Sir, let me read a sentence from a speech made by Lord Carnarvon when he was introducing this measure, the British North America Act, to the consideration of the House of Lords. He said, speaking of the House of Commons of Canada :

"The House of Commons will not indeed be the representation of mere numbers distributed equally in electoral districts ; but whilst population is made the basis of representation, each province will have its own number of representatives in proportion to its own population."

The principle recognized in our constitution is not equal electoral districts, it is representation between the provinces, as provinces in this House, in proportion to population. If there had been a desire to establish the principle of equal electoral districts there was no necessity of alluding to provinces at all, because if you were to divide the Dominion of Canada into districts of equal population, each province would have representation by population. But it was in order to give to each province representation by population, and to leave the districts

to be made such as local circumstances required, that we have a provision in our constitution in the form in which it stands. One hon. gentleman has referred to the gerrymandering of the Province of Ontario by Mr. Mowat. Well, that subject has been discussed and I need not allude to it, and even if it has not been discussed I do not think it necessary that I should now allude to it. I am not called upon here to discuss the propriety or impropriety of the course taken by the Prime Minister or by the Legislature in Ontario or in any other province of this Dominion, any more than I am in respect to the states of the United States on the Gulf of Mexico. We have nothing to do with that here. As a voter of the Province of Ontario I may use my influence to secure a fair division, and I may use my influence against any Government or against any party undertaking to make an unfair division. There is the proper place for me to discuss that question, and what I have to do here is to consider the propriety of the plan of representation that is submitted to this House. We are not called upon to travel outside of our own case. We are not called upon to consider it, with a view of censuring or of approving what has been done elsewhere, except in so far as we intend that it shall afford a proper guide to us that will throw light upon the question with which we are called upon to deal. Now, Sir, I do not admit that what the members of the Local Legislature may do shall have any control over us here. What we are called upon to consider here is the measure before us. I am called upon to consider that measure upon its merits, and if hon. gentlemen are adopting a proper measure, let it be defended upon its merits and show that it is one demanded in the public interest, let it be shown that it is the best division and one calculated to secure to this House from every possible point of view the best representation that can be had for the people of Canada on the floor of Parliament. It is from that point of view that I endeavoured, when I addressed the House before, and that I am endeavouring to-day to discuss this question. I am not appealing to the party interests or to the party prejudices of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House or that. I appeal to hon. gentlemen's love of the English constitutional system, and I am asking them to give to that parliamentary system a fair trial upon this continent. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that, in 1882, you departed radically from that system, you are not giving that system a fair trial, you are not adopting a policy that is calculated to secure in this House the fairest representation of the people of this country, and until you do return to the rule laid down in 1872 by the hon. gentlemen who then led that side of the House, you cannot have permanency and you cannot safely ignore the rights of those whose rights have been invaded. I am speaking, Sir, not merely of the Liberal party who have been wronged by the measure of 1882, but I am speaking of the whole of the country that has been wronged by the adoption of a measure that is calculated to degrade political life here, that is calculated to engender political bitterness and to make public life more disagreeable than it otherwise would be, disagreeable though it may be at the best. One hon. gentleman told us that if we adopted the principle that has been enunciated from this side of the House it would be necessary to change 74 constituencies. I do not care how many it may be necessary to change.

I do not care though it were necessary to change every constituency in this country; what I ask is, that we shall get back to a proper basis, and that basis was the one laid down in 1872. In the Province of Ontario alone, by the measure of 1882, there were changed 55 constituencies. Is it for an hon. gentleman who took part in the support of that measure and who insisted upon making these changes, to say that now, a measure that is to be extended to the whole Dominion and to place matters upon a satisfactory basis, will change 19 constituencies more. Well, I do not care to argue that question further because the hon. gentleman will see that the process is a very simple one. Why, I will venture to say that if we agree upon a rule, it would be possible for the gentlemen on that side of the House who sit on the Treasury benches, and it would be possible for half a dozen gentlemen on this side of the House to meet in committee and to agree within twenty-four hours as to every change that was required between the Atlantic and the Pacific in the Dominion of Canada. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) said, in discussing the constitutional question as to the extent of our power to deal with this subject, that it would show distrust in Parliament if any such limitation existed upon our powers. Why, Sir, every constitutional check, every constitutional guarantee, found in any plan of government, in that sense shows distrust. People who have regard for their privileges, and who wish to maintain their rights, generally take an interest in the adoption of these precautions which reason and experience show to be necessary for the protection of their liberties. The federal system is from beginning to end a system of checks and guarantees, and, that being so, you cannot attack the principle of limitations without attacking the whole system. We have on that side of the House two views presented to us as to the provisions of the constitution in this particular—the one enunciated by the hon. Minister of Justice, and the other by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey). The hon. Minister of Justice maintained that under the 91st section the power to legislate for the peace, order and good government of Canada conferred upon us the power to legislate upon this subject; that it was from that section that we derived our powers, and that the 51st section of the Act, while it enabled us to proceed in another way, did not impose upon us the duty of proceeding in the way that that section provided. Let us say with regard to this argument that the hon. Minister of Justice, it seems to me, has overlooked altogether that section 91 makes provision for ordinary legislative power. Section 91 does not deal with this Parliament as a constituent body. It does not confer upon this House any constituent power. From the beginning to the end, section 91 deals solely with the ordinary legislative functions of Parliament, and with the ordinary legislative functions of Parliament alone. The constituent powers that are conferred upon this House are conferred under other sections, and they are extremely limited, and limited for this reason, that this Dominion is the result of a compact. In the creation of that compact it was necessary to put very great restrictions upon any constituent power which the Parliament of Canada might be vested with. Let me read a short extract from the speech made by Lord

Carnarvon, which points out very strongly the origin of the Parliament of Canada. He says:

"The Conference of Charlottetown was adjourned to Quebec, and there in the month of October those resolutions were drawn up which have since become famous under the name of the Quebec resolutions, and which, with some slight changes, form the basis of the measure which I have now the honour to submit to Parliament. To those resolutions all the British provinces in North America were, as I have said, consenting parties, and the measure founded upon them must be accepted as a treaty of union."

And so, when separate and distinct political communities enter into an arrangement by which for certain purposes they are to become one community, it is very important that the terms of the union should be carefully set out, and that the state created by that union should not be departed from in a way that would seriously interfere with any of the rights or conditions which were terms precedent to the union. In section 41 of the British North America Act, we shall see some of the constituent powers of this Parliament. Section 91 deals only with legislative powers, and in no sense deals with any constituent functions. Section 41 says that until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provide, all laws which at the union relative to the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the Assembly of Canada, the qualifications or disqualifications of voters, and so forth, shall be the law until it is altered by the Parliament of Canada. Then our power to deal with the question of the franchise is not provided for in section 91, but in another section; and so with regard to every provision of a constituent character. If you look at section 92, you will find that the very first provision there is one conferring upon the Local Legislature the powers of a constituent assembly, namely, the amendment from time to time, notwithstanding anything in this Act, of the constitution of the province, except as regards the office of Lieutenant Governor. You have no provision of that sort in section 91, nothing approaching it—why? Because the powers which remained to each province were under control of the province as they were before the Union. Because the province, in altering its constitution in any of these particulars, thus exercising the functions of a constituent assembly, was not injuring any of the other members of the confederacy. But that rule does not apply to this Parliament, upon which restrictions are imposed with regard to its constituent functions which do not exist with reference to the Legislature of any province. Thus you find that in section 17 it is provided that there shall be but one Parliament for Canada. This is really a limitation on your powers of delegation. You cannot delegate to any other body any of the powers given to you in section 91; you cannot call into existence any municipal body as the Local Legislatures can. They have power to delegate to the municipal bodies any portion of their functions. But this Parliament cannot do so, because it is said in section 17 that there shall be but one Parliament. Wherever we examine the Act, we find restrictions imposed upon this Parliament which do not exist in the case of the Local Legislatures. There is a provision that there shall be yearly sessions of this Parliament, that more than twelve months shall not intervene between one session and another. There is a provision creating the Senate for the protection of sectional interests, as Lord Carnarvon said. Section 37 defines the House of Commons, providing how many members shall come from each province, and in that respect gives effect to what had been already agreed upon. It carries out in this respect the terms of the treaty to which the various provinces were parties before this Act became law. Then, it is said in section 40 that until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall have a certain number of members. Well, we have pointed out on this side of the House how the Parliament of Canada might otherwise provide. It must provide in accordance with section 51, and not otherwise; it cannot provide in any other way. Then, in section 48, we are told that at least 20 members are necessary to form a quorum of the House of Commons. I apprehend that we could increase our quorum to forty if we thought proper, but we could not make it less than 20. So, under section 52, we might increase the number of members for Quebec and the other provinces, regulating the representation by population; but we could not diminish the number. So you will find everywhere throughout the Act the constituent powers of this Parliament are defined and limited as to how they are to be exercised; but the legislative powers are unrestricted, except where they are limited by the exclusive grant of legislative powers to another body. Now, let us look at section 51. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) told us that that section had reference to the readjustment of the representation of the different provinces, and not to redistribution—it was not in regard to redistribution but to readjustment. Now, there is but one meaning to readjustment, and that is redistribution; there is no way of giving effect to readjustment except by redistribution. Until the number of districts is marked out, you have no readjustment. It is not readjustment to say that Ontario is entitled to 92, and Quebec to 65. The meaning of readjustment is the location of the members you grant, and this is shown not only by a proper construction of the Act, but by the very terms and provisions of the Quebec resolutions, upon which the Act itself is based. Let me read a few of these sections. Article 17 provides for the number of members for each province. Article 18 says:

"Until the official census of 1871 has been made up, there shall be no change in the number of representatives from the several sections."

Article 19 says:

"Immediately after the completion of the census of 1871, and immediately after every decennial census thereafter, the representation from each section in the House of Commons shall be readjusted on the basis of population."

How readjusted? Readjusted by stating that there shall be 92 members in Ontario and 65 in Quebec? Not at all. Readjusted by saying where the 92 in Ontario are to be placed, the districts from which the election is to take place, and until the constituencies are defined there is no readjustment. I will not detain the House by reading all the sections, but the further reading of them shows, because they are embraced in this section 51, that the provisions of this section 51 are all contained in those articles. Now, let me call attention in the first place to the earlier portion of this section:

"On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation

of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such manner, and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides."

Now, what is this readjustment which is to take place after every census? Is it to ascertain the number of members to which each province is entitled and nothing more? Why, the manner of doing that is marked out in this same section a little further on, and there is no necessity to instruct a body of men to ascertain it. And that is contradicted by sub-section 5:

"Such readjustment shall not take effect."

What is the meaning of these words: "shall not take effect." Do they mean that there shall be no Act passed? What is the meaning of giving effect to the readjustment? Why, the words following in that sub-section, "until the termination of the then existing Parliament" show that the taking of effect is the dissolution of Parliament and the election thereon. Now, there cannot be an election on a readjustment in the sense my hon. friend mentions. Let me read the section:

"Such readjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing Parliament."

If my hon. friend is right in his contention that readjustment simply means the determination of the number of members to be elected by each province, then by the words "take effect" would be meant the legislation to follow from that, but that is clearly shown not to be the meaning, because it says it shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing Parliament. It is as clear as noonday that the taking effect means the election that follows upon the dissolution or the readjustment. The hon. gentleman cannot say that the legislation shall not be had until after the dissolution, for that would be nonsense, then the taking of effect must mean something else, and that other meaning is that there shall be no election or need not be. "Such readjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing Parliament." There is no word of redistribution, from the beginning to the end of this Act, in the sense in which the hon. gentleman uses the expression. The word "readjustment" is used, and used to mean that legislation which is necessary to give effect to the actual representation required upon the census being taken. Now, at this moment where is the body that has to ascertain the number of members to which each province is entitled? Why, we ascertain that fact ourselves. We are to determine the manner in which this distribution is to be applied, and we are to create the body to whom instructions may be given; and where do we get the idea embodied in this? Why, from the English Parliament in 1832, in 1867, and in 1884. On each occasion provision was made for the creation of a commission, an authority, to whom instruction was given determining the manner in which the constituencies were to be created. Parliament determined the manner, and the commission gave effect to that determination of Parliament in a report which was made to Parliament. When we look at the English practice, when we see what has been done in England on three different occasions within this century, and when we look at the provisions of this Act and the provisions of the Quebec resolutions which this Act embodied, we see exactly what the Act was intended to mean. If there was any doubt in the words of the Act itself, and I do not see that there is or ought to be, then the surrounding circumstances, looking at what was done in England, show us what was the authority it was intended to create and what were the functions that authority was intended to perform, the manner in which these functions were to be performed, whether you shall have equal electoral districts or counties as the basis of redistribution. That is a matter which you are to determine by instructions to your authority; and when the authority is created, and when you determine the manner and time, then they may report to you, and you may legislate with the view of giving effect to what they have done. That, I take it, is what is intended by the provisions of this Act. I maintain, therefore, that there can be no readjustment except by redistribution. The readjustment is the act of redistribution, and until there is redistribution there is no readjustment; and you are not to give effect to that readjustment until the close of Parliament. How do you give effect to it after the close of Parliament? By having an election upon the readjustment. If the readjustment was not the redistribution, then these words would have no meaning. As they are, I think they are perfectly clear, and they show why the readjustment is to take place and the manner in which it is to be brought about. I have just a word or two more to say to show why we cannot take the gerrymander of 1882 as the basis for future action. It seems to me, if we are to have anything like permanency, we must have the counties as the basis of representation. If a county grows in population during 10 years so as to entitle it to an additional member, then it is the whole county which is divided; and the increased population, not in some one part but in the whole county, becomes the unit for another representative. But if you were to undertake to make the divisions of 1882 the basis, you could only have permanency upon the assumption that a division was not to have another member at all until it has a sufficient population to entitle it to another. I take the case of the County of Simcoe. That county at this moment is entitled by population to another representative, and it is not fairly dealt with unless it is given another, but if you were to take some one of the divisions of Simcoe as the basis, how are you going to determine where the new representative is to be placed? You unite the three counties and divide the three into four. The unit is the county, it is not the electoral division or the riding. But, if you take the division of 1882, of any one of the constituencies, you have no proper basis because, except perhaps in the city of Toronto, there is not a single division that has grown to such an extent as to entitle it to an additional member, and you have no means of applying the provisions of the British North America Act which authorize you to give to each province a representation in proportion to its numbers. That representation may be scattered over 20 counties or divisions. Are you going to put the whole 20 into one and redivide them into 21? Every one will see who considers the subject for a moment that there is no proper basis for permanency, and no proper principle for redivision unless you treat the county as a unit which may be divided into ridings, two when necessary, three when necessary, four when necessary, and by so doing you will give to the province a fair representation without a serious disturbance of the various

constituencies. Every one will know when the census is taken what particular portion of each province will be entitled to the additional representation. It will be as well known out of Parliament as in Parliament. The act of Parliament will be a mere matter of form. Whether you accept our interpretation or act upon your own, no injustice will be done and something like historical continuity in the several constituencies will be preserved. I trust hon. gentlemen opposite will not be disposed to press by a mechanical majority the provisions of this measure upon the House with a view of securing their adoption as law. It seems to me that the measure is arbitrary, it is unjust, it is framed in the interests of a party and not in the public interest, and it is a serious blow at British parliamentary government in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am very loth to intervene before the vote is taken upon the resolution, but I cannot allow the debate to close without calling attention to the provisions of the Bill, more especially as they affect the province from which I come. I promise the House that my observations will not be directed to the readjustments in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, which have been so thoroughly discussed by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me with personal knowledge of the facts, and, therefore, with more perspicuity and lucidity than I could hope to do. In justice, however, to my hon. friends opposite who have referred to the constitutional argument advanced the other day, I think I should refer to that question before referring to the details of the measure as to the Province of Prince Edward Island. The Minister of Justice, in replying to that contention, agreed substantially with the first proposition which we advanced, namely, that this Parliament has no inherent power to legislate upon this subject, but that its powers are to be found in and are controlled by the British North America Act. Starting with that proposition, both sides of the House have to ascertain from the words of that Act, and not by comparison with other bodies having inherent powers, how far we are to go and where we are to stop. It is also agreed by the Minister of Justice, if I understood his argument correctly, that section 51 would justify the construction we contend for, and that a plan of readjustment based on that construction would be strictly legal and within the terms of the Act; but that hon. gentleman went on to contend two things, first, that a construction had been to some extent placed upon that section by the action of Parliament in 1872 and 1882, and that this House would be largely guided in coming to a conclusion as to the construction of the section by the construction placed upon it by those previous Parliaments. I do not wish to underrate any importance which any hon. gentleman may give to an argument of that kind. To my mind it has not very great weight. I would be prepared to contest the proposition that the construction put on a section of the constitutional Act by one Parliament necessarily binds a subsequent Parliament, or that it is in any sense or way a controlling construction. I would be prepared to give reasonable weight to that construction, especially if attention had been called to it in the previous Parliament, but the action of the Parliaments in 1872 and 1882 was taken, not in view of the contention now before the House, but in view of a general feeling which existed and was not challenged, that Parliament had these unlimited powers. The Minister of Justice then found himself driven to look at other parts of the Act, and he came to the conclusion—hastily, I think; at all events it is one in which his legal confrères have not supported him—that such powers as we are attempting to exercise could be found under the 91st section, under the general power given to Parliament to legislate for the peace, order and good government of Canada. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. gentleman from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) have, I think, effectually disposed of that argument, because they have shown that the powers we are attempting to exercise come to us by virtue of specific clauses of the British North America Act, and, if we attempt to exercise specific powers under specific provisions of the Act, we cannot revert to a general section and say that the general section controls the specific powers given under a specific section. That was tacitly assented to by the hon. gentleman from Albert (Mr. Weldon) and the hon. gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey). They did not attempt to say that the argument of the Minister of Justice was one which would find favour in a court of law. These powers are given to us by the specific sections, and the general words used with reference to powers of legislation enumerated and others akin to them cannot override the specific words of the section under which we derive these powers. But the hon. gentleman from Cumberland and the hon. gentleman from Albert submitted to the House that there was another construction which this section would bear, and they submitted with a good deal of ingenuity an argument which would relieve us of our difficulty, and it amounted to this: that this section related entirely to state rights, that it entirely related to the readjustment between the provinces *qua* the provinces, and had nothing to do with the division of the districts. The first thing that struck my mind when that argument was presented was that that could not be true because the readjustment of the representation as between the provinces is not a matter which is in any sense or way left to the discretion of Parliament, because the readjustment as between the provinces—the number that Quebec shall have and the number that the other provinces each shall have—is a matter arbitrarily fixed by the sub-sections of the section under discussion. The broad words we are discussing are contained in the main branch of the section which declares that such distribution shall take place under such authority, in such manner and at such time as Parliament shall determine, necessarily implying a large and unlimited discretion on the part of Parliament of the principles under which the distribution is to be made. But the hon. gentleman will not contend that there is any discretion given to this Parliament as to the number of representatives which Quebec shall have, or which any other province shall have. That is arbitrarily fixed by the sub-section, and therefore he is driven to this position, that to maintain his argument he must omit the words, or fail to give any meaning to the words, which are the most important words of the section, namely, "In such manner as the Parliament of Canada provides." I admit that he was very frank and honest in that, for, when an hon. gentleman on this side challenged him, "What meaning do you

give to these words?" he said, "For the moment I am unable to give any meaning." Now, I want to submit this to the hon. gentleman, that if there are two constructions of a statute, one of which involves the omission of the important words in that statute, and one of which is consistent with the maintenance of those words, which construction must prevail? That which is consistent with giving effect to every word in the statute. That is a canon of construction which the hon. gentleman must recognize as correct, and which we all apply every day to the construction of statutes. Now, if his construction necessarily involves the excision of the most important words of this section, he must give it up and adopt the construction which gives effect to every word in the section. Well, that would seem to me to dispose of it, but I want to point out to him—repeating my argument, for we jury lawyers are very apt to do that—that while the construction he contends for cannot be true, inasmuch as the readjustment between the provinces and the fixing of the numbers are arbitrarily provided by the five sub-sections of the Act, the main sub-section of the Act which we are discussing, gives, we all agree, an unlimited discretion to Parliament to determine the manner in which the readjustment shall take place. There is no limitation as to the discretion Parliament shall exercise with reference to the manner in which they may determine this readjustment shall take place. You have absolutely unlimited power. You may declare that it may be by population; you may declare that it shall be by the boundaries of townships or the boundaries of counties; you may lay down any proposition you like, but that proposition must be a general one and affect all the provinces, and not an arbitrary one affecting only one province. That is the underlying principle of the section. Now, the hon. gentleman sees that the Imperial Parliament, when they intended to confer that discretion, used words which do not admit of any other construction: "in the manner which Parliament shall provide;" so that you are directed and enjoined to exercise a discretion, but you are not enjoined, or directed, or allowed—if the hon. gentleman will permit me to use the word—to exercise discretion as to the number of members which each province shall have. That is arbitrarily fixed. Therefore these words cannot refer to that, they must refer to something else; and, therefore, if this section is open to two constructions, one of which necessarily compels you to omit the most important words of the section, and the other gives effect to them, which construction would the hon. gentleman, as a lawyer, adopt? I know that his answer will be the latter if given as a lawyer, pure and simple. Now, there is another point that I think must have some weight with other minds as it has had some weight with mine. When I came to look at the section for which this is substituted, what did I find? I found it was substituted for a section providing for a readjustment of the boundaries of the districts which members were to represent. The original Quebec resolutions provided that those boundaries should be readjusted by the several provinces. That was taken away. I do not want to go over this argument again.

Mr. WELDON. If the hon. gentleman will refer to Cartwright's Annotations he will find he makes that rule 23 refer to an entirely different matter. He takes a different view altogether from that of the hon. member.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not see the comments which the hon. gentleman says are made by that text writer. I am referring to the language itself. I do not see that it can bear any doubt. Section 24 reads as follows:—

"The Legislature of each province shall divide such province into the proper number of constituencies and define the boundaries of each of them."

I do not care what anybody says, that is as plain as the noonday sun to me. There may be doubts about section 51, as my hon. friend and his associates differ from me, but there can be no doubt about the meaning of section 23: "The Legislature of each province shall divide such province into the proper number of constituencies and define the boundaries."

Mr. DICKEY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if that does not satisfy him that at the time the Quebec resolutions were under discussion, there was a particular definition of the redistribution of seats between the different sections?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, it satisfies me that the intention of the framers of the Quebec resolutions was to relegate to the different provinces a certain right which prevented them from being swamped, prevented their rights from being invaded. I think the object was to give Quebec, for instance, a power which she would hold in her own hands to prevent the dominant majority here from overriding her rights. I think that is the object, myself. Then the other section provided for a readjustment.

Mr. DICKEY. The terms readjustment and redistribution were quite distinct at that time in the Quebec resolutions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman uses the terms "readjustment and redistribution," but there is no such word as redistribution used in either Act; that is a new phrase which was not used then.

Mr. WELDON. Used for convenience now, that is all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, used for convenience now. But the hon. gentleman is aware that the number of members each province was to send to Parliament was always fixed by a hard and fast mathematical rule. My argument to the House is this, that there is no discretion vested in this Parliament as to the number of members which shall represent Quebec or represent Ontario. That is fixed by an arbitrary rule with mathematical precision contained in certain sub-sections of this Act, so that no words implying discretion in this Parliament can apply to that. That is my argument, right or wrong, and I tried to enforce it by saying that this substituted section which does give discretion to this Parliament to readjust the boundaries of districts, is substituted for a section which vested that same power in a Provincial Legislature. Now, that is the whole argument. My learned friend besides me (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) has so thoroughly and so exhaustively covered the ground this afternoon that many of my notes upon that branch of the case are unnecessary, and I feel I would be merely repeating, in weaker language, the argument he has used. But I will submit this: It does seem to me, and I say it with all deference, that if I am right as to the mere meaning of

the word readjust, then it bears a clearer meaning when applied to the boundaries of the districts than when used with reference to the redistributing the number of members amongst the several provinces. For instance, it seems to me, and I concur in the argument which the hon. member for Bothwell presented, that readjustment necessarily involves redistribution. You cannot take away or add to the number of members for any province without readjusting the boundaries of the districts in that province. Applying the argument to what you are doing here to-day, you are taking away some seats from New Brunswick. How do you do it? You do it by readjusting the boundaries of the existing districts. You are taking away one from Nova Scotia. How do you do it? By combining two districts together, Queen's and Shelburne. So that readjustment necessarily involves redistribution. To my mind it does seem to me almost conclusive. When I come to find out the reasons why it should be so, I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that must have been the intention of the Imperial Parliament, because I say experience has shown, and the confessions which have fallen from the lips of hon. gentlemen opposite justify me in saying, that if we have this power we have misused it so much in the past that we ought never to have had it. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and others admit that this gerrymander of 1882 was akin to an infamous measure, and they cannot and will not justify it. I do not think it was ever intended that a dominant majority in this House should have the power to legislate away the rights of a minority in any one province, and if you have the power you contend for now, you can do that. Now, I want to say a word or two about the important resolution before the House. That resolution asks the House to affirm the proposition that the adjustment to be made after the census of 1891 should be confined to those provinces where it is rendered actually necessary by the increase or loss of population. I understand that this House does not want to interfere more than is absolutely necessary with existing boundaries and the representation of Ontario and Quebec. If it is necessary to take a member away from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island, and give one to another place, let that be done; but beyond what is absolutely necessary, let us stay our hand. Do you want to raise the heartburnings which prevailed after the last decennial census? Do you want to have this country for the next year or two thrown into a state of agitation and turmoil on account of the alleged infamous gerrymander which is being attempted here? Do you want Parliament to sit here week after week and month after month during this summer arguing and fighting against that which it is not essential should be carried? Surely we have sat here long enough? Let us discharge our duties as far as they are essential, and then let us go to our homes. Passing from these generalities, I desire to say that while I assented to the motion made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I wish to guard myself against the charge that I agreed in the arguments by which he supported it. I would not have made this remark but for an observation that fell from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I did not understand the motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe absolutely to involve representation by population. There were other interests which checked and guarded it, and I accepted the resolution in the sense that it was to be a factor, but not by any means the controlling factor, in representation. If the principle of representation by population were rigidly applied, it would bring us down to mathematical precision and residential representation. Mathematical precision is not desirable, and I am sure the majority of the House will not believe that residential representation is desirable. They have tried that system in the United States—the principle under which the representative of a congressional district must reside in that district. I do not think it has been attended by good results in the States, and I am sure it would be unsatisfactory when applied to the peculiar circumstances of this country. For that reason, if for no other, I am opposed to the application of the principle of representation by population in its integrity. I now desire to call the attention of the House to the Province of Prince Edward Island. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) when he spoke the other night was under the impression that county boundaries were not being overridden, but privately the hon. gentleman mentioned to me that he had been in error.

Mr. WELDON. I was under a misapprehension. I am glad to make this acknowledgement publicly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) From my local knowledge I was aware the hon. gentleman was in error. We have in the Maritime Provinces a system of dual representation. The City and County of Halifax has two members, the City and County of St. John has two members, the County of Pictou has two members, King's, Queen's and Prince counties, in Prince Edward Island, are respectively represented by two members, and the County of Cape Breton has two members. Are you going to alter that principle or not? If so, why alter it as regards Prince Edward Island, and not with regard to the other provinces? I am perfectly willing that Parliament should adopt the principle of allowing only one man for each district, but I want the principle applied all around. I do not think it is fair to single out one province and withdraw dual representation from it, and retain it in adjacent provinces almost within sight. There are two members for the County of Pictou, which is within sight of the Island, two for Cape Breton, which is within four hours' sail, and also two for Halifax and two for St. John. It may be right or wrong to make this change, but if applied to the Island it should be applied to these other provinces. Let us adopt some system, but do not let us carve up provinces for party interests. What are the facts in regard to Prince Edward Island? I submit that in regard to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick you have maintained county lines everywhere. When it is desired to take away a member from New Brunswick, Queen's and Sunbury are amalgamated. When it is desired to take away a member from Nova Scotia, Queen's and Shelburne are amalgamated. County lines are respected in every instance. But in Prince Edward Island county lines are violated in every particular. Over 120 years have elapsed since those counties were first surveyed and laid out, and those boundaries established and recognized. For 100 years

the Legislature has been established, and the people have recognized these county lines as well-known boundary marks, and the different local districts in each county have been controlled by the county boundaries. There were five districts in each county sending members to the Local Legislature, and when, 30 years ago, the Island adopted the principle of an elective Legislative Council they adhered to county boundaries still, and subdivided the counties into ridings, but county boundaries were adhered to throughout in the election of members both for the Legislative Assembly and for the Legislative Council. The people of Queen's have been accustomed to act together in all matters relating to political life, and their local districts were well recognized and controlled by county boundaries, and when the districts were laid out for the Legislative Council they grouped two local districts for the House of Assembly together. This was well understood and had a good effect. What is proposed under this Bill? Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken Prince County and divided it into two parts, and have taken three large townships from Queen's and put them into East Prince. Why? The population of the counties do not justify it. No rule is being carried out with a view to placing the number of the population according to any well-known unit. I call the attention of the House, and I am not going to speak beyond the Maritime Provinces, to the very great discrepancy between the populations of the different counties of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, but no one is contending for a moment that the fact that such large discrepancies exist justifies a change in county boundaries. This principle has never been applied to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and why should it be applied to Prince Edward Island? In Westmoreland there are 41,478 people; in Restigouche, 8,309; in Albert, 10,971. No one contends that we should divide Westmoreland and add a portion of it to Albert in order to equalize the population and representation. This is not being done in Nova Scotia. On what principle are we proceeding? In many of the counties, such for example as York, Westmorland, Northumberland, Gloucester and St. John City and County the population is largely in excess of the unit; but I have not heard any one say that the counties should be divided into districts of smaller or larger size so as to equalize the population. The same condition of things prevails in Nova Scotia. There are 34,000 in Pictou, 25,000 in Inverness, 34,000 in Cape Breton, 71,000 in Halifax, 27,000 in Colchester, 24,000 in Cumberland, and other counties have from 10,000 to 15,000 beyond the unit; but you do not suggest to break up all the old historical county lines and the political continuity which has existed for a century in those counties. This, however, is done with respect to Prince Edward Island. What do we find in that Island? There is a population which enables you to dispose of this question very easily. If you want to apply to Prince Edward Island the same principle as you are applying to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, why not give King's County a member without taking any township from her and leave the other two counties as they are with a double representation? That, I think, would please all parties. King's County has 4,000 of a population above the unit, and why break it up, when you have counties in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick with 10,000 and 7,000 above the unit, and when it never struck you that when they were that many above the unit you should break the counties up? I maintain that King's County should remain as it is. Take a member from it, but leave it alone, and let the other counties remain as they are. If you insist upon applying to Prince Edward Island, principles which you do not apply anywhere else, divide the counties east or west, or north or south, or divide them as you like, but maintain the county lines. I have no doubt that this division of constituencies has not been prepared by any gentleman in this House. My local knowledge enables me to state to the House that is has been prepared by some one who has a local knowledge and that it has been prepared for the reason and the purpose of endeavouring to gerrymander myself and Mr. Yeo out of this House. There is no other possible combination of townships which human ingenuity could suggest which could possibly make the divisions so that they would have a chance of gerrymandering us out of our seats. They have divided Prince County and taken three large townships from Queen's and placed them in East Prince, and why have they done this? Prince County if divided up would leave two ridings each of which would come very near the unit, they are within twenty per cent of the unit. Why not leave the county alone and divide it into two, and if you want to have a further political advantage take it and we will discuss that with you. Take Queen's County and divide it up, and you have two ridings with about twenty per cent each above the unit, but leave the county lines alone. Then you have King's County with three or four thousand above the unit and let it have one member. You have taken three townships out of Queen's and placed it in Prince, and then you have taken three townships out of King's and placed them in East Queen's. I know why that was done. There were 128 majority for our Conservative friends there, and you think that by this you will overwhelm your humble servant here. You have not done justice even in dividing the counties. The counties are divided into five electoral districts, and if you had kept to the electoral district boundaries there would be some guide to go by, because then you would be keeping to what is known as the Legislative Council districts which elect members to the Local House. But you have gone and taken from the West Riding of Queen's, township 24 which belongs to it geographically, which belongs to it politically, and in which it has been voting for over half a century, and you have put it in East Queen's. Why have you done this? It is because that township had 200 of a Conservative majority, and it is necessary to take 200 Conservative votes from West Queen's, and 128 from King's County in order to gerrymander your humble servant out of parliamentary existence. I am not so thoroughly enamoured of party life that I care so particularly about that, I suppose I will make a fight over it, even though you do carry this Bill; but I say it bears gross injustice upon its face, and it is a violation of every principle you have applied to the other provinces. It is the introduction for the first time into the Maritime Provinces of the gerrymander, and it will bear bitter fruits in the future. It must be known that human nature prevails in the Liberal party and that if you gerrymander them down there, and they come into power, they must retort. Is it worth while for the sake of the

paltry political advantage of legislating me out of this House, to ignore principles which you have adopted heretofore with regard to all the other provinces, and to introduce the thin end of the wedge of this accursed gerrymander in the Lower Provinces, for such a pitiful object as to put one member out of this House. I do not know what may be the result. You may fail in your object. I have not heretofore been of those who shrunk before a contest because it was an unequal one. I have carried a great many elections in that county, both in the Local and Dominion contests, and if forced to it I will try my faith again, and I will have sufficient faith in the justice which lies deep in the hearts of the electors of Queen's County that they will not see me wronged.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of attention to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) and I am certainly very much surprised at the position he takes with respect to the proposed divisions of Prince Edward Island. He has told us in the course of his remarks that we have introduced for the first time into the Lower Provinces the principle of gerrymander, but I venture to say that when the members of this House and the people of the country understand the position that the hon. gentleman himself and his political friends have taken in Prince Edward Island in gerrymandering that province in the interest of themselves and their friends in the Local Government, they will come to the conclusion that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is not correct when he says that this is the first time that the principles of gerrymander were introduced into the Lower Provinces.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do two wrongs make a right?

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I do not intend to argue, Sir, that because the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and his party do a wrong, that we should do another. I contend that the subdivision of Prince Edward Island under the Bill before the House is the only just and reasonable measure that could be introduced under the circumstances. We find that under the census recently taken Prince Edward Island had to lose one of its representatives, and in order that the number should be reduced the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says: Why not do as they have done in Nova Scotia, amalgamate two counties; why not apply the same rule to Prince Edward Island that you have done to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? That could not be done in Prince Edward Island, because we had no small constituencies that could be doubled up as can easily be done in the case of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is quite willing that one of the members for King's County should be legislated out of his seat to make room for him, forsooth, or for some of his friends. That is a very plausible story from his own stand-point, but let me inform him again that the Government have made a fair and equitable division of the ridings. I dare say I myself would have preferred to have left my own County of King's whole as it was, but under all the circumstances of the case nothing else could have been done than to make the division proposed by the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that the principle you are going on in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick?

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I am speaking from a Prince Edward Island stand-point, and I find that the Government have made a very fair and reasonable distribution of the population and of the ridings. It was quite necessary under the circumstances to interfere with the county lines in order to make that division, but this Government never went so far in interfering with the counties as the hon. gentleman and his friends have in the Local Legislature. It seems as if the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has given them a leaf out of the book of the leader of the Government in Ontario and his political friends in the different provinces, because we find that he and his political friends have not only interfered with the county lines, but they have interfered with township lines as well. They have interfered in the same way with the township lines in the local constituencies in Prince Edward Island; but in this Bill the Government have not interfered in any way with the township lines. To show the House the extent to which these hon. gentlemen have been willing to go in order to keep themselves and their friends in power, and if my information is right, with the sanction and approval of the hon. member for Queen's, I will just exhibit a little of what they can do when they are left to themselves. The red portion in the centre of this map which I am showing is a local constituency. They took two half townships from the next local constituency and joined them to this in order to hive the Conservatives. They took another Conservative township from the next adjoining local constituency and also added it to this constituency. Then they jumped across a township and took two half townships from another constituency and added them here, in order to hive their political opponents and turn a majority of eight against them into a majority of eight in their favour. This was done in order to keep in power a Government which ruled with an autocratic sway by a majority of one, and it shows what these hon. gentlemen, who are so indignant with us for making a fair redistribution of the Province of Prince Edward Island, will do when they have the power. I must say that the present redistribution is a fair and reasonable one. The hon. member for Queen's says that the object of it is to gerrymander the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Yeo) and himself out of this House. That, on the face of it, shows how far astray the hon. gentleman is. What are the facts? The facts are that the hon. gentleman himself, according to the proposed redistribution of Prince Edward Island, will have a majority of about 400, and the hon. member for Prince will have an equal majority. If the Bill had been designed to keep the hon. gentleman and his friends in power, and to cause my hon. colleague and myself to step out, it would have been all very well, but instead of that, we have made a fair and reasonable distribution, and we take our chances in our county as it now stands.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Yes, a fair and reasonable chance and a fighting chance, I am prepared to take the constituency either as it now stands, or with the whole county; and the Bill leaves a fair fighting chance in the adjoining con-

stituency, which includes the balance of King's County. Then, the hon. member for Queen's will still have a constituency in Charlottetown, with a good fair majority, and I do not think he has any good reason to grumble. It would be all very fine if we so redistributed the Province of Prince Edward Island as to put the hon. gentleman and his friends in such a position that they would be sure to come back here. The Government have not done that, I dare say; but they have given them a chance to win their spurs, and to come back here again if they can. These hon. gentlemen are also very loud-mouthed in favour of the principle of one man one vote, and the extension of the franchise; but what do we find themselves and their friends doing in the Local Government? We find them not only gerrymandering the local constituencies in King's County, as I have shown you, but disfranchising a large portion of the electors in the province. By their local law they disfranchised all the employés of the Dominion Government. This is another of those magnanimous things which our hon. friends are so loud-mouthed about. They also, in their local Bill, gave a vote to every man holding a mortgage, thus giving the power to the monied men of the country over the industrious, hard-working farmer who might unfortunately have a mortgage hanging over his head. Now, the Bill before the House has not broken a single constituency in the Province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that no local constituency has been broken up?

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I meant to say a township. There has not been a township broken in Prince Edward Island by the present redistribution, as there has been by the Local Government of Prince Edward Island, and by the hon. gentleman's friends in the Province of Ontario. The only interference which the present Bill has made with old-established lines has been with county lines; but that was unavoidable in making a fair redistribution; and therefore I contend that the Bill all through is as fair a one as it is possible to make while redistributing the population of the province as a whole. Now, the population of the old constituency of King's County was 26,631, the population of the present constituency is 21,694, which is as close to the unit as it is possible to come. Queen's East under the present Bill will have 23,456, and Queen's West 22,210. Prince East will have 20,723, and Prince West 20,987. These, as will be seen at a glance, are as close to the unit as it is possible to get them without breaking into the township lines. I myself would never have consented to breaking into the township lines, and any little discrepancy existing between the unit and the figures I have given could only be made right by breaking into the township lines. The redistribution, as a whole, is a proper one in every sense of the word, and as fair a one as it is possible, under any circumstances, to bring about.

Mr. YEO. The hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Macdonald) says this is the only just and reasonable measure that could be introduced, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, and he has attempted to justify it by referring to the action of the Local Government. He has held out a map showing what he calls the gerrymander in Prince Edward Island. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he approves of this gerrymander or not; and if he disapproves of the gerrymander, as he terms it, of the Local Government, he surely cannot approve of the gerrymander before the House now. So far as I am concerned, I consider the manner in which it is proposed to distribute the seats now is, as was the gerrymander in 1882, a very unfair and improper one, based on an improper principle and which cannot be justified. There can be no doubt but that it has been done solely with the intention of strengthening the supporters of the Government and weakening their opponents. So far as I am concerned, I do not believe in endeavouring to win a seat by any such means. If I thought I could not maintain my seat here in a fair and honourable way, I should be very sorry to keep it, and I think that is the principle that ought to actuate every hon. gentleman. The hon. member for King's has said that township lines have not been interfered with in any way. That is quite correct, but he knows very well that the existing county lines which had been established in Prince Edward Island for over 120 years have been broken into. He is very anxious now to have the constituencies equalized. It is a wonder he never discovered this disproportion in population before. As far back as 1871 the population of Queen's County was 42,651, of Prince County 28,302, and of King's 23,068, King's a little over one-half the population of Queen's, but no attempt was made to deprive King's County of a representative or equalize the population from that time to the present. When we went into Confederation, it was unanimously decided by the Local Legislature that each county should have the same representation, no regard being had to the population of the different counties. Both Liberals and Conservatives alike agreed to this arrangement, which has existed from that time to the present, and I think the members of the Local Legislature had a better idea of what would be fair and just than the members of this House, very many of whom scarcely know there is such a place as Prince Edward Island, and I do not see why the county lines should be broken now. As has been very clearly pointed out by the hon. member for Queen's, we would be acting on a proper principle to leave the county lines as they are, and give the larger counties the same representation as at present, leaving King's with one representative. It is true, perhaps unfortunately for the carrying out of the scheme, that King's County is at present represented by two Conservative members, but on the whole that county has been quite as Liberal in sentiment since Confederation as the other counties. I think on two occasions only have they elected two Conservative members, and if my memory serves me right, Queen's County and Prince County have done about the same. Prince County, I think, has always returned one Liberal member but frequently a Conservative member, and Queen's has done the same thing, so that opinions in Prince Edward Island have changed very frequently. King's County may have been Conservative at the last election, but probably by this time a great change has taken place in the opinions of the people there. I do not say, so far as I am concerned, that a smaller representation should be given to King's because it happens to be Conservative for the time being, but I ask it as an act of justice. If the present scheme is carried

out, if you break into the county lines, in ten years' time, if a further readjustment is necessary, you will have to go still further; whereas if the county lines are left as they are at present, at the end of ten years, if it is necessary that we should lose another representative, naturally he would be taken from Prince County and so on; and if, on the other hand, we should be so fortunate as to be entitled to another member, it would be added to King's. As I said before, the difference all through, from the time we entered Confederation up to the present, has been largely in favour of King's, and according to the last census Queen's County had a population of nearly 46,000; Prince, 36,470; and King's, 26,631. So that it will be seen that King's County has only a very small number over the unit for one member, Queen's County is above the unit, Prince with 37,000 is below the unit for the two members; but this disproportion is not so great as in the neighbouring Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and I do not see why it was thought advisable to adhere to the county lines in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and not adhere to them in Prince Edward Island. We know that in the Province of New Brunswick, in the County of Westmoreland, for instance, there is a population of over 41,000, whereas in Restigouche there is a population of less than 9,000, and in Albert there is something over 10,000, so that it cannot be with the intention of equalizing the population that the Government propose to break into the county lines of Prince Edward Island. There must be some other reason. So far as the people of Prince Edward Island are concerned, I am sure I am correct in saying that three-fourths of them are opposed to the gerrymander of these counties, without regard to politics in any way. The people of the different counties have been accustomed to work together politically and would feel it a great hardship to be separated now. If this sort of thing is to be continued, it will end in disaster. I do not see why a different principle should be applied to Prince Edward Island than to the other provinces. It is evident from the way the gerrymander has been made that it is done with the intention of preventing the senior member for Queen's from holding his seat, and possibly in order to keep me out also. Possibly the latter would be no great loss to the House, and it would be less loss to me, but in the interest of the people I ask that this gerrymander be not done. What the Liberal party of Prince Edward Island want is fair-play. They do not ask for any favours. They only ask to meet their opponents on equal terms, and they are not afraid to meet them. If the policy of the Government is such as to commend itself to the people of Prince Edward Island they may always rely upon receiving support from them, but if their policy is injurious to that province, gerrymander as they may, they will not receive support. If an election were to take place at this moment, seeing how the people of the Island have been treated, I do not think the Government could get any supporters from that Island. It is not necessary for me to refer to the way in which Prince Edward Island has been treated in regard to railway matters, but that is one reason why the people of Prince Edward Island do not feel like giving their support to this Government. I contend it is wrong that a division of this kind should be made by any political party for political purposes. There should surely be some means devised of making divisions of this kind without having the province cut up for party ends. I agree with hon. members who say that, if this country is to be ruled properly and not altogether for party purposes, some other means should be devised than is proposed in the Bill before the House. It is immoral, and I think it is dishonest in every way. It carries dishonesty on the face of it, except as far as New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are concerned, where the Government seem to have acted with some regard for fair play. They have acted on a principle which, if applied to Prince Edward Island, we could not complain of. We all regret that we lose a representative. I do not think it was ever contemplated that we would lessen our representation. On the contrary we expected that it would be increased, but things have taken a very different turn from what was expected. The brilliant prospects which were held out to us when we came into Confederation have proved to be a failure and the best of our people are every day leaving for the United States. We are to lose a member now, and the chances are, if the present state of affairs continues, that after the next census we shall lose another. I think, as the smallest province in the Dominion, we have a right to ask this House for some fair-play, and I hope the hon. gentleman who leads the House will see that the same principle which has been applied to his own province and to New Brunswick will also be applied to Prince Edward Island. If I happened to represent the smallest constituency in Prince Edward Island, I should not at all object to one of the representatives being taken away because it would only be fair and right. I speak not only for the members of the Liberal party in Prince Edward Island but for the Conservatives as well. I was on the Island a short time ago and all I met, without exception, were opposed to a gerrymander of this kind. It is something new to us. We never had anything of the kind before, and the people dissent from it entirely, and I feel persuaded that many of those who now support the Government will object to do so further on these grounds if on no other, because they look upon it that the Government are passing the measure not in the interest of the province but entirely in the interest of the party, and are doing it for the purpose of enabling gentlemen who cannot get a seat under the present state of things to be returned here. It is clear to every one who knows Prince Edward Island and sees the division which has been made that it has been done with that clear and evident intention. We ask why we are not served the same as our neighbours on the other side of the water. In Nova Scotia the counties of Queen's and Shelburne have been merged together, which, I suppose, was a right and proper thing to do, but no other attempt was made to equalize the population there, though we know that a great disproportion exists there, and the same exists in New Brunswick. So far as the gerrymander in Prince Edward Island is concerned, I consider a reference to it entirely out of place here. I have no doubt, if anything improper has been done there, the people will resent it. I dissent entirely from the views of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald), who spoke on this subject. I do not wish to inflict any injustice on King's, but, looking at the way in which Nova

Scotia and New Brunswick have been used, I think we have a right to expect that the same principle should be extended to us. I hope the Minister of Justice will reconsider the intention of the Government, because, taking three townships from King's and putting them into Queen's, and taking three townships from Queen's and putting them into Prince is anything but fair, and it is the same in regard to the way in which the districts have been subdivided. I do not know so much of the other districts as I do of Prince, but in the western district of Prince they have taken lots from 1 to 14, passed over lot 15 and then taken lot 16, leaving lot 15 to go into the eastern district of Prince. The intention is clear. Lot 15 gives a large Conservative majority, and they have placed it in Eastern Prince, in order to secure a larger Conservative vote for that district. If they wished to do the fair thing why did they not take the townships in rotation from lot 1 to lot 15? I think something of the same kind has been done in Western Queen's. It shows me that those who have had the direct preparation of the division of Prince Edward Island have been actuated by but one motive, the desire to make three Conservative ridings and two Liberal ones. As I said before, I would leave the county lines as they are and make something like a fair division. You might have single districts if you desire, and still the people would be satisfied. I do not see why an exception should be made of Prince Edward Island in that respect. We know that Pictou, Cape Breton, Halifax, St. John and other constituencies have two representatives. We have the same thing in Prince Edward Island. I think we might fairly ask that if you leave these constituencies as they are at present, we should be left in the same position on Prince Edward Island.

Mr. McLEAN (King's, P.E.I.) If the discussion that has taken place with reference to the redistribution of seats in Prince Edward Island has resulted in nothing else, it shows the position in which our Liberal friends would place us in that Island if they had the opportunity. Of course they would have an object in so doing. If they could take a seat from the Conservatives, as they have explained here to-night, they would be quite willing that King's County, being Conservative, should be represented by one member in this House. I would just ask the House to look at the position of things in Prince Edward Island for a moment to see how we would stand under that proposition. King's County has a population of 26,633, and Prince County a population of 36,000. My hon. friend from Prince County who has just spoken (Mr. Yeo) would represent probably 26,600, and his colleague would represent 10,000 in this House. That is the position that they would place us in. As Prince Edward Island has a population of 109,080, if you divide that number by five, which is the number to which the Island will be entitled after redistribution, each member would represent about 21,800. Now, just follow me for a moment to see how nearly the Redistribution Act as it has been framed will come to that. The new riding of King's would have 21,694, or within 130 of the unit of population for the whole Island. It was impossible to make it come any nearer without adding another township, which would have made it nearly 23,000. Queen's East will have 23,466; Queen's West, 22,416; Prince East, 20,723; Prince West, 20,987. I claim that no division in that province can have an adjoining township added to it without making it over the unit for the population of Prince Edward Island. I may here challenge a statement made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies); I think he did it inadvertently, but he said there was no other possible arrangement that could gerrymander him out of his seat in Queen's County. Now, if wards 1, 2 and 3 of Charlottetown were put in East Queen's, and lot 24, which he complains is put in East Queen's, and lot 61 had been left in King's, it would have given the same population and would have given a Conservative majority of 13 more than it has at the present time. But it was not considered advisable that the city of Charlottetown should be interfered with. Had the city of Charlottetown been interfered with, and had wards 1, 2 and 3 been put in East Queen's, it would have given a further majority for the Conservative party of 13. It is claimed by the hon. member for Queen's, in speaking here, that the county lines have remained as they are for over a hundred years. That may be so. Had there been found a greater population in Prince Edward Island under the census, and had an additional number of representatives been given to that Island, it would have been claimed very properly that a new riding should have been made in Queen's County, but as Prince Edward Island was divided into three counties it was considered that it would be very unfair on the part of the Government to divide it so that King's County, having a population of 26,000, should be represented by one member, while the western end of the Island, with 36,000, should have two members. I do not think there is any fair-minded person in Prince Edward Island who would say that that would be a fair distribution of the constituencies. They are fairly divided now, and no other fair division could be made without dividing the city of Charlottetown. Take, for instance, the way that the Island is divided. Begin at East Point, and the old constituency of King's County was taken until the population was made up. The balance of King's County would go over into Eastern Queen's. Eastern Queen's had to go a little west of a straight line for the reason that Charlottetown was not interfered with.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. McLEAN (King's, P.E.I.) But the proposition I made to my hon. friend will hold good if he will take the figures of population. Take the votes that were polled in wards 1, 2 and 3 of Charlottetown, and add them to Eastern Queen's, and he will have a still further Conservative majority.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would my hon. friend tells us why he wants to apply to Prince Edward Island a principle that is ignored and repudiated in every other part of the Dominion, that there must be mathematical accuracy in the population of a district?

Mr. McLEAN (King's, P.E.I.) I will ask my hon. friend if he can divide Prince Edward Island into five equal ridings and not break county lines?

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

Mr. McLEAN (King's, P.E.I.) In what way?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) By leaving the counties as they are, and giving King's County, which has

only three or four thousand more than now, one representative.

Mr. McLEAN (King's, P.E.I.) Then one member for Prince would represent 10,000 and the member for Queen's would represent 23,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Two members from Prince, representing 18,500 each.

Mr. McLEAN (King's, P.E.I.) I cannot see how that would be fair. But if the division commences at Prince County and takes it down to lot 16, my hon. friend from Prince County thinks it is very fair that lot 15 should be left. The population is fairly divided when we see that one part of Prince West has 22,000 and Prince East 23,703. I consider myself that if there is no better ground of complaint against the gerrymander Bill in the other provinces of the Dominion, than there is at Prince Edward Island, it is a pretty fair Bill. We are only sorry that we had to lose one member from Prince Edward Island, but, taking that fact into consideration, I do not think any fairer distribution could be made than has been made under this Bill.

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

After Recess.

Mr. PERRY. I desire to say a few words on this very important subject of the Gerrymander Bill. Although the subject has been pretty well threshed out, it is the bounden duty of every hon. member to express his opinion in regard to it. I listened very attentively to the amendment introduced last evening by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), and for want of anything better, I am quite prepared to endorse the sentiments propounded by him. The present Bill is certainly not generally approved. It has been denounced by the independent press of the country; it has been denounced generally by the Liberals, and, with the exception of a few Tory papers, it has been denounced by the Tory press. The Bill must, therefore, be very objectionable on its face, it must be very unjust, it must have an ugly shape, it must have a bad smell, and it is impossible that this Bill can be accepted by the people. I cannot have any better proof that this Bill is not acceptable to the people than the fact that it has sickened the political stomachs of two of the strongest supporters of the Government. I must give those hon. gentlemen credit for their independence, and I am glad to find they have opinions of their own, and will not be driven to act contrary to their convictions. The Bill, I repeat, has been generally condemned, and it has been condemned even by the Tory press. I have here the opinion of a paper published in the interest of the Government, and I find it very strongly denounced—I allude to the Hamilton *Herald*. It is a paper that professes to speak for the Government, and it seems to have fully understood their views, at all events until lately, and the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches will hardly attempt to contradict the statement of that paper. It says:

"The Bill has been roundly denounced all along the line as one of the most infamous measure ever brought before the House, and it seems to be the crowning act of a session made memorable by the Government's juggling with the grave charges made against Judge Elliott and Sir Adolphe Caron. With the tremendous majority which Sir John Thompson has at his back, there is no doubt the Bill will be carried, but it can hardly be defended from any point of view."

I would not dare to use such language, but, coming as this opinion does from a paper friendly to the Government, hon. gentlemen opposite have no alternative but to accept it. This gerrymander Bill has two fathers: the Minister of Railways attempted to act as one, and the Minister of Public Works acted as the other as regards the Province of Quebec. They both stated in their places that the Bill intended to equalize the population, so that every riding, as regards population, would be as near as possible the unit required—22,700 souls. But what do we find? In Ontario this principle has not been carried out in any particular. We find in the following Liberal divisions the population as named: Bothwell, 25,594; Essex North, 31,523; Kent, 31,434; Lincoln, 27,043; Welland, 26,944; North Oxford, 26,131; North Perth, 26,907; Prescott, 30,717; Russell, 25,100; North Waterloo, 25,325; South Waterloo, 25,139; North Wellington, 24,956; or a total of 326,813. Taking a similar number of Tory constituencies in the same province we have the following: Brockville, 15,853; Cardwell, 15,382; Durham East, 17,053; Frontenac, 13,455; Grenville South, 12,929; East Hastings, 18,050; Leeds and Grenville, 13,521; Lennox, 14,900; West Northumberland, 14,947; West Peterborough, 15,808; North Victoria, 16,849; West Middlesex, 17,288; or a total of 188,035, as against a population in the same number of Liberal counties of 326,813. As regards Quebec, where the Minister of Public Works tried his hand, the Bill is even worse, as is shown by the following comparison: Liberal counties: Beauce, 37,222; Drummond and Arthabaska, 43,923; Iberville and St. John's, 24,175; Nicolet, 28,725; Portneuf, 25,813; Shefford, 23,263; Lévis, 25,999; Quebec East, 36,384; or a total of 245,510. Tory counties: Beauharnois, 16,662; Brome, 14,709; Two Mountains, 15,027; L'Islet, 13,823; Montmorency, 12,309; Vaudreuil, 10,792; Soulanges, 9,608; Quebec West, 8,700; or a total of 101,630, as compared with 245,510 in a like number of Liberal counties. Now, where is the justice in that, where is the equalization of population in this province as promised by the promoters of the Bill? Let us try now whether this principle has been carried out in Prince Edward Island, and we will see there the sorrowful picture which has been exhibited by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), when he addressed the House this afternoon. Prince Edward Island is composed of the counties of Prince, Queen's and King's. The population of Prince is about 37,000, the population of Queen's County about 47,000, and the population of King's County something like 26,000. Now what is the necessity of going from Prince into Queen's in order to equalize the population, or what is the necessity of going from Queen's to King's to equalize the population, when we find that some ridings in Ontario and Quebec have a population as low as 9,000. The population of Prince County if divided into two ridings fairly and squarely would have a representation of something like 18,000 for each member, and Queen's County would have the full unit and something more. Was there any necessity here for wiping out the county lines, which as stated by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) were established in 1784? They have been known ever since as the

county lines, and the people of the three townships of Queen's which are dragged into Prince county are used to attend the Supreme Court in the shire-town of Charlottetown, and the people of Prince go to Summerside, and the people of King's go to Georgetown, the capital. The whole arrangement is now disturbed, not for the purpose of giving representation by population, but merely to secure the return of the Tory member in East Prince. According to this arrangement the Liberals are hived in West Prince by a majority of six or seven hundred, and East Prince is made safe enough no doubt for a Tory member, whereas if the counties were left to remain as they were there would be two Liberal members returned. Is that fair, is it doing justice to the opponents of the Government in the Province of Prince Edward Island? How can the gentlemen on the Treasury benches sit in their seats and reconcile such action with the consciences? If I have to fight a political battle against my political opponents, ought not I to be put on an equal ground with them, and why should my opponents be legislated so as to have an advantage over me? It is the same way with Queen's County which now returns two Liberal members. When this Bill becomes law East Queen's will be safe enough for a Conservative. There is no doubt that this is intended to leave my hon. friend the senior member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) out, and to legislate him from this Parliament. I was a little amused to see the senior member for King's (Mr. Macdonald), waxing warm a little while ago, and it is quite natural when he thinks people are treading on his corns, for his corns are very near the quick, that he should feel a little sore. He could not let the local politics alone, but he had to introduce them here and he exhibited a map to the House. I do not know how much that map cost. I understand that there was a good deal of money distributed amongst the electors of King's in 1891, and I believe they had even more money than there was a demand for, and perhaps this map was bought with the balance of the money left after that election. Whatever way it was paid for the map has been obtained, and I do not suppose there is one hon. member here any the wiser after seeing it, for it looked very pale and miserable. The hon. member was very much displeased and was very cross because he said that the Local Government in Prince Edward Island gerrymandered his county, but he is not at all cross when the whole province is gerrymandered by this Government although he disapproves of the gerrymandering of the little borough called Georgetown. We know very well that there are constituencies for the local in Prince Edward Island which have 2,000 votes, while Georgetown had only a couple of hundred. The riding of Prince County which I represented for a number of years used to give me 1,100 votes, and my majority over my opponent was never much more than sixty, which shows that there are over 2,000 votes in that constituency. When the Local Government attempted to equalize the population of his county he gets annoyed, and he gets a map, and shows it here just as if hon. gentlemen in this House were personally interested in the affairs of Georgetown. The hon. gentleman seems to think that certain votes in Georgetown have a heavenly right, and that Georgetown was created some years ago for the purpose of making a constituency for certain gentlemen. I know that there are certain gentlemen who represented Georgetown and who think it very hard to be weaned away from it, because of course the longer a person enjoys a certain privilege the more he is attached to it whether it is in the interests of the country or not. My impression is that is what made the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) so cross, but if he looks to the measure now before this House, if he looks to the unreasonable gerrymander about to be perpetrated here and for which he is going to vote, as he tells us, he will find that one is nothing as compared with the other. At present we have four members elected to support the Opposition in this House, and two —I will not say how they come here, but they happen to be here—to support the Government. It is very seldom that King's County sends Conservatives here. In the last Parliament it was represented by two Liberals, and in the Parliament before that it had one man returned by the votes of the people, and another by the vote of this House. No wonder the gentlemen come here and dictate to us and to the country at large how this gerrymander must be managed to suit themselves. This is the kind of justice we are getting from these hon. gentlemen. I would give the Government some advice if they would be only kind enough to accept it, and I give it gratis. It would curtail legislation, and would secure them in power for all time to come, if they would withdraw the present infamous Bill, and put it out of the way altogether and introduce a short Bill making provisions that the present Government shall be kept in power for all time to come. There would be just as much sense in such a Bill as in the present one. If they are going to hold power by gerrymandering, by preventing the popular voice from being represented in this Parliament it would be more honourable for them to come at once before the face of the public and to ask to be legislated into power for all time to come. Their present course is like a person going behind his enemy's back and stabbing him with a dagger, instead of being man enough to go before his face, like an honest Irishman, and striking him squarely between the eyes. I think the Government had better take the bull by the horns, and ask Parliament to legislate them into power for all time to come. It would be more manly than abrogating the rights and liberties of the Liberals as they are doing by their Gerrymander Acts. Now, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House at any great length. I have endeavoured to show that the Bill with reference to Prince Edward Island is unnecessary and unfair. I do not care how they divide Prince County. I would strongly recommend that the members for that county be elected as at present, by dual representation, and Queen's County in the same way, and that King's County, being smaller, should have one member. I know that would be approved of by the people of Prince Edward Island. Conservatives as well as Liberals. What is the reason the present Government have such a bitter feeling against Prince Edward Island? Is it because the people think proper to send four members here to oppose them? The Province of Prince Edward Island is hard set to get justice. We are not getting justice. We are often asked, why don't you send men to support the Government, and you will get what you want. Mr. Speaker, that sounds very much like bribery, and the people of Prince Edward Island, except a little nest down

there, are not liable to be bribed. If the people of Prince Edward Island and the people generally throughout this Dominion have to send members here to support the Government in order to get justice, why, Sir, let us have an end of it. Let us send here fourteen Ministers of the Crown, and let them do everything they want by royal commissions. In the case of the city of London, let them strike out the words "city of London," and insert "riding of Elliott"; it would be more appropriate. I was not very much surprised to see my hon. friend, the senior member for King's, wax warm; but I was surprised to hear him introduce local matters in the House of Commons. I do not think we have any right to legislate here for the Province of Prince Edward Island or for any other province. Let me tell my hon. friend that the Bill of which he complains, which is going to annihilate the rotten borough of Georgetown, has not yet become the law of the land, and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what influence has been brought to bear to prevent the Lieutenant Governor of Prince Edward Island from assenting to that Bill: I know the hon. gentleman is able to tell me if he likes, but it does not suit the purpose. It suits the purpose very well if these hon. gentlemen can defeat the legislation. Both of them stand up here with very bad grace, and announce that they are going to support the Gerrymander Bill that is going to break up county lines and put the people astray in their political business, their social business and every other business. I can see no reason for these gerrymanders except to gerrymander my colleague and the hon. senior member for Queen's County. But perhaps this Gerrymander Bill will not have the effect which the Government and their friends desire. I know from letters which I have received from several Conservatives, prominent men, that the people of Prince Edward Island are indignant at this gerrymander. They say: If we have to hold on by unfair and unconstitutional means, we do not want to do so. I can characterise this bill as none other than an unconstitutional attempt to make constitutional what is not constitutional.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Somerville:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Innes,
Armstrong,	Landerkin,
Bain (Wentworth),	Langelier,
Béchard,	Laurier,
Beith,	Lavergne,
Bernier,	Leduc.
Borden,	Legris,
Bourassa,	Livingston,
Bowers,	Lowell,
Bowman,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brodeur,	McGregor,
Brown,	McMillan (Huron),
Bruneau,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mignault,
Casey,	Mills (Bothwell),
Choquette,	Monet,
Christie,	Mulock,
Colter,	Paterson (Brant),
Davies,	Perry,
Dawson,	Proulx,
Edwards,	Rider,
Fauvel,	Rinfret,
Featherston,	Rowand,
Flint,	Sanborn,
Geoffrion,	Semple,
Gibson,	Somerville,
Gillmor,	Sutherland,
Godbout,	Vaillancourt,
Grieve,	Welsh,
Guay,	Yeo.—60.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Joncas,
Bain (Soulanges),	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Baker,	Lippé,
Bennett,	Macdonald (King's),
Bergeron,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Bowell,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Boyle,	Mackintosh,
Burns,	Maclean (York),
Cameron,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cargill,	McKay,
Carignan,	McLean (King's),
Carling,	McLennan,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Madill,
Chapleau,	Mara,
Coatsworth,	Metcalfe,
Cochrane,	Miller,
Cockburn,	Mills (Annapolis),
Corbould,	Monerieff,
Corby,	Montague,
Costigan,	Northrup,
Craig,	Ouimet,
Curran,	Patterson (Colchester),
Davin,	Patterson (Huron),
Davis,	Pellerier,
Desaulniers,	Pridham,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Putnam,
Dewdney,	Reid,
Dickey,	Robillard,
Dugas,	Roome,
Dupont,	Rosamond,
Dyer,	Ross (Dundas),
Earle,	Simard,
Fairbairn,	Smith (Ontario),
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Sproule,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Stairs,
Foster,	Taylor,
Fréchette,	Temple,
Gillies,	Thompson (Sir John),
Gordon,	Tisdale,
Grandbois,	Tureotte,
Guillet,	Wallace,
Haggart,	Weldon,
Hazen,	White (Cardwell),
Hearn,	Wilmot,
Henderson,	Wilson,
Hodgins,	Wood (Brockville),
Hughes,	Wood (Westmoreland).—95.
Ingram,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Tupper,	Mr. Fraser,
Mr. Tyrwhitt,	Mr. Campbell,
Mr. Bergin,	Mr. Devlin,
Mr. Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mr. Préfontaine,
Mr. Cleveland,	Mr. Carroll,
Mr. McDougall (C. Breton),	Mr. Forbes,
Mr. Ryckman,	Mr. Edgar,
Mr. Masson,	Mr. Lister,
Mr. Lépine,	Mr. Delisle,
Mr. Burnham,	Mr. Beausoleil,
Mr. White (Shelburne),	Mr. Charlton,
Mr. Girouard (Two Mount.),	Mr. Frémont,
Mr. Stevenson,	Mr. Scriver,

Mr. SCRIVER. I paired on Friday last with the hon. member for West Peterborough, with the understanding on my part that the pair was to end with the sitting of yesterday. Since voting I have learned that the hon. gentleman understood the pair was to continue over to-day; and as I do not desire to take advantage of any misunderstanding on his part, I ask to have my name struck off the list.

Amendment negatived.

House divided on motion of Sir John Thompson that Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation of the House of Commons be read a second time.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Kaulbach,
Bain (Soulanges),	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Baker,	Lippé,
Bennett,	Macdonald (King's),
Bergeron,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),

Bowell,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Boyle,	Mackintosh,
Burns,	Maclean (York),
Cameron,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cargill,	McKay,
Carignan,	McLean (King's),
Carling,	McLennan,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Madill,
Chapleau,	Mara,
Coatsworth,	Metcalfe,
Cochrane,	Miller,
Cockburn,	Mills (Annapolis),
Corbould,	Monerieff,
Corby,	Montague,
Costigan,	Northrup,
Craig,	Ouimet,
Curran,	Patterson (Colchester),
Davin,	Patterson (Huron),
Davis,	Pelletier,
Desaulniers,	Pridham,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Putnam,
Dewdney,	Reid,
Dickey,	Robillard,
Dugas,	Rooney,
Dupont,	Rosamond,
Dyer,	Ross (Dundas),
Earle,	Ross (Lisgar),
Fairbairn,	Simard,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Smith (Ontario),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Sproule,
Foster,	Stairs,
Fréchette,	Taylor,
Gillies,	Temple,
Gordon,	Thompson (Sir John),
Grandbois,	Tisdale,
Guillet,	Turcotte,
Haggart,	Wallace,
Hazen,	Weldon,
Hearn,	White (Cardwell),
Henderson,	Wilmot,
Hodgins,	Wilson,
Hughes,	Wood (Brockville),
Ingram,	Wood (Westmoreland).—97.
Joncas,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Innes,
Armstrong,	Landerkin,
Bain (Wentworth),	Langelier,
Béchard,	Laurier,
Beith,	Lavergne,
Bernier,	Leduc,
Borden,	Legris,
Bourassa,	Livingston,
Bowers,	Lowell,
Bowman,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brodeur,	McGregor,
Brown,	McMillan (Huron),
Bruneau,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mignault,
Casey,	Mills (Bothwell),
Choquette,	Monet,
Christie,	Mulock,
Colter,	Paterson (Brant),
Davies,	Perry,
Dawson,	Proulx,
Edwards,	Rider,
Fauvel,	Rinfret,
Featherston,	Rowand,
Flint,	Sanborn,
Geoffrion,	Semple,
Gibson,	Somerville,
Gilmour,	Sutherland,
Godbout,	Vaillancourt,
Grieve,	Welsh,
Guay,	Yeo.—50.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Tupper,	Mr. Fraser,
Mr. Tyrwhitt,	Mr. Campbell,
Mr. Bergin,	Mr. Devlin,
Mr. Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mr. Préfontaine,
Mr. Cleveland,	Mr. Carroll,
Mr. McDougall (C. Breton),	Mr. Forbes,
Mr. Ryckman,	Mr. Edgar,
Mr. Masson,	Mr. Lister,
Mr. Lépine,	Mr. Delisle,
Mr. Burnham,	Mr. Beausoleil,
Mr. White (Shelburne),	Mr. Charlton,
Mr. Girouard (Two Mount.),	Mr. Frémont,
Mr. Stevenson,	Mr. Scriver,

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman declares in this section that British Columbia is entitled to six members. I do not so understand it. I think that, according to population, it is entitled to four, and I do not know upon what ground the hon. gentleman contends it is entitled to six. British Columbia was given six members at the time of its admission into the union, but the question has never been contested in the courts, and it seems to me, from the provisions of the British North America Act, that in making terms and conditions for the admission of any province, without imperial legislation confirming those terms and conditions, there can be no departure from the principles laid down in the Act itself. The union, in the first instance, consisted of four provinces. It is provided that when other provinces are admitted into the Confederation, they shall be admitted on such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the Parliament of Canada on the one side and the legislature of the province, and that these terms and conditions are to be set forth in an Address and to be embodied in an Order of Council approved of by Her Majesty, and that such terms and conditions shall become a part of the British North America Act, if not inconsistent with its provisions. Her Majesty cannot make a part of the Act inconsistent with the terms and conditions of the Act itself. Now, one of the terms and conditions of the Act is the clause establishing the rule of representation by population among the provinces. That rule is as applicable to any new province that may come into Confederation as to the four provinces originally embraced. We cannot give to a province a less representation than it would be entitled to in proportion to its population; we cannot give it more than it would be entitled to according to its population, and it would be a monstrous condition of things were it possible to make the rule otherwise. At this moment you are proposing to cut down the representation of Prince Edward Island to five members, and yet Prince Edward Island has a larger population to-day by several thousands than British Columbia. How, then, could it be seriously argued that you are entitled to give British Columbia six representatives and give Prince Edward Island only five? That is not in accordance with the provisions of the law at all. I will just read the section which I think settles the rule by which we are to be governed. Section 146 says:

"It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on Addresses from the Houses of Parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective Legislatures of the colonies or Provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those colonies or provinces, or any of them, into the union, and on address from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the North-West Territory or either of them, into the union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the Addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act."

Now, I say that we cannot import into the address any provision, as a condition of admission into this union, inconsistent with the terms of this Act. To give British Columbia a larger representation

than its population would entitle it to is to import a condition inconsistent with the provisions of the Act. I think, Sir, that is perfectly clear; nothing can be plainer. You cannot depart from the rule laid down. If there is any one provision of our constitution which should have more force than another, it is the provision that the rule of representation between the provinces shall be population. This whole question has been argued so fully in the discussion that has already taken place on the second reading of the Bill, that I need not enter into a fuller discussion in the committee:

"On the completion of the census in the year 1871 and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be adjusted, and so on."

And then there is the further provision, that in the admission of new provinces we are to be governed by the same rule. It is upon the terms and conditions set forth in this Act that the admission is to take place. It is true in the case of Manitoba we did give her a larger representation, but that was objected to at the time, and there was an Imperial Act confirming to Manitoba the increased representation conferred upon it. There is an Act, the British North America Act of 1872, authorizing us to alter the boundaries of the provinces, and to admit the provinces; but, so far as I recollect, there is no provision that the principles of this Act in these particulars shall be departed from, and that being so we have to consider the population of British Columbia, to see what their population is, to divide that by the one-sixty-fifth part of the population of the Province of Quebec, and to give her the representation that that divisor will entitle her to. You have no right to give her more, and what is fair to Prince Edward Island is equally fair to British Columbia. I want to know on what principle we could give British Columbia these six representatives with a population 30,000 less than Prince Edward Island to which you propose to give five. I hope the Minister of Justice will not press the adoption of this clause to-night, but will give the House the opportunity to look into the question. I did not suppose we would go beyond the second reading to-night or I would have been prepared to call the attention of the House to those provisions of the law which I have stated now in general terms. I need only refer to the 146th section of the British North America Act to show that you cannot give to British Columbia six representatives in this House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not propose to give British Columbia any additional representation which she is not now entitled to, but I simply propose to affirm by this Bill what she is entitled to. The 146th section of the British North America Act confers power on Her Majesty:

"By and with the advice of Her Privy Council, on Addresses from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and from the Houses of the respective Legislatures of the colonies or the Provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those colonies or provinces, or any of them, into the union and on Address from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the North-Western Territory, or either of them, into the union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the Addresses expressed, and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act, and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Upon the one condition.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman says "upon one condition." The words are not in the statute, but the hon. gentleman thinks fit to import them there. That may be the correct interpretation, but, if I find that this Parliament passed an Address to Her Majesty asking that the representation of British Columbia should be fixed in this House at six members, if the Legislature of British Columbia did the same thing, if I find that in 1871, 20 years ago, the order of Her Majesty's Council was passed to that effect, I do not think I need look to any refinements of interpretation to see whether that province is entitled to such membership or not. I have here the Order in Council and the Addresses both of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of British Columbia. First of all we have the Order in Council, dated 16th May, 1871, passed by Her Majesty in Council, and it declares:

"Whereas by the 'British North America Act, 1867,' provision was made for the union of the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick into the Dominion of Canada, and it was (amongst other things) enacted that it should be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council on Addresses from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of the colony of British Columbia, to admit that colony into the said union, on such terms and conditions as should be in the Addresses expressed, and as the Queen should think fit to approve, subject to the provisions of the said Act; and it was further enacted the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf should have effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

"And whereas by Addresses from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada, and from the Legislative Council of British Columbia respectively, of which Addresses copies are contained in the schedule of this Order annexed, Her Majesty was prayed, by and with the advice of Her Most Honourable Privy Council, under the one hundred and forty-sixth section of the hereinbefore recited Act, to admit British Columbia into the Dominion of Canada, on the terms and conditions set forth in the said Addresses.

"And whereas Her Majesty has thought fit to approve of the said terms and conditions, it is hereby ordered and declared by Her Majesty, by and with the advice of Her Privy Council, in pursuance and exercise of the powers vested in Her Majesty by the said Act of Parliament, that from and after the twentieth day of July, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, the said colony of British Columbia shall be admitted into and become part of the Dominion of Canada, upon the terms and conditions set forth in the hereinbefore recited Addresses. And, in accordance with the terms of the said Addresses relating to the electoral districts in British Columbia, for which the first election of members to serve in the House of Commons of the said Dominion shall take place, it is hereby further ordered and declared that such electoral districts shall be as thereafter defined."

There can be no doubt that any province coming into the union after the passage of the British North America Act is as much subject to the terms of the Act as any province which entered under its expressed terms, except as those terms may have been varied, and in every case of the admission of a province they were distinctly varied from the provisions of the Act. In the cases of Manitoba, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, those provinces came in under terms different from those which were in force in regard to the other provinces, and thereafter they became subject to the British North America Act except where it was otherwise provided in the terms of union, but the terms of union could not be infringed upon any more than the British North America Act could be repealed or infringed upon. The Address of the Parliament of Canada defines the terms upon which the province

shall enter, and among other things with regard to the representation it contains this provision :

"British Columbia shall be entitled to be represented in the Senate by three members and by six members in the House of Commons, the representation to be increased under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867."

So that express provision is made as to how far the representation shall be affected by the decennial census, and the provision is that, as her population increases, she shall have an increase in representation according to the provisions of the British North America Act, but if the population does not sufficiently increase, the representation is of course to remain the same as is provided for by the terms of this Order in Council. The Address of the Legislative Council of British Columbia contains exactly the same terms, and under these terms the Province of British Columbia did come into union with the express provision that her representation in this House should be six members, subject to its being increased under the terms of the British North America Act. I take it that, under these circumstances, there is simply no room for interpretation, and unless this Parliament takes the responsibility of declaring that Her Majesty in Council had exceeded her authority, that the Order in Council which the statute says is to have the same effect as a statute passed by the Imperial Parliament is null or *ultra vires*, as being in excess of Her Majesty's authority, the House will not undertake to break faith with British Columbia and violate the terms of union. I submit it is not in the power of this Parliament to do it, and if it were, it would be a striking breach of faith with that province, which has come in under an express declaration that she shall have a certain representation which may be increased under the provisions of the British North America Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Justice admits that the terms and conditions upon which all the provinces come into the union are the terms and conditions contained in the British North America Act, and that those terms and conditions apply to all the provinces that were in the union at the time the union was established, and all that have subsequently come in except where there has been imperial legislation as in the case of Manitoba. Now, section 51, sub-section 4, provides that where the population of a province, upon readjustment, is found to have diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards, there is to be a diminution in the representation in this House. The Minister of Justice says that does not apply to British Columbia. Section 52 says that the number of members of the House of Commons may be from time to time increased by the Parliament of Canada provided that the proportionate representation of the provinces prescribed by this Act, is not thereby disturbed. The hon. gentleman says that does not apply to British Columbia. The proportionate representation to which British Columbia is entitled under the provisions of this Act are to be overriden by the terms and conditions stated at the time of admission into the union. Now, I humbly submit to this committee that Her Majesty's Order in Council becomes a part of this Act in so far as it is consistent with its provisions. What are the words of the Act? "Subject to the provisions of this Act." Now, if British Columbia was given six members when it was entitled to three, there is a

provision in the terms and conditions not subject to the provisions of this Act, and therefore nugatory. The Minister of Justice knows that, under a proper interpretation of this Act, he could not apply any other rule. If there is power given to Her Majesty, if there is power given to any other body, to do a particular thing, the terms of that power must be strictly pursued. When the Province of British Columbia asked for six members, and when the Parliament of Canada at that time agreed that she might come in with six members, that may have been altogether inconsistent. The hon. gentleman seems to think that this Parliament can override individual provinces. Why, Sir, what is the spirit, what is the character, of the provisions of this Act? It is that the terms of the Act are a treaty, and that that treaty cannot be overriden. What protection would the Province of Manitoba, or the Province of Prince Edward Island, or the Province of British Columbia have under this Confederation if, by a combination of a simple majority of the larger provinces, the terms and conditions could be disregarded. We might establish terms and conditions wholly inconsistent with this Act, and that would have prevented a union altogether if they had been suggested at the initiation of the union. But the Minister of Justice seems to lose sight of the fact that when Her Majesty had those terms and conditions before her, when her advisers framed, upon those terms and conditions, an Order in Council, they were assuming that the Government of British Columbia and the Government of Canada had acted in consonance with the provisions of this Act. Was there a statement to Her Majesty as to what the population of British Columbia was? Was there a statement to Her Majesty: "May it please Your Majesty, British Columbia, under the terms of the British North America Act, would be entitled to only two representatives, and we propose to give her six?" Does any one suppose for a moment that six representatives would have been embraced in the Order in Council if the facts were actually known by Her Majesty's advisers? It is enough to put the matter hypothetically, to show that this is not the case. The 146th section provides for the admission of those provinces that were out, and I want to know if Prince Edward Island is to have its representation cut down to five with 30,000 more inhabitants than British Columbia, and that British Columbia is to have six? Is that a compliance with the provisions of this Act? Is any Order in Council which undertakes to guarantee British Columbia against the diminution of her representation in accordance with sub-section 4, of section 51, in accordance with the provisions of this Act? Why, Sir, British Columbia may in a few years be entitled to five times six for aught I know, but she would be aggrieved if she were deprived of her full representation, and why should she, a province rapidly increasing in population, insist upon the terms of the Act being disregarded and the provisions of the law set at naught? Because every one must understand, no one in the whole country knows better than the Minister of Justice, that he cannot put into an Order in Council a term inconsistent with the provisions of this Act. It is not necessary to state the matter further; and it is perfectly just because it gives to British Columbia her full representation, and it does not give to her a representa-

tion with a smaller population, larger than the Province of Prince Edward Island is to receive.

Mr. MARA. The hon. member for Bothwell has given the very best answer that could possibly be given to the objection he has raised. He has stated that the terms of union with British Columbia were in the form of a treaty. A treaty was formed between British Columbia and the Dominion Government, which was ratified by the Imperial Parliament. One provision of the treaty was that British Columbia should be entitled to three senators and three representatives in the Commons. At that time it was known that British Columbia could not fairly claim that number according to her population, and it was also known that the *per capita* allowance would not be sufficient to carry on the Provincial Government. The population was assumed to be 60,000, which was far in excess of the real population. But upon that assumed population the treaty was formed, a solemn bargain was entered into between British Columbia and the Dominion Government, which was ratified by the Imperial Government, and this House has no power, even if it had the will, to break that treaty. If this House broke that treaty we would have to apply to the Imperial Government to alter the terms of union. British Columbia entered under a different arrangement, with a different treaty, than did Prince Edward Island. The delegates who were sent here foresaw that there might be a doubt when the next census was taken, whether British Columbia would be entitled to the full representation of six members, and they took good care that, at all events, the representation of the province should never be reduced; therefore the number was placed at six with a right to increased representation according to population.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) All that the hon. gentleman says is true, and I agree with the spirit of his argument that the admission of British Columbia into the union was upon terms and conditions which amounted in point of fact to a treaty, and it would be a wrongful thing to change the terms of that treaty without the consent of all parties. I follow the hon. gentleman thoroughly, and I do not see any defect in his argument on that score. But that is not the point raised by the hon. member for Bothwell. It is this: What power have we to declare by a statute of this Parliament that the Province of British Columbia shall have a larger number of members than the Imperial Act provides. That province has 6 members by the terms of union.

Mr. MARA. By the treaty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) By what the hon. gentleman calls the treaty. The hon. gentleman said that that treaty was ratified by the Imperial Parliament. If he was right in that statement, there would not be room for argument; but the treaty has not been ratified by the Imperial Parliament, and, speaking as a lawyer, my impression is that the treaty will have to be ratified by an Imperial Act before British Columbia has a legal right to return six members to this House. I am not speaking against British Columbia having six members. Having made a treaty to that effect, we have a perfect right to pass an Address to Her Majesty asking the Imperial Parliament to carry it out. I fully agree with what the hon. gentleman has stated, that British Columbia made an agreement with the Dominion under which she was to be entitled to six members. But we must look and see what the Imperial Act says. The Province of Quebec has sixty-five members, and we cannot change that number. Other provinces return a number of members in proportion to their population, as compared with the number 65 for the Province of Quebec. Section 146 says:

"It shall be lawful for the Queen on Address from the Houses of the respective Legislatures of the colony or Provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit these colonies or provinces or any of them into the union on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the Addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf, shall have effect as if they had been elected by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland."

The whole question is as to what is the meaning of the words, "subject to the provisions of this Act." If those words were not intended to control the exercise of any power on the part of the Queen, to import into an Imperial Act terms and conditions inconsistent with that Act—if they were not intended to prevent such a thing, I do not know what they mean. I think that is their meaning. I think the terms and conditions recited in the Orders in Council are perfectly good unless they contravene an express provision of the Act. If they do so contravene, to that extent they were *ultra vires*. I submit that imperial legislation will be required to overcome this difficulty. It was quite proper for the Minister of Justice to point to the inconvenience that might arise, and there is no hon. member who desires to go back on the terms of the union, or alter the number of representatives to which British Columbia may be entitled; but that does not affect the question that we are now asked to declare as law that which we have no right or power to so declare. This is a very important law point and it is worthy of consideration. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will not press this clause.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We intend only to press this clause to-night.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No doubt this is a legal question of very great importance, and probably the Minister of Justice on consideration would determine as a lawyer that the contention of my hon. friend, from a legal point of view, is correct, and there will have to be imperial legislation to ratify the treaty made between Canada and British Columbia.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot agree with that position, nor can I in the slightest degree concede that Her Majesty had not the power by Order in Council to vary, as regards any province, the terms of the British North America Act. I think that was the express power conferred in section 146, and the words "subject to the provisions of this Act" refer to the powers conferred by the Act to make Orders in Council admitting other provinces to the union.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose a claim was set up for a change in the distribution of power; suppose, for instance, that a province claimed to control notes and bills and to levy customs on imports or collect indirect taxes. If the hon. gentleman's contention is correct, the condition of admission to the Confederation might be varied.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would be. At one time British Columbia proposed to make stipulations respecting customs duties, and the

answer given was that the union had taken place in the meantime. If she had stood out for additional powers or diminished powers we would either have had to refuse the demand or accede to it. If we had agreed to the demand for further powers, we would have stood by that agreement ; and we will stand by this treaty, whether it requires an Imperial Act to confirm it or not. The fact that it was entered into in good faith would make it binding on us. It is entirely within Her Majesty's power, it is that power which was expressly conferred in section 146, it is that power which was exercised in respect to other provinces coming in, and no question having been raised for twenty years this House should not hesitate to act upon the clear, explicit understanding arrived it, and not adopt the mere suggestion that the making of the treaty was *ultra vires*.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me the position of the hon. member for Bothwell is a correct one legally, whatever it may be in point of justice, fair-play and good faith as between British Columbia and this Dominion. But in view of the wording of the section, I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman's contention is right, because the Act says, "on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the Addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act." So Her Majesty cannot approve anything outside of the provisions of this Act. British Columbia might have entered Confederation under two conditions. First, under an Act of Parliament. If it had come in under an Act of Parliament, that would have been a ratification of all the terms stipulated between British Columbia and the Confederation. But it came in under the second condition, by an Order in Council, the conditions of which the Queen could approve "subject to the provisions of this Act," and, therefore, if there was in the Address anything which was not within the provisions of the Act the Queen could not approve it. But, at the same time, I am myself taken by surprise at the objection raised, for it has always been understood that British Columbia was entitled to six members. I have no doubt whatever that this circumstance, as stated by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara), is a factor in this discussion which cannot be lost sight of. We have always understood that British Columbia was entitled to six members until such time that she was entitled to a larger number, but that she should not be represented by a less number than six. For my part I would be sorry to come to any conclusion which would deprive British Columbia of that which the people suppose themselves to be their right ; but as a question of law, as to whether British Columbia is entitled to six members, that involves a position which must be rectified in some way.

Mr. CORBOULD. I do not wonder that the hon. member for Bothwell should have taken objections to British Columbia having six members, for certainly that province has not rendered much assistance to the hon. gentleman and his party. But it is strange that the hon. gentleman did not take that objection a long time ago. I wonder he did not take it in 1873, when he came into power. At that time he might have done so, but it appears he overlooked the fact that British Columbia, until the present time, was over-represented in this House. The contract made with British Columbia was a solemn treaty, and under section 146 the Order in Council was made the same as an Imperial Act of Parliament. It seems to me that to get rid of that, it would require an Imperial Act of Parliament to undo it again. Now, if the hon. gentleman wants to get rid of British Columbia altogether—and apparently that is his object, because he wishes to break the treaty under which British Columbia came into Confederation—it is just as well for that province to know what the feelings of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House are towards British Columbia. So far, I am sure they have not shown any friendly feeling towards our province at all. Since I have had the honour of being in this House I have not heard any hon. gentleman on the other side say very much in favour of the Province of British Columbia, and I presume it is because British Columbia has not sent them any assistance in Parliament. As to the legal point now before the House, I think the Minister of Justice has answered the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) completely, and I do not propose to deal with it at present, because before doing so I would like to look into it. I am sure that from the explanation the Minister of Justice has already given, that this House will be satisfied that it is impossible for us to-day to break that treaty with British Columbia without showing extremely bad faith. In fact, it would be impossible for us to do it without a British Act of Parliament.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has altogether misconceived the spirit of the observations which were made by my hon. friends here. There is no intention on this side of the House to deprive British Columbia of the six members to which we say in good faith she is entitled. But my hon. friends beside me have pointed out a difficulty which is a serious one. The hon. gentleman makes light of it, but perhaps it would be better to take it, not in the spirit of hostility but simply as calling the attention of the House to a great difficulty in the position occupied on the floor of Parliament by British Columbia. It is true that British Columbia has not done much for the Opposition, but that is more their misfortune than ours.

Mr. GORDON. The terms of union with British Columbia provide that the representation of six members may be increased but not diminished, and my hon. friend for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will find that the terms of union with Prince Edward Island are of an entirely different character. The 12th clause of the terms of union with Prince Edward Island states "That the representation of Prince Edward Island may be readjusted from time to time," whereas the terms of union with British Columbia states "That the representation of six members shall be increased under the provisions of the British North America Act." I am sure that the legal gentlemen of the House are well qualified to deal with the legal question, but I for one can see that it is quite plain that British Columbia is entitled to six members until her population entitles her to more, and that her present representation shall not be diminished.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not wish to lie under the imputation which my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Corbould) seems to desire to place on the

Opposition, that they entertain feelings adverse to British Columbia. I have never heard any of my hon. friends on this side of the House express any but kindly feelings towards British Columbia, and I beg to assure my hon. friend that so far as the individual members coming from British Columbia are concerned, we entertain nothing but kindly feelings towards them personally. I am in thorough accord with my leader that this is a matter of good faith. I think it would be a breach of faith on the part of Parliament to alter those terms if they could do it, but the point before the House is a purely legal question. If my learned friend's contention is true, one or other of these hon. gentlemen occupy a seat here improperly and illegally, and I am sure they do not want to be in that position. The suggestion was made that the illegality should be removed if it exists, and should be removed in the only way possible, not by a Bill passed in this House but by an amendment to the Imperial Act ratifying the terms of union. When I first rose that was the suggestion I made.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I thought the objection was taken that an Imperial statute was required, and that in the meantime we could not pass this section.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the meantime I am still of opinion, as I rose to suggest before, that an Imperial Act was necessary to remove this illegality.

Section agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progres.

THE PATENT ACT.

Mr. CARLING moved second reading of Bill (No. 90) to amend the Patent Act and Acts amending the same. He said: The chief provisions in this Bill are to extend the life of a patent from 15 years, as it is at present, to 18 years, and to do away with the necessity for models. At present models are not required in any country except the United States, and only there when specially called for, and from our experience in the department we do not think models should be required, except where they are absolutely necessary, and specially called for.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the term of the life of a patent in England and in the United States?

Mr. CARLING. In England 7, 14 and 21 years, I believe, and in the United States 17 years.

Mr. MULOCK. You propose to divide the term into three parts—6, 12 and 18 years?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the reason for extending the time?

Mr. CARLING. The Canadian Inventors' Association, who have discussed the granting of patents very fully, consider that it is very important that our inventors should be granted a patent for 18 years instead of 17 years as in the United States. I believe that it is intended to extend the term in the United States to 18 years; but by giving our inventors 18 years, we shall enable them to take out a patent here first, and still preserve the life of the patent for its full term in the United States, because in the United States it takes perhaps a year to get a patent through.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On grounds of public policy I question the desirability of extending the period of a patent right. Fifteen years nowadays is a very long time, practically a good deal longer than it was when the facilities of communication and transmission of knowledge were much less widely diffused. It is well known to everybody who has had occasion to look into this question of patents that in the case of valuable patents a number of persons are very frequently engaged on the same invention or substantially the same at the same time; and I question very much whether the public interest—which is after all more to be considered than what the Inventors' Association calls for—will be served by increasing the time for which a patent is granted. It appears to me that this is very questionable legislation, and no argument has been given in justification of it.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I have had a good many communications from the Canadian Inventors' Association with regard to the proposed Bill, and I think that a few explanations as to the length of the life of a patent, would relieve hon. gentlemen opposite of any doubts they may have as to the necessity for this legislation. I cannot do better than illustrate a case. When an inventor obtains a patent in another country, after having obtained one here, he can only get a patent for the remaining period of the life of the patent in the country where it is first issued. For instance, we issue a patent for fifteen years, and the man who gets a patent here and afterwards desires to take out one in the United States, instead of getting it for the full term of 17 years, can only get it for the balance of the term of 15 years. The result of that is that inventors go first to the United States, and that the United States reap most of the benefits of the invention, and we loose the fees and the advantage of the business that we should otherwise have. If the length of the life of a patent is extended to 18 years, the patentee has an opportunity of taking out his patent here and making some test of it within a year, and then getting out a patent in the United States for the full term of 17 years. In regard to the objection raised by the hon. member for South Oxford that this interferes with the rights of parties, it may possibly theoretically interfere, though I doubt if it does, but practically we know that it does not interfere with the rights of any person. We know as a matter of experience, in connection with the working out of the patent law, that not one patent in ten issued is carried on for many years afterwards. The patentees do not find a market for them, or are not able to perfect their invention, or it is perfected to a greater extent in some other countries. This extension of the life of the patent is proposed on the application of the Canadian Inventors' Association after they had fully considered the matter, and the object they desire to gain is that a Canadian inventor shall be able to take out a patent in his own country, and after that if it proves a success, he shall be able to take it out for the full term of 17 years in the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not going to take any objection to the second reading of the Bill, but when we go into committee I intend to discuss some of these provisions, especially that one making it optional to furnish a model. In many cases the patentee is anxious to get rid of the expense and

trouble of making a model, but my information is that the experience of the neighbouring Republic in doing away with the model has not been altogether satisfactory. Disputes have arisen as to the rights of parties under the patent, and there is no existing model by which those disputes can be satisfactorily determined. A party makes some alteration or improvement, which he maintains is not a part of the original patent; the original patentee maintains the contrary, and disputes arise which would not have arisen if the model had been furnished.

Mr. MULOCK. The only reason the hon. gentleman assigns for this legislation is his desire to secure the rights of patentees in a foreign country. I am surprised that he should found legislation on the practice of the United States or allow their laws or practices to control this Parliament. It seems to me the Canadian Parliament ought to be able to legislate for its own people without dictation from the United States. The hon. gentleman says that whilst to-day an inventor might apply for his patent in the United States first and thus have the full benefit of the law there, it will be better for him to stay at home and take out his patent here. I can see considerable advantage to this country in having the department saved a good deal of expense by the examination into the patent taking place in the United States patent office instead of here. I cannot see any great advantage in having the patent office here troubled with a lot of applications, nine-tenths of which, I suppose, are refused, and all of which labour would be saved if the patent was first got on application across the line. The Minister of Agriculture, he who is responsible for this measure, has not told us anything about the public. He says this legislation is asked for by the association of inventors. Has he consulted the public? Would it not be wise to allow some publicity to this proposed legislation before it goes into effect? We all know that to-day a patentee really enjoys a monopoly long after the expiry of the patent, for he grafts on it certain improvements which give him really the control of the original invention, and it is a rare thing to find even an expired patent becoming an article of common manufacture, so that I think he has failed to really make out a case.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think great care ought to be given to this Bill before passing it. I understand that the department now can exercise their judgment as to whether they shall require models or not. I would like to know if that is not the case.

Mr. CARLING. They require models unless the models are specially dispensed with; but what we propose now is that a drawing shall be prepared and submitted to the department for examination by the patent examiner, and if he finds it is not necessary to have a model, we will not put the inventor to the expense of furnishing one. The furnishing of these models is very expensive, the storing of them takes a great deal of room, and the taking charge of them entails considerable expense. The Americans have ceased exacting them altogether except in special cases.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I understand it, in the past it was the practice of the department not to demand a model where it was thought not necessary. That is all that is required. Any person will easily see that, in many instances, not even an expert can tell from a drawing whether the patent interferes with another or not. Further than that, I am credibly informed that the United States commissioner, in his last report, reported very strongly in favour of insisting on the furnishing of models although they had been dispensed with for some time. That being the case, if we are to be governed by their practice, we ought to be very careful before making any change. Further, I may say, that a person applying for a patent in the United States has to supply a cardboard as a substitute for the model.

Mr. COATSWORTH. In the same way as the department requires it here.

Mr. CARLING. The department requires a drawing.

Mr. COATSWORTH. The same drawing as in the United States?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman says so, but I do not think there is anything in the Bill or in the practice of the department to bear him out. The Minister will be able to say whether they require a cardboard the same as in the United States.

Mr. CARLING. According to the regulations of the department, they require, the same as in the United States, a proper drawing of the invention. That drawing will be put before the examiner, unless it is necessary to have a model.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. Minister says a drawing is required the same as in the United States, but I am trying to explain that there are cardboards required in the United States different from anything provided in this Bill.

Mr. COATSWORTH. The Minister says that drawings are required the same as in the United States, so that the only difference now between us and the United States is that we require models and they do not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know whether the hon. member for Toronto can speak for the Department of Agriculture or not, but his understanding in the matter is different from mine, and I have some experience in this, and I must take issue with him. I believe him to be incorrect, and unless this Bill makes provision we are not placed in the same position as in the United States. What I bring before the attention of the Government is the report of the commissioner in the United States urging upon the Government very strongly to change the system of not asking for models. I agree with the Minister that in many cases it is not desirable to press upon all applicants for models. In many cases they are not necessary and put the person applying for the patent to great expense without any benefit to the public, but there are many other instances in which drawings, or even cardboard, will not place the officers of the department, no matter how expert they may be, in a position to tell whether there is anything which encroaches upon another patent. The public are largely interested in this matter. I understand that this legislation is asked for by an association of patent solicitors, and that is one reason why this House should look carefully into it. We can see what danger there might be if the matter was so placed in the hands of an association that no application could be made

without toll being paid to the members of such an association. I think, on the whole, there has been no particular complaint in connection with the department by parties applying for patents. I think a great deal of care has been exercised and information has been given, and the interests of the applicants facilitated if they could show they were entitled to a patent. At least, that is as far as my information and experience go. I think the Minister ought to be careful about placing this in the hands of an association, as I have already pointed out, and I think he should consider the report of the commissioner of the United States.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do the United States give preference to their own subjects, as the Minister proposes to give to Canadians here?

Mr. CARLING. No, I think not. There has been an alteration made in this Bill which will be brought up in committee by which no advantage is given to Canadians over Americans.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The law of the United States was formerly that a higher fee was charged to subjects of Her Majesty than to those of any other foreign country, but I understand the law has been changed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 89) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act and amendments thereto.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DEWDNEY. Section 3 was held over when we were last in committee in accordance with the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in reference to the time at which the entry should be cancelled. I have considered the matter very carefully and I think, if we do make any extension, we might substitute two years for the six months in the Bill.

Bill, as amended, reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.55 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 15th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY ELECTION.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You informed the House, Mr. Speaker, a few days ago that you had received a report of the judges who had presided at the trial of the petition controverting the election in Chicoutimi and Saguenay. That report stated that corrupt practices had been found extensively to prevail in that constituency. I have not made any motion for a writ to issue, as the statute requires, in order that I might first receive from the judges a copy of the evidence taken and lay the same on the Table of the House, so that the House might be put in full possession of the facts before any motion should be made on the subject of the writ. With the view, therefore, of having the evidence before the House, I beg leave to move that an Order of the House do issue for the minutes of evidence taken at the trial, under the Dominion Controverted Election Act, of the case of N. Sturgeon and others, petitioners, against T. B. Savard, defendant, in relation to the election in the counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay in the year 1891.

Mr. LAURIER. Would it not be sufficient to secure the case from the Supreme Court?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was not printed, but I have the evidence and am ready to lay it on the Table.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In accordance with the Order of the House I beg to lay on the Table the evidence in that case, and to state at the same time that, if it be the pleasure of the House, I will move to-morrow that the writ shall issue.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery for the Dominion of Canada, for year ending 30th June, 1891.—(Mr. Patterson, Huron.)

PUBLICATIONS IN THE *GLOBE RE* ELECTION EXPENSES

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 30th day of April last, publish a series of documents purporting to be lithographed facsimiles of letters and receipts signed by the Hon. Sir A. P. Caron, or by others acting on his behalf, in words following:—

1. A letter addressed to the Hon. Thomas McGreevy:

"Please give Mr. W. B. Smith, one hundred and fifty dollars for legal expenses, for the County of Quebec.

"ADOLPHE P. CARON.

"Quebec, 9-2-'87.
"Honble. T. McGREEVY, Quebec."

2. A receipt from Sir A. P. Caron:

"Received from Honble. T. McGreevy, one thousand dollars for legal expenses, County of Quebec.

"ADOLPHE P. CARON."

3. A receipt from P. P. Hall:

"Rec'd $200.00 acct. legal exps., Quebec County.

"P. P. HALL.

"Jan'y 12, '87."

4. A receipt from Xavier Giroux:

"Quebec County.
"Rec'd of Hall Bros. & Co., one hundred dollars.

"XAVIER GIROUX.

"Quebec, Feb'y 3, '87."

5. A letter from Sir A. P. Caron:

"$400.
"Please pay four hundred dollars, legal expenses, County of Quebec.

"ADOLPHE P. CARON.

"Quebec, 17th Feb., '87."

6. A receipt from Sir A. P. Caron:

"Received from Thomas McGreevy, five hundred dollars, legal expenses, election of the County of Quebec.

"ADOLPHE P. CARON."

7. A receipt from A. Sharples:

"QUEBEC, 26th Feb'y, '87.

"Rec'd from Honble. Thomas McGreevy six hundred dollars for election purposes at St. Columban district.

"A. SHARPLES."

8. A letter of Sir A. P. Caron to Hon. Thomas McGreevy:

"1887.

"DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—Please give Mr. Tarte five hundred dollars. I shall explain.

"ADOLPHE P. CARON.

"Rd. this amount.

"J. I. TARTE."

9. A receipt from Sir A. P. Caron:

"Received from Honble. Mr. McGreevy, two thousand dollars.

"ADOLPHE P. CARON.

"QUEBEC, 19-2-'87."

10. A receipt from Sir A. P. Caron:

"$200.

"Received from Honble. T. McGreevy two hundred dollars for legal expenses for the County of Quebec.

"ADOLPHE P. CARON."

11. A receipt from Mr. Tarte as follows:

"Received two hundred dollars.

"J. ISRAEL TARTE."

A letter from Sir A. P. Caron to Hon. Thomas McGreevy, in the following words:

"(*Private.*) 3 February, 1887.

"DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—Will you oblige me by giving Mr. Tarte what he will explain to you required.

"Yours,

"Paid $150." "A. P. C.

12. A receipt from Mr. Joseph Hamel, as follows:

"7th February.

"$1,000.

"JOSEPH HAMEL."

13. A letter from Mr. Tarte, as follows:

(*Translation.*) "QUEBEC, 13th February, 1887.

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—Will you send me, by the bearer, forty dollars for St. Gabriel West, County of Quebec, organization of committees.

"Your devoted servant,

"J. ISRAEL TARTE.

"Received the sum of forty dollars.

"ED. CHINIC,
"For J. I. TARTE."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Members of the Government who receive the *Globe* newspaper are aware of the publication referred to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 11th day of May last, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles:—

1. A letter of Sir H. L. Langevin:

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—Mr. Théophile Laflamme, who is the expense agent of Dr. Lesage, will hand you this letter. I think you might let him have $400. The Doctor has a hard fight, and I think we must do what we can for him for his legal expenses.

"Yours very truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"QUEBEC, 31st January, 1887.

"P. S.—Let him sign the blank receipt on the other sheet. "H. L. L."

2. A receipt from Mr. Théophile Laflamme:

(*Translation.*)

"Received from Hon. Thos. McGreevy, four hundred dollars for legal expenses of the Dorchester election. I am disbursing agent for Doctor Lesage.

"THÉOPHILE LAFLAMME.

"QUEBEC, 31st Jan'y., 1887."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

3. A letter from Sir Hector L. Langevin:

"(*Private.*)

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—Please send as much as you think should be sent to Dr. Lesage. He has a very hard fight. His legal expenses are great under the circumstances, his county being large.

"Yours truly,

HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"QUEBEC, 14th Feby., 1887."

4. A receipt from Mr. Théophile Laflamme:

"QUEBEC, 14th February.

"Received for Dorchester, five hundred for legal expenses.

"THÉOPHILE LAFLAMME."

5. A receipt from Dr. C. Lesage:

"QUEBEC, 18th February, 1887.

"Received five hundred dollars.

"DR. C. LESAGE."

6. A receipt from Louis Taché:

(*Translation.*)

"QUEBEC, 25th January, 1887.

"Received from Mr. Thomas Magarwey the sum of six hundred dollars.

"LS. TACHÉ.

"$600.00. C. Rimouski."

7. A letter of Sir Hector L. Langevin:

"(*Private.*)

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—You might have the bearer, Mr. Alphonse Martin, carry to Mr. Ls. Taché say four hundred dollars for legal expenses in Rimouski. He might give his receipt on the back of the enclosed power of attorney from Mr. Taché.

"Yours truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"QUEBEC, 11th February, 1887."

8. A letter from Sir Hector L. Langevin:

"(*Private.*)

"DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—You might add two hundred dollars for legal expenses of Rimouski.

"Yours truly.

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"QUEBEC, 14th Feb'y., 1887."

"Reçu le montant.

"R. A. DRAPEAU."

9. A receipt from R. A. Drapeau:

"QUEBEC, 14 Feb'y., 1887.

"Received from T. McGreevy five hundred dollars for legal expenses in Rimouski.

"R. A. DRAPEAU."

10. A letter from Sir Hector L. Langevin:

"(*Private.*)

"DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—Mr. Charles Taché, brother of our candidate in Rimouski, leaves to-morrow morning for Rimouski. I think you might, on the balance allotted for legal expenses of that county, let him have eight hundred dollars. He is a safe man.

"Yours truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"Honble. T. McGREEVY.

"QUECEC, 13th Feb'y., 1887.

"Received $800.

"J. C. TACHÉ."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Members of the Government who see the *Globe* newspaper are aware of this publication.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 12th day of May last, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles:—

1. A receipt from Mr. Arthur Prieur:

(*Translation.*)

"QUEBEC, 31st Jany., 1887.

"Received from Thomas McGreevy, Esq., the sum of five hundred dollars.

"ARTHUR PRIEUR.

"$500."

2. Another receipt from Mr. A. Prieur:

(*Translation.*)

"$1,000.

"QUEBEC, 2nd Feb., 1887.

"Received from Thomas McGreevy, Esq., the sum of one thousand dollars.

"ARTHUR PRIEUR."

3. A receipt from Mr. Arthur Prieur:

(*Translation.*)

"$1,500.

"QUEBEC, 7th February, 1887.

"Received the sum of fifteen hundred dollars from Thos. McGreevy, Esq.

"ARTHUR PRIEUR."

4. A letter from Mr. Arthur Prieur:

(*Translation.*)

"ST. STANISLAS, 12th Feb., 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR,—The bearer of this letter is Mr. Duplessis, one of our devoted friends. He will take my place as to the matters with reference to which I have been commissioned to deal with you.

"Our friend Mr. Panneton has telegraphed me here to go down and see you in order to get further assistance, but as I am detained here in order to work for Mr. Montplaisir, I send you Mr. Duplessis. You can trust him in every respect.

"Your devoted servant,

"ARTHUR PRIEUR.

"He requires $2,000.

"P. E. PANNETON."

5. A letter from Mr. Charlebois:

"THREE RIVERS, 14th Feb., 1887.

"DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—Deposit four thousand without fail this morning at 10 a.m. the latest.

"Yours truly,

"H. CHARLEBOIS."

6. A receipt from Mr. Duplessis:

"$1,000.

"QUEBEC, 14th Feb'y., 1887.

"Received for Three Rivers one thousand.

"C. Z. DUPLESSIS."

7. A receipt from Mr. P. B. Vanasse:

"$2,000.

"QUEBEC, 17th February, 1887.

"Received two thousand dollars for Mr. Panneton at 3 Rivers.

"P. B. VANASSE."

8. A letter from Mr. Panneton:

(*Translation.*)

"THREE RIVERS, 13th Feb., 1887.

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—I made the offer to the party. He refused for $2,500.00. I offered at last $3,500.00, and he is to answer me to-morrow morning. If this suits you, be good enough to deposit the amount to-morrow when the bank opens and let me be informed by telegraph. If you have anything to ———— to me, confide in Mr. Charlebois, who is to come up here by the 2.30 p.m. train. See him without fail.

"Yours truly,

"P. E. PANNETON."

9. A letter from P. E. Panneton:

(*Translation.*)

"LA BANQUE DU PEUPLE.

"(*P. E. Panneton, Manager.*)

"THREE RIVERS, 26th Feb., 1887.

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—The fight is over and we have conquered. I congratulate you on your success.

"We are still indebted in the sum of $2,869.00.

"Sir Hector gave me last evening, the line you will find herein. I acted for the best; he had given me orders not to lose this election. Pelletier spent on his side at least $6,000. The struggle has been terrific.

"As this sum was borrowed from a friend and will be due on Tuesday, be good enough to have the amount deposited on Monday and let me be notified by telegraph.

"If you prefer to see me, telegraph on Monday morning early and I will go down at 11.30 a.m. Sir Hector wishes that nothing be neglected.

Yours truly,

"P. E. PANNETON.

"I have ascertained that $7,000.00 has been spent by Pelletier's committee. During the last two days they made frantic efforts.

"Destroy this. "P. E. P.

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—Please hear the bearer, Mr. P. E. Panneton.

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN."

10. A draft received from Mr. Gouin:

"$3,150.00. "THREE RIVERS, March 3rd, 1887.

"At sight please pay to the order of myself three thousand one hundred and fifty dollars, value received, and charge the same to the account of

"B.C., 1,418. Paid 18th. "A. J. GOUIN.

"To Hon. THOMAS MCGREEVY, Quebec."

11. A letter from Mr. P. E. Panneton:

(*Translation.*)

"(*Private.*) LA BANQUE DU PEUPLE.

"THREE RIVERS, March 3rd, 1887.

"Hon. THOS. MCGREEVY, Quebec.

"MY DEAR SIR,—The draft in question has been made this day by A. J. Gouin.

"I have added $281.00 to provide for certain accounts of which I was not aware. It will be presented to you to-morrow by La Banque du Peuple.

"Our friend wishes that everything should be settled up, so as to avoid any annoyance.

"We shall take steps to avoid a contestation.

"Yours truly,

"P. E. PANNETON."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The members of the Government who read the *Globe* newspaper are aware of the publications referred to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper did, on or about the 14th day of May last, publish the following statement containing a certain other lithographed facsimile, namely:—

1. A letter from Sir John Macdonald to the Hon. Thomas McGreevy:

"(*Private and confidential.*)

"OTTAWA, 6th May, 1884.

"MY DEAR MCGREEVY,—All my colleagues from the other provinces concur with me in the opinion that Langevin and Chapleau should try to live together in amity in the Government.

"They think that Chapleau is less dangerous when he is a hostage for his good behaviour by being in the Council—than as a man free to act—Langevin is sensitive to attacks in the newspapers, and if Chapleau takes the field against him, he will sting our friend to death. L. is going to Quebec by the end of the week and will see his friends. I wish you particularly to see him and impress on him the necessity of putting up with C. until the latter does something so wrong as to justify his forced resignation. Just now I cannot ask him to do so unless L. and Caron or one of them in writing, say either make and prove a sufficient charge or say that I must choose which of them to keep. This must be communicated to C. and he will wreak his vengeance so long as he lives on the devoted head of those who drive him out of the Government. The faults of C. will soon be forgotten and L. will be charged with persecution and jealousy. This will create a sympathy for C., and the Grits and Rouges will eagerly accept his assistance and he will become a power in the state. As a junior member of the Cabinet he is comparatively harmless.

"It is, I think, in your personal interest not to have a split. Tupper, with whom I have gone over the whole thing, agrees with me. I wish you would run up to Montreal on Friday and see him (Tupper). He would like to

see you on the subject, and I have told him I would write you to meet him. Be sure you go. He leaves Montreal for Halifax on Friday night. Burn this letter when read. You need not say to L. that I have written you.

"Yours sincerely,

"JOHN A. MACDONALD."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Those members of the Government who see the *Globe* newspaper are aware of the publications referred to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 17th day of May last, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles:—

1. A receipt from Mr. James Carrel:

"QUEBEC, 1st February, 1887.

$500.

"Received five hundred dollars for services and expenses.

"JAMES CARREL.

"Mr. Carrel gave a receipt on Feb. 5 for $500, on Feb. 16 for $250, and on Feb. 20 for $500. In all he drew $1,850. The Quebec *Mercury*, controlled at that time by Mr. W. J. Maguire, was fed on smaller sums, but in the aggregate it received a little more than the *Telegraph*. The *Mercury* vouchers, all signed by W. J. Maguire, are as follows:—

"Feb. 5	$ 500
Feb. 7	100
Feb. 13	100
Feb. 19	100
Feb. 25	100
March 5	100
March 19	100
March 26	100
April 2	100
Costs in libel suit	200
Fees of Mr. Dunbar, Q.C., and another	500
"Total	$2,000 "

2. A receipt from Mr. T. Chapais:

"Mr. Chapais, Sir Hector's son-in-law, figured in Kamouraska in behalf of Mr. Blondeau, the Tory candidate. On November 22, 1886, he gave a receipt for $1,000 to the reptile fund. This money was deposited for a protest against Mr. Gagnon, M.P.P. (Nationalist), who had just been returned for the county. The petition against Mr. Gagnon was withdrawn, and the money retained by some one in Kamouraska for use in the federal election. Then comes an undated receipt signed by Mr. Chapais for $500, and marked 'Kamouraska.' On 10th February, Mr. Chapais drew $1,000 more. Here is the facsimile:

"Reçu de l'honorable M. McGreevy $1,000 pour l'élection de Kamouraska.

"THOS. CHAPAIS.

"Québec, 10 février 1887."

"On 18th February, a receipt was given by Charles Dionne, of Rivière Ouelle, for $1,500. Mr. Chapais, on 15th February, had written to Mr. McGreevy from St. Denis in Kamouraska as follows:—

"SAINT DENIS, 15th Feb., 1887.

Hon. Mr. McGREEVY,
Quebec.

"DEAR SIR,—Will you be kind enough to send me by express the rest of the money destined for Kamouraska, namely, $1,500. I have already received, for our legitimate expenses, a total of $1,500, for which I have given you vouchers. I will acknowledge receipt by return mail. Address the package as follows:—'Monsieur Charles Dionne, merchant, Rivière Ouelle.' If you could send it in a box well tied up, so much the better. We are watched on all sides. It is impossible for me to get up to Quebec. That is why I ask you to send the money by express. Don't mark the amount you are sending on the package. I must beg of you to be expeditious. Matters are going nicely here. One more effort and all will be well. Charles Dionne, to whom I am asking you to send the money, is a safe man. He is my cousin germain. I can't find time to go up to Quebec. My presence here is essential.

"Yours, &c.,

"THOMAS CHAPAIS."

"Including the $1,000 deposit, which was spent in the Federal election—at any rate it was never returned to the fund—Mr. Chapais drew $4,000 for Kamouraska. His candidate was beaten. He himself ran at the general election in March, 1891, and was beaten."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Government who read the Toronto *Globe*, are aware of this correspondence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 18th day of May last, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles:—

Letters from Sir Hector L. Langevin and Sir A. P. Caron:

"The candidates in Bellechasse in 1887 were Col. Amyot, then an Oppositionist, and Mr. J. N. Belleau. As a general thing, Sir Hector and Sir Adolphe divided the constituencies in the Quebec district, Sir Adolphe looking after the upper and Sir Hector after the lower ones. This was in the distribution of the money. But both took a hand in issuing orders for their candidate in Bellechasse. First comes an undated order (it was cashed apparently on 2nd Feb.) from Sir Hector for $600. No name is mentioned in it, but the money was paid to a Mr. Santerre, a worker for Mr. Belleau, who gave a receipt for it. Here is his order in facsimile:

"(*Private.*)

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—I think you might give him six hundred for legal expenses.

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"On Feb. 2 Mr. Tarte got $300 for Bellechasse. There was a charming frankness about Mr. Tarte's receipts: he never pretended the money was for 'legal expenses.' This particular receipt reads thus:

"Received three hundred dollars for election purposes.

"J. ISRAEL TARTE.

"Quebec, 2 Feb. 1887.

"That was Mr. Tarte's usual style. On 4th February Sir Adolphe gave an order for $300 in favour of Mr. Santerre, who receipted it across the face, and on the 5th another in favour of the same person for $200. On the 8th Mr. Santerre got $500 on an order from Sir Adolphe. On the 9th Sir Adolphe gave an order for $100 to Pierre Fradette, who endorsed it in a bold hand. On the 10th $200 was paid on the order of Mr. Louis Lamontagne to a Mr. Dion. This money was intended for another constituency but found its way to Bellechasse and was charged against Bellechasse. On the 12th Sir Adolphe gave an order direct to Mr. Belleau for $400. Here is the facsimile. Mr. Belleau's receipt will be noticed in the right corner:

"Please give bearer (Mr. Belleau) four hundred dollars, legal expenses, for the election of Bellechasse.

"QUEBEC, 12-2-'87.

"ADOLPHE CARON.

"Honble. T. MCGREEVY, *Québec.*

"Reçu le montant.

"EUS. BELLEAU.

"On the 14th Sir Adolphe issued an order for $800 in favour of Mr. Santerre, (who by the way sometimes signs 'Santerre' and sometimes 'Sansterre' with the 's'); and on the 17th Sir Hector asked and got $100 for 'legal expenses in Bellechasse,' without naming the person for whom the money was destined. Altogether, the reptile fund supplied the following sums for use in Bellechasse:

"2nd Feb.	—Sir Hector's order		$600 00
2nd "	—Mr. Tarte's receipt		300 00
4th "	—Sir Adolphe's order		300 00
5th "	— " "		200 00
8th "	— " "		500 00
9th "	— " "		100 00
10th "	—Lamontagne's order		200 00
12th "	—Sir Adolphe's order		400 00
14th "	— " "		800 00
17th "	—Sir Hector's order		100 00
	"Total		$3,500 00

"From a fragmentary correspondence it appears that the Tories in the county raised about $600 in addition, and Mr. Belleau or his friends considerably more. At headquarters the hope of beating Mr. Amyot was never very strong. His majority was 637."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The members of the Government who read the Toronto *Globe* are aware of this publication.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 19th day of May last, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles :—

1. A receipt from Mr. P. V. Valin :

"At the general election in 1887, Mr. P. V. Valin was the Tory candidate in Montmorency. He was one of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. In his evidence before the Privileges Committee last year he said he got money on two or three occasions from Mr. McGreevy. Near the close of the contest his agents alarmed him by telling him that he was going to be beaten, and he went to Murphy of Larkin, Connolly & Co. and to Mr. McGreevy. Murphy said Larkin, Connolly & Co. had placed 'all that was necessary' in Mr. McGreevy's hands, and Mr. McGreevy said he could not give him any more money as the elections of the two Ministers and other elections had cost so much. Up to this time Mr. Valin had obtained three doles from the fund. The first voucher is dated February 8, and was for $250. The second is dated February 12, for $500, and the third, dated February 16, was for $250. Mr. Valin signed for each of these sums. Here is a facsimile of his first voucher:

"QUEBEC, 8th Feby., 1887.

"Received two hundred and fifty dollars for legal expenses for Montmorency.

"P. V. VALIN.

"In addition Sir Adolphe issued an order upon the fund, February 19, for $200, which was paid to Mr. L. J. or L. G. Desjardins, for 'legal expenses in Montmorency.'"

2. A letter from Sir Hector L. Langevin :

"After he had applied in vain to Murphy and Mr. McGreevy, Mr. Valin visited Sir Hector, who wrote the following letter, upon the strength of which, as will be seen, he got $500:

"(*Private.*)

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY.—Mr. Valin has come. He says that he wants more help for his legal expenses. Do what you think proper and necessary. And send him for any more to Senator Ross. This county is a very hard one.

"Yours truly.

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"QUEBEC, 17th Feby., 1887.

"Received five hundred dollars.

"P. V. VALIN.

"The Senator Ross spoken of was the late Senator James G. Ross, the leading financial man of a Government subsidized road, the Lake St. John. Mr. Valin who got $1,700 in all from the fund, was beaten by one vote. The case is dealt with on the editorial page."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The members of the Government who read the *Globe* newspaper are aware of this publication.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 20th day of May last, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles :—

1. A receipt from Mr. A. Gaboury :

"QUEBEC, 9th Feby., 1887.

"$1,000.

"Received one thousand dollars on account of legal expenses for the Q. C.

"A. GABOURY."

2. A receipt from Mr. A. Gaboury :

"QUEBEC, 15th Feby., 1887.

"$1,000.

"Received one thousand dollars *re* Q. C.

"A. GABOURY."

3. A receipt from Mr. A. Gaboury :

QUEBEC, 17th Feby., 1887.

"$1,000.

"Received one thousand dollars *re* Q. C.

"A. GABOURY.

"These are *facsimiles* of three of Mr. A. Gaboury's receipts for money received from the reptile fund for employment against Mr. Francis Langelier, M.P., in Quebec Centre in 1887. In addition Mr. Gaboury received $500 on Feb. 21, and $500 on Feb. 24, for which he gave receipts. Further on, April 12, a sum of $1,000 was paid from the fund to contest Mr. Langelier's election. The petition collapsed and the money was used in paying election bills. The total expenditure from the fund in the constituency was, therefore, $5,300. Mr. Burroughs, the Tory candidate, polled 626 votes. See editorial page."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The members of the Government who receive the Toronto *Globe* are aware of this publication.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 21st day of May last, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles :—

A letter from Mr. Joncas, M.P. :

"Pressure on space obliges us to cut this reptile chapter short to-day. At the general election in 1887 Mr. Joncas, the present member, was the Tory candidate in Gaspé. The election was held some time after the others. The first voucher in point of date is an order dated Jan. 30 for $500 from Sir Hector upon Mr. McGreevy in favour of Mr. Bisaillon, a Tory worker in Gaspé.

"On March 3 Sir Adolphe gave an order for $200 to be paid to Mr. H. Chassé, who went to Gaspé on election business. On March 8 Sir Adolphe gave another order for $400. Then $200 was sent direct to Mr. Joncas, who acknowledged the receipt of it in the following note:—

"STE. ANNE DES MONTS, 12th Mar., 1887.

"THOS. MCGREEVY, Esq., Quebec.

"DEAR SIR.—Your letter of the 8th March instant containing $200.00 has reached me here this morning. Many thanks.

"Yours truly.

"L. Z. JONCAS.

"In all $1,300 was despatched from the fund to Gaspé in the interest of Mr. Joncas. Mr. Joncas was among those who voted against Mr. Edgar's motion on the 4th instant. He preferred to have the charges mutilated and sent to a Royal Commission. As mutilated by the Government, the charges do not allow of enquiry being held into the manner in which the fund was expended, that is to say, it will be impossible for the commission, even were it inclined to do so, to take testimony with reference to the payments made to or in behalf of the Tory candidates at the election of 1887."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 23rd day of May last, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimile :—

A letter from Mr. Julien Chabot :

"In the County of Lévis in 1887 the candidates were Mr. Charles Darveau (Min.) and Dr. Guay (Opp.) The operations of the reptile fund are briefly described in the following letter from Mr. Julien Chabot :—

"QUEBEC, 19th Feb., 1887.

"HON. THOMAS MCGREEVY,
"Quebec.

"SIR.—Will it be possible to get the balance of the appropriation for the County of Lévis, *i.e.*, $3,000. Of this amount I have received :

"1st		$ 500 00
"2nd		200 00
"3rd		1,000 00
		$1,700 00
"You told me Mr. Darveau rec'd	$200 350	550 00
"Another		100 00
		$2,350 00
"The balance remaining and not paid yet		650 00
		$3,000 00

"Yours truly, &c., &c.

"J. CHABOT.

"The $500 received by Mr. Chabot was paid on his own receipt dated Feb. 11th. The $200 which he got was paid to him on an order from Sir Adolphe dated Feb. 14, which reads as follows:—'Please pay Mr. Julien Chabot two hundred dollars, legal expenses in the election of Lévis.—ADOLPHE P. CARON.' The $1,000 which he obtained was paid to him through Mr. A. Gaboury, President of the Banque Nationale, who gave this receipt for it:—'Quebec, 16 Feb.—Received one thousand dollars for Julien Chabot.—A. GABOURY.' Coming to the other items, the $400 paid to Mr. Darveau was paid on an order from Sir Adolphe, without date. Mr. Darveau signed for it. The $350 which Mr. Darveau got was paid to him on an order from Sir Hector dated Feb. 12. The $100 paid to 'another' was paid on Sir Hector's order of Feb. 12 to Mr. P. E. Bourassa, described in the order as 'the leading Conservative in St. Romuald,' a village four miles or so above Point Lévis. The 'balance of $650 remaining and not paid yet' was duly handed to Mr. Chabot and the transaction closed. Mr. Darveau was defeated by 394. See editorial page."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 25th day of May last, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles:—

1. A letter from Sir A. P. Caron:

"At the election in Portneuf in 1887, the Tory candidate was Mr. E. J. Duchesnay. Mr. St. George was the Liberal candidate. A good deal of money from the reptile fund was used in behalf of Mr. Duchesnay. Mr. V. W. Larue, notary public, of 28 St. Anne street, Upper Town, Quebec, received most of it and passed it on to the workers. The first voucher in point of date is an order (25th Jan.) from Sir Adolphe in Mr. Larue's favour for $500. Here is the facsimile:

"Honble T. McGREEVY.

"Please pay bearer, Mr. V. W. Larue, N.P., Quebec, five hundred dollars ($500) for legal expenses for the County of Portneuf.

"Quebec, 25-1-'87.

"ADOLPHE P. CARON,

"On 12th February, Sir Adolphe issued an order for $800 to be paid to Mr. Larue. For this as for the other payment Mr. Larue gave his receipt. On 15th February, Sir Adolphe ordered $300 to be paid to Mr. Larue, who transferred it by a written voucher to Mr. J. E. Prince, Mr. Duchesnay's election agent, who gave a receipt. On 17th February, Mr. Larue wrote to Mr. McGreevy asking him to give his clerk, Mr. Laplante, some money for the election, and the clerk got $500, for which Mr. Larue gave a receipt at the bottom of the letter. On 18th February, Mr. Larue wrote to Mr. McGreevy in English:—'Mr. J. E. Prince is the legal agent for Mr. Duchesnay, Portneuf. Please treat him as you would do with me.' On the strength of this Mr. Prince got $200, for which he signed at the bottom of Mr. Larue's note. On 21st February, the day before election day, Sir Hector sent an order for $200 in behalf of a Mr. Dionne. Here is the facsimile of it, with Mr. Dionne's receipt appended:—"

2. A letter from Sir Hector Langevin:

"(*Private.*)

"MY DEAR MR. McGREEVY,—Please let Mr. Dionne have two hundred dollars for legal expenses in the County of Portneuf. That is the last.

"Yours truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"21st February.

"Reçu deux cents piastres.

"21 février 1887. "J. A. DIONNE.

"In all, therefore, the reptile fund furnished Mr. Duchesnay and his friends with $2,500 for election purposes. In making a return, as required by law, of the expenses of the election, Mr. Prince gave them as $384.30. The return was printed in *Le Courrier du Canada* of 29th April. Yet as shown above, Mr. Prince himself signed for $500 from the fund, and it is reasonable to suppose that he knew of the other payments. Mr. Duchesnay was defeated by 301."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 26th day of May last, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles:—

1. A letter from Sir A. P. Caron:

"Four candidates contested Charlevoix at the Federal election of 1887. Mr. Cimon was the regular Liberal and Dr. C. H. A. Clément the regular Tory candidate. The other two were Mr. J. A. Hamel and Mr. J. A. Tremblay. The reptile fund did pretty well for Dr. Clément. First and foremost a sum of $1,000 was provided on Nov. 23, 1886, to carry on a protest against Mr. Joseph Morin, the Mercier candidate elected to the Quebec Legislature that fall. The petitioner, nominally one Bouchard, dropped the case and the $1,000 was turned in for use in the Federal election. On January 25, Sir Adolphe gave an order for $300 in favour of Mr. Tarte, who saw that the money was sent to the county. On February 7, Sir Adolphe gave an order for $800, of which this is a facsimile:

"$800.

"Please pay eight hundred dollars legal expenses for the election of Charlevoix.

"Quebec, 7-2-'87. "ADOLPHE P. CARON.

"This $800 was paid to two persons, Dr. Clément getting $500 and Mr. J. S. Perrault, a local lawyer, $300. They gave receipts. A day or two later Sir Hector wrote an undated note ordering the payment of $750 to Dr. Clément, Mr. Perrault and Mr. Rouillard. He did not sign the note, but Mr. L. J. Demers, who drew the money, did, by way of receipt. Here is the facsimile:"

2. Letter from Sir Hector Langevin:

"(*Private.*)

"MY DEAR MR. McGREEVY.—For Charlevoix you might give: $500 for Mr. Clément, $200 for Mr. Perrault, $50 for Mr. Rouillard.

"The $500 should be put under envelope addressed to Dr. C. Clément, Bay St. Paul.

"The $200 under another envelope addressed to J. S. Perrault, Esq., advocate, Murray Bay, and will be brought down to the county by Mr. Raymond Boivin, of Bay St. Paul.

"The $50 for Mr. Rouillard.

"J. I. TARTE.

"*Per* L. J. DEMERS."

"The intention was to hand the $750 to Mr. Tarte for distribution among the three persons named in the order, but Mr. Tarte wrote to Mr. McGreevy instructing him to give it to Mr. Demers. That is how Mr. Demers came to sign for it. On February 11 a sum of $150 was sent to the county by mail. It was sent to Dr. Clément's committee, but no receipt appears to have been obtained. Altogether, therefore, the reptile fund planted $3,000 in Charlevoix, yet Dr. Clément was beaten."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the same answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 27th day of May last, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles:—

1. A memorandum of Sir Hector L. Langevin:

"At the Federal election in Champlain in 1887 the Tory candidate was Mr. Hypolite Montplaisir. He defeated Mr. Trudel after a hard struggle by 115. The reptile fund helped him to the extent of $2,000. The first voucher is given below in facsimile. It is a memorandum in Sir Hector's handwriting, dated 3rd February, with a receipt upon it for $300, signed by Mr. J. Hamel. The money was paid by Mr. McGreevy to Mr. Hamel for Mr. Montplaisir. As will be observed, Sir Hector gave instruction to have it forwarded under cover to a local clergyman, that is, the package was addressed to Mr. Montplaisir and then placed in an envelope, which was addressed to a curé in the county—rather a neat way of introducing boodle:

"$300. "3rd February, 1887.

"H. Montplaisir, Ecr.,

"Cap de la Madeleine,

"Comté de Champlain.

"Under another envelope to

"Révérend Luc Desilets,

"Curé,

"Cap de la Madeleine,

"Comté de Champlain.

"Reçu le montant,

"M. HAMEL."

2. A letter from Sir Hector L. Langevin :

"On 7th February Sir Hector issued an order for $750 to be paid to Mr. Montplaisir, who got the money and signed for it. As Mr. Montplaisir is now a senator of the Dominion it may be well to confront him with the facsimile:

"(*Private.*)

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—Mr. Montplaisir might have now for legal expenses in his county seven hundred and fifty dollars.

"Yours truly,

"H. L. L.

"7th February, 1887.

"Reçu le montant,

"HYPO. MONTPLAISIR."

3. A letter from Sir Hector L. Langevin :

"On February 18, Sir Hector issued an order upon which one of Mr. Montplaisir's friends, Mr. E. Lanouette obtained $300. Here is the facsimile with the friend's receipt:

"(*Private.*)

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—You know that Montplaisir was to receive altogether $2,000 for his legal expenses. Please let him have, through Mr. Elzéar Lanouette, as much as you can, after deducting what you have already paid him.

"Yours truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"QUEBEC, 18th Feby., 1887,

"Received three hundred dollars.

"J. E. LANOUETTE."

"'You know that Montplaisir was to receive altogether $2,000, etc.'—this bears out what has already been said, namely, that Sir Hector and his friends deliberately put their heads together at the opening of the campaign and allotted a certain amount of boodle to each constituency. On February 19 a sum of $150 was sent to the county, but, strange to say, a receipt was not obtained. On February 20—the election was on the 22nd—a further sum of $500 was sent by a messenger who signed for it with his initials 'J.V.R.' This made up the $2,000."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 28th day of May last, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles :—

1. A letter from Sir A. P. Caron :

"Pressure on space compels us to cut the reptile chapter short to-day. Yesterday attention was called to the assistance furnished by the fund to Mr. (now senator) Montplaisir in the Champlain election of 1887. Mr. Landry is another member of the Upper House who got money from the fund when running for the Commons. In 1887 he was the Tory candidate in Montmagny. The first voucher was an order from Sir Adolphe, February 4, for $1,000, which was paid to Mr. H. Hébert, acting for Mr. Landry. Here is the facsimile :

"To the Hon. T. MCGREEVY,

"Quebec.

"Please give to bearer, under cover to P. Landry, Esq., one thousand dollars for legal expenses in election of Montmagny.

"ADOLPHE P. CARON.

"QUEBEC, 10th Feb., 1887.

"Received one parcel said to contain above amount,

"H. HÉBERT.

"On February 10 Sir Adolphe issued another order for $1,000. Mr. Hébert received the money and signed for it. Sir Adolphe stated some time ago that the reptile fund was used merely to pay the 'legal expenses' of poor candidates. Dr. Landry is part proprietor of the Beauport Asylum and a man of large means. He was beaten by Mr. Choquette."

2. Receipt from Mr. J. Robillard :

"THE BERTHIER ELECTION.

"The Tory candidate in Berthier in 1887 was Mr. Robillard. On February 7 he got $1,000. He gave a receipt, the body of which was in Sir Adolphe's handwriting. Here is the facsimile :

"Received from Honble. T. McGreevy one thousand dollars for legal expenses in election of Berthier.

"JOS. ROBILLARD.

"QUEBEC, 7-2-'87.

"A few days afterwards Mr. Robillard wrote the following letter to Sir Adolphe:—'Lanoraie, February 13—Hon. Sir: The fight is being carried on with much activity. The reports from all the parishes in the county are good. But I really must have $1,000 for legal expenses in order to finish the fight. Be kind enough to give it to the bearer, my brother. It is indispensable if I am to bring the contest to a satisfactory close.' His brother, Charles Robillard, received $500 on the strength of this note and signed for it on February 14. Mr. Robillard was defeated by Mr. Beausoleil. He expects to be appointed to the Senate in the room of the late Mr. Pâquet."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 30th day of May, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles :—

1. A letter from Sir Hector L. Langevin :

"The Tory candidate in Quebec East in 1887 was Mr. F. X. Drouin. The riding which returned Mr. Laurier by a majority of over 1,900, is strongly Liberal. Nevertheless Sir Hector resolved to make a fight for the purpose of keeping Mr Laurier from going abroad into the rural constituencies, and threw a lot of money into it. He and the rest determined to spend $2,000. That was the sum allotted from the fund for use in Quebec East. The first voucher is an order from Sir Hector for $500. Here is the facsimile with the receipt upon it :

"(*Private.*)

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—You might let Mr. Drouin have five hundred dollars, for legal expenses for Quebec East.

"Yours truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"QUEBEC, 10th Feby., 1887.

"Received five hundred dollars from the Hon. Thos. McGreevy.

"F. X. DROUIN."

2. A letter from Sir Hector L. Langevin :

"On 14th Feb. Sir Hector wrote to Mr. McGreevy as follows:—'You might let Mr. Désiré Guay, the bearer of this note, have $500 for legal expenses in Quebec East.' Mr. Guay drew the money and gave a receipt on that date. The day after 15th Feb. Mr. Guay got $500 more and signed for it. On 17th Feb., Sir Hector ordered Mr. McGreevy to pay the rest of the appropriation to Mr. Drouin. Here is the facsimile of the order :

"(*Private.*)

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—Mr. Drouin, our candidate in Quebec East, wishes more help for his legal expenses. He might have the balance.

"Yours truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"QUEBEC, 17th Feb. 1887.

"The 'balance' was turned over to Mr. Drouin's committee, and a day or two later $300 more was furnished, making the total expenditure from the fund $2,300. Mr. Drouin obtained 695 votes."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 31st day of May, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles :—

1. A letter from Sir Hector L. Langevin :

"Mr. P. R. A. Bélanger was the Tory candidate in L'Islet in 1887. He was beaten by Mr. Casgrain who had represented it for many years. Sir Hector directed the operations of the reptile fund in behalf of Mr. Bélanger's candidature. He allotted $1,800 to the county, but the actual outlay was $2,000. On Feb. 8 he ordered $350 to be paid to Mr. Fontaine for Mr. Bélanger, Here is the facsimile :

"(*Private.*)

"My Dear Mr. McGreevy,—Mr. Fontaine, lawyer, might receive five hundred dollars for L'Islet, to be delivered to Mr. Bélanger, our candidate, for legal expenses. The only expense that has been made is, I believe, $50 given to Mr. Fontaine by Mr. Hamel. He will require also $50 more. So that you may say $550 altogether to be given to him now.

"Yours truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"Quebec, 8th Feby., 1887.

"Reçu le montant mentionné.

"A. FONTAINE.

"Fév. 9, 1887."

2. A letter from Sir Hector L. Langevin:

"It will be seen that Sir Hector speaks of $50 having been paid to Mr. Fontaine by Mr. Hamel. Mr. Hamel kept the petty cash of the fund. Sums were placed at his disposal for sending speakers into the constituencies and meeting other small expenditures. On Feb. 12 two sums of $250 and $150 were sent from the fund by messengers to L'Islet. The messengers signed for them, but the persons receiving the money, whoever they were, did not give receipts. On Feb. 14 Sir Hector ordered Mr. McGreevy to give Dr. Bélanger, the candidate's brother, 'what you can send.' Dr. Bélanger received $300 and signed for it. On Feb. 17 Sir Hector issued an order for the 'balance' of the sum set apart for L'Islet to be paid to Mr. Charles Marcotte, a former Tory M.P.P. for the county. Mr. Marcotte got $500 and signed for it. Here is the facsimile:

"(*Private.*)

"My Dear Mr. McGreevy,—Mr. Chas. Marcotte, the late M.P.P. for L'Islet, might receive the balance for L'Islet.

"Yours truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"Quebec, 17 Feb., 1887.

"Received five hundred dollars.

"CHAS. MARCOTTE.

"This made up the $1,800, but on Feb. 18 $200 more was despatched to the county, apparently on a verbal order from Sir Hector. The messenger signed for it."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 1st day of June, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles:—

1. A letter from Sir A. P. Caron:

"The Tory candidate in Megantic in 1887 was Dr. Larose. The fund treated him well, yet he was beaten. The first voucher is an order dated 8th February, issued by Sir Adolphe for $1,000. Here is the facsimile with the receipt written across the face:

"$1,000.

"Please pay to Mr. Larose for legal expenses at Megantic, one thousand dollars.

"ADOLPHE P. CARON.

"8-2-'87.

"Hon. T. McGreevy, Quebec.

"Reçu le montant.

"D. L. LAROSE, M.D.

"On the same day Sir Hector wrote to Mr. McGreevy: 'Mr. S. E. George, the secretary of the committee of Inverness (central committee of Megantic), might receive $500 for legal expenses in Megantic. Yours truly, H. L. Langevin.' Mr. George got the money and signed for it at the bottom of Sir Hector's note. On 14th February Sir Hector instructed Mr. McGreevy by letter to give Mr. George more money. Mr. George obtained $300 and gave a receipt, signing 'For the C. C. C. (Conservative Central Committee) of Megantic.' Several small sums were sent to the riding by post and messenger, but we are unable to give particulars. They were lumped with other sums in the records. The final list of expenditures shows that $2,500 was spent in Megantic from the funds."

2. A receipt from Mr. J. J. Foote:

"A Staunch Defender.

"The Quebec *Chronicle* stands by Sir Adolphe. In its issue of the 30th it asserts that it will be 'unfair' for the Liberals to refuse to appear before the Royal Commission and prosecute an indictment, not of their making, but of Sir Adolphe's and Sir John Thompson's. It can see nothing wrong in the mutilation and garbling of the original charges. Indeed, Mr. Foote, the proprietor and present genius of the *Chronicle*, was probably glad to find that the Government had, by that means, shut off enquiry into the manner in which the reptile money was spent. Had the original charges been sent untampered with to a committee, or even to a commission, vouchers of this sort would have been handed in:

"Received on account of election expenses, five hundred dollars.

"JNO. J. FOOTE.

"1st Feby., 1887.

"This is not the only voucher with that historic name upon it."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 2nd day of June, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimile:—

"There were three candidates in the County of Beauce in 1887, namely, Mr. Godbout (Nationalist Liberal) who was elected by a big majority, Mr. Poirier (Conservative) and Mr. F. X. Dulac. Mr. Poirier's interests were looked after, so far as the getting of reptile money was concerned, by Mr. J. A. Morency, Mr. P. Legaré and others. The fund spent $2,500 in his behalf. Sir Adolphe opened the ball on January 31 by issuing an order for $200 in Mr. Morency's favour. Several small sums, $100 twice, $150 and $75 twice were paid to local men between February 1 and February 5. On February 7, $500 was paid to Mr. Pierre Legaré, who signed 'for Joseph Morin.' On February 8 Sir Hector got $200 for Mr. Morency:

"Dear Mr. McGreevy,—I think you might let the bearer, Mr. J. A. Morency, a faithful friend, have two hundred dollars, for the legal expenses of Beauce.

"Yours truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"Ottawa, 8th Feb'y., 1887.

"Received the amount,

"J. A. MORENCY.

"On February 11 Mr. Morency got $400 more. On Feb. 13 Mr. Morin or Mr. Legaré—it is not quite clear which—got $300, and between then and February 18 small sums, amounting altogether to $400, were sent to the local committee or paid to local men."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 3rd day of June, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles:—

"Lotbinière is a Liberal stronghold, yet the two Ministers from Quebec resolved to make a fight there in 1887. Mr. Angus Baker was put up by them and beaten by 509. The reptile fund spent $1,350 on his candidature. Mr. A. Kennedy was the medium through which some of the money was sent into the county. On February 4th he gave a receipt to Mr. McGreevy for $200. On February 18th, Sir Hector wrote this letter:

"(*Private.*)

"My Dear Mr. McGreevy,—Mr. John Sexton has just come to me and says that Mr. Kennedy told him to come and see you to have some help for legal expenses. I do not know how you stand. He wants to go back by next train. Do what you think well and best.

"Yours truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"18th Feby., 1887.

"Received two hundred and fifty dollars.

"JOHN SEXTON.

"Ministers had intended to run a man in Drummond and Arthabaska, another Liberal fortress, and on February 12th they made preparations for putting him in the field, as will be seen by the following letter:—

"My Dear Mr. McGreevy,—Please send me two hundred dollars in Dominion notes, and five hundred more for Drummond and Arthabaska. I will recoup you when I see you next.

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"Received from Hon. T. McGreevy the sum of seven hundred dollars as above mentioned.

"QUEBEC, 12th Feby., 1887.

"In the end it was deemed best to allow Mr. Lavergne (Liberal) to be returned by acclamation, and the ($500) paid to Mr. Demers on account of Drummond was turned over to the Lotbinière Tories. The phrase in Sir Hector's letter, 'I will recoup you when I see you next,' referred to the $200 in Dominion notes which he required for some political purpose of his own. Several smaller sums were sent into Lotbinière through local men. Mr. Baker is now in the Quebec Legislature, but not for Lotbinière. Mr. Kennedy, who hails from Megantic, is as active a worker as ever on the Tory side."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 6th day of June, publish the following statement containing certain other lithographed facsimiles :—

"The Tory candidate in Chicoutimi in 1887 was Mr. J. A. Gagné. He was beaten by 87 votes. The reptile fund spent $2,250 in his behalf. Some of the money was sent through the firm of Price Brothers, which has establishments in the county. Here is one of the receipts:

"Price Brothers & Co. (Cable Address—Price, Quebec.)

"QUEBEC, 7 Feby., 1887.

"$500.

"Received of D. T. Thompson, Esq., the sum of five hundred dollars, to be transferred to the credit of Mr. Gagné, Chicoutimi.

"PRICE BROTHERS & CO.,

"*Per* WALTER J. RAY.

"On Feb. 14 Mr. Ray, for Price Brothers, acknowledged the receipt of $150 'to be transferred to H. P. Blair for election purposes.' Other sums were despatched to the county by messengers and sent to local men. Mr. Gagné obtained 1,122 votes, so that the contribution from the fund came to $2 per vote."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the *Globe* newspaper of Toronto did, on or about the 7th day of June, publish the following statement containing a certain other lithographed *facsimile* as follows :—

"OFFICIAL LIST OF EXPENDITURES IN THE CAMPAIGN OF 1887.

"Here is a facsimile of the final list of expenditures in the Quebec district made from the reptile fund in 1887 :

Presse	$ 5,500	Megantic	$ 2,500
Quebec Centre	4,100	Lotbinière	1,350
Quebec East	2,300	Drummond	700
Montmagny	2,200	Dorchester	3,000
Montmorency	2,700	Jos. Hamel, petty	2,500
Lévis	3,500		
Berthier	1,600		$68,000
Gaspé	1,500	Quebec County	
Bellechase	3,900	" West	
Rimouski	2,750	3 Rivers	
Kamouraska	3,000	Charlevoix 2nd election	1,000
Temiscouata	2,250		18,500
Yamaska X	4,000		16,800
Champlain	3,000		68,300
St. Maurice	2,500		8,000
Charlevoix	3,000		
Chicoutimi	2,250		$112,700
Portneuf	3,000		
L'Islet	2,500		
Beauce X	2,500		
	$58,250		

"The $18,500 was the expenditure in Quebec County, the $16,800 was the expenditure in Three Rivers, and the $8,000 was the expenditure in Quebec West. There is an error in the main edition. The total should be $112,600. The matter is dealt with editorially. This brings our reptile story to a close for the present."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government have observed that the said documents, if authentic, prove that a very large fund was created and placed in the hands of the said Hon. Thomas McGreevy for the purpose of influencing the election in the several constituencies referred to, and that the said fund was regularly distributed in accordance with a careful, preconcerted arrangement ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The publication of the statements and documents quoted in the preceding questions, referring as they do to expenditures alleged to have been made in the year 1887 in the elections for the Parliament whose term expired in 1891, was evidently made in pursuance of the charges which were preferred in this House by the hon. member for West Ontario, and which were interpreted, by that gentleman and two or three other members of this House in opposition to the Government, as charges that the Postmaster General had diverted railway subsidies from the purpose for which they were granted, by receiving for election purposes large sums of money out of such subsidies and out of moneys raised on the credit of such subsidies, and so forth, as stated in the resolution of this House passed on the 4th of May, 1892. This House, on that day, resolved that it was expedient that enquiry should be made as to the truth or falsity of the allegations and charges, and that the evidence relating to the same should be taken by commissioners under the statute which provides for such enquiries being made by commissioners, and that the evidence, when taken, should be laid before this House. Two eminent judges have been selected to be such commissioners, and their appointment has been approved by the House, without any dissent being expressed as to their fitness and impartiality. Ample powers are being conferred on the commissioners, and when their labours are concluded, the result of such labours will be laid before the House for such action as may seem proper under the circumstances. The Government do not intend to ask the House to interfere with that investigation, or to substitute for it a method of investigation which would be less complete and less impartial, nor do they propose in the meantime to express any opinion on the questions which that enquiry will involve, or on the facts which are to be proved or disproved before the commissioners.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government have observed that the said documents, if authentic, prove that several members of the Government and many candidates and members of Parliament were fully informed of the disposition made and intended to be made of the said fund ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The answer I gave a moment ago will answer this question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government have observed that if the said documents be, as they purport to be, accurate reproductions of the original letters of the several members of the Privy Council therein named, they establish beyond doubt that the said members of the Privy Council were actively engaged in the distribution of funds throughout the several constituencies therein named, to an extent wholly inconsistent with the statement that said funds were required for "legal expenses?"

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The last answer I gave will answer this question likewise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the publication of said documents is calculated to convince the public at large that a very great number of constituencies were attempted to be carried by corrupt means by the use of the said fund?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The publication of the statements and documents quoted in the question was evidently intended to create that impression on the public mind before a proper and impartial investigation could be had.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Prime Minister, or the leader of the House, or any other member of the Government, have called the attention of His Excellency to the publication of the said letters and documents, and have conferred with His Excellency as to the methods of dealing with the said publications?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government have had such communication with His Excellency and have given him such advice as they considered their duty required of them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Postmaster General has made any statement or explanation to His Excellency or to his colleagues or any of them, in reference to such of the above letters and vouchers as purport to be signed with his name?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the said Postmaster General denies the authenticity of the said letters or any of them, and whether he alleges the said letters to be forgeries?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Postmaster General having made a statement to this House, when the charges were made, would prefer not to make any further declaration of his answer in detail until he appears before the commissioners.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the said Postmaster General, in case he denies the authenticity of the said letters, has taken or proposes to take any steps to prosecute the Toronto *Globe* for publishing documents which he alleges to be forgeries?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Postmaster General will await the result of the investigation by the commissioners as ordered by the House, and will appear before the commission to meet the charges made against him, and will take such further steps as may then seem proper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether, in view of the above statements, Government have made enquiry of any of the several other persons whose names appear as signatories of the said documents, and whether they admit or deny the authenticity of the same?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government have not done so, relying upon the enquiry before the commission being made full and complete with the aid of the information to be furnished, and the assistance to be given, by the persons making the charges against the Postmaster General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government, in view of the facts now made public, and especially of the circumstance that those documents, if authentic, prove that upwards of $112,000 were expended in 24 constituencies with the knowledge and approval of several members of the Cabinet and of many members of Parliament, intend to cause a committee of this House to be appointed to investigate into the said matters and particularly to ascertain from and by whom the said funds were supplied to the said Hon. Thomas McGreevy?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government propose to await the report of the commissioners before deciding what steps may properly be taken with regard to any matters which may appear not to have been comprised within the reference to the commissioners.

Mr. LAURIER. I rise to a point of order. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to state that these charges were to be considered by the Royal Commission?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will read my answer again, for the satisfaction of the hon. gentleman:

"The publication of the statements and documents quoted in the preceding questions, referring as they do to expenditures alleged to have been made in the year 1887 in the elections for the Parliament whose term expired in 1891, was evidently made in pursuance of the charges which were made in this House by the hon. member for West Ontario, and which were interpreted by that gentleman and two or three other members of this House in opposition to the Government, as charges that the Postmaster General had diverted railway subsidies from the purpose for which they were granted, by receiving for election purposes large sums of money out of such subsidies and out of moneys raised on the credit of such subsidies, and so forth, as stated in the resolution of this House passed on the 4th of May, 1892. This House, on that day, resolved that it was expedient that enquiry should be made as to the truth or falsity of the allegations and charges, and that the evidence relating to the same should be taken by commissioners under the statute which provides for such enquiries being made by commissioners, and that the evidence, when taken, should be laid before this House. Two eminent judges have been selected to be such commissioners, and their appointment has been approved by the House, without any dissent being expressed as to their fitness and impartiality. Ample powers are being conferred on the commissioners, and when their labours are concluded, the result of such labours will be laid before the House for such action as may seem proper under the circumstances. The Government do not intend to ask the House to interfere with that investigation, or to substitute for it a method of investigation which would be less complete and less impartial, nor do they propose, in the meantime, to express any opinion on the questions which that enquiry will involve, or on the facts which are to be proved or disproved before the commissioners."

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that these charges are excised from the scope of the commission?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not understand that all these charges are excised, but at all events the question involves an expression of opinion on matters which will come before the commission.

KENTVILLE POSTMASTER.

Mr. BORDEN asked, Whether the Government is aware that the Kentville postmaster, who was suspended on the 6th February, 1891, has recently died? May the inhabitants of Kentville, King's County, N.S., hope for an early appointment to the postmastership so long vacant?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The department has not received any report as to the death of the postmaster at Kentville.

ADJOURNMENT—CORPUS CHRISTI.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that, when the House adjourns this day, it stands adjourned until Friday at 3 o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation of the House of Commons.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to call attention to some of the remarks of the hon. member for King's County yesterday in reply to some remarks that I made. I think his remarks are calculated to mislead the House, and I am sure he did not intend to do that. The hon. gentleman, in answer to what I said in reference to the gerrymander in Prince Edward Island, attempted to palliate it by stating that a gerrymander had been committed by the Local Government in Prince Edward Island, or, to use his own choice language, by what he called a thing occupying the position of a Government in that Island, and he said that gerrymander had taken place with my connivance if not with my consent. I do not know anything about that gerrymander, and I desire to tell that hon. gentleman that this measure was passed there during this session of Parliament, while I was absent from the Island, and that I never heard of it or about it until he held up the map here in his place. I knew no more about it than he did. It is nothing but fair that the facts should be stated to this House. It was not the Government of Prince Edward Island that introduced that gerrymander at all; the Government of Prince Edward Island introduced a Bill to abolish the Legislative Council, and there was no alteration of any single district in Prince Edward Island in the Bill which the Government introduced. They carried their Bill through the Assembly, in which he says they have a majority of only one, without altering the bounds of any single district in Prince Edward Island. That Bill went to the Council. The Legislative Council is an elective body, but elected by property holders; they must own a hundred pounds worth of property. The Council said: No, thank you, we will not pass this Bill as it is now, because it leaves to a small village, and in the hands of people who do not possess property, the same right to return two men to the House of Assembly as is vested in a large constituency of 15,000 or 16,000 people. The town of Georgetown, which was originally laid off for a district, and was expected to grow into a town, did not grow into a town; it has remained a village, it has 282 voters, and 82 of these are absentees; it has 200 local voters, and they returned two members to the Assembly. The Legislative Council—not the Government—said: This is an outrage, we will not consent to abolish ourselves, nor consent that these 200 people shall have the right to return two members to the Assembly; we insist upon enlarging the district by adding on the townships on each side. The town of Georgetown stands at a point, there is a river running on each side, and my hon. friend held up a map showing these rivers, and the townships added were necessarily on each side of the rivers, they could not be otherwise. It looked very bad on paper, but there was no other way of doing it. I do not know anything about the boundaries they have added, whether it is right or wrong; I never read the Act. I know that Georgetown is on the point, and the townships they have added are across the river on each side; there was no other method of doing it. But I want to point out this fact, that I was neither party or privy to it, nor did I ever hear of it, nor did I confer with anybody who suggested or brought about this change in the boundaries. It was not done by the Government, it was done by the Legislative Council alone, and it was done by them because they thought it was unjust to allow 200 people to have the same rights as 2,000 people in every other district in the Island. It is on that ground that what he calls a gerrymander, is justifiable. It may be they have not put the boundaries right. I give no opinion, I have not examined it carefully. I do not know what the political complexion of the different townships is; but so far as the hon. gentleman's charge against me is concerned, of having been a party, or privy in any sense to this change, he is wholly mistaken. When I had the honour of leading the Government in that province, we passed a good deal of legislation, but no change in the boundaries was ever made.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's explanation, when he says he had nothing to do with the local gerrymandering of Prince Edward Island. Report connected him with it, and I gave it as a report when I mentioned it yesterday. Now, with respect to this local gerrymander, it is like any other dirty pool, the more you stir it the dirtier it gets. Since the hon. gentleman has brought this matter up again, it is necessary I should give some further explanation to the House as to the mode in which the gerrymander was brought about. It seems that this Local Government to which I referred yesterday in not very flattering, but justifiable, terms, were frightened into introducing this gerrymander into their Local Legislature. They had not the manliness, they had not the pluck, to bring it up and fight it out on the floor of the House of Assembly. They passed this gerrymander in the Local House and sent it to their friends in the Upper House where they had a strong majority, and the local Premier, who was ruling in the Lower House by a majority of one, came round by the back door and said to his friends: Gentlemen, I am only ruling by a majority of one, bring in a gerrymander that will offset this and enable me to come into the House at the next election with a good majority. That would be the right thing to do. The Legislative Council, at the bidding of this autocrat, passed this local gerrymander.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I wish to remark to my hon. friend that he is entirely out of order. The member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) rose to a personal explanation. When we reach the section dealing with Prince Edward Island, my hon. friend will have a chance to say what he wants to.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I bow to your decision, but I think, in justice to myself, I should have a chance to answer what he has said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will have a chance to do that when we come down to Prince Edward Island in the Bill.

Mr. WELSH. Mr. Chairman, I have something to say on this matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) When we come down to the section dealing with Prince Edward Island, I shall take an opportunity of showing you how the local Premier went to his Council and got them to pass the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I accept your decision. I was only going to say——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The committee is aware of what the hon. gentleman will do when we come to Prince Edward Island.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I trust the ruling of the Chair will be accepted by the hon. member, and he will have another opportunity of speaking.

Mr. WELSH. I am going to say a few words. I have not taken up much time of the House in talking this session.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WELSH. I just want to take up one minute of time. I am only going to make a few remarks. I am very sorry——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. WELSH. I am sorry to hear the confession of my hon. friend——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. WELSH. Do you know what I am going to say?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WELSH. Do you know what I am going to say? If you will wait and hear what I am going to say——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. WELSH. Do you know what I am going to say?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is one thing the hon. gentleman should know, and that is that when I stand up he has no right to stand up.

Mr. WELSH. I am down.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is nothing at all before the Chair, and the hon. gentleman has no right to say a word. The member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) rose to a point of personal explanation, as he had a right to do. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about, because there is nothing before the Chair.

Mr. WELSH. All I said, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am going to read the clause to show the hon. gentleman that he has no right to say a word at this time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Let me say a word before you read the clause.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That will be out of order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am about to make a motion, and that will put me in order. We are coming to the clause which provides that redistribution shall take place in the different provinces, and the first sub-section refers to the Province of Ontario. I desire to call the attention of the committee to sub-sections (*a*) and (*b*). These have been the subject of very much discussion in the House, which I do not intend to renew. I may, at this stage, explain to the committee the reasons which induced the changes proposed by sub-sections (*a*) and (*b*). It has been urged that the House should not be asked to adopt these sub-sections; therefore, in reading section 2 you will leave out these sub-sections. I move that section 2 pass with the exception of the sub-sections (*a*) and (*b*).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this Bill requires very serious consideration. We have discussed for a few days the principle involved in the Bill, and many hon. members have stated that while they agree with us as regards much that is contained in the Bill and with respect to the principles involved in this legislation, they would prefer considering the matter in detail when we came to deal with the Bill in committee. Now we are in committee, and I hope hon. members will consider with care the various propositions which I and other members think it necessary in the public interest to submit, in order to secure a fair representation of the people in Parliament. I may say for myself that I regret we have gone into the consideration of this Bill to-day, because there were some matters I wish to bring before the committee which I am not ready to submit at this moment, but which I would be prepared to submit when the House met on Friday.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We propose to leave the Bill in committee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that what I am anxious to do is to begin with the amendment of this particular section, and leaving the Bill in committee, if we make any progress, will not meet with my wishes in this particular. I think it is very important that the committee should have before it a map containing the changes we think should be made, and exhibiting the population of each constituency, with the boundaries marked on it. I think we can show the committee that the constituencies may be divided without invading county or city boundaries, that something like symmetry can be given to them, that everything like a gerrymander may be avoided, and that the division can be made of such a character as to give a large degree of permanency to the constituencies and secure a fair expression of public opinion on the floor of Parliament. I am sure there can be nothing I deprecate more than to see such a division of counties as would give to this side any more than to that side of the House a control of public affairs without being supported by a majority of the electorate of the country, and any division that will aid in accomplishing this result either in favour of this side of the House or of that will be very pernicious in its character. I again implore hon. gentlemen opposite that they will consider the principle enunciated by the leader on that side of the House in 1872, that we will revert to the condition of things that existed at that time, and proceed with this Bill by making a complete redistribution of the seats consistent with the principles then laid down. The hon. Minister of Justice proposes this Bill as a simple amendment to the Act of 1882. The Act of 1882, in so far as it was possible in the plan adopted by this Bill in regard to the Province of Ontario, is left undisturbed. Some hon. members opposite, including the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), admitted that after having carefully investigated the divisions made by that Act, the measure did not meet with their approval; and so I submit that

what they desire should be done in New Brunswick, what the Minister of Justice desires himself to have done in Nova Scotia should be done in the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec and Prince Edward Island. Surely there can be nothing unfair in this. While I have not had time, on account of my close attention to the business of the House, to ascertain what will be the political effect, looking at the vote as given last year, supposing this distribution adopted, it seems to me of importance that a systematic, proper and reasonable plan should be pursued in this Bill. I notice the section which is now before us provides:

"The said provinces respectively shall, for the purposes of election of members to serve in the House of Commons, be divided into the electoral districts established by the Representation Act and by this Act."

If there was no other objection to this section, I would say that I think that it is an inconvenient way of amending an Act already on the Statute-book. In a measure of this sort, to which reference has so frequently to be made, everything that it is intended should continue law should be embraced in this Bill, it should not be simply an amendment of a previous Act, but the former Act should be repealed and every provision should be included in the one measure. I would propose to strike out the word "the" before "electoral" and all the words after "districts," and insert the following:—

"Ontario shall be divided into municipal counties, ridings of counties, cities and parts of cities, each of which shall be an electoral district and entitled to return one member. The electoral districts shall be the following:—"

Then I propose that the County of Essex shall be divided into two ridings, that the County of Kent shall be divided into three ridings, that the County of Lambton shall be divided into three ridings. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice at this point to this fact, that the County of Hastings, which has a smaller population than the County of Kent—the population of Hastings being 58,386—has three members, and has had three members for many years. The County of Kent, with a larger population, cannot be said to have even two members. There is a portion of Kent embraced in Bothwell, and another portion is embraced in Elgin. If those two parts of the county were put together and said to be represented by one member, then, with Mr. Campbell as the representative of the western portion of the county, that arrangement gives only two members. Lambton has a smaller population than Kent, and it has two ridings, East and West Lambton. Half of Bothwell forms part of Lambton, and the township of Euphemia in West Middlesex. Lambton, with a smaller population than Kent, has two and a half members, while Kent, with a larger population, has less than two. That is an improper division. If Hastings is entitled to three members, Lambton and Kent are respectively entitled to three members. Let me read over what I think would be a fair division, and I will undertake to show that it gives far more equal constituencies as regards population than what it is proposed to establish if this Bill in its present shape should become law. I stated that Essex should be divided into two ridings—I suppose the proper arrangement is the one here; Kent should be divided into three ridings, Lambton should be divided into three ridings, Elgin should be divided into two ridings. Elgin has a population of 43,549. If we put St. Thomas into the west riding, and all east of St. Thomas into the east riding, you have a population, as I shall show, in each of these ridings very nearly equally divided, and they are both very nearly up to the average unit of population required to return a member to this House. The County of Norfolk would have one member, Haldimand would have one, Middlesex would have three, Huron would have three, Perth two, Oxford two, Brant one, Waterloo two, Wellington three, Dufferin one, Grey three, Bruce three, Welland one, Lincoln one, Wentworth one, Halton one, Peel one, Simcoe four, and York four. There is a portion of the York population included in the present limits of the city of Toronto. I have not the facts before me to enable me to say to what extent that is so, but I believe there is a portion of East York and also of West York embraced in the city of Toronto at the present time. If that be so then they could be included in the city, the city being given an additional representation; and if York falls below the population entitled to return four members then it would be reduced to three. But let me say this: Ontario would be entitled to two members, Durham two, Victoria two, Muskoka and Parry Sound one, Algoma and Nipissing two, Northumberland two, Peterborough two, Prince Edward one, Hastings three, Lennox and Addington one, Renfrew two, Frontenac one, Leeds two, Lanark two, Grenville one, Carleton two, Dundas one, Russell one, Stormont one, Glengarry one, Prescott one. In this arrangement there would be 19 counties represented by a single member which it would be unnecessary to divide into ridings, and 19 counties that by no process could be manipulated either in favour of one party or another. This would make in all 81 rural constituencies. I say rural because they are mainly such, although there are constituencies among these in which there are cities and towns of considerable size, which perhaps would have a preponderating influence, which would give to the urban population a very considerable degree of influence and strength. The city of London would be entitled to one member, Hamilton two members, Toronto five, Kingston one and Ottawa two. I am saying Toronto five members, not considering those portions of Toronto that, at the present time, are embraced within the County of York, and what their population is I cannot say just now. This would give eleven constituencies in the Province of Ontario which are purely urban. It seems to me, Sir, that a division of that sort would be a division in the public interest and one that would give you constituencies far more nearly equal than you propose to establish at the present time, and would leave the boundaries of the various counties intact. The hon. gentleman will see how much more satisfactory this is than the attempt to carve up the whole country into electoral districts regardless of county boundaries. If we are to adopt the principle of representation by population absolutely and to disregard county boundaries altogether, then we ought to begin at some point in the province, say at Essex, and every time that you reach the unit of population there mark the boundary of your constituency, and so go from one extremity of the province to the other. This would be fair as between parties. This would be disregarding party considerations altogether, as the Minister of Justice said should be done; but I

think that would be far less satisfactory than electoral districts, somewhat less equal in extent, but in which county boundaries are preserved, in which you recognize the political and social organic life of the country and do not undertake to cut and carve up, as has been done by the electoral district system in the neighbouring republic. Now, if we adopt the system I have suggested, I think that we will have results far more satisfactory than you can get in any other way. Thus, you have the County of Essex already divided into two constituencies, which might remain. Then, the next county that you would be called upon to divide into ridings would be the County of Kent, which is entitled to three representatives. I am now referring to matters which could far more intelligently be discussed if I had an opportunity of laying a map before the committee. Kent is a little below the population, but if you were to take the west riding of Kent, taking the townships of Romney, Tilbury East, Raleigh, Harwich, Tilbury Centre and Blenheim, that would give a population of 17,967 for one constituency. Then you would have the north riding of Kent, consisting of the township of Chatham, the township of Dover, the village of Wallaceburg and the town of Chatham, which would have a population of 22,000. The east riding of Kent, comprising Orford, Howard, Camden, Zone, Bothwell, Dresden, Ridgetown and Thamesville, would make a constituency of 17,500. That is as nearly equal as you could divide the county without dividing municipalities, and hon. gentlemen will see that you would have three symmetrical ridings with distinct boundaries. Then when you come to the County of Elgin you would have as the west riding, Aldborough, Dunwich, Southwold, and the city of St. Thomas, which would give you a population of 24,000, and East Elgin comprising Yarmouth, Malahide, Dorchester, Bayham, Port Stanley, Vienna, Springfield and Aylmer, with a population of 18,454. Unless you were to divide the town of St. Thomas you could not make this more nearly equal, and these two, the hon. gentleman will see, would approximate an equality more nearly than the divisions that it is proposed to make. The County of Lambton would be entitled to three representatives, and the west riding may consist of Sombra, Moore, Sarnia, the town of Sarnia and Point Edward, a constituency of about 21,000. The centre riding of Lambton would consist of Dawn, Enniskillen, Plympton, Oil Springs and Petrolea, with a population of 18,800, and the east riding of Lambton would consist of the townships of Warwick, Euphemia, Brook, Bosanquet and the villages of Thedford, Walford, Arion, Alviston and Forreston, making a constituency of 18,300. When you come to the County of Middlesex you could divide that into three ridings, which would be all it was entitled to. At present it is given four representatives by adding townships all around and breaking in upon the neighbouring townships. The County of Middlesex could be divided into three constituencies varying from 19,000 to 25,000. I might go over a large number of others in the same way; but I am pointing out how it is possible to preserve county boundaries and to have constituencies approximately equal. Then suppose you have a growing county with 60,000 population. There is some addition made to the population of every riding of that county. You have three ridings. If you undertook to make the divisions of 1882 your basis for future action, you would be necessarily obliged to wait until some one electoral district grew in population to such an extent as to warrant you in dividing it into two. The suggestion made by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) was that that should be done; but that would leave a far larger number of fractions of population unrepresented than would be done by recognizing the county as the unit. Take, for instance, the County of Simcoe, which has three representatives at the present time. It is entitled to four by its population. You are undertaking to secure to the Province of Ontario the retention of 92 members; but the population in that county is not fully represented. Now, if you undertook to treat any one of the present divisions of Simcoe as the unit, you would be obliged to take that which has the largest population at the present time, as the district for division; but if you treat the whole county as the unit, you redivide the county without reference necessarily to the existing divisions, and you give to the additional population of the county the additional representation to which it is entitled. I am satisfied that the plan of preserving county boundaries and the establishment of ridings can be carried into effect in a perfectly satisfactory manner, and one which would be fair to every interest and to both the great parties in the country. And so, in the amendment which I propose to this portion of the Bill, I am following very closely the words used in the British North America Act, that Ontario shall be divided into municipal counties, ridings of counties, cities, and parts of cities, each of which shall be an electoral district and entitled to return one member. That, I think, is a reasonable amendment to propose, and it is one that will give permanency to the constituencies. I am sure of this: that you could do nothing that would serve so well to maintain the spirit and principles of the English system of parliamentary government by respecting those municipal divisions. They are a part of the organic life of the state, and you cannot disregard them with impunity. You may break down these municipal divisions, and you may undertake to carve counties out into districts; but to see the inevitable result of such a system, you have only to look at the condition of things in the neighbouring republic and to compare the men in public life there to-day with the men in public life half a century ago,—men like Webster, Calhoun, Clay and others—men who had seen long public service; they saw long public service largely because the constituencies had in their day a degree of permanence that they have not to-day; and it is impossible to introduce that system here without doing serious mischief to the future well-being of this country. You say you desire to maintain your autonomy; you desire to preserve your constitutional system; but you cannot preserve it if you adopt a measure like this. You must recognize those municipal divisions if you are going to build up on this continent a new nation that will keep unimpaired the spirit and principles of the English system of parliamentary government; and it is because I believe that system is superior to any other that has been tried by man for the maintenance of freedom and for the progress of the race, that I am pressing this matter with so much

persistency upon the attention of this committee. I am satisfied, Sir, that it is in the public interest. I am satisfied, further, that you cannot adopt a measure which every man in his conscience must know is an unfair measure, without injuring yourselves, as well as those who are seeking to resist it. Now, Sir, I am not going at this moment to press this matter further upon the attention of the committee. I wish that we may not deal with this subject further until opportunity is given us to place before the committee a map showing the divisions which we think necessary in the public interest, and which will carry out in the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec and Prince Edward Island that system which existed everywhere before 1872, which now exists in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House from those provinces think ought not to be disturbed there. Surely, if hon. gentlemen are disposed, because they have a majority in those provinces, to maintain county boundaries intact there, where is the justice in undertaking to force a change, in absolute disregard of their votes and influence and support, upon Ontario, Quebec and Prince Edward Island? Let us deal fairly in this matter. Let us adopt that course which is best in the public interest; and if we do that, I am satisfied that we can make a redistribution measure satisfactory to both sides of this House; but you cannot make it satisfactory proceeding as you are doing. You either go altogether too far, or else you do not go far enough. If you are disposed to disregard county boundaries, make the electoral districts equal. But if you are not disposed to adopt the principle of equal electoral districts, let us preserve county boundaries intact, and make such divisions of counties as the population requires we should make. I move:

That section 2 be struck out and that the following be inserted as section 2:—

"The said provinces respectively shall, for the purposes of the election of members to serve in the House of Commons, be divided into electoral districts as follows:—

"Ontario shall be divided into municipal counties, ridings of counties, cities and parts of cities, each of which shall be an electoral district and entitled to return one member. The electoral districts shall be the following:—

Essex	2	Ridings	55,545
Kent	3	do	58,701
Lambton	3	do	57,918
Elgin	2	do	43,549
Norfolk	1	do	30,992
Haldimand	1	do	23,451
Middlesex	3	do	64,458
Huron	3	do	66,781
Perth	2	do	53,728
Oxford	2	do	49,849
Brant	2	do	36,405
Waterloo	2	do	50,279
Wellington	3	do	59,978
Dufferin	1	do	20,138
Grey	3	do	71,094
Bruce	3	do	64,594
Welland	1	do	30,610
Lincoln	1	do	30,079
Wentworth	1	do	29,869
Halton	1	do	21,987
Peel	1	do	24,134
Simcoe	4	do	82,733
York	4	do	82,713
	49		
Ontario	2	do	44,678
Durham	1	do	32,428
Victoria	2	do	32,991
Muskoka and Parry Sound	1	do	26,515
Algoma and Nipissing	2	do	54,878
Northumberland	2	do	36,136
Peterborough & Haliburton	2	do	36,410 5,000
Prince Edward	1	Riding	18,892
Hastings	3	do	58,386
Lennox and Addington	1	do	24,952
Renfrew	2	do	46,762
Frontenac	1	do	26,746
Leeds	2	do	34,475
Lanark	2	do	37,732
Grenville	1	do	21,613
Carleton	2	do	37,512
Dundas	1	do	20,132
Russell	1	do	18,289
Stormont	1	do	27,128
Glengarry	1	do	22,447
Prescott	1	do	24,173
	32		
London	1	do	31,977
Hamilton	2	do	48,970
Toronto	5	do	181,220
Kingston	1	do	19,264
Ottawa	2	do	44,154
	11		

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite surprised that after the laborious effort of my hon. friend from Bothwell in presenting to the House a scheme which bears upon its face the evidences of justice, and which is strictly in accord with the resolution proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe, the Government should treat the whole matter with such indifference that they will not rise to offer anything like a reasonable or plausible objection. I feel rather astonished at the manner in which the Government are disposed to treat remonstrances from this side of the House with regard to this entire Bill. We have endeavoured to show the reasons why they should be willing to accept, if not in whole, at least in part, the proposition of the hon. member for North Simcoe. We have endeavoured to sketch out the changes which we think the Government should be willing to accept, if they were actuated by a spirit of justice and fair-play, in the light prescribed by the resolution of the hon. member for North Simcoe. Now, in the face of all these propositions, for the Government to sit still and not even deign to offer a single objection or reason why they should not, to some extent at least, concede to the argument the hon. member for Bothwell has made, is treating the question in a manner unworthy of themselves and of this House. I was pleased to hear the Minister of Justice say that he intended to strike out sections A and B in the Bill, which virtually means that the Government do not intend persisting in the gerrymander of Russell County. I have not the slightest doubt, from the course taken, that the hon. gentleman—and I hope I am correct in saying this—was not fully aware of the pernicious and unjust character of the proposed change in Russell County, and that when he became satisfied that this proposed change was a gerrymander he intimated his intention of abandoning the clause. I congratulate the Government upon this evidence of fairness at least, but would like to see them go further. Surely we have not come to that condition of things in Canada that we must follow out to the letter the pernicious course adopted in many of the states of the union. We have had quite enough of gerrymander in Canada. I am not now going to say a single word in defence of any provincial gerrymander. The provinces have to deal with those matters for themselves, but I may say that I deprecate on the part of any province the doing of an act which is uncourteous or unfair to those in opposition. It is not British, it is Yankee. The whole gerrymander system

is unfair and unjust and un-British and uncourteous on the part of any Government, whether provincial or Dominion, and we have had in Canada quite enough of it; and I do think that the Government, with the backing they have in this House, could surely afford to treat this side in that spirit of fairness and justice which should be exercised particularly in connection with a measure of this kind. It is one with which we are only called upon once in every ten years to deal. And I say here, and I say it fearlessly, that the gerrymander of 1882 is one of the blackest political spots on the history of this Dominion. I contend that those who sat in Opposition at that time in this House incurred a very grave responsibility in permitting that measure to become law without having exhausted every mode which our parliamentary procedure enabled them to take to prevent that result. Had the Opposition resisted, as they should, with determination, resorting to every means within their power to defeat the Bill, the gerrymader of 1882 would never have become crystallized into a statute. There are a few members who sit in this House who were members in 1882, and if there is anything with which they can be charged, and I as a humble member of Parliament who was not in the House in 1882 charge them with it, it is their neglect to effectively and determinedly discharge the duty of an Opposition in connection with that measure. What is the duty of the Opposition? The duties of an Opposition are to resist to the utmost all legislation of a bad kind. You may attempt to charge us with obstruction, you may call it that if you like, but obstruction is justifiable by times, it is justifiable when the Government propose improper and pernicious legislation such as we have before the House now, and an Opposition should undoubtedly exhaust every legitimate means of opposing such legislation, but if, in the end, they are driven to the necessity of resorting to obstruction, they are justified in doing so, and I believe the country to-day will justify the Opposition in every move they make to prevent this proposed law becoming a statute of this Dominion. If there is anything more than another which justifies the Opposition in taking the course which perhaps we may be driven to take, of obstructing to the last the passage of this law, it is the fact that we have sitting on the Treasury benches a man of no ordinary ability, a man of extended parliamentary experience, a man who has had the courage of his convictions and has got up in his place and openly declared that this Bill was in itself one that should not be allowed to pass. In reference to that statement of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I would like to know if the Opposition would not be derelict in their duty if they did not resist day after day, hour after hour, and night after night, the passage of a measure which he has declared to be pernicious and unjust. Taking that as a starting point, and without considering whether we had the sanction of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) or the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) as to the course we should adopt, we felt that we should not allow this Bill to go through the easy course which was allowed to the Bill of 1882, and should become a statute of this country without a determined effort on the part of the Opposition to prevent the pernicious clauses becoming law. The Government can afford to treat the Opposition generously. You have a good following at your back. I do not know whether this is owing to what has been referred to in the many charges mentioned in the questions put by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) this afternoon, or whether it is that these incidents have driven the Government to the necessity of trying to hamper the resources of the Opposition in this House and in this country. I think the Government ought to be willing to appear before an untrammelled and unshackled tribunal. The people of this country should have the rights of British freemen to go and record their votes without their being penned up in corners where their votes would be nullified or their being taken away from their constituencies with which they have been working in order that supporters of the Government may be elected where they would do the most good. Is there anything British about that? I have seen hon. gentlemen opposite get up—and I have admired the enthusiasm they displayed in singing "God Save the Queen" in this House. They like to be characterized as loyal people, loyal members and loyal Ministers, and I would ask what consistency is there, what relation is there between the evidences of loyalty they give when they are singing "God Save the Queen," when at the same time they are carrying through this House principles which are based upon the "Yankee Doodle" system which prevails on the other side. What kind of liberty, or justice, or loyalty, is there in action of that kind? I think the hon. the Minister of Justice should shake himself completely clear of the clauses of this Bill by declaring that he had nothing to do with it, that it was prepared by the friends of the Government in the several provinces, that the whole thing was hatched and brought into existence by them. In the Province of Ontario we have heard that the Secretary of State was the principal individual in laying out the divisions, and in the Province of Quebec the Minister of Public Works does not hesitate to father the entire scheme for the province. He admits that he had a good deal to do with sketching out the intended changes there. When we saw the drawings of the different constituencies presented to this House a few evenings ago by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), I think some hon. gentlemen opposite who had not taken a very lively interest in satisfying themselves as to the justice of the Bill must now see that the object in view is to gain political advantage. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) deserves the thanks of the House on both sides for the statement he has made. He has shown that there would be a number of counties entitled to one member each, a number entitled to two members each, another number entitled to three members each, and some entitled to four, and the city of Toronto to five.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Hear, hear.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to hear one of the members from Toronto say "hear, hear." I noticed the other night, when the member for North Simcoe proposed that Toronto should not be deprived of her proper representation, there was not a member from Toronto who applauded the hon. member for North Simcoe, but no doubt they have begun to realize that the people of Toronto will expect, at least, that their representatives

would not resist their getting justice, and, as a result of that, no doubt, they have decided that it would be well and prudent and proper for them to come into line. I am glad if that is the result. They are all in line now, and they may assist us in the direction we desire, and in the line which has been sketched out by my hon. friend from Bothwell. I think this would be a proper, an honest, and an upright proposition. No doubt, if you adopt county boundaries, if hon. gentlemen opposite were disposed, under those circumstances, to do a little gerrymandering, they would still have some opportunity to do it. In the county in which I live, a number of municipalities might be brought together to return a Conservative, and they might divide the balance of the county which would give very pronounced Reform majorities. We have gone so far as to say that, if the Government did resort to an innocent gerrymander of that kind, very serious objection would not be taken if the divisions were kept within the county boundaries. That advantage, of course, they might fairly be considered as entitled to, although I should rather see the course adopted that has been outlined by the member for Bothwell. In that sketch he has enumerated the municipalities in the constituencies that he proposes to divide, and they would form fairly decent shaped ridings ; it is desirable that we should have ridings of that stamp. Under the gerrymander of 1882, the ridings were of a most hideous shape, many of them running into two or three counties, my own riding runs into three counties. I have no desire to raise any objection to that now, although I would like to have the assistance of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) in putting these ridings back into their proper shape within county limits ; but unless it is done in every case, I shall object to its being done in one case. Another feature proposed by the member for Bothwell is that which gives a proportionate number of inhabitants to each riding. That is highly desirable. If it is the object of the Government to give a numerical complexion to each riding, a proper number of inhabitants to each riding, then the Bill before the House does not do that at all. If, on the other hand, it is the intention merely to increase the representation and leave the unjust divisions that now exist, then the Bill meets that object. But I do think it would redound greatly to the credit of the Government and to the First Minister, Sir J. J. C. Abbott, it would be evidence of a spirit of fairness on his part, if he would accept the propositions that have been made, and undo the rascalities, I may be permitted to call them, that were perpetrated in 1882. The Act of 1882 was passed at a time when this House, perhaps, was not aware that the Act in this particular was open to constitutional objection. The constitutional point has been raised now and ably presented from this side of the House, and there is very strong evidence that this House has no power to gerrymander in the way that it now proposes, and in the way that was done in 1882. I am confident that this question will come up sooner or later. Some constituency will get into such a legal tangle over the elections that the parties will carry the whole question into court as to whether this House has any power to make the changes now proposed. I think the Government ought to accept the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). It is unfair, at least, that they should not offer a single explanation as to why they do not accept it. The member for Bothwell is a man of good ability; he has earned the respect of the people of this Dominion from one end of it to the other, he is a valuable man in this House, and I think he is entitled to that courtesy that would be extended to any man of the same ability who had laid propositions before the Government. The Government owe it as a matter of courtesy to the member for Bothwell to give some reasons why they cannot accept the proposition he has made. To my County of Wellington additions have been made from the right as well as from the left, from east as well as the west. If these additions were put into the counties in which they belong, these counties would be well represented by two or three members in each one. I think the proposition of the Government to have dual ridings, in some cases, is not a good one. I think we should follow the English practice so far as possible. Hon. gentlemen are aware that in England they have no dual seats, the ridings are all single. I think we should follow that plan here. Every man should be elected for a separate and distinct riding. At Halifax you have a city and county electing two members, which is an anomaly. I do not know why it has been considered necessary to keep that constituency in that shape. Then again, as I pointed out, the city of Toronto should be divided into five constituencies; whether they be of a political complexion that would return representatives to support this Government, should be a matter of secondary consideration. Hamilton also should be divided into two constituencies, and in place of sending two men from one constituency, we ought to have two men from two distinct constituencies in the city of Hamilton, Now, I think the Government ought to accept, at least, some portion of the proposition of the member for Bothwell. The leader of the House has intimated that he did not intend to break up the county boundaries of Russell. That is a good step in one direction, and I am glad to know it. The hon. member should now get up and state that so far as possible they will adhere to county boundaries and carry out the proposition that was made by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I suppose that if he did that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works would resent it ; in all probability the gerrymander he has made in the Province of Quebec would not have the desired results. I do not know what the boundaries in his constituency are, whether he is in one or two counties ; but he has been representing his constituency now for many years, and ought to be willing to trust his political life in its hands without gerrymandering it.

Mr. OUIMET. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that I should leave my constituency as it is now ?

Mr. LAURIER. Why not ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Because it is not the question now before the House.

Mr. LAURIER. It might come in by way of illustration.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Public Works has sat in this House all the time I have been here, and I have no doubt he has discharged his duties in such a way as would merit a renewal

of the confidence of his constituency from time to time. I say that no Minister of the Crown, nor any member of Parliament, should try to better his political condition by changing the political complexion of his constituency by such an unjust Bill as this, in order to perpetuate his seat in this House.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman is not in earnest when he says that I want to strengthen myself in my constituency. A man who has received two-thirds of the votes of the constituency, a man who has represented it for nine years and has been elected four times by acclamation need not be afraid of his constituency. I thought it would be a point in my favour if I took more electors than I have now. If I had kept my county as it was, hon. gentlemen would have said it was in my favour. I availed myself of my position as a Minister of the Crown to do what was right towards the voters in the Province of Quebec, and I thought I would be complimented for having done so instead of being attacked.

Mr. LAURIER. For increasing your majority?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for North Wellington has been out of order for some time. The amendment now before the committee has reference to Ontario, and we have not yet reached the Province of Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. I desire your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this point: whether an hon. member cannot advance his argument by facts and figures, and also by illustrations?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am prepared to give a ruling now, and I think it will be in the interest of the whole committee that I should do so. The subject now under consideration has reference to Ontario; the amendment moved by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has reference to Ontario, and we are discussing that province only. When we come to the other provinces we can deal with them.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not dispute that. I should like your ruling as to whether an hon. member cannot strengthen his argument by illustration.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for North Wellington was not giving any illustration whatever, but he was simply dealing with the Province of Quebec.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think it is right that in discussing this section I should be limited to an amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) or by any other member. The whole section is before the committee. The hon. member for Bothwell has chosen to take exception to the section so far as Ontario is concerned, and he has suggested certain changes with respect to that province. The section itself extends, however, further than Ontario. The section says:

"The said provinces respectively shall, for the purposes of the election of members to serve in the House of Commons, be divided into the electoral districts established by the Representation Act and by this Act."

I claim that I have the right to speak both to the section and to the amendment proposed. I was drawing the attention of the committee to the changes made in Laval, which is represented by the Minister of Public Works, and I do not think I was travelling beyond the limit of the privileges of a member of this House in dealing with that hon. gentleman's seat or the seat of any other hon. member, because all the seats come within this section. It is true, the member for Bothwell limited his remarks to the Province of Ontario, but I have chosen to travel over the whole ground. I affirm that the changes proposed in the Province of Quebec are not such as reflect credit upon those who prepared the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman is not speaking to the amendment, which is limited to the Province of Ontario. The scope of the section is very wide. No doubt when we come to the sections dealing with Quebec, amendments will be proposed, and the hon. gentleman will then have the right to speak on the proposed changes in that province. I ask the hon. member, in the interest of the committee, to confine himself to the question before the Chair, that is, the changes proposed in Ontario.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I ask whether there are not two propositions before the Chair, the original section and my amendment? The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) may move an amendment to the amendment. As there are these two motions before the Chair, I hold that the hon. member has the right to speak either to the section or to the amendment.

Mr. McMULLEN. I intend to suggest to the committee, if not by a motion in the course of my speech, the propriety of adopting the principle outlined by the hon. member for Bothwell, not only as regards Ontario, but also Quebec. While I favour the adoption of the amendment as regards Ontario, I should like to see the same principle applied to Quebec, because changes have been proposed there which will seriously interfere with the old district lines to which the people have become accustomed. In fact, I desire to see this principle applied to all the provinces, and not to one alone. With respect to Prince Edward Island, it has been shown by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) that the boundaries of the counties have been interfered with. As regards that province, therefore, the principle advocated by the hon. member for Bothwell should be carried out. The people have been accustomed to meet in municipal matters for over a century, and it is nothing short of cruelty to change the boundaries and establish ridings which bear on their face evidence of a gerrymander. I do not know what the conditions are in British Columbia, nor yet as regards the divisions in Manitoba. I believe some changes are proposed, but when we come to deal with that province, we will point out the changes that are necessary. I have been disappointed that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches have not answered the hon. member for Bothwell. I was disappointed yesterday with the discussion on the whole question. When I looked across the floor I observed that the Minister of Finance was reading, I do not know whether it was a novel or not, and he was paying no attention to the debate, and great indifference has been shown towards members on this side of the House in the discussion of public questions. It appears to me that the Government have prepared a cast-iron measure, which they are determined to press through this House. The same course should be adopted here as was adopted in England, where a settlement of the difficulty between the Opposition and the Gov-

ernment was secured by means of an amicable interview between Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury. I do not understand why the Government should feel itself humiliated by extending an invitation to the leader of the Opposition to have an interview with the members of the Government in order to arrive at some arrangement. It is obvious that hon. gentlemen opposite have not taken their cue from English practice in dealing with this question, which is a vital one. A great responsibility is placed upon the Opposition. We must get rid of the gerrymander in Canada, and here and now on the floor of this House and in connection with this Bill we must fight out the principle of gerrymander, and if it is going to live in Canada, it will prevail after a most strenuous and determined effort on the part of the Opposition to choke off its existence in this Dominion. We have had enough of the gerrymander in Canada. I will say this to the Opposition in the Ontario House: That if any Bill introduced by Mr. Mowat or any other Government bears the evidence of gerrymander, they would be quite justified in exhausting any legitimate means to prevent its passing. We intend here—and I hope I am not divulging any secret—to resist determinedly the passage of this Bill in its present shape. If the Government were disposed to talk over the matter in a conciliatory spirit, and draw up an outline of a fair Bill. we would consent to that. Of course we would expect that the Government would have the best end of it and would insist upon having a little advantage; but we would be willing in the case of the division of counties to give them that little advantage. However, we will not allow the gerrymander to remain in this country if we can help it. You can depend upon that. We are sorry to have to do this. The weather is hot and it is unpleasant to be here, but we have a duty to perform and the people of this country are expecting us to perform that duty. Hon. gentlemen opposite may think that they may attempt to weary the Opposition in this matter by sitting through day and night. Well, we had an experience of that kind of thing before. The Franchise Act gave certain members of this House a certain training in that line that was of advantage to them. While I do not for a moment desire to offer any threat—and it is not in that spirit that I am making these observations,—yet we must insist upon fair-play in this House. If hon. gentlemen opposite can show that the basis of readjustment proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is unjust and unfair, it is very easy for us to consider it and try to come to an understanding. I have seen the Opposition and the Government come to an understanding on the floor of this House on certain occasions when dead-locks were reached before, and when concessions were made on both sides. I do not see any difficulty whatever in coming to an understanding with regard to this Bill, and I do say that we should get back to county bounds and arrive at the decision that we will deal with each other fairly and justly in this House. Suppose this measure does become law, and suppose the Government press it on the Opposition until they are exhausted, let me ask hon. gentlemen opposite, do they expect that they are going to live for ever? No, you will drop off out of this House one by one and somebody else will come in to take your places, and you will find that Toryism will not always sit on that side of the House.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes, as long as the Opposition takes the course it does now.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think the hon. gentlemen will be long here for he is going up above—not to the happy regions I should be glad he should reach, but he is going higher up. No doubt the First Minister will say to him: Well done, thou good and faithful servant, go a little higher up; and somebody else will come to take his place here.

Mr. CAMERON. It will be a bigger Tory than I am.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can tell the Government that if they insist on an unfair and unjust course towards Reformers in this House, the result will be that some day the Liberals will have to go to work and rearrange the constituencies. I do hope the Government will avoid that and adopt the county boundaries. I hope for the credit of that man who was our leader in this House, and who unfortunately passed away from amongst us this year, and to whom no man could point the finger of contempt and say that he ever passed an unjust, unfair or improper measure; I do hope that the Government will follow his example in giving fair-play to all. I say that we should be willing to treat each other courteously, and that the Government should deal with this Bill in a generous British spirit, and not to attempt to play a game of political euchre to cheat us out of our just rights. The Government has no right to take advantage of their numerical strength in this House to interfere with the rights and privileges of the members of the Opposition. It is neither just nor generous. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite, when we try to prevent the passing of improper and unjust laws such as this, look upon us with some little feelings of indignation. However, I am glad to say there is not a great deal of that in this Parliament, because while sometimes there is a considerable amount of bitterness in debate, yet at the same time we generally treat each other with courtesy and consideration in the discussion of public questions in this House. This is not an ordinary law that we are now discussing. It is a law that will affect both sides of the House. It is a law calculated to hamper the Liberals of this country in getting elected to this House, and, on the other hand, to facilitate hon. gentlemen opposite in perpetuating their political existence. I should like to know if it is just that the Government should try to so change the constituencies that it will prevent the return of Liberal members to Parliament. Even if I had the power I would have no desire to prevent any hon. gentleman on that side of the House from returning to his seat—not even the Minister of War, who hardly deigns to recognize an humble individual like myself, and which I laugh at rather than feel annoyed at—I would not be a party to make an unfair and unjust move to deprive even him of his seat.

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

After Recess.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

HIRAM A. CALVIN, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Frontenac; introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Bowell.

MIDLAND RAILWAY OF CANADA.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 93) respecting the Midland Railway of Canada.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Chairman, before you report the Bill, I desire to move an amendment. In doing so, I may say that I have now been in this House for three or four weeks, and most of the discussion that I have heard during that time has been of a constitutional nature, much of it relating to the ethical conduct of members of this House. While that may be well enough, I think the discussions of this House should concern, first of all, the material development of our country; in the second place, the realization of our boundless resources; next, the settlement of our waste lands; and, in the fourth place, the best means of extending the common comforts which people are supposed to possess in these modern days, and one of the things that people ought to enjoy more than they do is railway travel. I am glad to see that a newspaper which has been quoted here a great deal to-day, expressed itself yesterday as in favour of encouraging the iron industry of this country. I give that paper great credit for taking that position; it is a hopeful sign; it is a practical acceptance of the National Policy, because to encourage our iron industry, whether by the Provincial Government or in any other way, is the true idea of the National Policy, which is supported by the majority of the people in this country. Now, while I have been only a few weeks in this House, in my campaign I announced as my platform the National Policy and the creation in this country of a railway commission such as that advocated by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I told the people that, if elected to this House, I would favour a measure looking to the regulation of the charges made for railway passenger traffic, and in the newspaper with which I have been identified, I have for years taken the position that rates for passenger traffic should be regulated by Parliament; and now that I have the opportunity, I propose moving in that direction. My amendment applies only to the Midland Railway Bill now before this committee; but I intend to move that it be applied to every railroad measure that comes before this House; and if the hon. Minister of Railways carries through his Bill now on the Order Paper to amend the general Railway Act, I shall ask this House to include my amendment in that Bill, so as to have the principle adopted for the whole Dominion. Now, I will give some reasons why I think we should have a uniform rate for passenger traffic in this country. For thirty years past there has been what all political economists call a great shrinkage in values. The prices of everything we consume have fallen; but there is one notable exception, that is, the rates of passenger travel, which are the same to-day that they were thirty years ago, and which will be the same thirty years hence unless Parliament takes up the question. It may be said that the railroads cannot afford to have a reduction made in their passenger rates; but the reverse is proved by our experience of reduced postal rates. The rates of postage have been reduced from time to time, and the reductions have resulted in an increased revenue to the Post Office Department, along with greatly increased benefits to the people. So it will be with regard to reduced passenger rates on the railroads; a greater number of people will travel and the railroads will make more money. Most people think that there is at present a maximum rate for passenger travel in this country; but there is nothing of the kind provided for in the Railway Act. Railways can make any charges they like, and I am told that in some parts of this country passengers are obliged to pay as much as 5 or 6 cents a mile. It would be no hardship on the railways to require them to adopt a 2 cent rate. Even if it should be thought to be a hardship on the Grand Trunk to apply the rate to the Midland Railway, that railway is only 200 miles long. Let us put the onus on the Grand Trunk of trying the experiment. I believe that several English writers on experimental legislation lay down the principle, that the best way to test anything is to test it in a small way. Let us test this experiment on the Midland Railway, and if it should prove unsuccessful there the Grand Trunk Company would have reason to ask this House to repeal the measure. Now, the amendment which I propose is framed after the law in the State of New York. That great state does regulate the rate of passenger travel, and it has made the maximum rate of 2 cents a mile. That measure was not adopted as a sweeping general principle, but was applied to the New York Central Railway. Here is the clause:

"But nothing in this Act contained shall allow any rate of fare for way passengers greater than 2 cents per mile to be charged or taken over the track or tracks of that railroad now known as the New York Central Railroad Company, and the rate of fare for way passengers over the track or tracks now operated by the said New York Central Railroad Company shall continue to be 2 cents per mile and no more wherever it is now restricted to that rate of fare."

The New York Central Railway Company was seeking for legislation of some such character as that before us to-night, when that provision was inserted. To-day it is practically the law of the State of New York, and every one who travels in the States knows that that state is the most satisfactory state of the American Union with regard to railroad fares. The wisdom of the change is proved by the fact that, although there are seven railways competing for business, the New York Central carried nearly 9,000,000 passengers in the year 1880. In England there is practically a parliamentary rate of 2 cents, or a penny, a mile, and it works very satisfactorily. Now, the railways give all sorts of advantages in the way of rates to different classes of people. The commercial travellers have a preferred rate. The pressmen, of whom I happen to be one, have a preferred rate. So have clergymen, and so have Indians.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). To my knowledge, Indians have a preferred rate on the Grand Trunk.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They have not now.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). So much more to the discredit of the hon. member for Haldimand, who ought to look after the interests of his constituents. These different classes have preferred rates, but the ordinary traveller, who pays the top price, receives

no consideration. If you go on the trains, you find it is the man who has the excursion ticket or the man who has even the dead-head pass, who gets all the attention, while the man who pays 3 cents a mile gets the least. Now, I propose that he shall have this much attention, that he shall get the benefit of a statutory passenger rate which shall not exceed 2 cents a mile. We may be told that we are not the best judges of what the railroads ought to charge, but that they are the best judges themselves. I just want to read two or three words from a well-known book published in England to show that the railroad companies do not know what is in their own interests. It was they who opposed third-class passenger traffic; they discouraged it in every way: yet now it is their most profitable business, so much so that they could not live were it not for that traffic:

"It would be naturally supposed then that the railway companies would have catered for the million. History relates, on the contrary, how the third-class passenger has had the time table made impossible to understand by nonsensical restrictions as to the stations to which third-class tickets would be issued; how the passenger was often stowed in some shaky vehicle fit only for cattle; how the windows were of the smallest possible dimensions; how the spaces round doors gaped wide, and with the lamp holes in the roofs, admitted fearful drafts; how the company's servants were barely civil to them; how they were compelled to travel by trains starting at unearthly hours in the morning, to be shunted eventually at some roadside station to allow a fast train to pass them; how the seats were narrow, square and hard, with no space between the knees for others to pass, like the carriages of the Great Western Company and the District Company, running over the District Railway are to this day, &c. Fortunately for railway shareholders, most of these foolish doings are abandoned."

I think that will prove to you that the railway companies are not the best judges of their own interests in this matter; and it is no answer to say that it should be left to competition, because the railway companies have arrangements between themselves, and competition will never settle this matter. It is the duty of Parliament to settle it, and settle it in the best interests of the people. If the companies say that they are not making money now, and that we are proposing to reduce their income, I answer that a reduced passenger rate will enable them to make more money, and we are just as good judges of that as they, and we ask them to make the experiment. Let them look at the success of the New York Central Railway, and of the railways in England which are compelled to have a penny passenger rate. I also want to read, for the information of the House, a letter I received to-day. I only gave notice last night of this question, but already letters are coming, and this is from a gentleman in London:

"I have just read with pleasure that you are the father of a 2 cent per mile railway scheme for some part of the Midland, and that it may become general. If you are the father and can succeed you will be the most popular man in Canada. I painted that picture in its brightest colours to Sir Henry Tyler, last summer, and he promised to lay the matter before the Grand Trunk Railway board. This would compel the railways to introduce the transferable mileage book, good to any one and until used. The public would then all ride, the railway would double its business and only burn a little more coal, and pile up their bank account on a simple promise to pay that may not be presented for a year. This plan is in operation in Vermont and works like a charm. The farmer buys a book of 1,000 miles for $20, and his family can all use it, with the hired man thrown in. Mine was a suggestion to Sir H. Tyler, and those who did not buy books to pay 3 cents as usual; and to issue commercial men 20,000 mile books at 1½ cents.

"I claim it is time something different came in use. Other countries have it and the only plan to get our ends properly is to legislate, and the sooner Grit and Tory drop their party work and take up matters that fit our times and circumstances, matters that we are all interested in, the better will it be for our people. And I say the man or set of men who will father a Bill of that kind cannot help but receive the whole voice of Canada."

I have simply to tell the House that the people are in favour of a 2 cent passenger rate, and I propose to keep up the agitation. I propose to bring up this amendment every time a railway Bill is introduced here, and when the principle is adopted, as I know it will be, and when it is proved, as I know it will be, that it will pay railways to adopt it, we will find them coming here and saying that a 2 cent passenger rate has been so successful that they are in favour of reducing the rate to a 1 cent passenger rate. I, therefore, beg to move that the following clause be inserted in the Bill:—

Nothing in any by-law or regulation of the company, whether approved of by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or not, shall be construed as to allow any rate of fare for way passengers greater than 2 cents per mile to be charged or taken over the track or tracks of such company.

Mr. HAGGART. With reference to the interesting remarks made by the hon. gentleman from East York, prefacing his amendment to the Bill before us, I think it must strike the hon. gentleman that it would be obviously unfair to apply that principle to one railroad alone, the Midland Railway. I will promise the hon. gentleman that this matter, which has been so ably advocated by him, will have the serious consideration of the Government, that the Government will enquire into the matter, and if they think it is proper will introduce it in the Railway Bill. I will ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his amendment and to allow the Bill to go through the committee. If he thinks it necessary he can move it at the third reading; or he might have an opportunity of moving it in amendment to the Railway Bill. The question is an interesting one. He has quoted from New York State, in which he says there is a fixed rate per mile. I think, with reference to English railways, he is wrong in saying that there is a fixed rate per mile. There has to be a penny per mile rate, but that only applies to what are called "parliamentary trains," of which each railway is obliged to run one once a day. The subject is one which will have the attention of the Government, and we will give it every consideration before introducing the Railway Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Would the hon. gentleman let the House know whether it is the intention of the Government to press the amendment to the general Railway Act, Bill No. 84, and thus give us an opportunity of discussing it this session?

Mr. HAGGART. It is the intention to introduce the Bill to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. SPROULE. In seconding this motion, I do so because I have held the opinion for a long time that it would be not only in the interests of the travelling public but in the interests of the railway companies to have this rate fixed. Some years ago Canadian railway magnates held that they could not afford to run excursions at reduced rates to any great extent. There was a conflict of opinion among railway experts regarding that question, and they have discussed it from year to year; but as time advances they are resorting

more and more to popular railway excursions; and I understand, from looking over some discussion that took place about a year ago, that the railway companies, not only of Canada, but of the United States and England, find that reduced rates and more frequent excursions pay much better than ordinary railway traffic. When we know that railways, by reducing their rates one-half, make more money than they did by charging the full rates, it is evident they could, by reduction on ordinary travelling rates, increase travel and make more money. In the United States, as the hon. member for East York says, the reduction in rates has proved a success. In some of the states there is a law prohibiting companies charging over 2 cents a mile, in others they charge 3 cents a mile. Of course it would be scarcely fair to railways in Manitoba and the North-West Territories to impose such a law, because travelling there is very limited. But in the older provinces of the Dominion, where the travel is increasing all the time and is very large at present, I think it would tend to make more people travel. Travelling through the western states some years ago, I found in some portions of the country you were obliged to pay 5 cents per mile, in Manitoba 4 cents, further east 3 cents, and still further east 2 cents a mile. I noticed that, where the rate was lowest, the travel was greater than it was where the rate was higher. It may be said that the reason for this was that the settlement was not so great in those sections where the rate was higher, but I think it may be taken as a fact that people could afford to travel under a low rate who could not afford to pay 3 or 4 cents a mile. I do not want to press the matter in view of what the Minister of Railways has said, but I think it is worthy of his consideration and of the consideration of the Government and of the House. I believe it would be in the interest of the public and of the railway companies if some law were passed to reduce the rate where travel is much greater than it is in the newer settlements of the country, and to make it cheaper to those who are obliged to travel.

Mr. FRASER. I understood the Minister of Railways to say that this matter would be discussed under the general Railway Bill this session, and that in the meantime the Government would enquire fully into it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the motion which has been made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) is an equitable one for all concerned. The railway companies now, in cases where there is a great deal of travel, make reduced rates. It is well known that, in the neighbourhood of cities and large towns, both the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway give great advantages in the way of reduced rates, that they have special rates from nearly every town in western Ontario at any rate, and they have frequent excursions to enable these people to go, at least, to the lake shore, so that those who wish to travel do not now suffer as much as they would but for the advantages which are given by the railway companies. No doubt they consider their own interest as well as the interest of the public. Then again, certain classes of people, such as commercial travellers, who have occasion to travel a great deal, are furnished by the railway companies with reduced rates, which to a large extent does away with necessity for legislation of this kind. If, however, the railway companies could make a general reduction in the passenger rate, I believe it would be to their own interest financially. I would not like to offer my opinion in opposition to the opinions of those who are interested in this business, but it is my belief that the receipts from passenger traffic on the railways would be very much increased if the lower rate were adopted. Of course, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), there would be always some exceptions, and I am pleased to hear the Minister of Railways say that this matter will be inquired into and will receive consideration. It is only fair to say that the railway companies have given the people the benefit of local rates wherever they have found it possible, but I believe it would be in the interests of the railway corporations as well as of the public to pass a provision of this kind.

Mr. TISDALE. With all deference to the anxiety of the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) to have this discussed this session, I think it would be in the interest of the legislation he suggests that he should not press it now, even when the general Railway Act comes up for consideration, because I hope we are getting somewhere near the close of the session. This is a very broad question. I do not think the hon. gentleman can have any serious idea that this should be pressed upon one piece of railway and not upon the whole, and I therefore think he should allow it to go over to another session and should then bring it in as a substantive motion. As in regard to all important principles of general railway legislation, the House should not proceed in this matter without giving the railway companies the opportunity of being heard, and it would require very full discussion. In justice to a matter of such importance, I do not think the hon. gentleman would get as much consideration for it now as he would if he would defer it to another session. It is a very important question, as is evident from the remarks which have been made on both sides, and instead of bringing it up as an amendment, the Minister having promised that it shall have consideration, the hon. gentleman might leave it to another session and bring it in in such a shape that it might be fully discussed. I need not point out to him that this is a departure from our present system under which the rates are within the jurisdiction of the Privy Council. I am not expressing any opinion in regard to it, but the hon. gentleman, having fulfilled his duty to his constituents, would, I think, do better to leave it over in the meantime. If we are going to discuss what is almost a constitutional departure on this subject, we should have a full discussion. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying this is the first opportunity in regard to the Midland Railway, and, holding such strong views, he was right to press them upon the first opportunity he had. But I suppose no one would think of imposing this condition on one railway instead of making it general.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the proper mode would be for the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) to ask for a select committee to send for persons, papers and records, and report to this House. Then he could ask the leading railway officials to come before that committee, and could collect information from various sources and make

a report which would be the basis of the action he desires to take in this House. It seems to me that to do this without the necessary data would be a mistake and would not hasten the legislation which he desired. I agree to a large extent with the hon. gentleman. Some years ago I had occasion to look into this matter, and I found it was shown by Mr. Galt and others who discussed the subject that the revenues of the railways increased rapidly during the continuance of the reduced rates, and that the aggregate earnings were larger under the lower charges than under the higher charges. No doubt in these matters men who are responsible for railway management are somewhat timid in taking anything like a bold step. There are two parties who are interested. We give to railway corporations certain franchises, and we encroach upon the rights of private individuals in giving them. We enable them to expropriate property and to exercise other functions that belong to a sovereign body, and it is only on the ground that the public have an interest in these railway corporations that that kind of power can be justified. While it is important that the railway companies should be protected against wrong being done them, seeing they have invested their capital in the country and have no means of withdrawing it, it is also desirable that the public interest should be cared for without doing the railway companies any wrong. I think, if the hon. gentleman were to ask for a committee on this subject to collect information as regards the experience in the United Kingdom and in the United States as well as in Canada, he would confer a substantial benefit upon the public of this country, and furnish to Parliament, perhaps, the basis of important legislation for the future.

Mr. MULOCK. I congratulate the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) in having brought to the attention of the House a question which, from the reception it has received, is manifestly one of much importance. However, inasmuch as the discussion is likely to be renewed at a subsequent date, perhaps it would be well for the member for East York and others who intend to give it their attention, to bear in mind that in a country such as Canada, it will, I think, be found impossible to fix one arbitrary rate for the whole of Canada. For example, I presume the cost of haulage, say in the mountain districts, far exceeds that in the more populous parts of Canada. It has been stated that in England legislation provides for a fixed rate. England is a small, compact and populous country, and what would apply to the conditions in England would hardly apply to a country such as ours, where the population is so sparse. Probably it is out of consideration for these local conditions that this Parliament enacted some time ago, under the advice of the present Minister of Justice, if I remember correctly, that the Governor in Council should be required to give his sanction to any rate that might be prescribed by a company, and further, that the Governor in Council could, of its own motion, initiate any change in the existing tariff; so that we have to-day the machinery on the Statute-book whereby the rates may be changed from time to time on one railway and on another, as the Governor in Council deems wise. I am not myself altogether enamoured with the policy of handing over to the Governor in Council such powers as it has been their custom to take from Parliament for the last few years. Nevertheless, there are some questions of a practical character such as this which have necessarily to be largely entrusted to the Administration. They are not legislative but rather administrative in their nature. Whilst I sympathize very much with the argument of the hon. member for East York, he will find a practical difficulty in laying down one arbitrary rate either for freight or passengers throughout the whole Dominion; for if it is a good doctrine as regards passengers, I presume it would be equally good as applied to freight. As the question is likely to come up again, it is with the view rather to aid the discussion than to discourage it, that I call the attention of the member for East York to some of those conditions which exist in Canada and do not exist in the old country from which it is sought to draw a precedent.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). I am willing to withdraw the motion, but I would remark that while there are difficulties in the way, Parliament ought to be able to meet those difficulties. I think it will meet them, and that it will take the matter into consideration, and perhaps the suggestion of the member for Bothwell might be adopted. I will consider the matter with some of my friends, and we will see the Minister as to whether it would be better to bring up the question again this session. I will take this opportunity of informing the House that it is my intention to prosecute this question and to take upon it the opinion of this House whenever a proper occasion presents itself. This House will stand education, and I know the country has already a pretty strong opinion on the subject and requires very little education. When members become acquainted with the opinion of their constituents they will come back here prepared to vote for a uniform passenger rate in this country; or it may be that we may adopt two rates, one to satisfy western Canada and another for eastern Canada. All the men who have considered the railway problem have said that the question of a uniform passenger rate is one of the greatest importance, and that Parliament and other legislative bodies must find a universal maximum passenger rate for the railways over which they have jurisdiction.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. When you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was endeavouring to show some reasons why the Government should give more serious consideration to the proposition made by the member for Bothwell than they are apparently disposed to give it. In 1882 the Bill was pressed upon the House on that ground that it was desirable that representation by population should be carried out so far as possible. The basis on which Confederation was organized was that of representation by population; that was the reason why

the number of members was fixed in that Act: Quebec was to have 65, and the other provinces a proportionate representation. Now, if representation by population is the principle we are after, we should endeavour, in a readjustment of this kind, to come up as nearly as possible to the expectation of the people of this country when Confederation was adopted. We are not doing that. The Government will admit that the Bill before the House is not characterized by features of that kind. The member for Bothwell clearly shows that if county representation was adopted the principle of representation by population would be much better carried out than it was under the Bill of 1882. We should first consider whether it is desirable to respect county limits in the representation of the provinces of this Dominion. I think it is highly desirable we should do so. As has already been forcibly stated by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), community of interest is highly desirable. It is desirable that the people associated together in regard to municipal institutions and who have grown up together and understand each other's views with respect to matters of county, provincial and Dominion concern should also, if possible, be united in matters of political concern. Take, for instance, my own county, Wellington. The population of the county was 66,000, and it was entitled to three representatives. By the Bill of 1882, 10,000 people were added, bringing the population up to 76,000. Although they are nominally called ridings, North, Centre and South Wellington, they are actually in three counties and the people are brought together for Dominion elections from three counties, although it is called the County of Wellington. We should get back to county limits. Some hon. members have mentioned that the Redistribution Bill of 1882 was not just, that it was an unfair Bill. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) virtually admitted that such was the case, and that injustice had been perpetrated by that Bill. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) admitted that the results of the Bill had not been satisfactory and afforded strong evidence of injustice. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) also admitted that injustice had been done, and the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), although he did not admit that the Bill was unjust in itself, went so far as to say that, if injustice had been committed, it should be remedied. Under these circumstances, it may be asked whether we are here to maintain unfair laws, or to amend laws when found to work unjustly. Every session amendments are adopted to different Acts. If we find that under the administration of the law the people are dealt with unjustly, it is the duty of every hon. member to support an amendment to the law to remedy the injustice. It is not only our duty to do so, but the people expect that we will amend such laws, and that applies to the Act of 1882, which has been proved unjust. The reason I object to the Province of Quebec being subjected to redistribution as Ontario was subjected in 1882, is, because this Bill extends the same pernicious principle of distribution as was extended in 1882. There is no portion of the Dominion where the people are in a better position to speak as to the pernicious results of the measure than are the people of Ontario. We have been subjected to the inconvenience and injustice that has overtaken the people of that province, we know what the results of that Bill have been, and we desire to protect the people of Quebec being so unjustly treated and being rendered subject to a Gerrymander Act such as this now before the House under which they will suffer gross and grievous injustice so long as it remains on the Statute-book. We should begin our work by casting aside the legislation of 1882 and by adopting a principle which will give honest and fair legislation to all our people, and one way of doing this is to adopt county boundaries and distribute the counties on an equitable basis: and if the Government will adopt this honourable and fair course and step into the breach at this particular junction and deal honestly and fairly in this redistribution matter, they will be entitled to credit. That would be a proper move for them on this occasion, and that is why I consider it my duty to press the consideration of the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), which he presented very clearly and pointedly, and at the same time courteously. I have not exceeded the privilege of a member of this House in endeavouring to show that it is our duty to seriously consider the whole situation on the very threshold of the consideration of this Bill. It is evident from the statement of the Minister of Justice that the Government are not going to deal with Russell in the manner indicated in this Bill, and I hope as we advance clause by clause the same spirit of fair-play will be evinced, and then I have not the slightest doubt that the leader of the House will be induced to withdraw the objectionable features and in their place introduce a system of county representation and the maintenance of county boundaries.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not rise for the purpose of discussing at any length the amendment now before the House. All I have to say is that I am in favour of any measure which will redistribute the seats in this Parliament in such a way as will be fair to all parties. The leader of the House was good enough to refer to clauses *a* and *b* in this Bill at the opening of the House to-day, and before they had been reached. He was good enough to say that those clauses would be eliminated from the Bill, and I rise now simply for the purpose of expressing my gratification at the decision the Government has reached in this particular case. During the course of the debate on this question I endeavoured to lay before the House in a straightforward way the position in which the County of Russell would be placed under the suggested redistribution. I will not now refer again to the question, but will simply say this, that by leaving the Counties of Prescott and Russell as they were, the Government will give universal satisfaction to the people of those counties. I may add, that I am very glad indeed at what has been done, and if the Government show the same fair-play to the Opposition throughout the discussion of this Bill, I am sure all will go away as gratified as I am.

Mr. BOYLE. I rise with some diffidence in this matter, but I should like to ask if the amendment is in order? It seems to me that the matter of county boundaries was fully set forth in the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and this House, by a vote, declared its feeling on this question and decided that it was not expedient to entertain the question of limiting the representation to city and county boundaries. I

contend that that is the entire gist of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and before discussing it at any length, I would like your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to whether it is in order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Chairman, I think it is very plain that there is nothing in the point of order my hon. friend has undertaken to raise. It is true that this House voted against the proposition of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), but that does not preclude the House from adopting any amendment it may think proper. That amendment was an attempt to enunciate a general principle on which we should proceed, but the House did not proceed upon that principle, and the Bill was read the second time and went into committee, and hon. gentlemen opposite said that they would undertake to consider any amendment that might be proposed in committee. I do not know whether my amendment is exactly on the lines in every particular of the amendment of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) or not, but I think that by his amendment there would be perhaps one or two members more given to the city of Toronto. Then another thing, my hon. friend's proposition related to the entire Dominion, whereas my proposition relates simply to the Province of Ontario. Any hon. gentleman may say that I would accept this for 19 counties out of 20, but I will not accept it for the twentieth county, and there is nothing to prevent us supporting this amendment on account of any action taken before.

Mr. SPROULE. At least I think that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) ought to be in accord, because it is generally rumoured that they met together and made out the amendment on the lines proposed by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) some days ago. If I understood the hon. member for North Simcoe correctly, he stated that he only included the Province of Ontario in the principle, because he said in that province alone were the county and township boundaries well defined, and therefore in applying the principle to other provinces some other scheme would have to be adopted. It occurred to me, when the hon. gentleman for Bothwell moved his amendment, that it was exactly on the same lines as that moved by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Whether an amendment can be moved on similar lines to one voted down, or at all events an amendment enunciating principles that have been voted down, is a matter for the Chair to decide.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is perfectly in order. An amendment made at one stage of the Bill and rejected can be taken up again at another stage, and even if it were the same wording as the amendment of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) it would still be in order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Nothing that has been said by the member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) calls for a reply, except the statement by him—possibly on a misconception, but certainly an erroneous statement—that our silence implied a discourtesy to the gentleman who moved the amendment. I beg to say that it is impossible that we can accept the amendment. We have already discussed and voted against the principles involved in that amendment while on the second reading of the Bill. The discussion which took place then involved not only the reasons for sustaining an amendment of this kind, but the reasons which induced the majority to refuse to adopt it. I may say further, that the amendment would, as was stated in the debate on the second reading, involve a change in 75 or 80 of the constituencies in the Province of Ontario, and in that respect would entirely depart from the principle of continuity which was advocated on both sides of the House. If there is any province in Canada in respect to which it may be said that the county lines are mutable it is the Province of Ontario. In the other provinces, such as the Maritime Provinces, and of those I particularly speak, the county lines have been inviolate for a great period of years. I am sure that it is half a century since in the Province of Nova Scotia a county line has been disturbed. Before that, when county lines were disturbed, they were only disturbed in consequence of a great increase in population which occasionally required the separation of counties into two. I may be wrong in stating that even within the last half century such a change has been made, because my impression is rather that we must go back three-quarters of a century, or a century, to find any county line departed from for municipal or any other purpose, while in the Province of Ontario the county lines have been absolutely obliterated from time to time. Counties have been joined together and counties have been made to disappear even since the Act of Confederation. That, however, is not a matter of any prime importance. I understand that the effect of the amendment, if carried out on the lines suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), would be the most extreme system of gerrymander that was ever presented to Parliament; that it is a scheme by which the Liberal party of the Province of Ontario, regardless of the popular majority of votes, would increase their representation by some 12 or 15 or 20 members, and that if operated on lines which would be available to the majority it would result with equal disaster to the Liberal party and equal success to the Conservative party. Without entering into a minute discussion on this point, I think it will satisfy all the requirements of courtesy to say that the amendment cannot be adopted, for the reasons which were stated, when the principles of it were discussed and rejected on the motion for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. I am glad to see that gentlemen on the other side of the House have recovered their power of speech. For a moment there was reason to believe that these hon. gentlemen had all become dumb as they sat silent and no one would utter a single word in defence of the project before the House. But we have already had some evidence that, after all, if silence is sometimes golden, speech is also sometimes golden; because from the short discussion that we have had upon this Bill already, the measure has been modified in a very important aspect. An important provision of the Bill, in fact the very first which is to be found in it, has already been withdrawn. The township of Clarence which was to be removed from the County of Russell and placed in Prescott,

we are now told will remain as it was before, in the County of Russell. Now, nothing in my estimation, and I submit it also to the judgment of the House, can show in a more conclusive manner the absolutely arbitrary character of this Bill than the manner in which this provision was introduced into it and the manner in which it was withdrawn from it. When my hon. friend the Minister of Justice introduced this Bill he simply said that such was to be the change and nothing more. This is the language he made use of at that time:

"The only other changes in the Bill are the township of Clarence, which is taken from the County of Russell and added to Prescott, thereby tending to equalize the population, and place Clarence in a riding where the people will be more in harmony with the rest of the population of the riding."

This is the only reason that was given—no reason at all, but a simple statement of facts. The hon. gentleman simply contented himself with saying that such and such a thing would take place, that Clarence would be removed from Russell and put in Prescott, and no reason was given for it, unless it was to be found in the remark of the hon. gentleman that Clarence would be put in Prescott, where the people would be more in harmony with the rest of the population of the riding. It seems that this was the object of the Bill—to hive the French, as the Rouges are hived by this Bill in the Province of Quebec, and as the Grits were hived in Ontario by the Bill of 1882. As I understand, Clarence is a strongly French township, and the County of Prescott is also strongly French. If I do the hon. gentleman an injustice I am quite ready to withdraw my remark and apologize, but that was the only reason we heard him give for taking Clarence from Russell and putting it into Prescott. Now, after several days' discussion, in which it was pointed out again and again that there was no reason for this change, the Government at last give way; and why? They give way in the same manner in which they introduced the measure, without a single word of explanation. We have only the simple statement of the hon. Minister of Justice that Clarence will remain as it is. Now, as I said a moment ago, can there be a more conclusive reason that there is no principle whatever to be found in this Bill from the first line to the last? The hon. gentleman stated, in introducing the measure, that its object was to equalize the population; but it has been shown conclusively that the object as stated in the hon. gentleman's speech was not to be found in the four corners of the Bill. There was a pretense of equalizing the population in some of the constituencies, but these were the exceptions, and the changes made are just as arbitrary as the withdrawal of the change with regard to Clarence. If there is a principle which ought to be recognized in a measure of this kind as far as possible, it is the principle of representation by population. How that principle is to be carried out it is difficult to say. One way has been suggested on the other side of the line. It has been proposed, in the State of Delaware, which sends five or six members to Congress, to abolish all the county divisions, and to have cumulative voting, allowing each elector to vote for six candidates, and declaring the six having the largest number of votes to be elected. That might be very well in a small state like Delaware, but it is manifest that such a system would not work in the Province of Ontario which elects 92 members, or in the Province of Quebec, which elects 65. Then, there is the system known as the *scrutin de liste* in France, that is, instead of having one or two members elected by each department, to have six or seven departments grouped together. That was a measure advocated by Gambetta for many years, but I believe he died before it was carried out; and, according to my information, it has not worked satisfactorily. What Gambetta expected was that local measures would not have the same importance as they have at present, and that the character of the men selected would be improved; but that anticipation was not fulfilled, and I understand that the measure is to be abandoned, if it has not yet been abandoned. What is the best principle to adopt? For my part, I can think of no better one than that suggested by my hon. friend for North Simcoe, which is now proposed in practice by my hon. friend for Bothwell, that is to say, to keep the counties as they are. I do not think that the proposal of my hon. friend for Bothwell is at all deserving the reproach which the hon. gentleman has just passed upon it, that is to say of being a gerrymander, because as I understand the scheme, county lines would not at all be interfered with, but there would have to be a division within the county. For instance, the County of Simcoe would be divided into four ridings, Brant would be divided into two, and so on. Under such circumstances, the principle for which we contend is a respect for county lines as they exist at the present time; and unless this principle is adhered to, unless it is to be understood that henceforward county lines will be respected, the Government will have to be stronger, not in numbers perhaps, but stronger in moral fibre, if I may say so, than the present Government, to resist the pressure that will be brought to bear upon them by their friends in uncertain counties. How is it possible, for instance, to justify the changes which are made in the County of Bagot in the Province of Quebec? That county has a population of about 12,000 souls. Two parishes are taken from it and added to another county, and one parish is added to it from Richelieu and two parishes from Drummond, and all these changes decrease the population by 40 souls. Is it possible to justify this change by any rule whatever? Is it not manifest that the object of this change, which diminishes the population by 40, while it increases the majority of the sitting member from 55 to over 200, is a party one, which cannot be defended or avowed on the floor of this House, but which must remain a secret? So long as we do not respect county boundaries as they exist at present, I submit to my hon. friend on the other side of the House, if it should be his lot again to have to introduce another Redistribution Bill, that it will be almost impossible for him to resist the pressure which will then be brought upon him by his friends from different quarters, who feel the ground shaken under their feet. And, moreover, for my part, I attach very great importance to the historic traditions associated with the county boundaries. The hon. gentleman for Albert (Mr. Weldon), the other day, spoke sentiments entirely in accord with mine. He showed conclusively that the historic traditions in counties have a beneficial effect, that they must tend to elevate the moral tone of the county, and if you do away with these, you do away with certainly a most potent factor in pro-

noting the health and morality of political life in this country. Unless something better be introduced as a substitute to what my hon. friend desires, we can do nothing better than take the amendment he has just proposed.

Mr. McCARTHY. The only alternative proposition I have heard with reference to this matter is to stand, as the hon. member for Albert has said, with both feet upon the redistribution plan of 1882. I think that we ought, if possible, to lay down at this time some scheme, I do not care what, some rule by which the redistribution of seats is to be arranged. For my part, I am not particular as to what that scheme may be. In the best consideration I have been able to give the matter, I think the wiser and more simple plan would be to take the county as the political unit. But some of my hon. friends, who do not come from the province from which I come, put it in this way: What difference does it make to them what the old counties of Ontario may have been. They find in the British North America Act certain constituencies carved out from the old counties, and which, by that Act, the charter of our constitution, were given representation. I am quite willing, if that is the opinion of the majority of the committee, that we should adopt as the political unit these counties which are carved out in the Act of Confederation, but I do not think it is the more convenient division, and do not believe it will be so easily managed as if we went back to the old county lines. Remember, Sir, that before Confederation the county lines of Ontario were just as sacred, just as inviolate, just as undisturbed as they were in the Maritime Provinces; and it is only because at the time of Confederation it became necessary to confer, so far as my knowledge of the subject goes, upon the Province of Ontario a large number of additional representatives that the county lines were to a certain extent ignored. I have never heard any unfairness attributed to that arrangement, and have no doubt it was the result of an agreement between both parties, because both were represented in the scheme of Confederation. As I have said, if it is the belief of the great majority of the members that it would be better for us to rely upon the scheme defined in the Act of Confederation, and to treat that as the starting point, let us adopt it. But I do not believe it is the more convenient way; on the contrary I believe it would be a far more difficult way than to fall back on the old county lines. We followed that in 1872, and in 1882 we departed from it. I do not pretend that I am not responsible, as a member of this House who then had an opportunity of protesting against the Act of 1882, for not having taken that opportunity; but I may say here, as a matter personal to myself, because it may be the only opportunity I will have of making the explanation, that I am only responsible to the same extent as, and not more than, any other private member for that Act. It was stated by the Minister of Railways in his speech the other evening, or it was insinuated by him rather than stated, that I had more to do with it than any gentleman outside the Administration. I take this opportunity of denying that statement. That is not the case. I accept to the full the responsibility of my action in the House when I was present here and voted for the different measures proposed on this side or against the different amendments moved by the opposite side, and I do not apologize or make any pretense of saying, in connection with votes taken when I was not present, that I would not have voted similarly had I been here. I do not want to sail under false colours; but I deny and repudiate the charge that I had anything to do with framing the Bill of 1882 except in suggesting the propriety of splitting the riding of North Simcoe, which I then represented, into the present ridings of North and East Simcoe, by following, as regards North Simcoe the lines then adopted by the Local House, perfectly fair and legitimate as they were, and making of the balance East Simcoe, and to which was attached a portion of the district of Muskoka. That, however, is a personal matter altogether apart from the question now before us. I notice by a statement reported as having been made by the Minister of Justice to a deputation, that he feels himself in no way personally responsible for this measure, that he merely introduced to the House as leader of the Government, without the knowledge—which I am perfectly satisfied the hon. gentleman had not—of the way it divided either the Province of Ontario or Quebec; and we have been gratified this afternoon by the announcement that one of the provisions of this Bill, a provision which all those on this side who desire to see fair-play regretted to find in it, has been abandoned. It is not correct, I venture to say, with greater knowledge than the Minister of Justice, that to adopt county lines in the Province of Ontario would have the effect of working gerrymander in favour of the opposite side of the House. I have gone over that matter, not merely from the stand-point of fairness but from the stand-point of party interest, and I can venture to prove, to the satisfaction of any fair-minded man, that the party on this side would not be substantially weakened by a fair measure for the representation of the people in this Parliament. But that is but a minor question, because the great question here is to establish some principle. Take the Bill before the House, and can you find any principle in it? The first theory was that it would equalize population, but that has been abandoned, because, as has been repeatedly pointed, out, many other constituencies would require to be changed in order to effect equalization of population. It is impossible to suppose that was the object, whatever the object may have been in suggesting the changes. Then take the city of Hamilton, there you find that the Government took as the line the present municipal boundaries. You go to the city of Ottawa and you will find they have left the boundaries as they were in 1882. Then go to London, and you find they take part of the boundaries as they were in 1882, leave out the additional suburban part, which has been added since, and take in an independent municipality. Take any county in that Bill, and say whether that section agrees with any other section or is based on any principle or rule. If this redistribution is to be done, as I am satisfied the Minister of Justice desires to do it, on fair lines, a principle ought to be laid down. I have suggested a principle which may not be the best, I am not at all wedded to it, but some principle should be laid down to which could be referred the settlement of the distribution of seats of the members of this House. If we adopt what the hon. member for Albert the other

night suggested, if we start on the basis of 1882, I am unable to see how we are going to proceed. If we start with the redistribution of 1882, and call these divisions political units, as a matter of simple, plain business, I see no end to the confusion. They do not agree in population, there is no principle running through the scheme which can be recognized or followed; and, therefore, if that scheme is not possible, what else is there? I say none other than that which is now brought to the notice of the committee by the hon. member for Bothwell. I do not agree in all the details, and the hon. gentleman admits he has been hasty. For instance, he has put down Brant as entitled to but one member, though it is undoubtedly entitled to two, according to the scheme I have worked out. Toronto he has but down as entitled to five, and I see no reason why it should not have its fair number of representatives, but that, of course, is a matter on which opinions may differ. I do not know whether I may be allowed to class myself still as a supporter of the Government, but if I still am allowed to occupy that position, I appeal once more to the Government to adopt—I do not care what plan it may be—but some plan; and if the plan as laid down in the amendment be adopted, I believe it will be found impossible for hon. gentlemen opposite or any member of the Government in succeeding years to change it or depart from it, and it will be the basis on which to carry out any scheme of redistribution the House may accept. Only the other day I was reading something with reference to a matter which was happening in the British Parliament. In the scheme for local government for Ireland, it was necessary to constitute county divisions. The Opposition said: Who are going to mark out those lines? What was the answer of the Government? The answer of Mr. Balfour was: We have left it to the chief officers of our ordnance department, and if the gentlemen on the other side of the House are not satisfied with what they do in marking out these divisions of the counties, we will appoint a royal commission. So in 1832 I believe there was a royal commission, though in that I am speaking from information. There was a royal commission proposed by Mr. Disraeli in 1867, and in 1885 there was an agreement of the parties. In all these cases it was done on a fair and proper arrangement without any attempt on one side or the other to gain party advantages. I am not now insinuating that my hon. friends on this side will do worse or even as badly as hon. gentlemen opposite when they get the chance, but I insist that the people of this country should be represented irrespective of their opinions, and I would not give the hon. gentlemen opposite the advantage they undoubtedly will have if they ever get to this side of the House, as they may, of giving us a gerrymander such as that described as having been meted out by the Government in the Province of Ontario. I do not want to carry that argument out now, because I think it is foreign to this question. What we have to do is to do what is right, and not to take a constituency and divide it according to population here, and then divide another constituency upon some other principle. We should do the whole on some defined principle, and I think on the whole the result might not be unsatisfactory to one party or the other.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps, as this is the first opportunity I have had in the hon. gentleman's presence, I may be allowed to make some remarks in reference to charges made against myself by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. McCarthy). I am aware that the hon. gentleman before the close of last session urged upon the Government, and upon every member of the party, the necessity of passing a Redistribution Bill. He said the bye-elections were coming on, and the probabilities were that the party might not be as successful as we would desire in the campaign, and it was a duty to the Conservative party that last session there should have been a Bill to redistribute the constituencies. I leave it to the hon. gentleman whether he meant to redistribute in the line of county boundaries or in the interests of the Conservative party. I made a statement here the other evening in reference to the consultation of the hon. gentleman with the members of the Government as to the plan he introduced not long ago. I stated I had no knowledge of that plan. The hon. gentleman may have been perfectly right in saying what he did, or he may have any feeling he likes as to me, and may say that he did not consult me, but he said he notified my leader. I assert here that my leader never knew that the hon. gentleman intended to introduce a motion on the subject, and I say that my leader and every colleague of mine in this House was more than astonished at the motion proposed by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It is true that the lines he introduced as to the redistribution of the seats in the Province of Ontario were communicated to my leader, the Hon. Mr. Abbott. It is true also that I knew of it, not only because I saw the proposition that he intended to introduce, but I heard it from dozens of my fellow-members on this side of the House whom the hon. gentleman had consulted about it. It was the same as propositions which were handed in to the members of the Ministry by half-a-dozen members of the House. I was not, however, speaking of this, but of the manner of proceeding in reference to his motion by the hon. gentleman. I was not speaking in regard to the Redistribution Bill or to his plan of redistribution. I knew his views in reference to the matter. He said he mentioned them to me.

Mr. McCARTHY. I never said so.

Mr. HAGGART. He said I was present when the conversation was going on in reference to it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Never.

Mr. HAGGART. At all events I never heard of it. I was speaking of the manner in which the motion was introduced, and the wording of the motion which made it a direct vote of want of confidence in the Government. The hon. gentleman has a right to his opinion. he has a right to be independent and to introduce any resolution he chooses. I only spoke of him as a prominent member of the party when he introduced a motion condemnatory of the Government, and I said that I or some member of the Government should have had notice of it. I deny that I had any notice of it, except from what I might have gathered from some of the whisperings of members on this side a few days before I heard he intended to introduce a motion. No other knowledge had I than hearsay, and the motion was not only a surprise to me but to all my colleagues in the House. As to the references the hon. gentleman made to me, I do not care what opinion he has of himself or of me, but I

stated what I considered it my duty to myself and my colleagues and the Conservative party in this House to state, and I think the statement was perfectly correct and within the proper lines.

Mr. McCARTHY. At the risk of occupying the time of the committee on what is simply a personal matter, I must ask permission to say a few words in answer to the statements made by the hon. gentleman. It is perfectly true that I did not give formal notice to the Government of the terms of the resolution which I put on the paper—and why? I gave notice to everybody. I put the notice on the paper two or three days before I moved it. Otherwise I would have felt bound to give notice to the leader of the Government of the resolution I made. But, as the hon. gentleman has admitted—and that does not square very well with the attack he made upon me—I took the earliest opportunity to communicate to the leader of the Government my dissatisfaction with the measure introduced. He asked me for the memoranda on which I based my argument, and I said I would be most happy to give him a copy of them, and the next day I did place before the Premier my figures, my propositions in all their detail, more than I have unfolded here in anything I have said to the House. It is a matter of party allegiance, a matter with which the public are not, as far as I know, in any way concerned; but, occupying as I have for many years a position in public life, I have always understood I was not actually a slave or bound to the Government in every respect; but I have understood that, if I differed from any plan of the Government, it would be only proper for me to communicate with the Government that I did differ with them, and not to spring my opposition upon the floor of Parliament. I thought I did so. I intended to do so. I acted with perfect good faith. I have for months past had the opportunity of discussing with the leader of the Government this question of redistribution, and although no lines were marked down, Sir John Caldwell Abbott has been perfectly familiar with my views on the subject. The hon. gentleman has insinuated that last year I was pressing upon the Government, as I was, the propriety of carrying out the redistribution as necessitated by the census. But the hon. gentleman has no right to insinuate that I was not then of the same opinion I am now, because conviction, from various reasons, has been forced upon me that the Bill of 1882 was not only a party but a political mistake in every sense of the term. I do not know, Sir, that because I made a political mistake, or a blunder, in 1882, I am to be compelled to continue that in 1892. I have accepted the responsibility, I am not shifting it upon the Government or upon my friends on this side of the House, I accept responsibility to the fullest extent for all that occurred in 1882. I am willing to suffer for that, as I ought to suffer for it; but I do not know that because I have realized that the Bill of 1882 was a mistake, I should not urge upon my friends here in the first place, and upon the House in the second place, a change in that respect, a change which I think could be more readily made now than it can be ten years from now. I have only this to say. I am exceedingly sorry if there is a member of the Administration who thinks that the course I took, that the admendment I proposed, was equivalent to a vote of want of confidence. In what sense was it a vote of want of confidence? My motion was that the Bill be not now read the second time, and that this declaration be made. I do not understand that was a vote of want of confidence. On the other hand, it was a motion that every member of the Government might have voted for if they agreed in the principle. My principles were, first, equality of population, secondly, that the representation should be made by assuming county lines, and that whenever in cities more representation was required by the population, that distribution—because there might be a great evil resulting in carrying out the division of a county—that distribution of the county itself, should be based upon some definite principles, which I suggested as being equality of population, compactness, the geographical position, and the other suggestions which were made in the amendment. I did not mean it as a vote of want of confidence. I still have confidence in the trade policy of the Government, I still have confidence in their general policy. If the hon. gentlemen do not desire that I shall be counted one of their followers, they have only to say so. I do not stand here, and I did not come here, as a slave of the Government, or of anybody else. I came here to act according to what I believed to be right; I believed their trade policy to be right; I believed the policy of commercial union advocated on the other side of the House was wrong, and I was prepared to stand by the Government on their policy; and if there was now any danger of the trade policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite succeeding, I would not now be embarrassing the Government, as I may be by my attitude on this question. But when that question has had its quietus, I do not see any reason that should prevent me supporting what I believe to be not merely in the interest of the party to which I belong, but the country of which I am a citizen, and I believe that interest is met by the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may say a few words upon this question; indeed I feel called upon to say a few words in consequence not only of what the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has said, but in consequence of what the leader of the Opposition has said since I offered a few words to the committee a little while ago. I think it unnecessary to say more than a very few words with regard to the phase of the question which has been so recently under discussion by the Minister of Railways and the hon. member for North Simcoe. The hon. member for North Simcoe has made observations with respect to the attack made upon him the other night by the Minister of Railways, and has justified what he said in repelling that attack. The only difference between my hon. friend and myself upon that point is that I have never been able to understand down to this moment—and I have just perused the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways of the other evening—where the attack came in; and the hon. member's observations apparently addressed to the House with great asperity the other evening in reply to the Minister of Railways, seemed to me altogether unprovoked, unless provoked by a casual and good-natured observation, which my hon. friend did not offer to the member for North

Simcoe in any unfriendly spirit at all. But as regards an attack in the ordinary parliamentary sense, I think the member for North Simcoe must be entirely mistaken if he thinks that such an attack was made upon him. I wish to say with regard to the hon. member's position with reference to the party which supports the Government of the day—and, upon this subject I would not trouble the House with a single observation if it were not that it has been brought to the notice of the committee to-night—that we entirely agree with the hon. member that he is not a slave of the Government, that he is in no sense obliged to support every measure that the Government brings in, that we in no sense dispute the independence of any hon. member, or the right of any member of Parliament, to criticise, to move against, or attempt to defeat, any measure which may be brought forward for the assent of Parliament. I beg to say, however, a little further on that point, that the Government has no slave in this House, and when the hon. member for North Simcoe asserts that he is not a slave of the Government, I beg to assert the same on behalf of every member who supports the Government from time to time. I recognize to the fullest extent the right which the hon. member for North Simcoe has asserted—the right to an independent judgment upon this question and upon every other. If there is another point upon which I differ from him—and it may be only a point of expression—it is the point in which he intimated that the Government was now strong enough to do what is right, implying that the Government if weak, might properly, for the purpose of gaining a party advantage, introduce measures which would not be justifiable if the Government had the support of a large majority of the House. I beg to assert, not for the information of the hon. member for North Simcoe, because I know that he needs no such information, but for the purpose of putting the Government right before this House and before the country, that whether strong or weak, we do not at all desire the support of this House, or of any members who are associated with the Liberal-Conservative party, merely for the sake of sustaining this Government in power. Whatever proposition we offer to the House in our administration of affairs, is offered for the independent judgment of every member of the House. If any member of the House, whether belonging to the Liberal-Conservative party or not, thinks proper to support that measure, we do not—because we assert our independence as well as we allow the independence of our supporters—we do not feel personally grateful for that support, because we assume that it is given in the exercise of independent judgment, just as the member for North Simcoe supports our trade policy and our general policy, not out of personal regard and personal friendship for us, but because he believes that it is in the interest of the country, whose interests, I am sure, he has at heart. If the members supporting our general policy and our trade policy, think proper to give us their confidence in respect to other measures which, perhaps, are fully understood by them, but which are not fully explained to Parliament in the exigencies which may arise from time to time, if they think proper likewise to give us their confidence to the extent of consulting us as to what measures we ought to introduce, and informing us as to the extent to which those measures can receive their support, we feel exceedingly grateful for it without regard at all to any limit of independence of the member who may offer such advice. Therefore, while I say to the hon. member for North Simcoe that we are pleased with any confidence he may give to the Government, that we are pleased with the advice he may give to the Government as to its measures from time to time, and while we are glad to have his support of the trade policy of the Government, we are also pleased to recognize the equal independence of any other member of the House who usually votes with us upon the trade question or upon another; and I assert for every one of them the same independence which we cheerfully accord to him. Now, if I were disposed to answer my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, in the tone in which he answered my remarks, I would say that if anything indicated a disregard of principle in his line of action in regard to this Bill, and a disposition on the part of his party to attack it in the interest of faction and not in the interests of principle, it was the observation which he made with regard to dropping sub-sections *a* and *b*. The hon. gentleman addressed the House, and I am sure a great number of his supporters addressed the House in evenings gone by, for the purpose of showing us that the removal of the township of Clarence from the County of Russell and placing it in the County of Prescott would be an unjustifiable act, and one not in accordance with the principles which I enunciated in introducing the Bill. The hon. gentleman and his party were profoundly dissatisfied with those sub-sections of the Bill which would remove Clarence from the County of Russell and place it in the County of Prescott, and yet to-night when I have made the statement to the committee that we do not intend to press those clauses and do not intend to ask that the township of Clarence should be removed from Russell and put into Prescott, the hon. gentleman attacks me by the assertion that we have given no reason to the House to justify such a change of opinion on the part of the Government. Why, Sir, I stated to the committee when I made the announcement that I might take up the time of the committee by stating the reasons which justified the introduction of the proposition and the reasons which justified its abandonment; but what was the use of discussing propositions which the committee were not to be invited to accept. I am inclined to think, especially after hearing the observations of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that what we do propose to the House by this Bill will afford matter for discussion enough for the House for a little time to come, without my inviting the House to discuss matters we do not intend to propose. If I wished to enter upon abstract discussions to-night, I would explain why this might be introduced and why it might be withdrawn. It is sufficient surely for the present discussion, which I presume is intended by the great majority of members of this committee, if not by the whole committee, to be a practical business discussion, with a view to practical legislation, to say that we do not propose to press those clauses on the attention of the committee, and, therefore, it is unnecessary to state any principle on which they can be justified or on which their withdrawal can be justified. Representations have been made to the Government not only by members of the committee but by persons outside of the House, by the constitu-

ents themselves, as to what they preferred, and as to the reason which would justify the abandonment of that proposition, and due weight has been given to them. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to show that at any stage of the debate I have not recognized that the Government were open to reasonable argument or reasonable representation as to why anything we proposed should not be abandoned or anything we have not offered should not be offered. On the contrary, the only time I addressed the committee in the course of the debate on the second reading I deliberately, emphatically and repeatedly declined to discuss the details of the Bill, stating that we were not afraid to meet discussion as to those details, that we were not unprepared with an answer to the arguments which had been brought forward against those details, and that likewise we did not unduly undervalue the criticisms offered upon those details; but I reserved my answer upon the question of details to the committee stage, in order that I might then state to the committee the results we had arrived at, and if we were not able to yield to the objections brought forward we would have more freedom of discussion as to the justification which the Government might claim for resisting those suggestions or as to the justification which we might claim for yielding to them. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) likewise was quite mistaken in attributing to me the argument that a redistribution made in Ontario within county lines would be a gerrymander. What I stated to the House was, that a redistribution made in the Province of Ontario, in accordance with the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and therefore within county lines, might be made a complete gerrymander in the interest of either party. The hon. member for Bothwell will realize that, when I repeat the observation I made a few moments ago, that in the brief recital we were able to catch of the distribution according to townships as outlined by the hon. gentleman there would be a gain to the Liberal party, according to his redistribution within county lines, of fifteen or twenty members in Ontario; while keeping within county lines we could make an equal gain for the Liberal-Conservative party. I made that statement for the purpose of showing the committee, and there are many hon. gentlemen better able from their geographical and local knowledge, who would be able more distinctly to show it, that the principle for which hon. gentlemen opposite contend, that we must above all things stand on county boundaries, is by no means an infallible principle, because within the county lines either side of the House can work as despicable a gerrymander as ever was offered. But the fault I find with the principle stated by the hon. member for Bothwell and embodied in the amendment, whether brought forward in opposition to the second reading of the Bill or in committee now, is, that if you keep within county lines everything is justifiable, no matter how atrocious the gerrymander may be. We can accept this amendment, and accomplish, I repeat it, as great a gerrymander as was ever perpetrated, and gain 20 seats in Ontario; and hon. gentlemen opposite will have been met by their own principle, that we have not departed from county lines and that everything you do within county lines is justifiable. Hon. gentlemen opposite can on the same principle, if this amendment be adopted, accomplish a gerrymander quite as atrocious in the interests of the Liberal party. We do not accept the principle to that extent, we do not accept the principle that if you keep within county lines you can commit any atrocity in the representation of this country you please. The one sacred idol they set up for worship here is the county line. I have pointed out already, that while it is established by provincial authority, above all things in Ontario, the provincial authority has not recognized it or fallen down and worshipped it when it was set up, and that while in other provinces the county line has been preserved inviolate beyond the memory of the present generation, it is quite within the memory of the present generation that counties have been altered in Ontario and two counties rolled into one for municipal purposes whenever it suited the exigencies of political legislation in that province—I do not mean party legislation, because I am not undertaking to express an opinion on that, and am not qualified to express an opinion on it from my personal knowledge of the politics of Ontario, but whenever it suited political requirements in the Province of Ontario, for proper legislation I will assume, county lines did not stand long in the way. Therefore, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was quite mistaken in supposing that my contention was that redistribution within county lines must necessarily be a political gerrymander. With respect to what the leader of the Opposition said, that in the event of future pressure from this side of the House at the next decennial census he would very much distrust the moral fibre of the Government, and that certainly it would require greater moral fibre than the present Government possesses to resist pressure, to secure a party advantage when the next distribution came round, and his advice to us to take refuge in some principle which would be respected by the other side,—I confess that I have not sufficient faith in hon. gentlemen opposite, greatly as I admire them, to believe in the soundness of any principle they would offer to the House, or as to their moral fibre to stand by that principle when party advantage could be secured by departing from it; and, therefore, I would rather trust the good sense, the fairness and honesty of the Liberal-Conservative party to make a fair redistribution not only now, but when the next decennial period comes round. I shall rather trust that spirit of fairness and equity, than trust the security of any principle which our hon. friends on the other side would adopt as being in any sense likely to be invulnerable against their inroads if they can obtain the power to depart from it. I have just a word to say with regard to the observations of the hon. member for North Simcoe (McCarthy) with reference to the functions discharged by the chief officers of the Ordnance Department, and possibly (another alternative) by a Royal Commission. The hon. gentleman I think exaggerated unintentionally the extent and the force of the observations made in that regard. The practice in England has always been, if I remember it aright—certainly it was in the Redistribution Bill of 1885—to have the particular delineations made by a boundary commission composed of the chief officers of the Ordnance Department, and any member of the committee who thinks it necessary can find in the Library the report which that commission made on the redistribution of 1885, and the volume containing

the maps prepared under their direction showing the redistribution of seats which was made in accordance with the principles arrived at in that year. Any hon. gentleman who may be curious enough to consult that report will find what the functions of the commission were, and they will find some of the outlines of constituencies drawn by this boundary commission—no doubt fairly, in pursuance of the instructions and powers conferred upon them—much more extravagant in irregularity of outlines, than the delineations proposed in this measure as they may be represented to the House in the discussion on the details of the Bill. I am not one of those who think that political or moral rectitude and virtue are confined to right angles. It may be possible notwithstanding the denunciations that have been made, that a zig-zag line struck on the map as if it had been drawn by forked lightning, is more correct, more fair, more honourable and more honest than one that runs in rectangular figures. I am the more convinced of that from the sense of provincial prejudice which moves me, because when I look upon the map of my own province and find county boundary lines which have stood there for upwards of a century, I find them sometimes running in a course which would have provoked the moral indignation of many of the people in this country who assert with uplifted hands, that rectitude can only run in right angles, squares and parallelograms. I dare say it may be so in other provinces, but I know that it is so in my own. We follow after all in these matters the direction of convenience, not of party convenience, but of public convenience, especially with a view to the continuance of existing lines, of existing methods and of existing divisions. It seemed to me when I heard, as I did with pleasure, the observations which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) delivered to the House a week ago, that he had described, as well as could be described, the reasons which would justify, and which would in fact make one prejudiced in favour of the county system, when he spoke of the habits of the people and the disposition they had to consult each other upon matters relating to territorial divisions within which they were accustomed to act in common. Every word that the hon. member said upon that subject as regards their community of interests, as regards their familiarity with each other's views, as regards their consultation with each other as to the best men to represent them in Parliament, as to their habit of thinking together and their habit of meeting together for purposes connected with their representation in Parliament; every word that the hon. member said in favour of continuing the county lines applies with ten-fold force to the continuance, as far as possible, of the existing political divisions of the constituencies. If the hon. gentleman recognizes that it is proper to keep people who are accustomed to sit on the jury bench together, who are accustomed to elect municipal councillors together, who are accustomed to select their wardens together; if it be at all important to congregate these persons together and keep them within the lines within which they are accustomed to act, it is surely of equal importance, at least, that these people, having been congregating within certain political lines during the last ten years, since 1882, in political matters so far as this Parliament is concerned for the last ten years, and shall not now be wantonly separated upon any mere theoretical principle as regards county lines or any other. Is it not important that we shall maintain the principle of continuity, that we shall continue within the party convention it may be, the party caucus it may be, the occasional political discussion it may be, of men who are accustomed to assemble to discuss their political requirements? Is it not important, I ask, that we should provide that these persons shall continue to congregate, and to meet, and to consult, and to advise and to vote together, as they have been doing for the last ten years, unless some good reason can be offered to this committee to the contrary? It is upon that principle that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) urged his view with regard to the county lines—and all of that we are not disposed to dispute as regards any matters which affect the counties themselves—but it applies with ten fold force to the maintenance of the political divisions of the last ten years, unless some reason is given to show that that political line is unjust, that it ought to be violated, or that it operates unjustly to some other section of the country requiring representation. With regard to these considerations, we are entirely open to conviction; but we are unwilling—merely on the principle that persons are accustomed to be governed by other lines, in serving on juries or in electing their wardens or councillors—we are unwilling to depart from that principle in laying down the rule upon which men shall consult to select their candidates for this Parliament, and to vote on national questions. I repeat that I think we cannot accept the amendment to proceed on county lines merely in consideration of municipal interests and municipal continuity, when the continuity of political questions with which this Parliament has to deal and with which this Bill deals, would thereby be disturbed and placed upon entirely new lines. For that reason, we cannot accept the hon. gentleman's amendment and undertake to change the entire political map of Ontario by rearranging the lines of some seventy or eighty of the constituencies in that province.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is not my intention, of course, to allude to anything of a personal or party nature that has occurred between the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the members of the Government. With that portion of the Minister's speech I have nothing to say. There was one remark, however, which the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) as an independent member of the House, an independent member of the Conservative party, threw out, that I had hoped the Minister would have replied to. That was his pertinent question as to what principle it was that guided the Government in introducing this measure. There is a principle offered here by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), something similar having been offered on the second reading by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and he asked in contradistinction to that, what principle guided the Government in this Bill. I had hoped that the Minister of Justice, before he resumed his seat, would have given us the principle that guided him when this Bill was drawn up. I listened through all his remarks, and I listened attentively, and the only thing I heard approaching a declaration of principle on his part was that in framing a Bill of this kind, you should have regard

to continuity—not regard to county bounds, but regard to the electoral divisions as they had previously existed. His argument, if I understood him aright, was that if there was any strength in the argument in favour of maintaining county lines, because the people of the county associated and worked together, it was far stronger when applied to an electoral division, in which people had been in the habit of working together in electing a member to this House. Now, without attempting to show that the Minister's position in that respect is weak, I would ask him, if that be the principle on which the Bill is framed, how is it that he has disregarded it in 21 cases in Ontario and in 25 cases in Quebec?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. For the purpose of giving additional representation to the centres of population.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But it is a sad departure from the principle.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Oh, no.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, because the Minister will admit that he could have given the additional representation without altering so many bounds as he has done in this Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot admit it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will the hon. gentleman give me the privilege of drafting a Bill in that respect, and will he accept it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will give the hon. gentleman the privilege of drafting one.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to have the assurance that the Minister will accept it, and then I will undertake the task. We cannot regard that as his principle, much as we like to accept his declarations. I have then to ask him, what principle guides him? If he would take the position that it is not necessary, in drafting a Bill of this kind, to be guided by any principle at all, we could understand him; but he has not taken that position. Nay, more; if I understood his statement aright, it was this, that whenever he introduced a measure into the House and asked the House to consider it and pass upon it, he did not ask his supporters to support it because it was introduced by the Government, but on the principle of the Bill being just and right. If that is the case, I ask his supporters behind him on what principle are they justifying this Bill? It cannot be on the principle of equalizing the population; that would be too much for the members opposite to argue, nor could they argue that it is because the Bill maintains the county lines. I have heard some hon. gentlemen opposite denouncing Mr. Mowat, because they said he had not adhered to county lines in his redistribution, though it was shown in the discussion that he had; yet the indignation that they manifested on that account showed that they could not approve of a departure from county lines, or they were hypocritical in their utterances. No one could condemn Mr. Mowat for being guilty of a violation of a principle of justice and right, and then go and violate it themselves. It was also said that he divided the townships. By this Bill, or the one it amends, townships are divided, and no attempt is made to rectify that. On what principle, then, I ask the Minister of Justice, are his supporters to judge of the merits of this measure in giving an independent vote?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman did not read my speech.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I did, and I listened to it also, as I always listen to the hon. gentleman with pleasure. Now that he has said that members must only vote on this Bill on principle, what principle must guide them in coming to a conclusion? I have looked at the matter from every principle I could conceive of as a basis for a Bill of this kind, and I cannot find any. I have listened to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I have not heard one of them state the principle on which they can justify it, and I wait now for the Minister to say what it is. As he does not state it, I am forced to this conclusion, which is not ungenerous to hon. gentlemen opposite—not complimentary to them, I grant, but I am forced to it—that there is no principle to guide men in supporting this Bill in its present shape, except that of securing a party advantage for the party which introduces the Bill. If hon. gentlemen opposite would say: We justify this Bill because while it strengthens some of our Conservative supporters, it also strengthens Liberals, there might be something in that, if it would bear investigation. True it is, they strengthen some of their supporters, and they strengthen a few of the Liberals; but let us look at it. The supporters they strengthen in many cases I think are those who perhaps I am not wrong in saying were among the number who made suggestions to the hon. Minister of Railways as to how this Bill should be drafted—gentlemen who felt that they would be the better of a little more support than they had, support secured by legislation in the Parliament of Canada rather than by trusting to their own eloquence and to their defence of the measures which they might discuss before the people. But when you come to the Liberals who are strengthened, you find that my hon. friend behind me for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) is strengthened by 250 or more votes; but when you remember that he had a majority of 1,116 at the last election, and has done nothing to forfeit the confidence of his supporters, you will see that he did not need to be strengthened very much. It is true, the hon. member for West Bruce (Mr. Rowand) will be strengthened a little by the Bill; but when you remember that he had a majority of about 700 in the last election, and that his personal popularity has increased in the riding, you will see that he did not need much in the way of support. It is true, my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) is strengthened materially by this Bill; but when you remember the immense odds against which he fought his last battle and came off victorious against the combined influence of the Ministers' personal presence and their personal magnetism in his riding, with a majority of 240, it looks as if he did not need much in the way of support. Do hon. gentlemen opposite justify the measure because it strengthens 16 or 17 of their supporters and three or four of the Opposition, if three or four may be considered as equal to 16 or 17? But when you look at the gentlemen who have been strengthened, you will see that there cannot be anything said for the Bill in that respect. The question then comes back for the Minister: On what principle have you framed this Bill?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Oh, just read my speech.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think, as long as that question remains unanswered, some principle ought to be established; and if the principle of following the county lines, suggested by this amendment, will not do, give us some other principle. But no other principle is mentioned. As I say, the principle of maintaining the electoral districts even cannot be accepted, so that it is not to be wondered at that the Opposition should ask why it is you want this Bill to go through in its present shape. The Minister replies, because we want to give additional representation to the large centres of population, and he proposes one member additional for Toronto and one for Algoma. That certainly would not necessitate these twenty-one changes provided in this Bill; but I differ with him altogether in what he states that because men have been acting together once every four or five years in electing a member for this House, their interests are more closely united than when acting within county limits, within which they are brought so often in contact one with another. If the hon. gentleman understood the working of the county system in Ontario, and he must understand it in some measure, because I presume the system is much the same in the East, he would see no weight can be attached to that argument. True, you will have your party convention once a year for the election of officers in electoral districts, and you may bring the leading members of the political parties together in that way, and when an election comes round, you will find a central committee proposed, or, in the case of some electoral districts, different committees, for one central committee could not well manage a riding of three different counties, but that is all; whereas in the county, as the Minister knows, the people are brought together frequently several times during the year, they are brought together in their county council meetings, they are brought together in their deputations to the county council to urge municipal legislation, they are brought together in their township council and in their agricultural shows, and these bring them together perhaps more than anything else. There is no comparison between the union of interests in electoral districts, as constituted under the Act of 1882, and in the union of interests inside the county lines. In the Bill of 1882, the pretense was made that it would equalize the population. The Minister of Justice was not in the House then, and hon. gentlemen opposite now show a little more honesty than they did at that time, for it is not now pretended that this Bill will secure in any degree the equalization of population. Any one who will look at the divergent number of electors in the different ridings, as constituted by the Act of 1882, will see how utterly it fails in this regard. That was an iniquitous measure, and I am glad to see that some of those who supported it then are honest enough to condemn it to-day. We have not heard the Minister of Militia condemn it. I believe he was given the credit of being the father of the Bill, but I must say he was not wholly the father. At that time a sight was seen here, which I trust will never be seen again in Canada. We saw the leading wire pullers of the one political party summoned from all parts, assembled here, and in darkness and secrecy with closed doors, with the maps before them, they were asked to point out, from their local knowledge, how the political opponents of the Government in this House, who were waging an honest warfare, could be politically stabbed and put to a political death. And when that information was obtained from these men, craven enough to give it, there were found men in this House to introduce a Bill based on that information, and there was a government found sufficiently strong, with a sufficient number of supporters behind its back, to force that Bill through by means of all-night sittings, in face of the protests from this side. I would ask the Minister of Justice, when fifty-four ridings were ruthlessly destroyed with this object, destroyed for the purpose of ruining one of the political parties of this country, does he mean to tell me that after ten years of that iniquity, we are going to have the people working more harmoniously together by basing our future legislation upon the iniquity perpetrated at that time? I need only point out my own personal experience to show how revolting this system is to the feelings of our population. I cannot go as I tried to go every year, to the agricultural show of one of the districts, wrested from the County of Brant and put into the County of Oxford, but the old men meet me and shake my hand and almost with tears in their eyes speak of the Bill of 1882 as an iniquitous Bill and ask if there is no chance of that injustice being remedied.

An hon. MEMBER. Tired of voting for Cartwright.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They are voting for Cartwright and are proud of him as a representative, but they know he would have been elected to this House if they had never been put into that riding, and they know he would be elected again if they were restored to their own limits. I simply mention this to point out to the Minister that he is all wrong when he thinks it would be better to continue the lines established because the people have become accustomed to working together. How is that possible? They took the little township of Oakland out of South Brant and attached it to South Oxford. Its nearest point must be 10 or 12 miles from the County of Oxford. They attached it to a riding, which had 24,000 souls, and took it away from a riding which had 22,000 souls, in order to equalize the population, and the township itself had 900 souls. Does he mean to tell me that the men living in that township, almost within the sounds of the bells of Brantford, and who are attached to a riding, the principal town of which is Ingersoll, 50 miles away, can ever be satisfied with the change? They are scarcely ever in the county to which they are attached. Brantford is the town in which they do their trading, and they have hardly any communication whatever with the people in the other locality. They go and vote to show their confidence in Sir Richard Cartwright, but they know that they were virtually disfranchised when that Act was passed, because they were taken out of the riding where they were needed at the time, and they were taken out of it in order to politically kill an opponent of the Government. Things have changed, but when the Government put these people in there, the Government virtually disfranchised them. I mention this as an illustration to show that there is no force in the argument that it is better to leave the electoral districts as constituted. The feeling, the ill-will, the feeling of wrong being done them, is as alive in the breasts of these men to-day as when it was

done. Why? Because it was a dire iniquity, a gross injustice. They know it now. They feel it. They realize it, and they will always feel it. I have only instanced that because it was within my own knowledge and to show the Minister that his argument, that, because since 1882 they have worked in the same divisions as electors, it is to their best interests to continue it, is a great mistake, and prove that he has not recognized the enormity of the iniquity perpetrated in 1882. If he cannot accept in full the amendment of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), if he makes it a matter of pride, is he not prepared to receive amendments that will rectify the most glaring of the iniquities of the Redistribution Bill of 1882? If he did that, I might have some belief that there was a principle actuating hon. gentlemen opposite that was worthy of members of this House, but, if there is a persistent refusal to rectify the injustice that was done, and not only that but a determination to perpetrate the same iniquity in the Province of Quebec, then I must say that the Minister of Justice has not fulfilled the expectations I once had of him as a gentleman who at any rate would try to do what was fair and honourable. Hon. gentlemen opposite must acknowledge that no principle has been enunciated, and no reason has been assigned to justify the clauses of this Bill, and those who were in the House in 1882 know that when you are introducing a Bill of this kind, not only the sins of commission are to be considered, but the sins of omission, and, if the hon. gentleman is interfering, as he is, with the bounds of 21 electoral districts in Ontario, and 25 in Quebec——

Mr. SPROULE. 19 in Ontario. You are counting Prescott and Russell.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We have not reached that yet.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the motion before the committee.

Mr. WALLACE. Are the boundaries of West Toronto changed?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They are changed, because there is another member given there.

Mr. WALLACE. There is no change in the boundaries.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That would be 20 any way. If you are justified in making the changes which are proposed, what is to prevent you rectifying your sins of omission. How far is the Minister of Justice prepared to go?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not prepared to go to 80.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It would tend to harmony in this debate, and perhaps to a shortening of the discussion, if we could learn from the Ministers what clauses they are prepared to drop and what amendments they are prepared to accept in rectifying their sins of omission. The fact that the Minister has yielded on one point would strengthen the statement I understood him to make that he was prepared to receive suggestions. I trust that is so, and I think it would be better for the Minister to state what percentage of this amendment he would accept and whether he would go to the extent of rectifying the iniquity committed in 1882, or the iniquity which is contemplated in this Bill in regard to the Province of Quebec. I was glad to hear the Minister say, in proposing the amendment in reference to Prescott and Russell, that he had listened to the objections of the Opposition. That shows that our labour was not in vain, and perhaps the same labour may be now bestowed with a more cheerful spirit because we will be expecting a harvest from pointing out more and more the deficiencies in this Bill. It might be well if the hon. gentleman could be persuaded that we are right on the whole, and would admit that the arguments of the Opposition are not only right in regard to the meditated change in Prescott and Russell but in regard to all points in the Bill, and if he would agree to frame a Bill on more equitable lines. We should have a measure which will give no particular advantage to one party or the other but will give fair representation to the people of this country, which will give them a chance to express their view as to who should represent them, and then we should go and take our chances upon the different policies we advocate. I commend the language of the leader of the House when he said he wanted no man to be a slave or to follow him blindly, that he only wanted support when he put forward principles that members could defend without a blush of shame. That is a grand position. Mr. Minister of Justice, supplement that by giving to the people of this country the same liberty you have proclaimed to your followers behind you. Let them have an opportunity, unfettered and independent, under a fair and honest Bill, to say who shall come into this House, and then you will have carried out a sentiment grander and more worthy of you than the one to be commended in reference to the independence of your followers. This Bill will not do that; this Bill, whether designedly or not, will accomplish an advantage to one political party to the disadvantage of the other, and that should not be done. If this Bill was not introduced at all, the old Bill, that is in no respect amended by this in the direction it ought to be, remains in force, and as long as that is in force it leaves the political parties of Ontario unequal in the fight; one political party has not the fair fighting chance that the other party has. It is not consistent with the principle of leaving his supporters behind him free and unfettered to judge questions on their merits, that an act should be introduced that will bind the electorate that selects the representatives of this House, and gives to one portion of them an undue advantage. That was the effect of the Bill of 1882. True, it did not succeed in all cases; in my own riding it did not succeed. That was a strong Reform riding, but it was made into a Conservative riding, and it was supposed, of course, that a supporter of the Government would be returned for that riding. I found it necessary to tell my Conservative friends there, I am in a minority now, and it will be necessary for a certain number of you to leave your party and to come over and support me. I do not ask you all to do it, but I want a sufficient number of you to do it, and unless you should make a mistake, be sure that rather more than less of you do it. And they did it, and they came over, and by their support and with the aid of my old supporters that were left ungerrymandered I retained a seat in this House, though in opposition to the Government. I want to point out that, while that is the case, and while that has been the case in other

counties, the Government deserve no credit for it. Their intention was most dishonourable, but it did not succeed. In other cases it did succeed, and some of the hon. gentlemen of this House sit here by virtue of that gerrymander of 1882; there is no doubt about that, and it is not as honourable a position to sit here by virtue of an Act of Parliament as it is by the free choice of ungerrymandered electors. Should the Minister doubt the wisdom of rectifying this, I can point out to him that if the gerrymander of 1882 was made right, so far as the County of Brant was concerned, it would neither strengthen the Government nor weaken them, because now there is not a municipality in the whole County of Brant, or a municipality that was torn from the County of Brant and thrown into other counties, that does not give a Reform majority. It is changed from what it was in 1882, and hon. gentlemen say that because that is so, leave it, but that did not justify them at the time. Although they may succeed in forcing this Bill through, I still hope and trust that there are enough honourable Conservatives and independent men in many of the mutilated counties in the Province of Quebec who will resent this, as it was resented in the other provinces, where the force against them is not too strong. But even if that result does follow, it will not remove the stigma of dishonour upon a party in Parliament that would seek by legislation to tie the hands of the free electors of this country. No, no, this Bill is not right, this Bill cannot be defended on any principle. no gentleman has attempted to defend it on any principle, and you are forced, even with the broadest charity in your mind, seeing that this Bill does strengthen one political party to the detriment of another political party, to pronounce its condemnation. This Bill ought not to be adopted as it is. In the amendment offered by the member for Bothwell I do not understand that he divides up different townships. Touching upon that one point, the Minister of Justice replies that by maintaining the county lines he could have gerrymandered worse than this. Possibly so, but the member for Bothwell does not ask that this shall be so. I question if it could be so myself, but he does not ask it, the resolution that was moved on the second reading did not so propose; it proposed that in the division into ridings of a county entitled to more than one member, there should be a principle observed, a geographical principle, and a principle of population as nearly as it might be applied. You cannot adopt it with mathematical precision, and so the hon. member for Bothwell, in introducing this, has not asked the House to accept a division of the townships into various ridings, nor does he propose to disregard the geographical connections between different townships, and to disregard population altogether, but his proposition is to adopt that as a determining principle upon which to start, and in making out the details of it, to let some principle of justice and fair-play obtain, having regard for geographical limits and having regard for population, not with mathematical precision, but as close as may be in the interest of what is right and fair. There is a principle, at any rate, and if that cannot be accepted, if the Minister of Justice is not prepared to go that whole length, I think it would tend to harmony and possibly to shortening this debate, if he would frankly state whether they are prepared to receive any considerable amendments to this Bill, whether they are prepared to drop the more obnoxious clauses of it, if they cannot adopt the principle that is laid down by the member for Bothwell; whether they will be guided, at any rate, by the principle of doing something that is just, and fair, and honourable as between the two political parties. I think an assurance of that kind from the Minister might have the effect of shortening the debate and of maintaining more harmony and better feeling in the House. If I was asking anything that could not be granted by any honourable man, I should be ashamed of myself; but I think I am asking only what will commend itself to any man of honour, and with a love of fair-play, who may be honoured with a seat in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member who has just taken his seat, in one part of his speech expressed his respect for the honest, independent electorate of Canada, because they had not endorsed the iniquitous Bill of 1882; and although by the arrangement of that Bill it was intended to leave himself at home and elect a Conservative in his place, the independent yeomanry of the County of Brant had again elected him to Parliament. Now, if he believes that the honest and independent electorate of the county will do what is right, why should he fear so much the changes in this Bill which he professes to call a Gerrymander Bill? If he has respect for the intelligence and the honesty of the electorate of Canada, why should he express so much fear with regard to this Bill? The hon. gentleman says it is necessary to remedy the evil that was done in 1882, that there were sins of omission as well as sins of commission, and that we should not follow the lines that were laid down years ago under which the people of Canada acted during the last ten years. The hon. member has forgotten that they have not only acted within those lines for the last ten years, but in many constituencies they have acted within them for the last twenty years. The present Redistribution Bill only proposes to change 18 ridings out of the 92 in Ontario, leaving some 74 ridings untouched. In those 74 ridings, at least, the people must have acted together during the last three elections, and for the last ten years. Now, I think it would be unreasonable to disturb that condition of things under which they have acted harmoniously for the last ten years. But the hon. gentleman says that it was intended to hive the Reformers so that they could not be fairly represented in this House, and he goes on to tell us that that result did not follow. No, it did not, because in the western half of Ontario where there are 46 members, a large majority of them are Reformers, so that the Redistribution Bill of 1882 could not have affected those counties so injuriously to the Reform interest as the hon. gentleman pretends. Therefore, I say the Redistribution Bill of 1882 was not so bad as represented, or else there must be a sterling independence and honesty among the electorate, or else his argument is not worth anything. I was much amused at one part of his speech. He drew a graphic picture of the sorrow that was indicated in the eyes of the electors of his part of the country when he met them at agricultural shows, because they had been foisted into South Oxford. I wonder whether they were sorry at parting with the genial representative of North Brant, or at the un-

fortunate accident which had thrown them under the tender mercies of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Which was it that caused the grief? The loss of their friends, or the new ban under which they had been placed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It was because they were virtually disfranchised, and they feel it to-day. It was because in ridings where they had hundreds of votes to spare before, they received additional votes.

Mr. SPROULE. The use of the franchise is to elect members, and if voters wished to register their votes in favour of the hon. member for South Oxford, they had the privilege of doing so, and therefore were not disfranchised. They could pile up a majority in favour of that hon. gentleman, and show their condemnation of what the Government had done, but this they did not do.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says that the proposal of the hon. member for Bothwell is the proper one, and that a principle is embodied in it which should not be overlooked, the principle of keeping within the boundaries of counties. I do not know how far the hon. gentleman is inclined to believe that that is a principle or not. But it must be admitted that no matter whether the Bill of 1882 was a bad or a good Bill, there are many of the constituencies that have not been changed since Confederation. I have before me the British North America Act, which maps out the constituencies of Ontario. There are 92 of them. This Bill proposes to change 18. If I remember correctly, the Bill of 1882 changed 54, and the changes made to-day are in many of the counties changed then, therefore a large number of counties have remained unchanged since Confederation. They were mapped out by the fathers of Confederation, and were admitted to be fair by both political parties. If they were fair and correct, then the population has not so much changed as to necessitate a change in the boundaries; but notwithstanding that, many of the constituencies are held to-day to be unfair to the Reform party, though no change has taken place in them since Confederation, because changes are not made in the boundaries on which they were first organized. I need not tell the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Paterson) that the fathers of Confederation did not see the urgent necessity of keeping within county lines, because there were several new counties established. I find by the Act that there are four or five such cases. Bothwell was taken from different counties, Monck was also taken from different counties, as were also North Victoria and one or two other constituencies. So the boundaries were not acceptable any more than in 1882 or in 1892, and yet the fathers of Confederation adopted boundaries that were considered fair to both political parties, and the boundaries of some of those ridings, although they remained unchanged, are now held to be unfair. It destroys, in a measure, the force of the arguments advanced by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Paterson) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in support of the amendment submitted to the committee, because the hon. member for Bothwell proposes that changes be made in 82 constituencies, while there are only 92 constituencies in Ontario, and many of them have remained unchanged since Confederation. I was amused with the argument advanced by the hon. member for North Wellington in favour of the adoption of the amendment. He declared the Bill of 1882 was an unfair one, that in his constituency redistribution was made for the purpose of strengthening the Conservative party and leaving the Reformers at home, but he was glad to say that this attempt did not succeed; he further declared that he had no reason to find fault with the present boundaries of Wellington because all the ridings sent Reformers to this House although it was intended by the Bill of 1882 that Conservatives should be returned; but he said that if the object was to go over the whole country and change the other ridings he would be satisfied to have changes in Wellington, although he would not concede that changes should be made in his county without changes being made throughout the whole province. So the hon. gentleman first declared that the redistribution of 1882 was an unfair one, and that the principle adopted was not correct, and the changes made in the Wellingtons were unjustifiable; but he said that he would not consent to any change in Wellington now unless changes were made in other ridings. There is no force in such reasoning. If the legislation is bad, it is so whether certain changes will be made or not. Such arguments can have very little weight. The impression created on my mind by the hon. gentleman's speech was that he gave away the secrets of his party, that it was intended that there should be systematic obstruction of this Bill in the House, and that the session should be prolonged as much as possible until the Government was worn out to such an extent as to be willing to abandon the Bill. I do not think the hon. gentleman can justify his conduct and that of his party in this regard, and let this debate be long or short, and the hon. gentleman has made his boast as to what they will do and uttered his threats, the electors. I trust, will remember the expense heaped up by this waste of time in debate, not carried on for proper and practical purposes and fair discussion, but for obstruction merely to a measure proposed by the majority, a measure which the people of the country will admit was fair, not only to both political parties in this House, but also fair with respect to the equalization of the electorate in the various constituencies and the arrangements of the various townships in the constituencies or electoral divisions.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). For what purpose were you detaining the progress of the committee?

Mr. SPROULE. In order to answer unfair arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MULOCK. Whatever information the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Sproule) possesses as to the intention of the Opposition, I can only say that I am not aware of any decision arrived at to obstruct or enter into any discussion not intended to promote the public interest.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said that he hoped he was not giving away the party's secret when he said they intended to obstruct the passage of this Bill by every means in their power.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not care what the hon. member for North Wellington said, or what any one said on that point, but I reaffirm my statement that so far as I know, no such conclusion has

been arrived at as has been suggested. In proof of it, my observations will occupy but a very few moments. I believe the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) took part in fastening on the country the Gerrymander Act of 1882, and if he has not repented of it, I can well understand his characterizing as obstruction any action on the part of the members of this House which is calculated to delay the Government in re-enacting that measure. Looking at the Bill now before us, it is impossible to ignore the fact that if we allow that measure of 1882 to remain unrepealed, we are re-enacting it by our legislation now. If we use it as the foundation upon which to arrange representation for the next ten years we are re-enacting that Act of 1882 which I think the Minister himself stated was a most unfair and unfortunate measure. No hon. gentleman in this House has attempted to defend it. I have heard one after another rise and regret its existence, but contend that it had received the sanction of age, and must be suffered to exist for that reason. I have not heard one member of the House say that he would now vote in favour of the Bill of 1882. That Bill attempted to defeat the object of representative institutions. We are supposed to be a Parliament voicing the sentiments of the people, but in 1882 Parliament deliberately set about to defeat the object of our existence and to strangle public opinion. Parliament in 1882, committed treason against the interests entrusted to it by the Imperial Act which brought it into existence, and it is impossible for us to ignore the responsibility resting upon us to-night if we do anything to confirm the action of Parliament in 1882. That Bill aimed at the destruction of our whole system of Government, and if we do not honestly arrange for a fair representation of public opinion, we are certainly disregarding the highest trust reposed in us. I need not remind the Minister of Justice what the duty is which devolves upon Parliament to-night. The question now before us is the most important one that can be submitted. There is no other question which involves a more unbiased and a more impartial decision than that involving the representation of public opinion on the floor of Parliament. Mr. Chairman, the very question which is striking at the root of our liberties demands that we shall approach it, as I approach it to-night, wholly free from any party or political bias. The question demands that the Ministry shall in like manner approach it in that spirit, and there is no plainer proposition in law than that one shall not sit in judgment upon his own interests. If unfortunately we are to-night compelled by the construction placed upon the British North America Act to sit in judgment on questions so nearly concerning ourselves, that circumstance added to the importance of the question itself, demands from every member of this House that he shall bring to bear upon it an entirely judicial spirit. That being the case, I ask whether it is not due to the country that we shall not legislate upon this important question in an arbitrary manner, but rather upon some principle which can be defended, whether that principle operates to the advantage of one party or the other. In my judgment, Sir, it is of little importance, compared with the consequences, whether the results of the redistribution aids one party or the other. If the effect of it is to confirm the right of the Government to arbitrarily legislate itself into office, or to prolong by arbitrary legislation its enjoyment of office, then the consequence is not only to degrade Parliament in the eyes of the country, not only to rob Parliament of the confidence which it ought to-day enjoy at the hands of the people, but that for all time to set an evil example productive of increasing disaster to the country. Though Parliaments may come and go, though Governments may come and go, if we to-day reaffirm the unfortunate action of 1882, we discredit ourselves, we discredit Parliament, and we strike a blow at the liberties of the people. Therefore I would ask, I would beg of the Government, and especially the Minister of Justice to whom I will give credit for endeavouring to bring to bear upon this question an unclouded and impartial judgment, I will beg of him before it is too late to reconsider the situation and if possible to dispose of this question by reference to principle, and not as it is to-day apparently sought to be disposed of, by some arbitrary rule wholly disregarding principle. Mr. Chairman, as I stated I should by my action in making these few remarks give at all events proof of my sincerity in that my expressions of opinions are the outcome of my convictions, and not simply for the purpose of taking up the time of the House. Viewing as I do the importance of the question I feel that I would be wrong if I allowed the measure to proceed without recording my disapproval of it as it is at present framed. Therefore, I place my views upon record, and I hope that before the Bill is further proceeded with, the Administration will see their way to again reconsider it, and to see whether it is not their duty towards themselves, towards the trust they have in their charge, and towards the country at large to endeavour to find a solution of this question which will receive the approval of the whole country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Chairman, there has been a good deal of discussion upon this very important Bill, and a great deal of latitude has been taken in discussing it. Listening to the speeches which have been made, I could scarcely imagine that this is a Bill introduced in the Dominion House of Commons. You would imagine, perhaps, that you were in the Local Legislature of Ontario, and that those on the Government side have not given their attention to this Bill, but to a Bill which they pronounce iniquitous, which was passed by Mr. Mowat in the Legislature of Ontario. I was surprised at the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) taking this course. He exhibited maps to show the irregularities of the electoral divisions in the Province of Ontario made by Mr. Mowat's Bill. I am not here to pronounce on Mr. Mowat's Bill; I am not here to approve or condemn it as a member of this House. That Bill was a local Bill. The crowning glory of the Conservative party in their past history has been the exercise of the veto. They hold this as essential to the well-being, the preservation and the integrity of the Dominion of Canada. All local Acts that were bad they held it to be both their duty and their privilege to veto; and if Mr. Mowat's Bill was bad and infamous, why did not the hon. Minister of Justice veto it? If that Bill was bad, every gentleman in this House who condemns it is responsible for not insisting that the Minister should veto it. Now, it is desirable that we should arrive at some principle

on which to base a Bill of this character—one that would be fair between the parties. It should be the duty of the Government to exhibit fair-play in their measures before the House, and when a measure comes before the House which affects the weal or the woe of the different parties before the country, it is the duty of the Government to see that no injustice is done to any party, whether it is in a majority or a minority.

Mr. WALLACE. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am very glad to hear the hon. member for West York applaud that principle, because when he does I am sure he will support the amendment now before the Chair.

Mr. WALLACE. It goes the other way, though.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But I am a little surprised at the hon. Minister of Justice, because he is always temperate and dispassionate in debate, and he appeared to me to-night to fall into the intricacies of discussion. No sooner does he lay down the principle that the political associations of the people who have been living together in different districts should not be disturbed, than he breaks up that principle in a good many places. In fact, he has broken it in every place to which the Bill applies, and he tears asunder his friends who are drawn together by party co-operation. No, that is not his principle. I have listened with a great deal of attention to his observations to-night, and I find that there is a principle in the Bill, and that is the principle of moral fibre. When the Minister speaks of the moral fibre that pervades the Government, and then introduces a Bill of this kind, I know what he is talking about. He is talking, however, about something beyond the comprehension of his supporters. Moral fibre in a gerrymander—I rather like it. It may not be very sound in theology, but the moral fibre in a gerrymander—I do like that principle; it is a peculiar principle indeed, where people are taken out of one constituency and put into another for the purpose of gaining a supporter for the Government. That is the moral fibre. That is the principle that governs the Government in introducing this Bill. But I notice that the Minister of Justice, in his speech, has not taken credit for all this moral fibre, for he disowns the paternity of this Bill; he is not as responsible for it as other members of the Government. I do not know exactly to whom he ascribes its paternity; I do not know any one member of the Government whose moral fibre is more prominent than the others. If I did, perhaps I would know which member of the Government was the author of this Bill. Now, it is a singular thing that in this day and age of the world a Government should imagine themselves so firmly entrenched in power, and should boast of their majority, and yet be afraid, after the falling away of our population, as shown by their own census, to go to the people again under the old divisions. The Bill under which the last two elections were held was indefensible; there is no man with any moral fibre who can defend it; yet, bad as it was, it is now sought to make matters infinitely worse in 52 places by the present Bill. It is a singular thing, if the policy of the Government is so much commended by the country, that with their large majority in this House, they want to change 52 places in addition to those changed before, and appeal to the country on that basis. Why have they not the moral fibre to face the country on the old lines? Why do they not rely on their policy to commend them to the confidence of the electorate of Canada? Now, I think if there is one duty, which the Government owes to the country it is an educational duty, that is, if they possibly can, to make men better than they are, to set them an example of fair-play. There are many men who perhaps look up to the Government and are swayed by them. The Government have a large majority behind them, and I am glad to see that the Minister of Justice says that they are not slaves, although I think that they sometimes vote as if they were. I would like to see this Government take a stand and say: Yes, we will stand on our platform; we will stand by the grand old traditions of the Conservative party which have inspired it since the formation of that party; we despise a gerrymander; we despise taking advantage of our opponents: we see that they are in a minority in this House. Instead of this high ground, they say: We are afraid to meet them before the electors of this country until we have arranged them by another gerrymander. This is the third one we have had since Confederation. It is a singular thing. The operation of their policy has been such as to lower the number of people in the country, and the consequence is there has to be a reduction; but where no reduction is required why should we make more changes? Why have changes when an increase of members is not demanded by the constitution? Why not be true to the principle of letting well enough alone? Whatever is is right, is one of the principles of the Conservative party. Then, why be tinkering here and introducing those radical American measures into our practice? You have a majority of 50 or 60, and yet you change 40 or 50 constituencies in order to make you stronger. See how quickly little boys playing games will rebuke any one who plays unfairly. Why not learn a lesson from the pages of the House? If you will not copy the example set in other countries, why not copy the example set by the boys at their games, and show the people that you can afford to be just when you have a majority at your back. When it was implied by the Minister of Justice that if the Government were not so strong as they are now they might be tempted perhaps to introduce a measure which would gerrymander more counties than the present one, that seemed to me to be rather rich and to afford some food for discussion. If when they have 60 of a majority, they are obliged to cut up 40 or 50 constituencies, how many constituencies would they require to cut and carve before appealing to the country if they had only 20 majority. There is something for the Government to consider. But, of course, neither the Minister of Justice nor his Government attach any weight to considerations of that kind, for power is something they do not crave, and they would not make this Bill for power alone, but it is done purely to gratify the moral fibre of their supporters. Nothing has moved them but the constitution and their moral fibre to introduce this gerrymander. It is grand to see a Government led by a Minister of Justice who repudiates this Bill and disinterestedly gives the credit to his supporters. The Minister of Justice, a very able lawyer as a Minister of Justice should be, said something which rather struck me, as a layman, as being somewhat peculiar, when he said that political lines were to be the basis of the changes. That

seemed to have something in it, but when he gave the reason, he made the same mistake as the other judge did, who used to give very good decisions but made very grave mistakes when he gave reasons because his reasons were not founded on justice. I do not know that I will say any more on this subject. I am very much surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite have shown a desire to criticise the Bill that emanated from another House and altogether fight shy of this Bill, because it is this for which the Government is responsible. There can be no doubt that the principle embodied in the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell is the correct principle. The hon. member for Bothwell does not assume that because there is room for a gerrymander without violating county lines, the Government are compelled to gerrymander, but he does assume that the historic character of the county lines shall be observed and that the divisions within those shall be made on fairly geographical, commercial and other grounds so as to have justice done to the people generally. I think it is a fair amendment. It is not intended by it that the Government should create a majority by Acts of Parliament, but it is intended to confine the operations of any redistribution within the limits of the county. I heartily support the amendment, because I believe it appeals to our national sentiment, and if there is one thing more than another that the Government should endeavour to promote, it is national sentiment, for, if we had an honest national sentiment, we would not have such Bills as this introduced. It is desirable that the Government should be loyal to Canada and the traditions of Canada, and, if they were, the measures they introduced would be founded on the eternal principles of honesty and justice, and we might have hope for the future welfare of the Dominion. It may be said by our opponents that there is nothing wrong in taking the money of the people and applying it to build up a political party. It may not be considered wrong by the Government to frame a Bill for the express purpose of defeating their opponents, but if national sentiment were properly developed no Government would venture to introduce such a Bill as the present one. I hope the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell will carry. It establishes a principle worthy of the support of fair-minded people; and I hope the Government in the future will endeavour to commend themselves to the people by the honesty of their measures rather than steal an advantage from their opponents by Bills which are indefensible, and which no member on that side of the House has yet had the hardihood to defend.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Having spoken very recently on this question, I will not detain the House very long, but I feel deeply interested in this matter, because the passage of this Bill interferes with a great principle, a principle that the Liberal party has fought for before now, the very principle that the Liberal party fought for in 1837-38, the principle of representative government. We were then deeply interested, as we are now, in the maintenance of a proper representation in Parliament, so that the people of this country might have the opportunity of expressing their views and guiding the deliberations of their representatives in placing proper laws upon the Statute-book. The Liberal party took such a bold stand on that occasion and, after years of agitation, during which, every constitutional means at their command having been exhausted, they were forced to exercise what I firmly believe they will have to do again, and in addition to their labours of tongue and brain they had to use physical force to bring about the ends they had in view. I speak advisedly, when I say that we may have to repeat what has been done in the past. We have the instance of King John, when the ancient barons of England clad in arms and stern in conquest, did challenge and secure the charter of our freedom, and, when we find the underlying principles of that charter are being violated by hiving a portion of the people of this country so that they cannot on the floor of this Parliament express their views on public questions, then some other means must be adopted. The Liberal party is here to stay, until they show this country, as they have been showing it during the last ten years, that there is an iniquity sought to be perpetrated upon it which has been acknowledged to-night by the withdrawal of a certain portion of this Bill. The Minister of Justice said to-night, when he withdrew the clause in reference to Clarence, that the Opposition should be satisfied because he had assented to what they wanted. I give credit to him as having sense, as seeing as deeply into these matters as any man can possibly do, and, yet, without a smile on his face, with innocence beaming from every pore of his countenance, in introducing this Bill he declared that this change in the County of Russell was right and just, which after ten days' discussion he admits was wrong. The very parties who assisted him to separate Clarence in that way knew they were doing injustice to the hon. member who sits for Russell (Mr. Edwards). Did the hon. gentleman know, when he gave as the ground for this change that it was to readjust the population, that he was only readjusting it to the extent of 100. Had the Government taken from Russell, New Edinburgh and added it to the city of Ottawa, of which it forms a part, the population of both would be nearer the unit of representation. Does he expect that we can come to the conclusion, after two weeks' discussion, that he did not see this as clearly when he introduced the Bill as he does to-night? If he did, it was then that, as an honest man, he should have told the framers of the Bill that it was in direct contradiction to the principles of justice. But, when we exposed the injustice of it through the newspapers of this country, when his own friends saw the injustice of it, and when he found that the whole country was alive to the injustice which was sought to be perpetrated upon the Liberals in Russell, then, in order to save his own cuticle, he withdraws it. It has always been so ever since I have learned anything about the Conservative party. They have not acted upon the principles of honour and integrity that one would expect from a great party. True, there are honest men among them. True, there are honourable men in their ranks in matters of commerce, but methinks, when they come to the political questions, they think everything is right and just in the warfare of politics, and the result is that politics stink in the nostrils of the people of Canada, because that party do things which are unjust and acknowledge to be unjust. How many members have attempted to justify either the Redistribution

Bill of 1882, or the Redistribution Bill now before the House? What principle have they laid down for separating Clarence from the County of Russell? Not one, and those who sit dumb and silent have in their heart a conviction that they could not justify supporting the Government in passing such an iniquitous measure. But these are battles which we have been fighting, and which we intend to fight until the lately expanded leaves of the trees around us are crisp with November frost if fair amendments are not made. We will stay here fighting for the liberties of the people. I am not threatening, but I say I will be here until there are more concessions made in accordance with justice, and we will make your physical system suffer if we cannot affect your consciences. Did not the Liberal party in 1882 fight for the interests of good government until they were almost wasted by the stultifying and impure air of this Chamber, and, after fighting for weeks and weeks, what did you do? You did a thing which you are ashamed of at this day, and not one supporter of the Government has stood up to justify the iniquity which was perpetrated on the Liberal party in 1882. You divided this country, and carved it and cut it up to suit your own political ends, and, although you did not gain as much as you expected to gain, not to you be the credit, but to the honourable Conservatives throughout the country who saw the iniquity you perpetrated and refused to vote to sustain it, because the Conservative Government had done a thing which took away from the people of this country the opportunity of expressing their opinions properly at the polls. That was not sufficient. When that passed away, 1885 came, previous to another election, and, instead of depending upon the virtues of the National Policy, of which you boasted and which you said had conferred such favours upon the people of this country, you passed another iniquitous Bill for the purpose of legislating into the halls of this Parliament members to support you again, and you placed the whole machinery of the Franchise Act in the hands of your own political partisans, so that the Liberals again suffered from that iniquitous legislation. And now in 1892 we are called upon again to fight the battles of the people of this country in that way, and you now propose to take from us ten or fourteen of our supporters, thinking, probably, that we have too many in this House at the present time. We have more ability in this House at the present time than the whole number supporting the Government, but when it comes to voting there is where we fail, and that is the only point in which we fail. Do not your actions show every day that I am right? You cannot get up on your feet and argue and reason out the justice of your course; and when we show time and time again the iniquities of the Bill you have brought before the House, which is condemned by the free and independent press of the country, yet those who are sent here to criticise the legislative action of the Government, are either afraid or incapable of getting up on their feet and defending the redistributions of 1882 or 1892. I see hon. members sitting back there who will vote because it only requires a sign from their leader, but when it requires the exercise of mind and tongue, they sit like dumb dogs in their seats, and vote for the Government every time. It is time the country should step in and put a stop to these things. I am resolved as long as strength is given me, and as long as I am able to stand up in my place, to do the utmost of my humble ability in opposition to this attempt to perpetrate a great wrong upon the Liberal party of this country. I pointed out the other night sufficient proof to show that the statements I am making here to-night are based upon facts. I pointed out that the Conservative party of the Province of Ontario in the last general election cast 186,000 votes, and the Liberals 182,000, and yet although the Conservatives had only 4,000 of a majority in the popular vote, they sent 59 members here supporting the Government, while the liberals have only 33, distinctly pointing to the fact that your system of gerrymander has taken from the Liberals of this country the power of making their influence felt at the polls to the extent to which they are entitled. Sir, the Minister of Justice to-night said that according to our plan of preserving county boundaries, he could gerrymander far worse than was done in 1882. I challenge him to point out wherein he could do anything of the kind. There are 21 counties that he could not lay his finger upon, because they contain the proper populations to entitle each one to a representative; therefore they could not be touched with the vile finger of gerrymander. Nor could they cut and carve 17 other counties, except by one line, and if they sought to cut it in such a way as to indicate to the people living in that section of the country where the line was being drawn, that it was dishonest, I am satisfied there would be a sufficient number of Conservative voters in that vicinity to resent the injustice and to render unsuccessful any attempt of that kind. There are only 11 counties that would require more than one line of division, and, therefore, the injustice of any government, whether Conservative or Reform, would have to be confined to 11 counties, and a better and more just redistribution could be made by adhering to county lines. But the Minister of Justice states that it was just as natural to have the people associated together within these districts as within county boundaries. Now, is there one hon. gentleman opposite who believes that for a moment? Do not the various municipalities of a county associate for many purposes which bring them together? They get their jury from the county, they pass their by-laws for the county, they gather their taxes from the county, the reeves and deputy reeves come from the various municipalities to transact their business in the county, and the farmers of the county generally do their law business and their other business in the county town. Now, I want to draw my remarks to a close by saying that I hope the Conservative party in this House will rise above this low, grovelling position of political partyism. I would say the very same thing to our own friends if they were in power, and were to attempt to carry such a Bill for the purpose of gaining a party object; I would be just as determined and positive as I am now in condemning this. I ask the hon. members to do what is just between man and man, and until you do that the country will remember you in the day of its wrath, and bring its judgment upon your heads.

Committee rose and reported progress.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Hormisdas Jeannotte, Esquire, member for the Electoral District of L'Assomption.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

HORMISDAS JEANNOTTE, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of L'Assomption; introduced by Mr. Chapleau and Mr. Ouimet.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 17th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RECEPTION OF REPORTS ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland) moved:

That the time for the reception of reports from Committees on Private Bills be extended until Friday, the 24th instant.

Motion agreed to.

IRISH HOME RULE.

Mr. DEVLIN. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I rise to a question of privilege. I have observed in the London *Times* of Saturday, the 4th June, the following despatch :—

"Recognizing that the feeling of the House of Commons is against him, Mr. Devlin will not submit his motion in favour of Home Rule for Ireland. A small section of the Liberal Opposition, on Mr. Devlin's invitation, met privately and passed a resolution of want of confidence in Lord Salisbury. They also decided to extend the sympathy of Canada to the action of the Gladstonians. This has made them the laughing-stock of the House.—Our Correspondent."

I desire to say that this is a gross and outrageous misrepresentation in its every particular, in its details as well as in its entirety. It is a message as false as any ever conceived, and can be only inspired by one whose sense of right and justice is decidedly weak. This was intended as a reflection on the Liberal party, and I take the earliest opportunity of correcting it. With regard to my Home Rule motion, if the opportunity be given me and no obstacles are put in the way, I shall press it to a vote.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved third reading of Bill (No. 89) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act and amendments thereto.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the third reading, I desire to call the attention of the Government and the House to one point connected with this Bill. Last year we passed the following: —

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

"Notwithstanding anything in the Dominion Lands Act or in this Act, a settler may homestead any cancelled quarter section or cancelled pre-emption while residing within two miles of the said homestead."

The way that clause was drawn up was this: The hon. the Minister asked me if I thought that portion of the amendment was important, that is, of an amendment which I had on the Paper, and I said I thought it was. He then asked me if I had a clause drawn up. I had not, but I drew this up rapidly, and I do not see the grounds for the doubt that seized on the mind of Mr. H. H. Smith and the officers of the department in interpreting that clause. The clause provides that, notwithstanding anything in the Dominion Lands Act, a settler may homestead any cancelled quarter section or cancelled pre-emption. At the time no person was allowed to enter as an ordinary homestead for a cancelled homestead or a cancelled pre-emption. Well, when the land reverted to the Crown, I could not see any reason why he should not be allowed to enter for the cancelled homestead or pre-emption, nor can I see it now. At that time, however, a settler was not allowed to homestead his pre-emption, and no doubt this would have provided for the homesteading of the pre-emption, and I rather think this was the point which gravelled Mr. H. H. Smith. Now, we have passed a clause enabling the settler to homestead his pre-emption, and I am told by the authorities of the department that there is nothing to prevent a settler homesteading a cancelled homestead, but at present he cannot homestead a cancelled pre-emption. I may say, however, that, when I spoke to Mr. Burgess and to other officers of the department, I found that they were under the impression that this could be arranged by a regulation of the department, and they seemed to think there would be no difficulty about it. However, I find there is some difficulty, and I may point out to the Government that now we have opened a cancelled homestead and allowed a settler to enter for his cancelled pre-emption, why should you prevent a new settler from entering for a cancelled pre-emption on the same conditions as you allow a settler coming in to enter for the ordinary 160 acres which have never been entered, or for a cancelled homestead? I received a letter this morning from one of the best settlers in the North-West, Mr. M. G. Miller; he is an Ontario farmer; he is farming largely, he has two sons living with him who are about to farm there, and they want to enter on the same conditions as they could for a cancelled homestead or for an ordinary homestead. They want to enter for cancelled pre-emption; they are living within two miles of a cancelled pre-emption; and surely it is not in the interest of the country that these two young Ontario men should not be allowed the same privilege in regard to this cancelled pre-emption that a new-comer would be allowed in regard to a cancelled homestead or in regard to an ordinary homestead. Now, the only argument that can be used in favour of keeping a cancelled pre-emption from entry by a settler under the two-mile radius is this: that some revenue may be derived from it. Now, Sir, I wish to point out to the Minister of the Interior that only an infinitesimal sum can be got from that, because this Bill opens the cancelled pre-emption to general entrance, and I need hardly point out that those who will have an

opportunity of living within two miles of the cancelled pre-emption will be very few indeed. I will now read to the House this letter from Mr. M. G. Miller, which I received this morning. He was down here after this Act last fall, and I told him: "Now you can go home and your boys can enter." This is what he writes to me:

"CARSDALE, 12th June, 1892.

"N. F. DAVIN, M. P.

"DEAR SIR,—I am sorry to be troubling you again about my sons getting entered for their homesteads on the two-mile limit. I understood from you while in Ottawa last session of Parliament, that such privilege would be allowed them. I called at the Crown Land Office, Regina, who stated they had received no instructions as yet, so, tired of waiting, I wrote to the Minister of the Interior, who in reply states it is impossible to grant my request under the present regulations. Now, while you are in Ottawa, if there is any way you could get my request granted you would confer a great blessing on both my boys and myself. We are not speculators, but residents of the North-West Territories, and my home shows that with all the trees I have planted; I have some of all kinds, which are doing well, and thanks to Mr. Saunders, of the Experimental Farm, Ottawa, who sent us last year, 300 of forest trees, this year about 100 of evergreen and a variety of willows and lealock. Together with that you know this is only my second spring, and I have 150 acres of crop in "——

Only the second spring; I need hardly tell you that is a first-rate farmer.—

—" 150 acres of crop in, which looks splendid, and have about 50 more broke now, but we intend breaking 100 or over. Now, my main object in this request is to keep us as a family circle unbroken, so long as we can. Hoping to hear from you, I remain your humble and obedient servant,

"M. G. MILLER."

Now, in the very excellent Bill before the House we have this sub-section (*a*) to sub-section 5 of clause 3:

"Any person obtaining homestead entry for the land included in such forfeited pre-emption entry, shall be required to perfect his entry by erecting a habitable house thereon, and commencing actual residence in the said house within six months of the date of such homestead entry, and shall be required to continue such residence for at least six months of the three years next succeeding."

Now, I am inclined to think that the Government, in preparing this Bill, was under the impression that it was providing for the very case that I want to provide for. At the present time a man going into the North-West Territories can homestead in various ways, and amongst others he can homestead in the following manner:—

"In addition to the cases hereinbefore mentioned, any person claiming a patent under a homestead entry, or under a homestead and pre-emption entry, shall be entitled thereto upon proving:

"That he has erected upon his homestead a habitable house and has *bonâ fide* resided therein for not less than three months next prior to the date of his application for his patent;

"That for the period between the time within which, by clause thirty-six of this Act, it is provided that a person who has obtained a homestead entry shall perfect his entry, and the commencement of his said three months residence upon his homestead, he has been *bonâ fide* resident within a radius of two miles from his homestead quarter section."

I call the attention of the House to that, because that is the operative part to this clause.—

"That within the first year after the date of his homestead entry he broke and prepared for crop not less than ten acres of his homestead quarter section;

"That within the second year he cropped the said ten acres and broke and prepared for crop not less than fifteen acres in addition, making not less than twenty-five acres;

"That within the third year after the date of his homestead entry he cropped the said twenty-five acres and broke and prepared for crop not less than fifteen acres in addition, making in all not less than twenty-five acres of the said homestead cropped, and fifteen acres in addition broken and prepared for crop, within three years of the date of perfecting his homestead entry."

That is, from his residence two miles distant from the homestead, either at his father's house, or at the house of some friend. Now, anybody going into the North-West at the present minute can homestead a cancelled homestead or an ordinary homestead, under the conditions of that clause, and anybody going into the North-West after this Bill is passed can homestead a cancelled pre-emption in the ordinary way. Is there any use, is there any reason, even on the ground of getting an income from selling these pre-emptions which you are abandoning in the clause of this Bill, especially as you now allow, on certain conditions, the homesteader to homestead his own pre-emption —is there any reason why we should not give to the settler, to the few settlers who will be benefited by that clause in the Act of 1886, the privilege of completing their improvements on a cancelled pre-emption while living two miles away? I shall, therefore, move that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole in order that I may add the following words to the clause. The clause at present reads:

"(*a*.) Any person obtaining homestead entry for the land included in such forfeited pre-emption entry shall be required to perfect his entry by erecting a habitable house thereon, and commencing actual residence in the said house within six months of the date of such homestead entry, and shall be required to continue such residence for at least six months in each of the three years next succeeding."

Now, I want to add to that:

"Or he shall be entitled to a patent therefor if he has erected upon his homestead a habitable house and has *bonâ fide* resided therein for not less than three months next prior to the date of his application for his patent, and between the time within which, by clause thirty-six of this Act, it is provided that a person who has obtained a homestead entry shall perfect his entry, and the commencement of his said three months residence upon his homestead, he has been *bonâ fide* resident within a radius of two miles from his homestead quarter section; and within the first year after the date of his homestead entry he broke and prepared for crop not less than ten acres of his homestead quarter section; and within the second year he cropped the said ten acres and broke and prepared for crop not less than fifteen acres in addition, making not less than twenty-five acres; and within the third year after the date of his homestead entry he cropped the said twenty-five acres and broke and prepared for crop not less than fifteen acres in addition, making in all not less than twenty-five acres of the said homestead cropped, and fifteen acres in addition broken and prepared for crop, within three years of the date of perfecting his homestead entry."

I want to impress on the House and the Government that what we provide for is a very small thing, that it will touch very few people. It cannot affect the revenue, except to a fractional extent; and unless you adopt it, you still keep up a little fretful arrangement in the legislation that will cause a great deal of trouble and inconvenience to those who are affected by it and by whom it will be considered a hardship. And not only so, but you adopt what, as a principle, you are adopting along the whole line, with this one exception; and in order, therefore, that the legislation should be harmonious, I suggest to the Government that I hope they will not offer any opposition to going into committee and making this addition to the clause and so making their policy complete. I never approved of the idea that the country, or the Department of the Interior, was

in any way benefited, above all the country, by holding cancelled homesteads or cancelled pre-emptions for sale. A settler, with his family, on a homestead of 160 acres, who buys the goods imported into the country, and who pays the duty, and who is making wealth, is, I need hardly say, worth three or four times the $400 or $500 which might be obtained from that quarter section by keeping it open.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I presume what the hon. gentleman wants is to carry out the view he intended to express in section 12 of the Bill of last year, which was handed in on the spur of the moment. It was considered by the Commissioner of lands not to be very clear, and was consequently not acted on. I do not think there is any particular objection to the adoption of the proposition of the hon. gentleman, but it will be better to adjourn the debate, and if the hon. gentleman will then send me a copy of the amendment he proposes, we can take it up at a future stage.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to offer a few remarks with respect to the proposition submitted by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). It is clear from the indication given by the Minister of Interior, that the Government intend to accede to the request made and change the Bill. The proposition submitted is an objectionable one for several reasons. It is objectionable because the proposition is to allow a man to reside during two years and nine months two miles distant from the land which he wishes to homestead, and in this way we will reduce the number of domiciles in the North-West. An inducement will be offered to people to board with neighbours the principal part of the time necessary to enable them to get their patents, and then within three months of the time when they intend to apply for the patent, the claimant will erect a house upon the land and become a resident for three months. This will create a disposition to speculate very largely. I do not think it is right that a man who professes to be a *bonâ fide* settler should be allowed to board and at the same time claim the right to homestead land simply by residing on the land during three months. Moreover, it is offering a premium for an increased crop of old bachelors in the North-West, and at the present time we are cursed with that unfortunate condition. Under this proposition men will be able to go there, hire board without living on their homesteads, there will be no families, but a whole lot of bachelors will become homesteaders. I hope the Government will seriously consider the proposition of the hon. member for Assiniboia, and decide against his suggestion, which will undoubtedly militate seriously against settlement and increased population in the North-West.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Probably the hon. gentleman is not aware that this has been going on for a number of years; indeed, ever since the Land Act was in force. There has been a provision by which people could take up land under the two-mile radius clause. The hon. gentleman probably is not aware that this clause was repealed, but will again come into effect the first of next year. In the meantime the hon. gentleman has pointed out that there are several parties who have come into the country knowing that this provision was on the Statute-book and expecting to be able to settle within a two-mile radius, and he asks that provision be made to enable them to take advantage of that two-mile radius clause with respect to cancelled pre-emptions. It is a very small matter, and only had reference to those who enter between now and the first of next year. It is to meet the case of those persons who have come in between the date of the passage of this Act and the termination of the two-mile radius privilege.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHARLTON. Before declaring this amendment lost, I wish to say a few words in support of it. I consider the amendment placed in your hands is a proper one, and I intend to briefly give the reasons which I believe warrant me in making the assertion that the amendment is proper and justifiable. I think, Mr. Chairman, that a fair examination and consideration of this question now before the Committee of the Whole, must convince any fair and dispassionate man that the Government are working along the lines of injustice; and if such is the case, Sir, if the features of the Redistribution Bill as introduced by the Government are not justifiable, if the principle which actuates the Government is not an honest one, certainly the House ought to take this matter into consideration to rectify what is wrong. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are following up the lines of action that we were following in 1882, and there is not a member of this House, I venture to say, who will stand up in his place and affirm that the Redistribution Bill of 1882 was an honest measure, a just measure, a politic measure, a measure conceived in the interests of this country. There is not a member of this House who would risk his reputation for veracity and common sense by making such an assertion. The Bill of 1882 was emphatically an unmitigated political fraud. It was a stab at the rights of the people of this country. It was a blow at the fundamental principle of free representation. Now, if that is the case, Mr. Chairman, then the next question to be enquired into is: What is the character of the present Redistribution Bill? Is the Bill following in the lines of the Bill of 1882? Or is it a Bill that proposes to redress some of the grievances created by the Bill of 1882? If it is a Bill that proposes to redress a wrong, if it is a Bill that proposes to retrace steps taken in a wrong direction, why then no member of the House having the good of the country at heart, would be justified in rising in his place and moving an amendment or hindering its passage. But if it is a Bill continuing in the same vicious direction, if it is a Bill seeking to further saddle upon this country the injustice saddled upon it by the Bill of 1882, why then every person in this House who has the good of this country at heart is not only warranted in doing, but is not honest in the faithful discharge of his duty, if he does not do exactly what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is doing in

pressing this amendment upon the House. The Bill of 1882, it is unnecessary to say, will be a blot upon the reputation of every hon. gentleman who had anything to do with it. It will be a more enduring monument to the late leader of this Government than any monument that can be erected in marble to him—although not a monument so desirable. It will be a monument to the manipulators who, in the secrecy of their committee rooms, devised the details of that Bill, and if that Bill is an admitted outrage, then the refusal to rectify the wrongs committed in that Bill is tantamount to a justification of those outrages. Now, the demand has been made, and the demand is made in this amendment presented by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that we shall devise and accept and move upon a principle of redistribution—a fixed principle of redistribution, a just principle of redistribution—that we shall first establish a principle and then proceed to square our action and measure it with our principle. This is a reasonable proposition. There was a principle underlying the Bill of 1882, it is true. What was the principle? It was the principle of stabbing the Reformers. It was the principle of perverting free representation. It was the principle of giving to one voter on one side an amount of influence equal to two voters on the other side. It was a principle which, applied in practice, was subversive to free government. That was the principle that was underneath the Bill of 1882, and we have a right to demand that the precedent which we are making in that respect shall be abandoned, and that the House shall accept a just principle, and having accepted that just principle proceed to act upon it.

Sir, the party upon the opposite side of this Chamber—I suppose we are bound to accept their assertion—is the loyal party. They claim that they are the loyal party *par excellence*. Every issue of their journals, almost every speech of their orators, cast discredit upon the loyalty of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. We are Yankee sympathizers; we are Yankee imitators—Yankee sympathizers and Yankee imitators. We borrow our principles from the United States. We are guilty of looking towards the United States with a friendly eye. Our policy is one calculated to fasten upon this country the evils of the American system.

Mr. WALLACE. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) says "hear, hear." The country reeks with proclamations with regard to the loyalty and honesty of hon. gentlemen who sit on the opposite side of this House. They are the political Pharisees of this day. They stand up like the Pharisees of old and say: "We thank thee, O God, we are not as other men are, extortioners, political gamblers, thieves and corruptionists; we are not even like these poor publicans on the other side of the House." That is what we hear. What example, I would ask, are these hon. gentlemen following to-day? Where did they get the example that they acted upon in 1882; this example that they propose to act upon in 1892? Where did it come from? Are they Yankee imitators? Are they introducing anything out of the American system into this country? Let my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) say "hear, hear." Is there a record of a gerrymander in England?

Mr. WALLACE. You have the record of Mr. Mowat's gerrymander.

Mr. CHARLTON. Hon. gentlemen opposite are slavish imitators of the vilest class of American politicians, and have adopted the principle of assassination and rascality which disgraces the political history of the United States; and they have adopted that system in its worst features and forms. There is not a more perversive principle, a more slavish imitation of the most contemptible form of gerrymander which existed in the United States, than the Bill of 1882. This entire gerrymander system is the sum of political villainy, and is the weapon of political villains, and has been used as their weapon since 1812 in the United States. It was used in Canada for the same purpose in 1882, and it is proposed to use the principles of that measure in the same line of action to-day. Talk about American example! About the Opposition of this country following Yankee example! Here are the Yankee imitators, imitators of the Yankee system of political villainy, of everything appertaining to the American system that is pernicious and bad. Nothing that the most unscrupulous of American politicians are prepared to resort to, for the purpose of promoting their own evil influence, but hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House are not only prepared to resort to, but have resorted to it, and are resorting to it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer just for a moment, and very briefly, to some of the great triumphs of the gerrymander principle in the United States, just to show our friends they have done very well. They have almost surpassed those whom they are imitating. The original gerrymander, the article upon which the patent was first taken out—the Act of 1812 in Massachusetts—as I have stated on a former occasion in this House——

Mr. SPROULE. Is the principle not there?

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) will listen, he will learn something, and I will recapitulate some things that the hon. gentleman wants to know. In the operation of the measure which was introduced by Governor Eldridge Gerry of Massachusetts it was so arranged that 50,000 voters on one side elected 29 senators and 51,000 voters on the other side only elected 11. Thus it took 1,736 voters from one side to elect a senator, and 4,706 on the other. That was pretty good work. That was fully equal to the practical outcome of the scheme devised in 1882; and in the case of Ohio with its ups and downs, the gerrymander, first by one party and then by the other, would almost remind one of the operations of Turkish pashas in some tax-cursed country of the Orient, where one plunders the people, and his successor plunders them again, one setting an example in the line of plundering and rascality that his successor adopts and improves upon. In Ohio in 1880 the Republicans arranged the districts in such a way that it took 68,114 Democratic votes to elect a congressman, and only 24,202 Republican votes. This was an equalization with a vengeance. In 1886 the Republicans gerrymandered the state in such a way that it required 22,404 Republican votes and 54,273 Democratic votes to elect a congressman; and in 1888 it took 26,032 Republican votes and 79,128 Democratic votes. Then the Democrats came into power again and gerrymandered the state so that it required

51,803 Republican votes to elect a congressman, and only 25,109 Democratic votes. This thing has been going on year after year in Ohio and in various other American states; and this is the system adopted in this country—not the British system, as I shall proceed to show in a short time; not the system in vogue in the country from which these hon. gentlemen profess to draw their inspiration; but a system in vogue in the country to the south of us, and denounced by every honest man in the country, no matter to what political party he may belong. In connection with this matter there is one white spot in the United States, that is, the State of Wisconsin, which has adopted just such a provision as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) proposes in his amendment. That state has adopted the principle that county lines should not be disregarded in the redistribution of districts. In that state last winter a gerrymander of a very odious character was passed, one almost as bad in some particulars as our own of 1882. Upon appeal to the Supreme Court of the state, that gerrymander was set aside on the ground that it had transgressed county lines. By means of that provision, which safeguarded the rights and liberties of the people, the Supreme Court of the state was enabled to set aside that unjust and rascally law. Now, in Ontario the result of the gerrymander of 1882 was almost as bad as anything that can be pointed out in the history of gerrymander operations in any country. We had a popular vote in Ontario which gave a very slight majority to the Conservative party. A majority of two members in the delegation from Ontario in the House of Commons, would have been relatively larger than the majority that existed in the popular vote.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the popular majority?

Mr. CHARLTON. It was less than 5,000. While with a fair apportionment of the seats the Conservative party would probably have had a majority of two or three in the Ontario delegation in this House, under the villainous manipulation of that Bill they had more than two to one; and every Conservative voter in the Province of Ontario exercised a power equal to that exercised by two Liberal voters. If that is not political villainy, if that is not subversive of free institutions, if that is not an abuse of the powers of the Government, I ask what can be an abuse; and if men will stand up in this House and justify a measure of that kind, they will justify a total subversion of the liberties of the people, if it serves their party purposes to do so.

Now, I propose to turn from this American system, to point out to my hon. friends on the other side of the House a better system. If they are the loyal party of this country, if they admire British precedents and British justice and British fair-play, I propose to point out to them what British precedents are, and what British usage is with regard to redistribution. I propose to point out to them that when the last redistribution was carried out in Great Britain in 1885, the outcome of the discussion, and the struggle of parties upon this question, was the adoption of a principle of action that would secure a fair and honest redistribution, that would secure to each party in that country its fair proportion of influence and votes in the House of Commons. I propose to point out that it was realized and admitted, and the admission was acted upon in Great Britain, that the redistribution of seats in Parliament was not an operation to be attended to by some little star chamber junta in secret—that it was not something that came within the operation of party government, something to be perpetrated by party managers for party advantage; but it was placed on the basis of an operation to be entered into, carried forward and perfected by the joint action of all parties—by the intervention of a judicial and impartial tribunal that, after considering the question, should formulate a scheme on certain fixed principles and lines, which, when formulated, should be laid before the House of Commons. The Government proceeded to appoint six commissioners, and these, finding their labours too heavy, asked leave of the Government to appoint three assistant commissioners. These nine commissioners proceeded to do—what? They were directed, in the Act which laid down and defined their duties, to examine the ordnance department survey maps and to determine from these and all available sources of information what would be the proper bounds of the ridings to be created. They were directed to make these divisions as compact in regard to geographical divisions as possible. They were directed to name each of these divisions from some important town or place or area within it. They were directed, when they had provisionally determined the bounds of a riding, to give public notice by advertisement in the local papers in that riding, and to name a day when one or more commissioners should appear in the riding to hear objections to the bounds of that riding as provisionally determined upon; and prior to the calling of this court a map of the provisional riding was to be filed with the clerk of the peace in the county, and every man who desired to examine the map was at liberty to do so. These were the provisions with regard to counties. With regard to boroughs, community of interest was to be respected, and the boundaries of boroughs were to be made consistent with well-established limits, such as parochial limits and so forth; and the bounds of the riding, when provisionally arranged, were to be subject to the criticism, canvassing and objections of the people directly interested, by the publication in the newspapers of a notice that upon a given day the commissioners would appear to hear objections to the provisional bounds of the borough as shown by the map filed with the proper officer. They were directed to have the population of these ridings approximately equalized, and in arranging divisions special regard was to be had to the pursuits of the population. And the boundaries were to conform with existing boundaries except as altered by the schedule number 5 of the Act. These were the duties placed upon the commissioners by their instructions, and when their report was made it contained the following points:—First of all, their report asked for and obtained permission to appoint three assistant commissioners. It went on to speak of the importance of deciding the boundaries, and it referred to the fact that petty sessional divisions were generally respected. Their report contained an apology for an apparent want of compactness, where in some cases fixed rules prevented it. It stated that the names of divi-

sions were taken from the most important points in them, from the borough towns, and so on. The report set forth the fact that arrangements in every case were made for hearing local enquiry and local objection before the commissioners holding court within the borough or riding. The report stated the fact that public notice, depositing a map of the divisions with the clerk of the peace of the county and permission to inspect that map, preceded the holding of these courts. And their report made mention of the fact as to the character of the enquiries. These provisional courts were numerously attended by prominent persons, by political associations, and by political agents, and yet the fact is stated that there was a remarkable absence of any display of party feeling, the whole thing was being arranged upon a business basis with a desire to secure fair representation, with the desire to avoid absolutely giving to either one party or the other an unfair advantage; and when objections were made as to the bounds of provisional ridings, these objections were required to be stated in writing, and the objections were filed where they could be referred to in case there was a desire to review the matter at any time again. And in the case of boroughs one or more commissioners were sent into the borough to make a personal examination, and they were directed to call upon the local officers and to get information from any and every source where they could obtain it, for the purpose of obtaining local knowledge before arranging the bounds of the borough; and in every case the officers received assistance of a most valuable character from the local officers.

Now, this is the example I would advise the Government to follow. I would strongly urge upon them to cease the evil example they have been following. I would urge upon them to cease following after strange gods and dishonest methods, and to return to British methods and be governed by British precedents. I would urge upon them to be governed by the spirit of British fair-play which actuated both parties in England in the session of 1885. I propose to spread upon the *Hansard* of this Parliament the whole of this report containing instructions to the commissioners. I want to place it in a shape where the people can avail themselves of the opportunity to see what the British system was, to understand it in every detail, to be able to contrast it with the abominable system pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite:

"*To the Rt. Hon. Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, Baronet, M.P., President of the Local Government Board:*

"SIR,—We, the commissioners appointed by the Rt. Hon. Sir William Vernon Harcourt, M.P., one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, to enquire into the boundaries to be assigned to the divisions of the several counties and of the boroughs and divisions of boroughs in England and Wales constituted or affected by the proposed Redistribution of Seats Act, 1885, have now the honour to present to you our report. The duties assigned to us are contained in the following instructions issued by you to us on the 5th December last."

I hope our hon. friends opposite will listen to this. I hope the hon. member for Laval will give it his attention.

Mr. FOSTER. *En français.*

Mr. CHARLTON. I understand he was one of the commissioners appointed to redistribute the seats in the Province of Quebec, and I want to show him how much more machinery was required to do this in Canada.

Mr. OUIMET. It would be fairer to read it in French.

Mr. CHARLTON. As soon as I have done in English we may have it repeated in French.

"The duties of the commissioners will be the following:

"1. With respect to counties:

"In the first place, to examine the survey maps of the Ordnance Department, and determine from them and other documents in the possession of that department and the Local Government Board, and from other available information, the boundaries to be assigned to the several divisions of each county to be divided. In forming the divisions care must be taken in all those cases where there are populous localities of an urban character to include them in one and the same division, unless this cannot be done without producing grave inconvenience and involving boundaries of a very irregular and objectionable character.

"Subject to this important rule, each division should be as compact as possible with respect to geographical position and should be based upon well-known existing areas, such as petty sessional divisions or other areas consisting of an aggregate of parishes. In some instances, however, it may be found necessary to include separate parishes, but the divisional boundary should not intersect a parish.

"Each division will be named from some important town or place within it, preference being given to any merged borough or boroughs, or, when it consists wholly or mainly of some well-known area, from that area."

Now, the hon. Minister of Public Works will please give strict attention to this section:

"When the divisions have thus been provisionally determined, public notice must be given of their contents, by advertising in one or more local newspapers, and a day and place appointed for the attendance of one of the members of the commission or an assistant commissioner at some principal town in the county, to hear any objections to the proposed constitution of the divisions and receive proposals for their alteration. It will be convenient that the substance of such objections and proposals should be handed in to the commissioners or assistant commissioner in writing.

I suppose my hon. friend did not call for those interested in the ridings, or arrange to hear their objections, or have their objections deposited with him in writing. I suppose the determined area was absolutely fixed without reference to the wishes, interests or objections of those interested.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman ought not to assert that without knowing.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think I do know that the only case where those interested in any matter of this kind were heard was in the case of a demonstration made here in Ottawa by citizens of the township of Clarence. I believe there have been no other public demonstrations where those aggrieved by any action on the part of persons opposite engaged in redistributing seats, have made themselves heard. There has been no public demonstration or hearing of their objections asked for, and certainly no statements of objections were asked for. There has been no provision made by which those interested in any of these changes might attend at a given place or on a given day and place their objections before the commissioner or those who are concerned in it. The public have not been considered in this matter, but they have simply been pawns in the hands of these men who have been gerrymandering the province in order to consolidate their own power.

Mr. OUIMET. All these people have been invited from my place and by other Ministers to send in their objections, as we have invited suggestions from the other side, but I see that, instead of mak-

ing suggestions, those hon. gentlemen are making recriminations. Give us suggestions and we will consider them as we have considered every suggestion which has been made from the Province of Quebec or elsewhere. We are ready to act upon those suggestions, but we will not act upon obstruction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is a suggestion now before the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman, unfortunately, is not debating it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think I was talking about something which is most pertinent to the motion. I am pointing out what was the system adopted by the British Parliament, what the scheme of redistribution was there, and that has something to do with the scheme we are considering here to-day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not saying that the hon. gentleman is not discussing the question before the House, but the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) replied to the Minister of Public Works that there was a suggestion before the House, and all I said was that that suggestion was not under debate at present.

Mr. CHARLTON. The suggestion made by my hon. friend is under debate.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is not discussing it. It has not been mentioned to-day.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am placing upon record the instructions given to the commissioners. I have given the instructions in regard to counties, and I now proceed with those in respect to boroughs :

"The duties of the commission will be, in cases where the alteration of boundary arises, to ascertain whether the present boundaries or those indicated by the Bill embrace the whole of the population which ought to be included within the borough. The commissioners will, therefore, previous to making any recommendations, take the necessary steps for satisfying themselves whether or not there are any considerable number of houses beyond the boundaries but contiguous thereto, the occupiers of which, either from community of interests with the borough or from other circumstances, form part of the town population proper. Where, however, the adjoining areas consist of large and populous urban districts it will often be found desirable, especially in those cases where otherwise it would be necessary to intersect the districts, that they should be left to form county divisions instead of being absorbed into the borough.

"In every case where the boundaries of a borough are proposed to be altered, whether by extension or otherwise, the alteration should, if possible, be consistent with well-established limits, such as parochial or other similar boundaries.

"When the divisions of the boroughs which are to be divided have been provisionally determined, the proceedings will be similar to those in the case of counties.

"In dealing both with county and borough divisions, the boundaries of the divisions must be adjusted so that the population, excluding in the case of the county divisions that of the parliamentary boroughs, may be approximately equalized, and in the arrangement of the divisions special regard should be had to the pursuits of the population. If the county voters having qualification in the parliamentary borough within a county division are numerous, some regard may properly be had to their number in determining the population to be embraced in the division.

"As between counties and boroughs, the boundaries must, when the divisions are found, be in conformity with existing boundaries, except so far as these are altered by schedule 5 of the Bill; and where it appears to the commission, from information obtained in the course of their enquiry, that an alteration of existing borough boundaries is desirable, a description of the alteration should be embodied in their report.

"CHARLES W. DILKE."

In their report, the commissioners say :

"Immediately upon our appointment, which was dated the 29th November last, we entered upon our duties, and shortly afterwards, finding that without additional assistance we should be unable to complete the work entrusted to us before the reassembling of Parliament, we applied for the appointment of three assistant commissioners, and accordingly Major-General Phipps Carey, R.E.; Captain M. W. Skinner, R.E.; and G. Pemberton Leach, Esquire, barrister-at-law, were, with the consent of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, attached to the commission in that capacity.

"In the first instance, we directed our attention to the formation of the county divisions, and after much consideration we determined that, as a general rule, they should be based, as far as practicable, upon petty sessional divisions, in preference to any other areas consisting of an aggregate of parishes.

"Although, in the Boundary Acts of 1832 and 1868, the petty sessional divisions were adopted to a limited extent for the county divisions, the hundred was the area chiefly selected for that purpose. The hundred has the advantage of having fixed boundaries, which can only be altered by the intervention of Parliament, but it is now almost obsolete, often has detached parts, and its boundaries in some instances are no longer ascertainable.

"The poor law union is perhaps the best known aggregate of parishes; but, as nearly 200 unions overlap county boundaries, it could not be accepted as a satisfactory area for the purpose in question. The petty sessional division, on the contrary, is always contained within the county, whilst its units, like those of the poor law union, consist in almost all cases of entire parishes. It is almost as well known as the poor law union, and it has been formed by the county authorities with a view to the convenience of inhabitants of each locality. There is, of course, the same objection to the petty sessional division as to the poor law union, that it can be altered without the authority of Parliament; but the county divisions will be passed upon the petty sessional divisions as they now actually exist, and, as the orders of justices under which they are constituted are matters of record, there will be no difficulty hereafter in ascertaining their present contents.

"Whilst, however, we have, as a general rule, adopted the petty sessional areas as the units for the county divisions, there are many instances in which we have been compelled to modify this rule in order either to distribute the population of the county with approximate equality amongst the several divisions, or to include in one and the same division important urban districts or communities engaged in similar pursuits.

"In consequence of this course of proceeding which was rendered imperative upon us by our instructions, some of the divisions will be found wanting in compactness, and to present to the eye boundaries which might otherwise be open to objection.

"Where the freehold voters for a county have been very numerous in any borough, we have endeavoured to adjust the several divisions of the county so that the population of the division in which the borough was included should be below that of the rest; but in some instances we could not have accomplished this without either severing populations having similar pursuits or combining those of a different character. We have, therefore, dealt with each case according to its peculiar circumstances, having found it impossible to arrive at any definite rule on the subject.

"In selecting the name to be given to a division, we have, in conformity with our instructions, adopted that of some merged borough within it, and, if there has been more than one such borough in a division, we have selected the most important amongst them. In other cases we have taken the name of some well-known town or area.

"Having provisionally decided upon the division of a county, our next step has been to make the necessary arguments for a local enquiry either by one of our own body or by an assistant commissioner to hear objections to the proposed divisions, and receive suggestions for their alteration; and, in order that we might be the better enabled to consider such objections and proposals, we requested, as suggested by our instructions, that the substance of them, in writing, should be handed in at the enquiry.

"Public notice by advertisement in the local newspapers has been given of each enquiry, and we inserted in the advertisement a description of the contents of each proposed division. A map showing the boundaries of the divisions was at the same time deposited with the clerk of the peace of the county, for the public inspection.

"The enquiries have been numerously attended; many of the most influential persons in the country have been present and taken part in the proceedings, and the different political associations have almost always been represented by their agents. It is satisfactory to note that the discussions which took place on these occasions were distinguished by a very general absence of anything like a display of party feeling.

"The result has been that we have obtained much valuable local information, which has enabled us to improve some of our provisional schemes in important particulars.

"The subject which gave rise to the greatest difference of opinion and the most discussion at the enquiries was that of the names to be given to the divisions. In some counties a strong wish was expressed that the divisions should be named after the points of the compass, in order to preserve the county name for each division, whilst in others it was insisted that a merged borough ought not to have a preference over a more important town or a well-known district.

"It is scarcely necessary to remark that, having regard to our instructions, we did not adopt either of these views, and, with respect to the former, it is obvious that, where the county divisions are very numerous, to name them after the points of the compass would be impracticable.

"It was only to be expected that the urban authorities would each be anxious that the divisions should be designated after their own towns, but we believed that much of this anxiety arose from the erroneous impression that if a town gave its name to a division it would necessarily become the place for holding the court for the election of the member.

"We have often found it difficult to obtain satisfactory names for the divisions from the fact that there was neither any large town (except, perhaps, a parliamentary borough) in the division, nor any well-known area comprising the greater portion of it. In these cases we have adopted such means as appeared least open to objection, and the most appropriate, taking all circumstances into consideration.

"The following is the number of county divisions which have been formed by us:

7	counties with	2	divisions each	14
5	"	3	"	15
9	"	4	"	36
6	"	5	"	30
4	"	6	"	24
5	"	7	"	35
5	"	8	"	40
1	"	23	"	23
1	"	26	"	26
Total counties 43		Total divisions		243

"With respect to boroughs it appeared to us that as they were not susceptible of division for the present purpose, either by parishes or aggregates of parishes, the best area to be taken as a basis for the divisions would be the wards formed for local elections under the Municipal Corporations Act, or, in the case of the metropolis, under the Metropolis Local Management Act; and in order to obtain full information as to the position of these wards, and the pursuits of their population, we determined that the assistant commissioners should, as a preliminary proceeding, visit and inspect the several boroughs to be divided, and obtain such information as would enable us to prepare provisional schemes to their division."

I hope my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House will give due attention and pay due respect to the examples of the Home Government.—

"Accordingly, on the 17th December, we addressed to the assistant commissioners the following letter of instructions:"

All this is vastly important, Mr. Chairman.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have all read it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am placing it before this House because I believe it is a precedent worthy of their imitation, and I am placing it before this House coupled with an earnest appeal to the Government that they should copy this wholesome British precedent, rather than follow the example of our friends to the south of the line.

"'BOUNDARY COMMISSION,
"'8, RICHMOND TERRACE, S.W.,
"'17th December, 1884.

"'SIR,—I am directed by the boundary commissioners to request that you will, without delay, visit the boroughs named in the margin of this letter, for the purpose of obtaining such information as will enable the commission to settle the boundaries of the several divisions into which each borough is to be divided.

"'The printed instructions issued to the commission will guide you as to the main principles to be attended to in suggesting the division.

"'In order to obtain the further information required, it is desirable that you should place yourself in communication with the town clerk of each borough, and ascertain from him the particulars of the several wards into which the borough is divided for municipal purposes, and ascertain how far those wards can be utilized in forming the parliamentary divisions. In many instances the census will give the population of the municipal wards; but they are, doubtless, cases in which these wards have been readjusted since 1881.

"'The borough engineer or surveyor will be able to render useful information as to the boundaries: and sometimes it will probably be found necessary to apply to the parish officers in order to estimate the population, where parochial boundaries or other areas have to be intersected.

"'If any scheme for dividing the borough has been prepared by the borough authorities, or any local association, you should, if possible, obtain a copy of it.

"'You will understand that the existing boundaries between borough and county are to be considered as conclusive, except where they are proposed to be extended by the 5th schedule of the Bill; and in those cases the boundaries, as extended, must be deemed to be the actual boundaries of the borough.

"'You will observe that, in suggesting the division, regard must be had to the pursuits of the people; and in order to satisfy yourself on this point you will not fail, before reporting, to visit the different parts of the borough.

"'I am to add that every exertion must be made to obtain the information required as early as possible.

"'I am, &c.,
(Signed) "HOWEL THOMAS,
"*Secretary.*

"'To Assistant Boundary Commissioner.'

"In the preliminary enquiries every assistance was promptly rendered to our assistant commissioners by the local authorities and their officers. In many instances schemes with maps were prepared by them for our consideration, and in some cases meetings were arranged with the agents of the two political parties which resulted in an agreement as to the manner in which the divisions should be formed.

"After we had framed our provisional schemes upon the information thus obtained, public enquiries were held, after notice by advertisement, in the same manner as in counties, and where the result of the enquiries was to show that amendments were either necessary or desirable the schemes were subsequently amended by us accordingly.

"There was a strong desire in every borough that in forming the divisions the wards should, if possible, be preserved intact, and in reference to this feeling we have allowed a larger disparity in the population of several of the divisions than we should otherwise have recommended.

"In the course of our enquiries applications were made to us for an extension of the boundaries of other boroughs than those extended by schedule 5 to the Bill. In some cases the application was made mainly with the view of increasing the population of the borough in question to such an extent as would support the claim put forward to retain a second member, but when it was pointed out that an extension of boundaries would not be allowed to disturb the apportionment of representation made by the Bill, these applications were not further pressed.

"It appeared to us that we were precluded from recommending any enlargement of borough boundaries of so extensive a character as would entitle the borough to an additional member or have the effect of taking away one member from the adjoining county.

"As regards boroughs with a population under 15,000, any enquiry with a view to extension was evidently unnecessary, as they would under any circumstances be merged in the county.

"Where he had reason to suppose that a borough did not embrace the whole of the population, that ought to be included therein; we have taken steps to ascertain whether an extension of the borough was desirable. Sepa-

rate reports are appended to those boroughs in which we recommend that the boundaries should be extended.

"With respect to the boundaries between counties and boroughs we were, in forming the new divisions precluded by our instructions from adopting any other boundaries than the existing ones except so far as they were altered by the Bill. In the case, however, of Liverpool, we were informed that there had been an oversight in including in the borough the whole of parish West Derby, a large portion of which was rural in character, and that it had been intended to adopt in the main the extension recommended by the boundary commissioners in 1868. This extension, with some alterations required in order to obtain a well-defined boundary line, was accordingly acted upon by us in determining the divisions both of the county and borough.

"With respect to the borough of Birmingham the schedule already referred to indicated that some extension might be made, but we found that we could not consistently recommend any extension which would not disturb the scheme of representation laid down by the Bill.

"In the case of Stoke-upon-Trent and the new borough of Hanley there is a discrepancy in schedules to the Bill, for whilst Hanley is taken out of the present borough of Stoke-upon-Trent the latter is left with two members, apparently in error.

"A part of Stoke-upon-Trent is also proposed to be added to the borough of Newcastle-under-Lyne, with a part of the parish of Wolstaton left undefined by the Bill.

"We have selected that part of the last named parish which ought, in our opinion, to be added to Newcastle under-Lyne, and we have settled the county divisions upon the boundaries so defined. They need not, therefore, be disturbed, either in the event of Stoke-upon-Trent being divided or remaining undivided and retaining two members as at present.

"In 1886, the boundary commissioners recommended that certain populous districts adjoining Gateshead, South Shields and Tynemouth, should be added to those boroughs: but the select committee of the House of Commons reported against the proposal, on the ground that its effect would be to extend, in each case, the parliamentary beyond the municipal boundaries.

"The suburban districts referred to have largely increased in population since 1868, and we should have been unable to recommend their intrusion in the adjacent boroughs without subtracting from the representation of the adjoining counties, and unduly increasing the population of the boroughs. We have, therefore, constituted these districts into two compact county divisions, one on the south, and another on the north of the River Tyne.

"Wigan is another case in which extension was recommended, but afterwards refused in 1868: and similar reasons to those just referred to would prevent the extension of that borough also.

"We find that in the undermentioned boroughs, not included in schedule 5 to the Bill, the municipal boundaries extend beyond those of the parliamentary boroughs, and in these cases we recommend that the parliamentary limits should be extended to the municipal boundary.

"The boroughs referred to are:—

1. Bury.
2. King's Lynn.
3. Newport (Monmouth district).
4. Cardiff district.

"The following boroughs:—

1. Maidstone,
2. Boston,
3. Darlington,
4. Conway,

have small detached parts which we consider should be merged into the county.

"The following is the number of borough divisions which we have formed:—

1	borough with	9	divisions.....	9
1	"	7	"	7
1	"	6	"	6
2	"	5	each.....	10
4	"	4	"	16
7	"	3	"	21
11	"	2	"	22
Total. 27			Total.....	91

"In the course of our enquiries our attention has been drawn to the effect which the division of certain boroughs will have with respect to the exercise of the franchise by non-resident freemen. At present their votes may be taken at any of the polling places within the borough (see fig. 2, c. W., fig. 4, c. 45, s. 68), and it is obvious, therefore, that some provision must now be made for the determining the division or divisions within which they shall in future vote.

"Another matter that has pressed itself upon our notice is the growing desire of boroughs for municipal extension, and the frequent extensions which are sanctioned by Parliament without any concurrent extension of the parliamentary boundaries.

"We have also had occasion to observe numerous instances where parishes or parts of parishes belonging to one county are locally situated within another.

"Upon these matters we venture to offer the following suggestions:—

"1. That provision should be made by the Bill for enabling the revising barrister at the first registration to apportion in alphabetical order the non-resident freemen equally as far as practicable amongst the several divisions of the borough, the apportionment to last for the voters' lifetime; and at each succeeding registration to apportion in like manner any new freemen, either in filling up vacancies or by apportioning them amongst the divisions of the borough.

"2. That with respect to future municipal extensions beyond parliamentary limits by private Bill, the case should be the subject of a special report to both Houses, so that provision may be made, if thought desirable, for the extension of the parliamentary boundaries at the same time.

"3. That as regards isolated parts of parishes, whenever they are dealt with under the divided parishes acts and annexed to some adjoining parish, any part so incorporated shall be deemed to be part of the parish to which it is annexed for parliamentary purposes.

"Separate reports containing the electoral and other statistics relating to the counties and boroughs divided by us together with a description of the new divisions are appended hereto. These statistics have been taken from the census of 1881 and the parliamentary return No. 25, 1884.

"We have also appended maps of all the counties and boroughs divided by us, and also of the boroughs where an extension of boundary has been either made by the Bill or recommended by us, except in those cases where the extension is merely that of the parliamentary to the municipal boundaries. In some instances the borough maps will not show the extent of buildings down to the present date, as no recent surveys were available.

"We have to acknowledge the readiness with which the shire and town halls have been placed at our disposal for our enquiries, and the valuable assistance which we have received from the county and borough authorities and their officers.

"We have also to express our obligations to the officers of the Ordnance Survey Department for their indefatigable exertions in the preparation of the maps required.

"And further, we must not omit to record our sense of the ability and untiring industry with which our secretary, Mr. Howel Thomas, has discharged the onerous and important duties which have evolved upon him.

"We annex a list showing the number of public enquiries which have been held under our direction, and the dates and places when and where the same were held.

"We have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servants,

(Signed) "JOHN LAMBERT,
"*Chairman.*
"FRANCIS R. SANDFORD,
"*Vice-Chairman.*
"T. H. W. PELMAM.
"J. J. HENLEY.
"R. OWEN JONES.
"H. TULLOCH.

"10th February, 1885."

Now, Mr. Chairman, hon. gentlemen may have thought this an unnecessary consumption of time, but I felt it was perhaps proper that the report of these commissioners should be in our own *Hansard*, that the information which it contains should be laid before the people of Canada, so that they might ascertain how this matter was proceeded with in England. We have a pretty thorough knowledge of the mode of doing business in the United States, and I wish to have the electors of Canada in a position to be able to contrast between the two. I wish them to be able to draw a distinction, between the methods pursued by this Government, copied

from the worst examples in the United States, and the method pursued in England in 1885. Here is this volume, filled with maps of the different ridings. These ridings were adjusted and the representation provided for by these commissioners. First there was the provisional riding formed. Then a court was held in that riding, people were summoned to attend before that commission, to show reason why they objected to the provision made, and after that a full examination of all the reasons, presented in writing, that any man or party or association, or election agent desired to present to the commission, the riding was finally determined upon. Here are the maps drawn by the Ordnance authorities, map after map in this report of the commissioners, embracing every riding in Great Britain ; and this mass of information, this work performed in a business-like manner by a business commission, performed thoroughly, and performed along certain lines of instruction. These lines of instruction did not direct them to seek the political advantage of one party or the other, but to secure the representation and redistribution of seats upon a basis that would be fair to all parties and in accordance with the true spirit of representative institutions. I see here that we have all this information prepared by these commissioners and laid before the British Parliament to be acted upon. Here is a report which may be taken as a sample of the manner in which the commission acted. Here is the map upon the left-hand page and the report upon the right-hand page.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you please read the map first.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will send the book over to the Minister of Finance in order that he may draw his own lessons from it, and I hope the reading of it will impel him to act uprightly and conscientiously hereafter.

Mr. McMULLEN. He has no conscience.

Mr. CHARLTON. I give this as a sample. I do not wish to detain this House long and shall therefore hurry over the details :

"The county returns two members. Its area is 458 square miles. The population in 1881 was 129,940, showing an increase of 533 since 1871. The number of inhabited houses in 1881 was 27,621. The number of electors on the register for 1882 is :

Freeholders, copyholders, leaseholders, &c.	4,673
£50 tenants at will	517
£12 rated occupiers	2,131
Total	7,321

"The only parliamentary borough in the county is Bedford, with a population of 19,533, now returning two members. Under the proposed Redistribution of Seats Act, 1885, the county will be divided into two divisions, with one member for each division. The commissioners propose that one of the divisions shall embrace the northern, and the other the southern part of the county. By this arrangement the straw-plait industries of the county, the greater part of which is agricultural, will be brought within the same electoral area.

"The names assigned to the two divisions are : (1) The Biggleswade Division, and (2) The Luton Division ; the former taken from a large and important poor law union, and the latter from the municipal borough of Luton, with an increasing population of 23,969 inhabitants."

Now, Mr. Chairman, we will have upon *Hansard* the instructions given to the British commissioners and the report of the British commissioners, and we shall have the scheme before this House, showing how the principle of redistribution was acted upon in England ; and I think if any member of Parliament who will give this matter consideration, who will give it fair and candid consideration, cannot but be impressed with the fact that the British system is vastly the fairer. It is designed to secure fair-play. He will see that there is a business-like way of doing it, and that the scheme which was acted upon in 1882, in contradistinction of the scheme acted upon in England is the very reverse. This scheme is characterized by fairness, impartiality, uprightness, and a desire to secure an honest redistribution, while in every respect the other is exactly the opposite. The other, is one that the Government has acted upon once, and is acting on now. I believe that as the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) wished to have this *en français*, I had better hand it over to the Deputy Clerk to have it read in French.

Mr. OUIMET. You cannot do that.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman does not comprehend it, then we will have it translated.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the representation on the basis of population according to that report ?

Mr. CHARLTON. The instructions to the commissioners were to equalize the population as far as possible and to conform to the principles and lines laid down in those instructions. If the hon. gentleman will take the population of the British Empire and divide it by the number of members of the House of Commons he will find what the unit of population is. He will find that the population of these boroughs, while they do not conform precisely and exactly to the average basis of population, they conform to it as nearly as the circumstances of the case, and the instruction of the commissioners will permit. The Bill, Mr. Chairman, is a Bill that met with the approval of the whole country. It was prepared by no party. It was devised by a joint conference of the managers of both parties. It was agreed by men on both sides of politics that it should be a fair, equitable measure, and it is an example that we may very properly and with good results to ourselves follow. It is an outrage to have a Redistribution Bill devised and its details fixed in party caucus, and any such attempt in England to throttle either party, to pass a Bill calculated to deprive one side of the House of its fair representation, would not have been entertained, and had an attempt been made to perpetrate such an outrage in England as was perpetrated in this House in 1882 the attempt would have led to revolution. No man in this House who would justify the redistribution scheme of 1882, who will not condemn that redistribution scheme to-day and say it was a dishonest one, and will not give evidence of that by attempting to rectify its abuses, would be fit to sit in the British House of Commons, and would not be considered a fit associate for gentlemen in that House. This may seem rather harsh to say, and hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I tell you that an attempt was then made to subvert the liberties of the people of this country—that one of the vilest schemes of the political assassin was carried triumphantly in this House in 1882. That measure was followed in 1885 by a measure equally dishonest and equally disreputable, and I say that our whole course of political action in this country has tended on the downward road to ruin ; that we have been following the worst examples

presented by the worst species of democratic action on this continent; and the party in power has no right to claim British policy as a precedent, has no right to claim the respect for these proceedings, nor to claim that they are actuated by principles that govern every statesman in that country. You may laugh and jeer and sneer in this matter. You have the people by the throat. You succeeded in passing a Bill in 1882 that gave one Conservative the power of two Liberals. You may regard this as a cunningly devised scheme and something that you may laugh about, but I tell you that it is an act that is subversive of human liberty, that it is an act that will entail infamy upon every man who participates in the outrage. As I said before, it will be a more enduring monument to that dead statesman who was a former Prime Minister of Canada than any monument in marble that can be erected. It will be a monument that will stigmatize his memory and be a blot upon his reputation as long as there is a history of Canada. Yes, laugh about it. The mills of the gods grind slow, but they grind exceedingly fine. It may seem to you that there is no conscience in this country to-day. That apathetic condition of the public conscience is not, however, proof that there never will be an awakening. There is such a thing in Canada as a belief in fair-play and justice, and that feeling will assert itself. It will not assert itself along the line of perpetuation of existing political outrages that have the support of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side who are responsible for this condition of things. I see by the *Hansard* report that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice objects to the proposition made by my hon. friend from Bothwell, because, he says, it would result in giving anywhere from 12 to 20 seats to the Liberals. From that I judge that even the Minister of Justice is incapable of looking at this question from any other than a party stand-point.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think the statement of the hon. Minister of Justice will bear that interpretation.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; I have looked at it. Now, the scheme contemplated by the hon. member for Bothwell is that we shall respect county lines. The hon. Minister of Justice says that this could be made the most objectionable kind of a gerrymandering scheme, because it might result in increasing the Liberal forces in this House by from 12 to 20 votes; that is, it might possibly result in giving the Liberals something nearer fair representation in this House. If it did increase our forces by from 12 to 20 votes, we would not even then have a representation commensurate with the number of votes we received in the country. But the question whether this scheme would increase the Liberal representation or not, has nothing to do with the matter. The question is whether the principle is a just one. Is it a correct principle that our redistribution should be made on a basis which respects county lines and give the people a fair representation? This Parliament is here to guard the public interests. Many men believe that this Parliament is here only to forward party interests. But this Parliament is the custodian, not of the interests of the Conservative party, but of the interests of the people of Canada, and the people of Canada should be represented in this Parliament according to their views and wishes. They should have a fair, equitable, honest representation here. There should be no scheme adopted that will give to one party a representation in this House unduly large in proportion to its numbers. Now, Sir, whether this scheme results in increasing or diminishing the representation of any particular party in this House, if it will result in giving the people of this country a fairer representation on the basis of their political views than the Bill gives, that is all that an honest man need ask about it. If it increases the Liberal representation and reduces the Conservative representation, it is necessary to do that in order to have in this House a fair representation of the public sentiments. The representation in this House to-day is not in accordance with the sentiments and wishes and feelings of the country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, it is.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not at all. No man can tell me that the Conservative representation in this House bears to the Conservative vote the same proportion that the Liberal representation bears to the Liberal vote.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. gentleman the figures?

Mr. CHARLTON. I have common sense, and I suppose the hon. member for Haldimand has too. Here is the Province of Ontario with an actual Liberal majority at the last election, and will the hon. gentleman tell me that to-day there is a representation of that Liberal majority in this House?

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is no Liberal majority of popular votes.

Mr. CHARLTON. In 1882 the votes of the two parties were almost equal, and yet there were 63 Conservatives and 29 Liberals returned to this House. Was that a proportionate representation of the sentiment of the two parties in this country? No, Sir; the operation of that measure has been to give the Conservative party undue representation and to silence a large portion of the people of this country.

Mr. WALLACE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Reformers had a popular majority in the last election.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, we had a popular majority.

Mr. WALLACE. What are the figures?

Mr. CHARLTON. About 5,000 or 6,000 majority.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will state, if you will permit me. According to the statement made by Mr. George Johnson, the statistician of the Dominion, and formally placed in the hands of every member of this House, the last general election gave a Liberal majority of 7,200 odd votes in the Province of Ontario. That was the official statement from the Department of Agriculture to me and others, and let the Government say whether it is right or not.

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to say that Mr. George Johnson, Dominion statistician, never made such a statement at all, and the hon. gentleman cannot produce it over the signature of Mr. George Johnson. I defy him to do it. The hon. gentleman knows that he cannot produce it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has no right to say so. I am stating

here what was placed in my hands a few months ago from the Department of Agriculture by Mr. George Johnson, and the figures were 172,000 Conservative votes to 178,000 or 179,000 Reform votes. The figures were given in detail. There are plenty of other members in the House as well as myself who received the statement.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman says he has an official statement over Mr. George Johnson's signature, all he has to do is to produce it. I say he cannot produce it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not carry these matters in my desk.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman cannot produce it, we charge him with playing a bluff game.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, Sir. I am stating what I know, and only that the hon. gentleman is unworthy of my further notice, I would tell him what I think of him.

Mr. WALLACE. That game has been played outside of this House, but I tell the hon. gentleman that I have not had to go over the whole Province of Ontario looking for a constituency, but the constituency that sent me here first is still sending me by an increased majority.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You never had your county wiped out by an Act of Parliament, as my hon. friend had.

Mr. WALLACE. I never had my county gerrymandered either. It is the same as that which first elected me.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My hon. friend never had to wring the hands of weeping constituents who had to vote for him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had not a clerical friend at my back to tell me that I should be elected because I could plunder the country best.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman never had any respectable element of this country at his back.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All I can tell the Minister of Justice is that I do not call it respectable backing when there commendation of me to my constituents is that I am a good plunderer.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I wish to say one word about these figures. I went over the figures of the last general election, and I found that the Liberals had a popular majority of 4,000. Then I corrected the figures by the bye-election returns, and I found, allowing 1,000 for the election by acclamation in Simcoe, that the Conservatives had a majority of 4,334. These are the figures I gave the other night. In round numbers the votes were 182,000 Liberal votes and 186,000 Conservatives, taking in the bye-elections, and the representation in the House was 33 Liberals and 59 Conservatives. Each Liberal representative here required the polling of 5,520 Liberal votes, and each Conservative representative required 3,150 Conservative votes; so that the figures given by the hon. member for North Norfolk were very nearly correct, when he said that it required about double as many Liberal votes to send a representative here as Conservative votes. Now, these figures have been worked up from the official returns by my own hand, and I know them to be correct.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if in making up these figures he did not, in some constituencies where there were two or three candidates against the Government candidate, put them all together as Conservative votes?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I conscientiously divided the votes in the way I thought would be right and just in all those cases. The hon. gentleman can see that I tried to do my best because I gave a Conservative majority of 1,000 in a county which elected a representative by acclamation, and altogether my figures are as near as any mentioned in the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Where there were three candidates in a riding, you always gave two against the Government.

Mr. BORDEN. I desire to say a word with reference to the report referred to, which was made by the Dominion statistician, Mr. Johnson. I have a very distinct recollection of having had the report referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford, and that report showed a majority of over 7,000 in the Province of Ontario for the Liberals in the aggregate, at the last Dominion general election, over the vote given for the Conservatives. I have not the report here, and am speaking from memory, but have a very distinct recollection of that fact.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) says that the Conservative majority, according to his own figures, was 4,300.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not at the general election.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). After the bye-election.

Mr. WALLACE. But the hon. gentleman wants to go back beyond the latest elections. They might as well go back to 1878.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman going to withdraw his denial?

Mr. WALLACE. With reference to Mr. Johnson, the Dominion statistician, I will say this: that the hon. member for South Oxford claimed he could produce a signature of George Johnson, Dominion statistician, as showing that the Reformers had a majority of 7,000 in Ontario. I challenged him to produce that statement, and I challenge him again to produce it. I say he cannot do it, and I say further, that had the Dominion statistician given figures simply showing 7,268 of a Reform majority, that would not settle the question. We want to have the figures in detail. We were proposing to have them from the hon. member for East Huron. I asked him for a statement about one or two constituencies the other night, but he was afraid to submit those figures to the House then, as he is afraid to-day. We ask those gentlemen upon what they base their calculations, what were the majorities in the several constituencies, notably the County of Carleton? The hon. gentleman refused to give the figures even for one electoral district. I have submitted the figures to this House of every constituency in the Province of Ontario, figures which were given by the hon. member for Cardwell, and published in the Montreal *Gazette*. Those have never been, and cannot be confuted. They were the figures for the general election before the bye-elections, and by those figures

the Conservatives had a substantial majority, not a very large one, but we had a majority of four members from Ontario—48 to 44—and had more than a thousand majority or something like that for those four. That majority was largely increased at the bye-elections, and it is the latest test of public opinion which should guide the House to-day. I repeat that the hon. member for South Oxford cannot produce any such statement as he says he can over the signature of the Dominion statistician; and if he could, the figures would have to be criticised the same as any other person's figures.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I remember reading the statement of Mr. George Johnson when it was published, and the statement was unfair to the Liberal party, and unfair in this particular that in the Counties of Middlesex and Bothwell—I refer to those two particularly—the statistician represented the Patrons of Industry of Canada as a Conservative association, and counted the votes polled by the Patrons of Industry in each case as votes given in favour of the Administration, whereas the Patrons of Industry are in favour of unrestricted reciprocity and condemn the policy of protection upon which the Government went to the country. And the figures which appeared in the Montreal *Gazette*, and which were a revised edition to some extent of Mr. Johnson's figures, represented my majority as 21 in the County of Bothwell. Why, I had a majority of 550, and they represented the majority of the hon. member in West Middlesex as a very large vote.

Mr. WALLACE. Not at all.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is proving it is all wrong anyway.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am proving that the majority of the Reform party was larger than Mr. Johnson represented it to be.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You have not succeeded in that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is what I am pointing out, that Mr. Johnson and the very map the Government have prepared for us, marked both in Middlesex and Bothwell, two Conservative candidates in the field, when that was not the case. And there is this fact, which hon. gentlemen on the opposite side cannot controvert, that the Liberal vote in the election of members to this House, if divided by the number of members who sit here, is represented from Ontario in the proportion of one member for every five thousand and some hundred votes, while the Conservative vote is represented by one member for every three thousand votes. That is the difference. I stated the other day that the hon. gentleman was adopting the old slave doctrine of the American constitution, that five Reformers were as good as three Conservatives.

Mr. SPROULE. That is about the proportion,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman wants details. He shall have them. They may take a little time, but that is no fault of mine. I have got the list of returns for the several general elections to the House of Commons of Canada, issued by Samuel St. Onge Chapleau, who I suppose will be accepted as an authority. We will go through those in detail, and the hon. gentleman, if he possesses sufficient intelligence to add together the figures, can ascertain definitely who is right and who is wrong as to the actual majority.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not the question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Be quiet, Sir. I am going through this and will not be interrupted. I request the Chairman to keep order.

Mr. WALLACE. I rise to a point of order-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. State it.

Mr. WALLACE. It is this. The hon. gentleman went out to get a statement signed by Mr. George Johnson, and he comes back with one signed by Mr. Chapleau.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you ought to call that hon. gentleman to order for stating a point of order which is simply an impudent deception on the House. He has no right to rise in his place and talk any such trash. I am going to give you a list of the several general election returns of Ontario from beginning to end. The County of Addington returned my hon. friend Mr. Dawson by a majority of 61. The County of Bothwell returned my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mills) by a majority of 550 over Mr. Longwood, and 918 over Mr. McClarty. I take the smaller number 550. North Brant returned the sitting member (Mr. Somerville) by a majority of 1,116. The south riding returned Mr. Paterson by a majority of 542. The riding of Bruce represented by Mr. Rowand returned that gentleman by a majority of 530. The riding of Bruce represented by Mr. Truax returned him by a majority of 114. The riding of Durham represented by Mr. Beith returned him by a majority of 198. The riding of Elgin represented by Mr. Casey returned him by a majority of 682. The riding of Essex represented by Mr. Allan gave him a majority of 57 on the final count. The riding of Essex represented by Mr. McGregor returned him by a majority of 849. Mr. Landerkin was returned from Grey in the first instance by a majority of 46, but thanks to certain manipulation of the ballots by certain zealous partisans, that majority appears to have been reduced to 3.

Mr. WALLACE. Which do you count—the 46 or the 3?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I count the 3. East Hastings returned the late Mr. Burdett by a majority of 54. The west riding of Huron returned Mr. M. C. Cameron by a majority of 379. East Huron returned Mr. Macdonald by a majority of 308. South Huron returned Mr. McMillan by a majority of 855 over one candidate, and of 1,791 over the other. I have taken the smaller vote. The County of Kent returned Mr. Campbell by a majority of 476. The County of Lambton returned Mr. Lister by a majority of 598. The County of Lennox returned Mr. Allison by a majority of 57. The County of Lincoln and Niagara returned Mr. Gibson by a majority of 48. The City of London returned Mr. Hyman by a majority of 183. South Middlesex returned Mr. Armstrong by a majority of 624.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that over one candidate or over the two?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I believe there were only two candidates running there. The County of Monck returned Mr. Brown with a majority of 260. North Norfolk returned my hon.

friend beside me (Mr. Charlton) by a majority of 468. The west riding of Northumberland returned Mr. Hargraft by a majority of 37, as declared by the judge. South Ontario returned Mr. Davidson by 33, as declared by the judge. I am talking from the electoral returns. The riding of Ontario which returned Mr. Edgar gave him a majority of 999. One riding of Oxford gave Mr. Sutherland a majority of 1,534, and South Oxford returned myself by a majority of 734. The County of Peel gave Mr. Featherston a majority of 54. The County of South Perth returned Mr. Trow by a majority of 177.

Mr. WALLACE. Where is he now ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, the boodle brigade could tell the hon. gentleman not only where he is but what it cost the Government to defeat him. I think the hon. gentleman was there himself and helped to defeat Mr. Trow. Mr. Grieve's majority was 81. Mr. Proulx in Prescott received a majority of 661 over one candidate, 737 over another, and 934 over another. I have taken the smallest vote. The riding of Simcoe which was represented by Dr. Spohn, returned him by a majority of 207.

Mr. WALLACE. Where is he now ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Ask the boodle brigade or ask two or three of the hon. gentlemen beside you, who could give you some minute details.

Mr. WALLACE. The court said the boodle brigade was over there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; the court did not say that by any manner of means. North Victoria gave a majority for Mr. Barron of 202. North Waterloo gave Mr. Bowman a majority of 30, and Mr. Livingston was returned for the south riding by a majority of 312. In Welland, Mr. German received a majority of 447.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Where is he now ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Ask Mr. Lowell. He can tell you. In North Wellington, to the great disgust of my hon. friends opposite, Mr. McMullen was returned by a majority of 136. In the centre riding my friend Mr. Semple had a majority of 156, and the south riding returned Mr. Innes with a majority of 376. North Wentworth gave Mr. Bain a majority of 200, and it is up for judgment in consequence. North York gave Mr. Mulock a majority of 363. East York returned Mr. Mackenzie by a majority of 26. Now, if the hon. gentleman chooses, he can add those majorities together for himself, and I will give him the other side if he is anxious to have it. The riding of Algoma returned Mr. Macdonell with a majority of 430. The riding of Brockville returned Mr. Wood by 178; the riding of Bruce returned Mr. McNeill by 30; the riding of Cardwell returned Mr. White by 248; the riding of Carleton returned Mr. Hodgins by 43; the riding of Cornwall returned Dr. Bergin by 218; the riding of Dundas returned Mr. Ross by 60; the west riding of Durham returned Mr. Craig, the present member, by 61; Elgin returned the present member by 46; Frontenac returned the late member by 205; Glengarry returned the present member by 321; Grenville returned Mr. Reid by 111; Grey returned the present member by 19, according to the statement here; Mr. Masson was returned by 247; Haldimand returned Dr. Montague by 78; Halton returned Mr. Henderson by 104. In Hamilton, the majorities were, in the one case, 654, and in the other case, 624. In Hastings, Mr. Mackenzie Bowell was returned by 206; Mr. Corby was returned by 360; in Kingston the late Sir John A. Macdonald was returned by 483; in Lambton, Mr. Moncrieff was returned by 566; in Lanark, the present member was returned by 301; in the other division of Lanark, the Minister of Railways was returned by 630; in Leeds, Dr. Ferguson was returned by 146; and for the south riding, Mr. Taylor, by 106. In Middlesex, one hon. gentleman was returned by 2, which was subsequently increased to 6; another was returned by 410; Mr. Marshall was returned by 165; in Muskoka, Col. O'Brien was returned by 140; in North Norfolk, Col. Tisdale by 412; in Northumberland East, Mr. Cochrane by 236; in Ontario Mr. Madill was returned by 254; in Ottawa City, the majorities are given as 1,083 for Mr. Mackintosh, and 455 for the other member; I have taken the larger number. In Peterborough the present member was returned by 233; and Mr. Burnham by 29. In Prince Edward the final count was 39 in favour of Mr. Miller. In Renfrew, Mr. White received 79 majority; Mr. Ferguson, 444; in Simcoe, the present member was returned by 296. In the three ridings of Toronto the majorities were 1,752, 502 and 1,465. In the south riding of Victoria, the majority was 25; in Wentworth South, 1; in York East, 806. Now, Sir, I have here a statement which was copied from Mr. Johnson's statement on the 19th October, 1891. According to Mr. George Johnson, Dominion statistician, the number of votes polled in Ontario was 171,595 for the Government, and 178,871 for the Opposition, giving a majority to the Opposition of 7,276. This is a copy made from a official statement which was placed in my hands, from the Department of Agriculture, which has been copied into one of the papers of this Dominion. I think these papers show conclusively that at the last general election in 1891, the Reform party had a considerable majority of the popular vote actually polled, although the Reform party were in a minority of four votes, being 44 against 48, so far as regards the representation in this House.

Mr. WALLACE. With reference to the statement made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, he pledged his word to this House that he would produce a statement made by Mr. George Johnson. He has failed to do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is in error. I said I had seen the statement and had it in my possession; I did not say that I had it here.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman stated in his first speech that he had a statement officially prepared by the Dominion statistician.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So I have.

Mr. WALLACE. I say there is no such statement, I challenge the hon. friend to produce it. He read a statement here to-day, and what does it show, on his own figures? We will take them for what they are worth, and what are they worth ? For instance, in the County of Carleton he gives Mr. Hodgins's majority as 43. Why, does not the hon. gentleman know, does not every member of this House know, that in that election two Con-

servatives ran in the County of Carleton? The opponent of Mr. Hodgins was Mr. Dickinson, who represented the county in the last Parliament, but Mr. Dickinson was a staunch Conservative, in fact he was opposed by Mr. Hodgins because it was considered that Mr. Dickinson was too staunch a supporter of the Government. The normal majorities in that county range from 1,200 to 1,800. Yet the hon. member for South Oxford has the audacity to put down a Conservative majority in the County of Carleton as 43. I say that he cannot bamboozle the people of this country with such a statement as that. The honest and straightforward way for him would have been to take the majority in the previous election when a Grit and a Tory ran. Then, take the County of East Durham, and what does he give us there? In East Durham two Conservatives ran, and Mr. Craig had a majority of 61 over another Conservative. His majority over a Reformer would have been probably ten times as many, or 500 or 600. East Durham is strongly Conservative, but when two candidates ran there the majority of one over the other was 61 votes. The hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) proclaimed to this House and the people that the Conservative majority was only 61, which was on a par with his statement about Carleton.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Ross represented East Durham at one time.

Mr. HUGHES. And it cost him $61,000 to get there.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman assisted him.

Mr. WALLACE. Instead of giving 1,000 as the Conservative majority in Carleton and 400 or 500 as the Conservative majority in East Durham——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman say what the majority in Carleton was when the Prime Minister ran there and Mr. Stewart ran against him?

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Stewart lost his deposit.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes. If the hon. gentleman knows anything about the matter, he should know that that gentleman lost his deposit.

Mr. BOYLE. The majority was 1,085.

Mr. WALLACE. Take the other side of the account. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has passed through a good many contests, and his majorities have generally been counted with two figures but not by very large figures. The last in which he was engaged was a triple contest as in the County of West Middlesex. The Farmers' Institute brought out a candidate, and in this triangular contest, the hon. member (Mr. Mills) won the seat by nearly 500 majority. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) bravely put down the Reform majority in the County of Bothwell at 500.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, and it would have been 1,000 majority, if there had been only two candidates. If the hon. gentleman will look at the votes of the two townships of Sombra and Dawn, where the candidate of the Patrons of Industry got his vote, where I polled a majority against my opponent, this will be apparent.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what was his majority in the previous election?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). 27 majority.

Mr. WALLACE. And what was the hon. gentleman's majority in the election before that?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will tell the hon. gentleman. In 1878 the votes polled in what is now the County of Bothwell showed a Conservative majority of 291.

Mr. WALLACE. I want an answer to the question, not a speech.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not going to make a speech, but to answer the question.

Mr. WALLACE. I took my seat because I understood the hon. gentleman was going to answer the question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman does not want my answer.

Mr. WALLACE. I took my seat because I thought the hon. gentleman was going to answer the question, but I will not take my seat again until I get through my speech. The hon. member for Bothwell considered himself a very fortunate man indeed when he had a majority of 27 and was elected, but at the last election he secured 500 majority because there were three candidates running.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. WALLACE. I say a fair estimate was obtained by taking the record of the previous elections, and not the record of a triangular contest, as in West Middlesex, where a contest similar to that in Bothwell took place on nearly the same grounds.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman had better go back to 1874 election in East Durham.

Mr. WALLACE. In 1891 the majority in East Middlesex is put down as 155, but there were two Conservative candidates running. I will ask hon. members if that is a fair statement of the majority. In the previous election the majority was about 758, and that is about the normal majority when a Grit and Tory only are running. I think the majority was over 500 at the bye-election. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) places the majority at 155, and that is about on a par with his calculations respecting Carleton and East Durham. According to the manner in which that hon. gentleman has manipulated the figures, he might as well have placed the Grit majorities at tens of thousands, instead of at a few thousands as he has done. The statements we have submitted are fair and honest statements of the votes at the last election. In the case of Carleton, East Durham and East Middlesex, where only two Conservatives ran in each case, how is it possible to estimate the Conservative majority by the figures of the returns? The only fair way is to take the figures of the preceding election, or take an average of preceding elections. If there was a straight political fight at the previous elections, then those figures should be taken. But, Sir, these hon. gentlemen have never done so. They have not submitted a straight and square statement to the people. They have not, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said he would do, submitted a statement over the signature of George Johnson, Dominion statistician. They have submitted no such statement, and the hon. member for

South Oxford in giving his figures does not tell us whether they add up to the amount given by George Johnson, as he claims they were obtained from George Johnson, from the newspaper slip which he read. He does not tell us whether the figures amounted to—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Add them up, if your capacity extends so far.

Mr. WALLACE. I will say this, that if my capacity for figures did not exceed the capacity of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I would step out of this House mighty sudden. He has mixed and muddled his figures throughout his financial career, though always looking out for a main chance for himself. Let that be borne in mind. I say that the figures in the statement submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) are not correct. They are not correct in relation to the County of Carleton by more than 1,000 votes. They are not correct with respect to East Durham by 400 votes. They are not correct as far as East Middlesex is concerned by 500 or 600 votes, and they are not correct with regard to the County of Bothwell by between 400 and 500 votes. Then, Sir, they are not correct statements of the returns of the last Dominion elections, and more than that, they are not what the hon. gentleman started out to give when telling this House he was going to give the figures of the Dominion statistician, which, I repeat, he cannot give to this House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has deliberately and wilfully misstated what I said. I said I had repeatedly seen the figures. He has deliberately and wilfully misstated what I said.

Mr. WALLACE. I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. WALLACE. My point of order is, that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—if we have to call him an hon. gentleman—stated that I wilfully and deliberately misrepresented. I say that no gentleman will use such a statement in this House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I corrected him, and after the correction he twice repeated the falsehood.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am in order, When an hon. gentleman has been corrected and does not take back what he has said he must be told about it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the dignity of the committee will be served by such language.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My statement is this : I have corrected the hon. gentleman twice, and after that correction he persisted. When an hon. gentleman being twice corrected persists, then my words are in order.

Mr. WALLACE. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether the member for South Oxford is in order in making such a statement? We will have to have your ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have said already that the hon. gentleman is not in order, and I would call upon both gentlemen to conclude that the discussion has gone a little too far on both sides. This discussion commenced in a light way and has turned out very badly. I will have to call upon both gentlemen to take back some of their statements.

Mr. WALLACE. If you will point out any statement that I have made that is contrary to the rules of this House, I will be happy to apologize. I know of no rule that I have broken ; but you have said that the hon. member for South Oxford had broken a rule, and I now call upon you to enforce the rules of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If it goes as far as that, I have decided that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) did not say what was right, and that the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Wilfully repeated a misstatement.

Mr. WALLACE. The member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) must apologize. If he does not do it, I will ask that the words be taken down and reported to the Speaker.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are taken down already, no doubt.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BOYLE. There was something said about reporting the words to the Speaker. The hon. member——

Mr. WALLACE. I call upon the member for South Oxford to set himself right before we proceed. This is quite in order. The same rule should be applied to every member of the House, and I protest against the member for South Oxford being permitted to say things that would be contrary to the rules of the House if any one else said it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I might remind the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) that he has accepted the figures of the hon. member for South Oxford, a thing which he could not have done if he did not believe him.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not accept anything of the kind. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to correct a remark that was made by you, Sir, in saying that I accepted the figures of the hon. member for South Oxford.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. WALLACE. I desire your ruling, and also to have the words taken down. If these gentlemen on the other side do not know the rules of the House, we will sit here until they learn a little. Mr. Chairman, I was saying that I understood you to say that I had accepted the figures of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Is that correct?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I said that the hon. member for South Oxford gave some figures and

the hon. gentleman did not then offer any objection, as he might have done, if he afterwards wished to contradict him.

Mr. WALLACE. I say that the only proper time to object is when you get on your feet to speak. When I got to my feet, I did object, and showed that the figures were absolutely false; that he was not truthful in giving these figures; that he has no foundation for making these statements.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, order. Hon. gentlemen must come out of this situation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. WALLACE. I said nothing about the member for South Oxford at all. I said the figures were absolutely false; that I had proven they were false; that I had proven they were false when the statement was made that the Conservative majority in the County of Carleton was 43. I said that the statement was absolutely false, because the Conservative majority is, on an average, more than 1,000 in the County of Carleton. I said further, that with reference to the County of East Durham, the figures given by the hon. member for South Oxford were absolutely false, because he gave the Conservative majority at 61, when two Conservatives ran and where the normal Conservative majority was 400 or 500 or 600. I said more than that, that the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford in regard to the County of East Middlesex was absolutely false because he gave there a majority of 155 when the majority at the previous election was 758, and the normal majority is 500 or 600 in that electoral district. I may say that the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford with reference to the electoral district of Bothwell was false and misleading, because he stated there was a Reform majority in that district of over 500, when the Reform majority in that riding, by the evidence of the member for Bothwell himself, at the previous election was 27, and for the election before he was afraid to give the majority because it was so small. I believe it was about three. Now, I say when the hon. member for South Oxford made these statements that were false and misleading, he knew they were false and misleading. Now we are even.

Mr. CHARLTON. I ask your ruling on a point of order. I understood the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) used very offensive language towards an hon. member on this side. I want to have your ruling about it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is the same ruling that I gave with regard to the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I think they are square now.

Mr. BOYLE. As this disturbance is now settled to the satisfaction of all concerned, we may go on with the discussion. I remember that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) figured out that the Reformers in the last general election had a majority of 7,200, and this, he said, was on the authority of the Government statistician. I went to that gentleman myself and I asked him if that was a correct statement. I told him that I had gone over the figures myself, and could not verify it or bring out any such result. He told me he had no recollection of having made such a return. He said that he had no intention of making up a political statement or of giving figures showing the votes polled for Conservatives or Reformers. I gathered from his remarks that he took the sum total of the vote polled for the Conservative candidate, and then took the entire vote polled for all the other candidates—counting two candidates or three candidates, as the case might be, who opposed Conservatives—and made that the gross Opposition vote. Now, when I addressed the House last week on this question, I submitted some figures which I have to ask the House to bear with again; and these cover the result of the bye-elections as well as that of the general elections. They show the following Liberal majorities:—

North Oxford	1,534
North Brant	1,116
West Ontario	999
West Bruce	930
South Huron	855
North Essex	849
South Oxford	734
West Elgin	682
South Middlesex	624
West Lambton	598
Bothwell	550
South Brant	542
Kent	476
North Norfolk	468
Russell	413
South Wellington	376
North York	363
South Waterloo	312
East Huron	308
Prescott	269
Welland	267
Lincoln	232
North Wentworth	200
West Durham	198
North Wellington	186
Centre Wellington	156
Peel	132
North Perth	97
North Waterloo	85
South Essex	57
Addingfon	61
South Grey	3
Total	14,662

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman, if he desires to be fair, will say that my majority is more than three.

Mr. BOYLE. I give the returns from the official statement.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The official statement is that the ballot boxes were stuffed and that I had a majority of 65.

Mr. BOYLE. If the hon. member for South Grey wants to stuff that down our throats——

Mr. LANDERKIN. If you will read the return, you will find that the ballot boxes were tampered with, and stuffed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I want the hon. gentleman to make a straight statement. He is making a most misleading statement.

Mr. BOYLE. The Conservative majorities were as follows:—

West Toronto	1,757
East Toronto	1,464
Carleton, 1887	1,085
South Simcoe	1,060
West York	806
South Lanark	630
East Lambton	566
East Middlesex	548

Centre Toronto	502
Ottawa (as two)	1,083
East Elgin	495
South Renfrew	444
Halton	440
Algoma	438
East Hastings	422
South Norfolk	412
West Middlesex	410
West Hastings	360
Glengarry	327
Hamilton (as two)	654
North Lanark	430
Monck	327
North Simcoe	296
Cardwell	248
North Ontario	254
North Grey	247
East York	240
North Victoria	239
East Northumberland	236
West Peterborough	232
South Victoria	228
Cornwall	218
Prince Edward	209
North Hastings	206
Frontenac	205
Brockville	178
South Ontario	167
North Leeds	146
Muskoka	141
South Leeds	106
London	102
Total	19,354

In this statement I have endeavoured to be more than fair. I give the hon. member for Bothwell credit for his 550 majority, and I have taken the majorities as they occur in Middlesex, Oxford and elsewhere. In the statement read to-day, the figures of 1891 were given. They are right as far as they go; but it is unfair to infer from those figures that the Conservatives are represented on the floor of this House according to the statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk. The hon. member should include the bye-elections of 1892. It is unfair to give the figures of 1891, and argue from them that we are unfairly represented on the floor of this House in 1892.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHARLTON. After the short parenthesis in my speech, caused by the interruption before recess, I will resume the remarks I intended to conclude before six o'clock, and I think I will be able to do so the more freely now that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have succeeded so admirably in pairing the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). There was some question as to a statement made by Mr. Johnson, Dominion statistician, regarding the popular majorities in the last general election. I have not the statement of Mr. Johnson himself, but I have a summary of it from a highly-respectable Conservative Journal, the *Citizen*, of this city, and I am sure no person will impugn the statement made in that journal, or accuse the editor of having attempted to mislead the public. The article was published on the 19th of October last, and is as follows:—

"Mr. George Johnson, Dominion statistician, has made a fair and impartial analysis, from the official returns, of the general elections on 5th March, and compared them with the returns of 1887. The returns show that there were 1,132,201 names on the voters' lists in 1891 as compared with 993,914 in 1887, an increase of 138,287. The number of votes polled was 720,459, as compared with 725,506 in 1887, showing that the great snowstorm which raged just before the last general election had the effect of keeping a large number of the voters from the polls. The following is the statement by provinces:—

Provinces.	Government.	Opposition.	Government Majority.	Opposition Majority.
Ontario	171,595	178,871	.....	7,276
Quebec	97,652	94,063	3,589	
Nova Scotia	36,694	31,131	5,563	
New Brunswick	30,094	23,649	6,445	
Prince Edward Island	8,994	9,483	.....	539
Manitoba	10,450	9,059	1,391	
North-West Territories	6,752	3,579	3,573	
British Columbia	6,176	2,267	4,809	
Totals	368,357	352,102	24,970	7,815

"This makes the Government's net popular majority 17,155 as compared with 15,628 in 1887, a very fair increase when the fact of the bitterness with which the Opposition fought and the questionable means resorted to are taken into consideration. The average governmental majority was 478 and the average majority was 230. There were 50 constituencies in which the majority was under 100, of which 28 were Government and 22 Opposition."

By this statement, it is evident that the Opposition majority of the popular vote in Ontario was 7,276. In Prince Edward Island it was 539, and the net Government majority of the popular vote was 17,155. This statement appeared in the *Citizen*, and, I think, may be vouched for; and I presume the evidence of the gentleman who compiled it from Mr. Johnson's own figures can be obtained if it be thought desirable to verify the statement. The discussion, therefore, we had on this point this afternoon was in a large measure wasted; and the assertion made was correct, that the popular Liberal majority in Ontario was something over 7,000 votes. I was speaking this afternoon on the marked disparity that existed in the representation in this House in 1882 between the number of members returned to support the Government and the votes cast for them. I was pointing out that this disparity was proof of the success of the gerrymander in 1882, and that it still exists. While there was a large Liberal majority of the popular vote of Ontario at the last general election, the Liberals were in the minority in this House from that province, and that minority is at present a large one; and I say that the practical operation of this policy was in 1882, and in a lesser degree has been since, to deprive the Liberal voters of this Dominion of their due weight and influence in the affairs of the country. As my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stated before recess, they were placed somewhat in the position occupied by the negro population in the south, during the period anterior to the rebellion. By a provision of the constitution, negroes were to count only as a basis of representation; five negroes were to count as three persons, and the representation of the south was based upon that constitutional provision. We are a little better off, however, than were the negroes in the south. The Liberals have not quite as great reason for complaint in Ontario as the negroes of the south had, because, although we are reduced to the

same proportion in point of influence as they were, although five of us only count for three, we are not absolutely deprived of our votes. The five Liberals are permitted to possess what practically amounts to three votes, while five negroes were disfranchised entirely, and only counted as a basis of representation. But the outrage is very great indeed, and the system under which it is perpetrated is one which ought not to meet with the approval of a free country. The gerrymander, however, which produced this result was not deemed quite sufficient, and the Government sought to supplement it by a subsequent piece of legislation called the Franchise Act, so that now we have not only the operation of the gerrymander but of the revising barrister and Government Printing Bureau, under the exclusive control of the Government, where, if any desire exists to commit fraud by stuffing the lists, I am unable to see how any remedy can be applied.

Before the little parenthesis in my speech this afternoon, I was endeavouring to impress on this House the desirability of following British precedent, and I am afraid the diversion that took place will perhaps lead the House away from the consideration of that very important question. We have had reference made to the American example, and I have pointed out, I think with sufficient clearness and fulness, that the course pursued by the Government in this country in 1882 in connection with their Redistribution Act, and the course proposed to be pursued now, is one copied from American example. Now, Mr. Chairman, you will not find in the United States a reasonable man, an honest man, a man who desires his country's progress, who does not deplore and condemn the practice of gerrymander in that country, and I have in a volume here, the American Law Journal, an article on the machinery of politics and proportionate representation, of which I propose to read a very brief extract, to give an idea of the state of sentiment existing among jurists and public men with regard to machine politics in that country.

Mr. BOWELL. What do you mean by machine politics?

Mr. CHARLTON. By machine politics, I mean that operation which goes on with the precision and the remorselessness of a machine, which is designed to crush out with the force and precision of machinery free sentiment and the rights of the people, as the Redistribution Act of 1882 and the Franchise Act have done. I read from this article as follows:—

"The last twenty years have settled the question of the best form of the government practically at rest. Constitutional government in the hands more or less completely of representative assemblies seems, for the present, to be fairly established in all civilized countries. Whether the chief of the executive, under the name of king, emperor, or president, shall retain more or less independence, and whether the popular basis of representation shall be more or less extended, are questions of detail likely to be variously determined under the influence of varying local and historical conditions. But that the preponderant and increasing importance is to attach to representative bodies for some generations to come, the political history of the last twenty years seems to put beyond question. While, however, the principle of representation is thus found in almost universal acceptance, it has happened that the actual working of representative institutions, and the condition of politics which has resulted from the attempt to carry the principle of representation into practice, have created a growing disgust and dissatisfaction which has found utterance, during the last twenty years, in every free country, in an urgent demand for reform.

"A considerable literature, springing up simultaneously and independently in England, France, Denmark, Switzerland, and the United States, has discussed the nature of the evil and sought for a remedy. Fortunately the doctors do not disagree. The symptoms are pretty much the same all the world over wherever free institutions are in existence, and there is a singular unanimity of opinion, both as to the real nature of the disease and as to the means of cure. Independent enquirers in London, Geneva, Copenhagen and Philadelphia, agree in imputing a chief part of the failure of representative institutions to the unscientific construction and rude workmanship of the machinery of elections, and agree in recommending certain measures of reform."

After dealing with the evils of the caucus system and other evils, the article goes on to say:

"But, if the preliminaries of an election are thus injurious and demoralizing both to public and private citizens, the results of an election are a positive injustice. Our elections fail in their chief purpose, that of furnishing a fairly representative body. It would seem that a deliberative assembly, standing in the place of the whole body of citizens, to discuss and decide in their behalf all matters of public moment, should as nearly as possible resemble in its composition the political community for which it stands, and that whatever varieties of interest and opinion exist in the constituency should find adequate expression among their representatives. The ideal method of elections is certainly the one that would thus make the elected body a perfect epitome of the body politic, giving to every political party, large or small, its fair share of members in the proportion of its numerical strength. The fair and just system of representation would be a system of proportioned representation.

"How far the present system of voting is from producing any such results, and how unjustly and unfairly it works, is notorious. A political contest is a struggle, not for a fair share of the representation, but for the whole. The outvoted electors are reduced to political slavery; they have no voice whatever in public affairs. Their rights of representation are taken from them, and are appropriated by their conquerors. It is a war without quarter, and it is the contest in which sacrifices of the victors are hardly less serious than the losses of the defeated party. Everything has to be yielded for the sake of victory, and as eligibility becomes necessarily the prime quality in a candidate, it naturally follows that, as we have said, men of mark give place to men of no mark, and the representative assembly comes to be composed for the most part of second-rate men, mere standard bearers in party warfare. hardly better known or more acceptable to the men who vote for them than to their opponents."

Men who can come in when the division bell rings, and vote the party through on all occasions, and who are never heard from on other occasions.—

"These evils,—the disfranchisement of minorities and the consequent tyranny of majorities. The tyranny of political managers over their followers, and the consequent helplessness and indifference of the electors; the tyranny of these same managers over public men, and the consequent withdrawal from public life of men who are seeking an honourable and independent career,—these evils are co-extensive with representative institutions, and are mainly attributed, by those publicists who have undertaken to place the causes, to the natural working of an objectionable election machinery. The scheme of majority voting, as almost everywhere practised, is not only vicious in principle, since it excludes from representation a large section of electors, but it is so crude and defective in its operation that it needs, as we have said, a special force of trained engineers to make it work at all. It is natural that these men should make it work to suit themselves."

And, after discussing minority voting and cumulative voting and so forth, this article proceeds to say:

"The most notorious evil connected with the system, however, is that known as 'gerrymandering,' by which is understood a skilful defining of the boundaries between different districts so as to secure to the party in power a larger share of representatives than its numbers fairly entitle it to. This is so easily done that it would probably be found that no party, since the process was invented, has ever had sufficient virtue to withstand the temptations it offers."

In a quotation in this article from a report of a Swiss commission, these commissioners proceed as follows :—

"The history of free countries in all times, including Switzerland and our own canton, is fertile in examples of this expedient,—a device so common that we hardly venture to give it its true name. But it is in fact fraud, jobbery and malversation in office. The Government thereby misuses powers conferred upon it in order that it may secure a representation to pervert and control the result of the election; it takes advantage of functions established for the good of the whole to further the interests of a part. For this evil, inherent in the district system, no remedy has ever been found."

I shall not inflict a long quotation on this House. I have read these brief extracts to emphasize the fact that the best minds in the United States and in all countries where representative institutions prevail deplore the state of things which prevents the due exercise of power and influence by the people on the legislative bodies of the country, that condition of things which exists in Canada and which it is sought to perpetuate by one party seeking to use powers which are at variance with every true principle of free institutions to secure their own position and to perpetuate their lease of power.

We have had reference made here to-day to the American example. I shall renew the statement made that, when we imitated that example and deliberately adopted it, when in 1882 we deliberately perpetrated an outrage on public rights as glaring and unjustifiable as was ever attempted in the United States, on that occasion we adopted a wrong policy, and we are as a people and a Government and a country in a false position. If we are now to justify the outrage of 1882, if we are to refuse to rectify the evil perpetrated then and the abuses then legalized, if we are to persist in the same line of action, in 1892, it is not only to be deplored, but it is political criminality, and the Government and the followers of the Government who persist in this policy are false to the trust reposed in them, and are persisting in a system which will entail grave evils upon this country. I wish to call attention to the British system that I alluded to before, and which I now assert is the precedent we ought to follow. In the instructions given to the British commissioners with reference to the accumulation of evidence and information and the devising of a scheme for the redistribution of the divisions in Great Britain, I assert that a proper policy was pursued, as I believe it was substantially that policy which was contemplated by the framers of the British North America Act. We have had a discussion upon section 51 in this House since this Bill was introduced, and while I do not profess to be able to throw any light upon the subject, in view of the fact that British commissioners were appointed, and in view of what I have already said with regard to the mode of preparing a redistribution scheme in England, I wish to call attention again to that section 51, which is as follows :—

"On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, and in such a manner, and at such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides."

Now, suppose this House had appointed commissioners to proceed in the same manner that these British commissioners did in 1885, had appointed commissioners to submit to this House a plan for redistribution of seats, would not the requirements of section 51 have been literally and absolutely obeyed? I think the contention that it was the intention of the framers of the British North America Act to provide for redistribution in this country upon such a basis as that which has been followed in England, is, by the language of that section 51, made apparent and beyond all question. What was done in England? Commissioners were appointed in accordance with the provisions, substantially, of section 51. If we appointed commissioners as was done in England we would have fulfilled the conditions of that section. What was next to be done? These commissioners would have received the instructions which are provided for in this section. What would the instructions have been? If the instructions were of the same character as those issued to the English commissioners, they would have been to secure a non-partisan distribution. Bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the plan of selecting commissioners was agreed upon by the leaders of both parties, it was a plan which was substantially made with the unanimous approval of the British House of Commons. It was not a party expedient at all, it was an expedient adopted to set at rest all party dissension upon this question, it was an expedient adopted for the purpose of securing a perfectly fair and honest redistribution, not in the interest of party, but in the public interest. Now, if we had proceeded upon the English plan, if we had appointed commissioners, if we had instructed these, as the English commissioners were instructed in 1885 to effect a redistribution, we would have complied with the provisions of section 51. And if we had followed British precedents, what would we have done? After the commissioners were appointed, and the instructions upon which these commissioners were to act, had been decided upon by common consent—not by a party caucus of the Government party, but by the common consent of both parties in this House, satisfactory to all the people of the country, a map would have been prepared, setting forth the boundaries of each riding and each county. The public would have been notified that they could examine that map in the office of the clerk of the peace. A day would have been fixed in that county when one of the commissioners would be in attendance to listen to the representations of all the parties interested. They would have attended before him and made their representations in writing as to their objections, as to their proposals with regard to an arrangement in the public interest; and the commissioner, acting in a judicial and non-partisan capacity, would have given due weight to these representations, and would have made such modifications in the provisional outlines of the riding as the circumstances of the case seemed to require. Having done that, having proceeded with riding after riding until every riding in this Dominion had been treated in this manner, and the public had been heard before the commissioners, the election agents of each party, the prominent men of each riding, the thing would have been fairly and openly discussed and a decision arrived at which, in the estimation of the commissioner, was in the public interest. Then that Bill as devised, with the maps and the commissioner's report, would have been submitted to the House of Commons, putting all the information before them, giving them the tracings

and outlines of the ridings; that report, recommended by these commissioners, would have been referred to the House, and the House would have acted upon their decision, or would have taken such course with regard to the matter and made such modifications with respect to the provisional arrangements made by these commissioners, as might seem in the wisdom of the House to be desirable or necessary. If, as in England, rules had been laid down that they should not disregard county lines, that they should have regard, in fixing their ridings, to similarity of occupation on the part of the people inhabitating these ridings, districts or divisions, that would have been a part of their duty, to reach as far as they possibly could equalization of population. There would be no partisan results aimed at, that would be the very thing the scheme would seek to avoid, not partisan advantage, not partisan arrangement, but a fair distribution made by impartial commissioners, and in the interest of the public, would have been the result. There would be nothing in this arrangement to complain of, nothing that would threaten the stability of the institutions of this country, that would be likely to deprive any considerable portion of the population of their just rights and their due weight in the councils of the nation. That is an honest mode of arriving at a solution of the difficulty. I was struck with admiration when I went through this British system. It is business from beginning to end. It is not partisan chicanery and rascality but it is pure business—business designed to secure the rights of the people, to secure a fair representation upon the basis of eternal justice to all. If we copy their example we will have taken a right step to relieve ourselves of the outrages that have been perpetrated upon the people, the debasing influences that corrupt our Government, that threaten the stability of our institutions and the existence of our country.

Mr. Chairman, we are engaged here in the business of founding a nation. Just now we are laying the foundations, and it makes some difference whether we build upon rock or upon sand—it makes some difference whether we build upon principles of justice and truth, or upon chicanery, and fraud, and political assassination, and an attempt to secure by unworthy and unfair means and dishonest trickery an advantage and the renewed lease of a corrupt party in power. In laying the foundations of the nationality in Canada we want to lay these foundations in justice and truth, and when we are dealing with this question of redistribution it is incumbent upon us that we adopt a scheme that will secure, not a party advantage, not the ability to make three men on one side have the power of five men on the other side—this is not what we should aim at—but we should aim, as they did in England in 1885, to secure justice for all the people, to secure to every class of the population their due weight in the councils of the nation, to secure a redistribution scheme that could be pronounced by all parties, honest and fair, and in the public interest. The interest of parties should be respected in this country as it is respected in England. Political crimes should be avoided in this country as they are avoided in England. We have had enough of political criminality. Parties have owed their existence to political criminality in this country long enough. The public conscience in this country has been sufficiently deadened by the evident intention of parties in power to disregard justice and truth and righteousness in their administration of public affairs. The perpetration of abuses in this country should be no longer attempted. We have had enough of abuses such as the Gerrymander Act of 1882. The history of abuses, chicanery, fraud and rascality which characterizes the operation of political parties in this country, should come to an end. If we are to build up a country we want to break off our sins. We want to give evidence of our repentance by fair dealing. We want to carry out our professions by deeds in accordance with these professions. We want, if we denounce the American example, to abandon it; if we admire the English example, we want to adopt it; and adopt it now and in connection with this redistribution scheme in this year of our Lord, 1892. Sir, not only this, but the crimes of the past should be repudiated and atoned for, as far as possible. No repentance that does not atone for sins is a true repentance. If we are to repudiate the crime of 1882, we should atone for the crime by undoing the crime done, and unless we do that, our professions of repentance are hollow and insincere. This repentance should by all means reach every act of the past that is not in accordance with principles of justice. We want to have done with the American system, we want to imitate the British system; and I appeal to the Minister of Justice himself, who is at the head of this Government, who is charged with the duty of administering the law, to whom posterity will look as the officer who had charge at this moment of legislation that had much to do with the well-being of the future, I want to impress on that hon. gentleman's mind that the well-being of future millions is a matter of more consequence than the temporary ascendancy of a party. I want to impress on his mind that there is more honour in laying the foundations of a nations institutions in justice and truth, in establishing a nationality upon principles that are sound than there is in securing the continuance in power of a mere party. I want to impress on that hon. gentleman's mind the truth that if he professes to love the old flag, to admire British institutions, to admire that spirit of fair-play and justice which characterize British political methods and actions, he had better abandon the system of Eldridge Gerry, the system of the political manipulators and schemers who have made the word gerrymander a by-word in the mouth of nations—he had better abandon that practice although it has in the past conferred advantages on his party and may do so to-day, and he must look in the future to principles of justice and to the good of his fellow-men, and adopt a principle that will result in benefit to the country. If I had the ear of the representative of Her Majesty, I would appeal to him. I would implore him not to permit such a villainous outrage to be perpetrated. I would implore him to secure for this country the safeguards for British liberty that are secured for the citizens of Great Britain herself. I would implore him to see to it that we had here that measure of fair-play and justice which the Tory party of England strove for in 1885 and secured. I would implore Lord Stanley, if I had his ear, to see that the responsible advisers of this country did not justify a great crime in the past and proceed to perpetrate

another crime of a similar character now. It is a grave matter we are considering. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has proposed a scheme in this amendment we are now considering. He does not say how the question has arisen—that is a matter for further consideration. But here is a scheme by which the representation of this province may be laid out on the basis of county lines, and the scheme, so far as I have been able to judge its character, gives advantages, if any advantages are given, to the Conservative party. For instance, the County of Victoria with but 32,000 odd inhabitants, is given two members: I suppose in all human probability those members would be Conservatives. Northumberland with 36,000 is given two members. In both these cases the county has considerably less than the average basis of representation for two members. Leeds with 34,000 will have two members; Lanark with 37,000 will have two members; Carleton with 37,000 will have two members; and so far as I can judge these cases of counties having less than the population entitling them, under any strict equalization of the population to two members, are most likely to give advantages to the Conservative party. But here is a scheme substantially just in its character, infinitely superior to the adjustment we now have proposed, which gives representation to this province without transgressing county lines in one instance, one substantially on a basis of justice and fairness and in harmony with the spirit of representative institutions; and if the scheme as outlined is deficient in any respect, appoint your commissioners, as was done in England, to consider it and have the scheme worked out on a non-partisan basis, by non-partisan judicial commissioners, and let this House revise their actions in the same spirit in which their scheme is prepared and as finally perfected submitted to us for our consideration.

I believe that one or two more mistakes such as were made in 1882 and 1885 will seal the doom of this country. I believe that any patriot who wishes for the good of Canada, who desires to see Canada a prosperous, virtuous and free country, and who will give his consent to any measure which his conscience tells him is wrong, who will violate his conscience for the purpose of supporting a political party, is unworthy of his own self-respect and the respect of his fellow-men. And if the Government have any pride in this matter about receding, I think the pride is a false one. Mr. Gladstone reviewed his action and retraced his steps in 1885. This Government in view of the British precedent, in view of all the light brought to bear on this question, will do honour to itself to revise its decision and to adopt a course in accordance with British precedent, and give us a fair and thoroughly considered measure of redistribution based on the opinions of commissioners who would make the question their special study and who would give us the benefit of their investigations and embody their recommendations in a scheme of redistribution that will be perfect in its provisions and framed in the interest of the entire people of this Dominion.

Mr. EDGAR. Like the great majority of members of this House, I had not the honour of a seat while the Redistribution Bills of 1872 and 1882 were going thorough this House. But I took some interest in public affairs during those periods, and outside of this House I certainly heard nobody defending those measures, especially the Act of 1882. Of course the legislation of 1872 was of a milder form; it did not go so far in the direction of unfair distribution of seats, in fact the word "gerrymander" was only applied to it occasionally at that time. But I happen to have had some personal experience even of the milder form of gerrymander in 1872. I had been nominated as a candidate in the County of Monck before the Bill became law, against a very strong man, Senator McCallum, who had carried that county with large majorities before, and to my surprise, and without very much reason a Conservative township was taken from Haldimand and added to the County of Monck by the Bill of 1872. That was done of course to prevent my success. It was very reasonable to suppose that it would do so under the circumstances; but I should like to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to this fact, that although a large Conservative majority was added to the already large majority of Mr. McCallum in that county, still the effect of the unfairness of that proceeding was so great in the rest of the county that the popular indignation defeated Mr. McCallum in the election that followed; and I believe that this attempted legislation of to-day will have the effect of disgusting and irritating large masses of the people of Canada just exactly as that small gerrymander in the County of Monck in 1872 converted that Conservative riding into a Liberal riding for that election at any rate. Now, while the gerrymander of 1872 was one of a comparatively mild form, I do not know that any public man of responsibility has defended the gerrymander of 1882 either outside of this House or in this House. What I feel about it is this, that having opened up this question, and having undertaken to deal, as the Government has, with the redistribution of seats in the Province of Ontario particularly, they have taken upon their shoulders the whole burden of justifying the gerrymander of 1882; because, Sir, if they do not justify it, they are bound, before this Bill becomes law, to rectify it. Surely any legislator in this House will admit that. Any legislator who cannot defend the gerrymander of 1882—and I defy any one to do it, if he is honest—and whether he is honest or not, he cannot deny before the face of the country that the responsibility rests upon him to rectify in this Bill the wrongs of 1882. That is what I feel about it, and that is why I feel, with respect to the Province of Ontario, which felt the weight of that gerrymander, that we have a right to stand here, I do not care for how long, and insist upon it that right shall be done in that particular. I believe, Sir, that the longer we stay here and insist upon the rights of the Province of Ontario in that particular, the more we shall be applauded and encouraged, not only by our constituents, but by all the independent electors of the Province of Ontario. There are other portions of the Dominion which feel the weight of the present legislation more than the important Province of Ontario; but I cannot dissociate the Act of 1882 from the present Bill, and therefore I say that though Quebec and Prince Edward Island and other parts of the country suffer more additional wrong than Ontario does under this Bill, the effect is cumulative in the case of Ontario, and we have all the wrongs of 1872 and 1882 to redress before we are finished with this legislatfon. Sir, there was a

good deal said this afternoon about the effect of the gerrymander of 1882 upon the elections of 1891; and a gentleman on the other side of the House undertook, not only to dispute the results of a calculation made by a Dominion official as to the numbers of the party votes cast in 1891, but he actually had the hardihood to accuse my hon. friend from South Oxford of making use of Mr. George Johnson's name improperly and in an unauthorized way. I think the extract which has been read from the Ottawa *Citizen* to-night shows, at any rate, that the statement attributed to Mr. Johnson was authentic. But I would like to go a little further, and show, not only that Mr. Johnson was quoted by the Government papers as having made that statement, but that over his own signature in a Government paper he subsequently acknowledged the accuracy of the statement. In the Montreal *Gazette* of the 19th of October last there appeared a discussion as to the popular majority at the previous election, and, among other things, that paper said this:

"The Dominion statistician, Mr. George Johnson, has issued a summary of the political complexion of the votes cast at the last general elections, making the majorities as follows."

Then it goes on to give Mr. Johnson's statement showing the Opposition to have a majority of 7,276 of the votes cast in the Province of Ontario, just exactly what my hon. friend from South Oxford said he had stated. Then, the *Gazette* undertook, as hon. members on the other side of the House have since then undertaken, to dispute the correctness of Mr. Johnson's summary, and he wrote to the *Gazette* a letter over his own signature, which will be found in that paper of the 2nd of November, 1891. In that letter he used these words:

"Whether your figures are the more correct, or whether the greater accuracy is with me, is a matter of small moment. My analysis simply pointed out, with the strongest desire to be fair to both sides"——

Why would he not be fair to both sides? Why would he not be fair to the other side, at any rate, when he was their paid employé?

—"with the strongest desire to be fair to both sides, that the abstentions were so large, and the total vote given so equally divided as to warrant the conclusion that in future the political parties will have to mind and mend their ways in order to bring themselves into greater harmony with the greater number of the electors.

(Signed) "GEORGE JOHNSON.

"OTTAWA, October 31, 1891."

Now, I am sorry that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is not here. If he were, he would surely now apologize to my hon. friend for having ventured to dispute the accuracy of his statement that Mr. George Johnson had made such a statement. Of course it is all right for him to attack Mr. Johnson and say that he does not understand his business, though I do not know whether it lies in the mouth of the men who have been going through the country praising Mr. Johnson as so great a statistician and as showing in his census returns how prosperous the industries of the country were, to attack him. However that may be, there were other statistics to show how the gerrymander of 1882 weighed upon the Liberal party in Ontario at the election of 1891, and those statistics were given by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald). On referring to the debates of last week it will be seen that the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle) stated, from the other side of the House, that he had carefully gone into the figures of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), that they were prepared in the fairest possible way, and were substantially accurate. So we have the Dominion statistician, supported by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), whose accuracy is vouched for by the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle), giving us figures to show that there was an exceedingly small Conservative majority even after the bye-elections—an exceedingly close Conservative majority, if any at all, in the Province of Ontario; and as you know, Mr. Chairman, the representation in this House from the Province of Ontario is as two to one in favour of the Conservatives. If that is a fair result of the gerrymander of 1882, are we not justified in calling upon the House to readjust on some equitable principle our constituencies, so that they will give the majority of the people their fair representation in the House of Commons? Now, Sir, I do not think it is possible for us, on this side, to repeat too often or to emphasize too much the patent fact that the Government, in this matter, are following the bad example set by the lowest politicians in the United States. Why, Sir, the greatest blot upon Republican institutions in America is that system of gerrymander which has been adopted in a number of different states by both sides in politics. It is a blot upon free institutions on this continent; yet the super-loyal, ultra-British party in this country must imitate the worst feature they could pick out in the whole working of the American system of government. They cannot deny that they are doing it. They got their precedent nowhere else. That system was invented over there in 1814 be Eldrige Gerry of Massachusetts, it has been worked out in different states of the Union by both parties, as unprincipled men from time to time control those parties, in order to give them unfair representation, not only in the State Legislatures and Senates, but in the Congress at Washington. Yet, Sir, our British super-loyal statesmen must go over there to find the precedent for what they are now doing. They cannot find it in England. The suggestion of any such action in the British House of Commons has been spoken of with scorn by all public men on both sides. They would not dream of it. The Government here are imitating the United States, and we know that imitation is the sincerest flattery. Not content with imitating, they are going infinitely further, and doing much worse than ever was done in the United States, and I will show you how. The distribution of the electoral districts for the Federal Congress is regulated by each state, and if the Republicans gerrymander in one Republican state in favour of the Republicans, the Democrats will gerrymander in a Democratic state, you may depend upon it, equally in favour of their party, so that the result is somewhat equalized and minimized. One Democratic gerrymander counteracts a Republican gerrymander, and on the whole, possibly, there is not very much injustice worked. But do you suppose for a moment that if the Federal Congress at Washington attempted to gerrymander, if the dominant party there assumed the power to gerrymander the whole of the United States in favour of the Republican or the Democratic party, whichever party had control at the time of the three branches of legislature—do you suppose that such an attempt

would not be followed by a revolution within six months? Why, they would not stand it; such a thing would not be tolerated in the United States. It would be an absolute revolution. It would be the seizing violently of power by those who held temporarily the reins in their hands. And what else is this attempt, this infamous, this impudent attempt made by the Government, by means of their temporary control of the majority of this House and the adjoining Chamber, to maintain themselves in power, willy-nilly the voice of the people? I absolutely defy them to point out any governing authority in any country, short of a triumphant tyranny, which has been guilty of such an attempt. Remember, I am not only speaking of the Act of 1892, but I also couple with it the Act of 1882. Now, Sir, I have as strong a desire as most men to see Canada continue a great Confederation and soon become a nation, but I do not believe, I cannot hope that, if this legislation be permitted to go on in this line. Confederation will last very long. I say that if the majority of the people of this country is to be gagged by Franchise Bills and by outrageous Gerrymander Acts, and is not allowed to carry out its will in legislation and in the executive functions of this country, the sooner Confederation is broken up the better. It is a rather serious statement for any man feeling the responsibility of a member of Parliament to make, I know, but I say that, unless the majorities can govern, we will resolve ourselves again into the original provinces and see if we cannot govern ourselves. In the Dominion a temporary majority seeks to gag and shackle our legislation. What are we supposed to do here? We are not armed forces at war with one another, trying to kill and destroy one another by all the artifices of war and strategy. No. We are one country, although we sit on two sides of the House. We are supposed to be trying to do here what the majority of the country wants us to do, and not what the 200 gentlemen sitting in this Chamber want to do. We are only to do the will of the people of Canada, and it is our first duty surely to legislate so as to ascertain what the true will of the people of Canada is and to get the freest possible expression of opinion from the people of Canada as to their will in regard to legislation of all kinds. We are committing a flagrant breach of trust if we do anything else, and the majority for the time being is acting in a tyrannical and revolutionary manner which the people of this country will not very long stand. I find the Government have refused a conference with the leaders of this side of the House, who represent close upon an equal number of the people of Canada with themselves, upon a matter which has not been delegated to this Chamber to settle, a matter which goes to the root of the whole representation of this House. They have absolutely refused and voted down a proposal for a conference on this important subject. I think the people of this country have watched that and have understood exactly what that means. They have also, I observe, voted down a very fair proposal coming from a prominent member on the other side of the Chamber to settle this question upon a principle of county boundaries, guarded and protected with very fair and proper words of limitation. I am very much mistaken if the people of this country have not been watching that with the greatest possible interest. Perhaps the hon. gentlemen think they can ignore the importance of the fact that a member occupying the important position of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in the Conservative party has taken that ground. Occasionally from the outside you see the truth better than people do who are inside, and I think that it is plain enough that the member for Simcoe occupies a position, not in the Liberal ranks, for he never pretended to be a Liberal nor an ally of the Liberals, but in the Conservative ranks which renders it very dangerous to ignore him on a question when he has the right on his side and has the people on his side, as he has to-day. It is very well for the Minister of Railways to undertake to read the member for Simcoe out of the party. If it were not amusing, it would be lamentable. The member for Simcoe occupied a prominent position on that side of the House and led them in many a hard fight and made many sacrifices for them long before the Minister of Railways dreamt of getting on the Treasury benches. Possibly the Minister of Justice would like to read the member for Simcoe out of his party, but he knows better than to try to do it, and he dare not use his influence in that direction. I venture to say that nine out of ten of the Conservative members from Ontario would shake in their boots if the member for Simcoe went into their constituencies and denounced them for their action on the Gerrymander Bill as he has in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. EDGAR. I am sure they would, and perhaps they will find what it means before they are very much older if this sort of things continues. I am not surprised that those hon. gentlemen do not listen to suggestions from this side of the House, but when they try to ignore the friendly voice of a gentleman amongst themselves who was there before they were, they are taking their lives in their hands. I saw that, among the very strong points urged in favour of this Bill while it was being discussed before the House during the last few weeks, there was the great importance of equalizing the population between the Counties of Prescott and Russell. I am not going to find fault with Ministers for hearkening a little to public opinion, and public opinion on that particular matter has been of so pointed and marked and personal a character evidently that they have have lost sight of the great principles involved in transferring the township of Clarence from Russell to Prescott, and they are now proposing to leave it where it was. I do not see why the other parts of their proposals could not be treated very much in the same way. I do not see why, better still, some broad, general principle could not be adopted. I think that the more you study the suggestion as to the Province of Ontario made by my hon. friend for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), the more reasonable it seems. It affords a means of not only making a systematic redistribution of constituencies, but of rectifying the wrongs done in 1872 against the people of Ontario. Of course it is said by the apologists for this Bill that the city of Toronto, for instance, needs more representation. I certainly agree with that. I am not entirely disposed either to say, as I know some of my friends on this side think, that because a member from an outside constituency happens to live in Toronto, he repre-

sents Toronto. I have a great respect for Toronto and for the great many people in it, but, although I reside there, I do not consider that on the floor of this House I represent Toronto at all. However, the proposal of the hon. member for Bothwell meets the case. He proposes five members for Toronto, and he proposes to take them from other parts of Ontario where he fairly can do so. I heard the Minister of Public Works to-day asking on the floor of the House: Why don't you make suggestions? Now, I have got a suggestion to make to the Government as to where they can get another member for Toronto, even if we do not adopt the scheme of the member for Bothwell. I tell them to take the member away from West Ontario; do away with the Grit hive in West Ontario, and put back the riding of West Ontario where it belongs, into North and South Ontario, and East and North York, and then they will do away with a Grit hive and get another member for Toronto. I think that would be a much more sensible scheme than to go away to Wentworth, and taking a member from North Wentworth, a member practically from Hamilton, and giving it to Toronto, when you can get one so near Toronto as West Ontario; and the member for West Ontario will take his chances, if he ever wants to come to Parliament, of getting a seat somewhere. Do away with some of the wrongs you have done, do away with the Grit hives in Ontario, in Brant, in Oxford, and places like that if you want to give additional members to Algoma and Toronto. Now, one word as to the constitutional question which has been raised during the discussion on this Bill. No one can dispute that there is a great deal to be said in favour of the view of the hon. members for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that we have no right, under the 51st section of the Confederation Act, to deal with redistribution in this way. I do not suppose I can shed any light upon the question, but I do think it is a most important one and ought to be authoritatively settled. Last session legislation was provided under which this question can be referred without the slightest difficulty, for the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. Surely that would be a fair and proper thing to do. There is no urgency that I am aware of for the passing of this legislation this session. It cannot come into force under the British North America Act until the dissolution of the present Parliament, and I am sorry to say that I do not see any immediate signs of the dissolution of this Parliament; therefore, I do not see that there would be any great danger to any interest in allowing this matter to stand until the opinion of the Supreme Court has been taken. At any rate I think that the people of the country would be glad to know whether the contention that has been raised against the action of this House, is well founded or not. Whether the section could now be interpreted as rendering it obligatory upon this Parliament to refer the redistribution of seats to another authority, surely there is a suggestion made in the original Confederation Act which might well be adopted by this Parliament even if it did not now, having been broken through on former occasions, have the force of binding law on this Parliament. I think, therefore, the amendment of the member for Bothwell should be earnestly supported by the House; I think the proposals of this Bill should be resisted where they are bad, as they are in so many cases; and I think that, more important than all, before this Bill is allowed to become law, it should be so amended as to give us an opportunity of undoing the wrong of 1882.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Having resided in the Province of Ontario for the last 49 years, I wish to express my disagreement with certain statements made by the Minister of Justice that the county lines of the Province of Ontario had been obliterated by local legislation. I have watched carefully the action of the Local Government with respect to the changes of boundary lines, and I know of only one case, for the last 25 years, since Confederation, and that was when the County of Dufferin was established out of some very large counties, at the request of the people. There is no other instance in western Ontario where county boundaries have been interfered with unless it was where a village established upon a boundary line between two counties, became an incorporated village, and of necessity had to be put into one county or another, partly withdrawn from the one and added to the other. Since 1882 we have had three general elections, and the people in the ridings of the county which I have the honour to represent feel to this day, very keenly the manner in which they were moved about under the Gerrymander Act of that year. The municipalities of Exeter and Stephen were put into the north riding of Middlesex in order to strengthen that riding. Let me say that we have ten meetings in connection with municipal affairs, farmers' institutes, meetings in the different ridings, for every one meeting we have in connection with the elections to the House of Commons of Canada. It is unjust to those who were moved about at that time to compel them to remain as they are now. Another statement I have heard in this House is, that we have not been able to show that any number of electors were disfranchised by being removed from their former ridings by the gerrymander of 1882. Let me take the neighbouring County of Perth, and take the two townships of North Easthope and South Easthope, one with 280 and the other with over 250 Reform majority; these were put into the north part of the County of Oxford, with a Reform majority of 900. Between 500 and 600 electors in the County of Perth were disfranchised by the gerrymander of 1882. I say emphatically, they were not only disfranchised, but the County of Perth was turned from a Reform into a Conservative county, and if it were not for that gerrymander, the south riding of Perth would to-day be represented by a Reformer. With respect to the alleged gerrymander of Sir Oliver Mowat, hon. gentlemen opposite have not been able to show a single constituency where a representative has been taken from the Conservative side and added to the Reform side on account of the redistribution that was made by the Local Government.

Mr. SPROULE. What about North Grey?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). It has not been contradicted that there were over 12,000 majority of Reform votes at the last general election in the Province of Ontario. Accordingly, the statements made with respect to the gerrymander in that province are evidently without foundation. With respect to the county I represent, it has been stated that if

the township of Hullett had been left in either the east or the west riding, Sir Oliver Mowat would have lost a representative. I am able to show that in 1871, before the first gerrymander took place, North and South Huron were both Reform ridings; that after the gerrymander in 1874, the election in 1875 gave a Reform majority in each of the ridings; and I am able to show also, that at the last two general elections for the Local Legislature, even if Hullett had been put into the east or west riding Reform representatives would still have been sent to the Legislature for both ridings. So the statement made in this regard is entirely incorrect. From the array of figures presented to this House, and I have followed them closely, it appears that the statements submitted by the three hon. members who have presented figures with respect to Ontario and the elections of 1891, are not very different. The first hon. gentleman who made a statement was the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). He calculated the Conservative majority, I understood him, after the bye-elections and he placed it at 19,085. He then went on to show that the Reform majority was 13,691, leaving the Conservative majority 5,394. The hon. gentleman stated the other night that he placed the majority at between 4,000 and 5,000, but it was 5,394, or only 1,027 more than the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) stated it in the course of his speech. The next statement was made by the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle). I give credit to the hon. member for East Grey for giving what he believes to be a correct statement, and I also think the hon. member for Monck was honest in the statement he submitted, and also in the congratulations he extended to the hon. member for East Huron on the great trouble he had taken in preparing his tables, which he said were as nearly accurate as it was possible to make them. The hon. member for Monck placed the Conservative majority at 4,619. Here are two hon. members, both on the Conservative side of the House, the only two who attempted to cover the whole province with a statement of the Conservative majority since the bye-elections took place, and one gives 5,394 as the majority and the other 4,619. The hon. member for East Huron placed the Conservative majority at 4,367, and for purposes of comparison he placed it at 4,000. The hon. member for Monck then went on to show that, if the votes cast received a proper expression on the floor of this House, the Conservatives would be represented by 46 and a half members and the Liberals by 45 members.

Mr. BOYLE. I was quoting what the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) had stated.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Certainly the hon. gentleman was quoting what the hon. member for East Huron said, but the figures of that hon. gentleman and his own figures came within one thousand of each other. So that the difference would only represent one quarter of the unit for one member as regards the whole. How then does the position in Ontario stand? It stands thus: 46½ members to 45 members. That is according to the figures of the hon. member for Monck; but they are—Conservatives, 59; Reformers, 33, thus giving a little over 4,000 voters, 26 members. I draw the attention of the Minister of Justice very strongly to this point, because he stated in one of his speeches that if a majority of votes were cast on one side, and the majority of the representatives were on the other side, the Government would be justified in making a proper distribution. If that is the hon. gentleman's view, he should certainly consider the position of Ontario. It has been alleged that the amendment would disturb 70 or 80 constituencies. What does it matter if we disturb the whole 92 constituencies in Ontario if justice is done and some system adopted that will lay the foundations of our nationality broad and deep, based on justice, righteousness and integrity? The time has come when we should adopt some principle that will give to each individual in this Dominion the proper influence of his vote in any election. I have not heard any hon. gentleman opposite state that this is a just measure, that it is fair that the Reform party in Ontario should be represented by 33 members, while the Conservatives have 59 in this House. I have not heard it stated that this is an unfair statement, and that this is not the true condition of affairs at the present time. A few moments ago when the hon. member for West Ontario stated that he believed that nine out of every ten people in Ontario sympathized with the Opposition at the present time in attempting to get justice, the hon. member for Albert held up his hand and said "No, no;" yet the hon. gentleman himself admitted the other evening that the gerrymander of 1882 had not done justice to the Province of Ontario; but that hon. gentleman will still vote for a measure that continues that injustice.

Mr. WELDON. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I did not hold up my hand to-night, and did not say "no, no." It must have been some other person.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I must accept the hon. gentleman's statement. I understood him to do so, because I would not say anything that I did not believe was thoroughly correct in regard to the hon. gentleman. Well, the hon. gentleman admits that he stated that the gerrymander of 1882 was a measure of injustice to the Province of Ontario. Will he have the honesty and the consistency to give his support to the proposal which is now brought before the House, and which in all likelihood will as far as possible make amends in 1892 for the wrong that was done in 1882? I do not believe that any other system can be adopted that will give the same measure of justice and equality, with regard both to population and to geographical position. It matters not whether under the present Government or the Government that may succeed them, such a measure would take out of their hands the power of gerrymandering in at least 21 constituencies which would return only one member each. Then, there would be 17 constituencies which would be divided into two ridings; and there would not be the same opportunity to gerrymander those constituencies that there is at the present time when boundary lines have been cut up and municipalities moved from one county to another. By the gerrymander of 1882, for instance, two municipalities were taken from the County of Perth, one from the north riding and one from the south riding, and one was put in North Wellington to assist the Conservative candidate there, and one in North Oxford in order to hive the Grits there, and one township was taken from the County of Huron and added to South Perth

in order to produce a Conservative majority there. All these wrongs ought to be corrected. The County of Huron ought to get back the three municipalities taken from it. That county has a population of some 66,000, which would give us a little over 22,000 in each of the ridings. In attending farmers' institutes, and I have attended a great many in the last five years, I did not attend a single one in any riding that was not all in one county. In these institutes I have often heard the remark made, how pleasant it was when the people in one county could all meet together and discuss matters of common interest. Now, I am thoroughly in accord with what the hon. member for North Simcoe said, when he said:

"I am quite willing, if that is the opinion of the majority of the committee, that we should adopt as the political unit these counties which are carved out in the Act of Confederation, but I do not think it is the more convenient division, and do not believe it will be so easily managed as if we went back to the old county lines. Remember, Sir, that before Confederation the county lines of Ontario were just as sacred, just as inviolate, just as undisturbed as they were in the Maritime Provinces."

In some of the outlying parts of the Province of Ontario the county lines could not be so well established; but as soon as they came to be thickly populated they have never been disturbed, except in the one instance I have stated. Then, we have the word of the hon. Minister of Justice that if the proposed system were adopted it would give to the Reform party from 12 to 20 seats, and he said that the Conservatives could take it up and make perhaps one of the most shameful gerrymanders which could ever be made, and which might give the Conservatives 20 seats. This is not the spirit in which the amendment to the Bill has been proposed. The spirit in which it has been proposed is that it will place the Government, whichever party may be in power, in a position to do as nearly justice as possible. If the Minister spoke the honest sentiments of his breast, he showed that the Bill was not for the purpose of doing justice to the Province of Ontario, else why gerrymander in favour of either one party or the other? I hold that there is no other system than that proposed by my hon. friend from Bothwell that will afford the same opportunity of making an equal distribution of population and also an equal distribution of area. The hon. Minister of Justice said that every man was at full liberty to exercise his own judgment and vote for or against the Government; but this statement was very different from that made by the hon. Minister of Railways when he complained that the supporters of the Government had found fault with them, and said that they rather deserved the thanks of their supporters than their fault-finding. His sentiment was that the supporters of the Government ought by all means to follow the Government in whatever measure they might bring before the House. Now, the rights and liberties of the people are based on a proper system of representation, especially in new countries, where the foundations of a great nationality are about being laid. The proper basis of representation has not yet been adopted by the Dominion Government for readjusting the constituencies every ten years, and no system can do full justice to the people that is not framed without any idea of advantage to one political party or the other. The committee which was originally proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition, formed from both sides of the House, and on which the Government would of course have a majority, I have not the least doubt, would if appointed have approached this question with the intention of doing justice and laying the foundations of our representative system in such a manner that very little change would have been necessary perhaps for two or three decades to come. I believe that that would be the result of such a system as is now followed. Let me say that no individual in Canada had such an opportunity of making a name for himself for honour, honesty and justice, as the Minister of Justice has had, but I am afraid, on account of the action he has taken with respect to this measure, he has lost the opportunity, and his name will be handed down to posterity in a manner not very much to his credit. Let me say that I believe the people in the western part of Ontario are with us, both the Reformers and the better thinking portion of the Conservatives, because the more honourable portion of the Conservative party ask no advantage in a general election. What they ask is a fair division and a fair fight upon a just basis, but it is impossible with the country gerrymandered as it has been since 1882, that the people obtain a fair expression of their views. Look at many of the constituencies. Just go into the County of Huron where we are put into three ridings; go into the County of Perth where we are put into two ridings; go into many of the other counties, and you will see it is impossible that justice can be done as long as this system continues. There is not the least doubt but that the gerrymander was done in the first place for the purpose of hiving the Grits and giving the Conservatives an advantage. I hope the Government will take the first step of doing justice in the Dominion with respect to the representation in this House. I hope they will take the first step of bringing back to Canada the good name she ought to have, and clear her of the disgrace of being what she now is, a by-word among the nations for political immorality in almost every respect. Le me say to the Government that I hope they will yet reconsider this measure, and will take up some scheme that will do justice to the people. Talk about the amount of labour that would be required in the Province of Ontario to make a redistribution of seventy or eighty ridings, when we consider the principles at stake, when we consider that we will be laying the foundation of a proper system of representation in a young country like Canada, with all its capabilities and advantages, what signifies the spending of one month to accomplish this, should it even take that time, but I believe a proper redistribution could be made in less than half that time. I am convinced that if the Government would take up a proper measure and set to work on it at present, they would complete it before this debate will cease. We were told, in the first instance, by the Minister of Railways that he was prepared to defend the Bill in all its parts when it came before the committee, but we have been told since that the Government are prepared to consider any change that may be proposed, but that promise came only after, not only the independent members of this House, not only many of the independent Conservatives in the country, but after the different denominations throughout the country had expressed their opinion of this gerrymander.

Mr. HUGHES. No union of church and state.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see that the Methodists, at their late convention, condemned the shameful gerrymandering that has taken place in the House of Commons; I see that it has been denounced by the Baptists, and I see that it was referred to at the Presbyterian meeting also; and I believe that these assemblies stand a great deal higher than my hon. friend to my left who has just been scoffing at them. I believe their opinion is worth more than his, and when they take the question up, depend upon it their views will have effect among the people. I hope the Government will see the necessity of giving a proper measure of justice to the people of this Dominion by amending their Bill so as to meet the views expressed by the mover of this amendment.

Mr. BOWMAN. It is very seldom I trouble the House with any observations, but the question now under discussion is such an important one that I feel impelled briefly to give my views with regard to it. The representation of the people in Parliament is one of the most important questions we can discuss, because a fair and equitable representation of the people lies at the foundation of all good government. If the people are not fairly and equitably represented in this House we cannot expect that their views will be fairly carried out. Now, this question of representation is one which has occupied the attention of the people in all countries, where constitutional government exists, to a very large extent. The battle of representation has been fought out in England for a great many years. It has been fought out in the United States, and here in Canada we have had it discussed and fought out in various phases from time to time. Many years ago, as most of us remember, the question of representation by population was the leading issue in Canada. When Confederation was adopted, we imagined that question was settled for all time to come, and settled on a fair and equitable basis; but since then the party which is in power to-day has undertaken to revise the representation then adopted, and to revise it in a manner which, in my judgment, has not been in the interests of the people. Representation by population is admitted by both sides of the House to be the basis on which we ought to work, but in the present instance that principle is entirely ignored, and it was ignored to a much greater extent by the Bill which was forced through in 1882. It is admitted by almost every one in this House to-day that the gerrymander of 1882 was one of the most outrageously bad measures ever forced through any Parliament. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), who poses as an independent member, admitted the other evening that the Redistribution Bill of 1882 did not reflect any credit upon the Parliament which passed it. In expressing that opinion, I think he gave utterance to a sentiment which was correct. He might have gone further, and characterized that measure in much stronger terms, but the most astonishing part of that hon. gentleman's speech, in my opinion, is this, that while he condemns the Redistribution Bill of 1882, while he characterizes it as being no credit to the Parliament which passed it, he at the same time refuses to lend his influence to rectifying the great wrong then perpetrated. He told us quite correctly that the territory in which that gerrymander was perpetrated to the greatest extent is the western section of Ontario. Now, it so happens that this measure of redistribution, now before us, attacks again the western section of Ontario more extensively than any other section of the Dominion, or at all events, any other section of the Province of Ontario, and I think the reason why that is done is not far to seek. It seems to me that the reason why the gerrymander of 1882 was made applicable principally to the western section of Ontario, and the reason why this Bill again changes the representation of that section, is because the Reform element is stronger there than in any other section of that province or of the Dominion. The plea which is set up by the Government for interfering with the representation in the western section of Ontario as they are doing, is that it is necessary to rectify the representation so as to get back more nearly to representation according to population. They profess that the object which they have in view is to rectify the inequalities which exist as between the different ridings or counties. If we examine that argument, I think we shall find that it is a mere pretense, and it seems to me that the members of the Government who put forward that argument cannot be sincere in what they say. Nearly all the changes which are made by this Bill are made in one particular section of the Province of Ontario, and when you examine the population of the ridings which are to be affected, you find the inequality is not nearly as great as in some other sections. We find that the County of Welland which it is proposed to disturb, contains at present just about the proper number, 23,396. Lincoln has 22,281. North Norfolk, 19,400, so we have at least three ridings which are to be disturbed which have just about the right number. Then it is true that there are six other ridings which are going to be changed, the population of which is considerably less than the required number. They are Monck, Haldimand, Wentworth North, Wentworth South, Norfolk South, Brant North. It is singular, if these hon. gentlemen are sincere in their professions, in the proposal they are putting forward, that their object is to equalize the population between the different ridings, that in the section of the province east of the city of Toronto we find a much larger number of constituencies whose population is much below the average, but these they do not propose to disturb. If these gentlemen are so anxious to rectify the inequalities in the population between the different constituencies, I think they will do well to turn their attention to some of the following. For instance, we find Brockville represented by a Conservative, with a population of 15,855, much below the proper number. Then Cardwell, which is west of Toronto, has 15,382. East Durham, represented by a Conservative, has 17,053. Frontenac has 13,445. Grenville South has 12,931, which is about half the requisite number. East Hastings has 18,053. Leeds and Grenville has 13,523. Lennox has 14,902. West Northumberland has 14,947. Peterborough East has 15,908, and North Victoria has 16,849. So that here we have no less than 13 constituencies whose population is as low and many of them much less than the constituencies they are about to disturb in the western section of the province. It seems to me that the pretense they are putting forward to justify this measure of redistribution,

that it is the equalization of the population, does not rest upon a proper foundation. It would be much more satisfactory if hon. gentlemen opposite could have seen their way to accept the proposal which came from this side of the House to have a conference and settle the boundaries of the constituencies so as to be satisfactory to both sides, because it matters not which party is in power, if either political party is allowed to readjust every ten years the constituencies in its own interest, it can keep itself almost interminably in power. The fair and proper way to readjust the representation of the people would be to have a conference between the two great political parties and adjust it so as to be satisfactory to both sides. I think it is a very dangerous principle to ignore county boundaries, and the proposal contained in the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is that county boundaries should in all cases be observed. It seems to me that a much fairer and more equitable system of representation could be devised and mapped out under that system than under the haphazard system which was adopted in 1872 and carried in 1882. At all events, if we were to preserve county boundaries, such outrageous abuses and iniquities as we had in 1882 could not be perpetrated. For instance, the township of North Easthope could not have been taken out of the County of Perth—a township which lies on the outskirts of the city of Stratford—and gerrymandered into the County of Oxford. Anomalies of this kind could not be perpetrated under that system. Another proposal, which I think deserves fair and candid consideration, is to take the arranging of the constituencies out of the hands of Parliament altogether and place it in the hands of an independent tribunal. That is the practice in England, and it seems to me that is the only plan by which you would get a fair and impartial representation. One hon. gentleman—I think the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon)—tried to argue the other evening that it would be difficult to get such an independent tribunal. I think that, if we were to select some of our higher court judges, we could find men among them who would make a fair distribution and settle the matter to the satisfaction of both parties. At all events, they could not be charged with doing their work for partisan purposes. Some hon. gentlemen tried to justify this gerrymander as well as the gerrymander of 1882 by endeavouring to show that the Reform party in the Province of Ontario under the leadership of the Hon. Oliver Mowat have done the same thing. They tried, unsuccessfully, to show that the same thing had been done for the local representation in the Province of Ontario. It is astonishing what statements are made by some hon. gentlemen in order to establish this notion. If they could only prove that the Reformers had done the same thing in the Province of Ontario, that, in the opinion of some hon. gentlemen, would be a sufficient justification to do it here. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) argued the other night on this line, and tried to show that the Reform party in Ontario had perpetrated a gerrymander which was just as bad as that which had been perpetrated by the Conservative party for Dominion purposes. Among other counties he referred to Waterloo, and tried to show that Mr. Mowat and his colleagues had gerrymandered the County of Waterloo in order to gain a partisan purpose. Now, I beg to inform the hon. member for North Victoria that he is entirely mistaken. The boundaries between the north and south ridings of Waterloo were fixed by the old Canadian Parliament in 1853, and they have never been changed since, either for Dominion or local purposes. Immediately after Confederation that boundary was adopted and it has never been changed. Now, in order to show you to what length some of those hon. gentlemen will go in order to fasten the idea of a gerrymander upon the Reformers of the Province of Ontario, the hon. member for North Victoria, among other things, said:

"Hon. gentlemen can also see the fantastic shape of South Waterloo. That the House may properly appreciate how South Waterloo is doctored up and to what extreme these purists of the Liberal party will go to gerrymander a county, I shall read you a description of the County of Waterloo from the Revised Statutes of Ontario."

Then, after reading a description of the division line, he said:

"You will notice that lots 49 and 52, as well as other lots which happened to be occupied by Tories, are omitted so as to make the gerrymander complete."

Now, I turned up the voters' list for the township of Waterloo to see who lived on lots 49 and 52. Where this hon. gentleman got his information, I do not know; but I find that those lots are occupied chiefly by Reformers. On lot 49 is Abraham Cressman, who is one of the strongest Reformers and best supporter I have got. It is also occupied by Fred. Grischow, by A. E. Shantz, and every body knows that a Shantz cannot be a Tory. It is also occupied by Wendel E. Shantz. Each of these three farmers is a pronounced Reformer, and has never been anything else. Then lot 52 is occupied by Mr. Israel Snider, and by Isaiah Snider. There are about 200 Sniders in the County of Waterloo, and not one of them a Tory. Then there is Mr. A. B. Shantz and Mr. Isaac S. Webber, all Reformers, so that these two lots which the member for North Victoria claimed were left out of South Waterloo, because they were occupied by Tories, are occupied by Reformers, and there is not a single Tory upon them. This is a fair sample of the statements which are made by hon. gentlemen opposite in order to convey the idea that a gerrymander was prepetrated by the Reformers in Ontario. Now, it seems to me too bad that we cannot settle this question of representation upon a fair and equitable basis. I think if the Government were actuated by a proper desire to give a just representation, they would receive suggestions from this side of the House and abandon the Bill which they have placed before us.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Bowman), with many other hon. members opposite, has done me the honour to refer to a speech I made last week on this question, to endeavour to convince me that my position was an unsound one. I would not have risen to-night to speak were it not that my speech then has been so often referred to, and most unfairly referred to, in the subsequent debate. But I must do the hon. gentleman from North Waterloo the justice to say that he is the first of the hon. members on the left of the Chairman who have undertaken to state what I said, and who has had the courtesy to use the very words that I used. It does not seem to me that the position I took in the debate the other

night is one that should subject a member to the criticisms that have been heaped upon me. I say this not by way of complaint; I am used to party fighting; but in my brief remarks I did express the opinion, and to that opinion, after all the lecturing I have received from hon. gentlemen opposite. I now strictly adhere, namely, that after a study of the map, and with the details of the Act of 1882 before me, having taken pains to discover what were the shapes of the constituencies at Confederation, what were the shapes of the constituencies in the Act of 1872, what alterations had been made in the boundaries of the electoral districts by the Act of 1882, having found that there was a great deal of difficulty in discovering where the townships had been scattered by the Act of 1882, I was led to the belief that that Act reflected little credit on the Parliament that passed it: partly for the reason—and I said very little about the reason—that it seemed to me an attempt of the party then in power to gain political advantage over their opponents by an Act of Parliament, and partly for the very grave reason that the boundaries of a great number of constituencies had been materially altered thereby, and an enormous amount of disturbance and confusion had taken place. I referred then, and I refer again now, I endorsed then and I endorse again now, the argument made by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in favour of the continuity of the boundaries in the electoral districts. For my part I care very little for the counties of Ontario, but I do care for the maintenance, as far as they can be maintained, of the boundaries of the old electoral districts. I say now that in some 80 odd constituencies of the Province of Ontario which had been created by the Act of the Imperial Parliament, which had fixed the boundaries within which the electors had voted in 1867, and again almost without change in 1872, and absolutely without change in 1874, and absolutely again without change in 1878, interests had arisen by reason of those four elections which were disturbed by the Act of 1882 to the very great prejudice of the country. I say to-night that for these reasons, largely the first and also largely for the second, the Act of 1882 was, in my judgment, an unwise Act. Then hon. gentlemen say that if the Act was unwise and did not reflect credit on Parliament, why not repeal the Act? I will give my answer. I desire to repeat it for the benefit of some hon. member who may not have heard what I said, or who may have read an incorrect or garbled report of it—I do not apply this remark to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, but to other hon. members who addressed the House in the early part of this debate. My answer is this: That if we undertook in this Parliament to repeal absolutely the Act of 1882, and to go back to the electoral districts with the boundaries they had in 1867 and 1872, we would bring about an enormous number of changes in Ontario, a great deal of confusion, and we would tear up by the roots constituencies and their boundaries, merely for the purpose of equalizing constituencies in which three elections have been held, namely, in 1882, 1887 and 1891. I pointed out then, and I think it was very material to my argument, at all events it influenced my mind, and I cannot complain if hon. gentlemen opposite challenge the sincerity or genuineness of my convictions, for we must accept that accusation, but it is not material to the argument if the motives of the speaker are challenged—that in that portion of Ontario which I described the other night, which lies west of a line drawn between York and Peel and projected northward to Georgian Bay you find exactly one-half of the population of that great province, you find from that part of the country 46 members returned to this House, and by adding the figures as I stated them, and I took them from the returns (in Bothwell, for example, where there was a three-cornered fight, I placed the majority at 500 or 600) and the voting power of the Liberal electors as compared with the voting power of Conservatives in the western half of the province was very much less than their voting power in this Chamber. That is to say, that if the Liberals in the western half of Ontario were suffering from a gerrymander to-day or suffered from a gerrymander at the last election, it would have expressed itself in this way, that, relatively to their voting power in the country, their numbers in this House would be small, while practically the opposite is true. In the south-western part of the province, having half the population, sending half the members from the province here, having regard to the voting power of the two parties—and I should like to go into details with any hon. gentleman who challenges my statement—the Liberals would naturally return 24 members instead of 26 as is the case at the present time. So they have members here in excess of their voting power. Therefore whatever may have been the aim of the gerrymander, and however wrong its object may have been, the Liberals are not suffering from it to-day. Let us, therefore, put an end to this decennial unrest and adopt a fixed basis for such legislation and make the measure now before the committee as fair a one as is within our power.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How about East Ontario? There was gerrymandering in the east too.

Mr. WELDON. I was speaking of the western portion of the province, for the reason that more serious disturbances occurred in the west than in the east, and the disturbances complained of principally, such as in the Brants, Wentworths and Oxfords, were in the west.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Nothing was worse than Lanark.

Mr. WELDON. I am not speaking of single instances.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say——

Mr. WELDON. I will not bandy words with the hon. member for North Wellington for I am reminded of the Spanish proverb: "It is a waste of soap to scrub an ass' head with it." I was going on to say that in speaking the other night I should have liked to have presented the views I hold as to the principles which should govern a Parliament in enacting a Redistribution Bill. The House in the main agreed upon those principles. A large number of hon. members have stated that in their judgment the cities of the country should be under-represented. In that position I agree with them, partly for the reason given by the Minister of Justice, partly for the reason given by the leader of the Opposition, and still more largely for these reasons, that the cities by reason of the daily newspapers published there influence the political thinking of the people, by reason of the influence of their wholesale merchants and banking institutions and

universities the opinions and feelings of the cities are projected upon the country outside, so that the cities, independent of their representatives, have an enormous influence upon political opinion in the country. I also believe that in this country, wherever it is possible, we should fully, or even over, represent large and sparsely settled districts where the population is growing rapidly. I also believe in this principle, that, other things being equal, we should have regard to the equalization of population. I also believe in this principle, and this seems to be the most important principle of all, that there is great wisdom in leaving things alone, there is great advantage in preserving the historical continuity of electoral districts. Hon. gentlemen may tell me that while these principles are all true and sound the difficulty is putting them into practice; that if you undertake to carry out the principle of leaving things alone and preserve unbroken the boundaries of old electoral districts and at the same time equalize the population you will find you are trying to introduce two antagonistic principles. The difficulty resembles that of two engines on one track running against each other—you must decide which shall be the controlling principle. A great deal of difficulty in connection with this discussion has arisen at this juncture—I do not complain of the criticism that has been indulged in with few exceptions—but hon. gentlemen who have discussed the question fairly will agree with me that the difficulty lies in deciding which shall be the controlling principle. Under the colour of equalizing the population you can do a cruel and unjust wrong to your opponent, and therefore I express my own opinion in the strongest way, that the controlling principle, and these principles may some time be in open conflict, should be to leave things alone and preserve the boundaries first. When I declare these principles I take the responsibility of what I declare, and if these principles are largely departed from, then it seems to me to be our duty in committee to bring such criticism to bear as will lead to the Bill being amended. I think the Minister of Public Works made a very fair statement when he invited criticism on the details of the Bill. I am glad to have this opportunity of stating what I deem to be the most important of all the principles that should be adopted by this Parliament, that is to leave things alone as far as possible. But you cannot make a good Redistribution Bill by following slavishly any one principle, you must adopt 2, 3, 4 or 5 principles. At the same time I dissent in the strongest possible way from the leader of the Opposition in the view he propounded, for I think he presented a false principle. The principle declared by the hon. leader of the Opposition does not conform to the usage of the mother country, namely, that you must so redistribute the provinces as to preserve the balance between the parties. You cannot do that. No Act of the British Parliament has ever recognized parties; the British statutes do not know anything about such things as parties. Therefore, when the leader of the Opposition took that position he took what in my judgment is an entirely unsound position, and in doing so he put himself in conflict with his colleagues for Bothwell, Queen's (P.E.I.) and Brant. I wish to say that I repudiate that as a false principle. The hon.

Mr. WELDON.

gentlemen know that in the British Reform Bills to which they wish us to look, and very properly, for light and guidance, no such principle controlled. They know that the Reform Bill of 1832 was so far from preserving the balance of parties that it dished the Tories and enthroned the Whigs, who for half a century have been in power. The great measure to which he directed us works dead against his controlling principle. I entirely disagree with the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe, except in one or two points. I would not have spoken again were it not that my position had been misstated by some hon. members, and misunderstood by a number of others, whom I have always found to be very fair and courteous in discussion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would not trouble the committee either were it not that an hon. gentleman with so logical a mind as my hon. friend who has just taken his seat must see where his own argument lands him. His argument is similar to that made by the hon. Minister of Justice that there should be no changes made in electoral divisions. But does not the hon. gentleman see that he is defending a Bill which is doing the very thing he says ought not to be done? If the hon. gentleman's argument means anything at all, it means that there are twenty-five changes in the Province of Quebec, and twenty-one in the Province of Ontario that should be wiped out of the Bill. If he means to say that the electoral divisions should be retained, I could understand his laying that down as a prevailing principle; but I do not agree with it, because it would leave unremedied the wrongs done in 1882. But if he takes that position does he not see that it is the same as that taken in an amendment which was voted upon the other night, that the readjustment should be confined to those provinces where the census rendered it necessary?

Mr. WELDON. I said that we should be careful not to run one principle into the ground, but that we must deal with districts where there are ten or twelve thousand people without a representative here, and also with places like Toronto which are under-represented.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We could do that without disturbing bounds at all. There could be a union of two small counties to make the representation which the hon. gentleman wants; and he is logically bound by his own principle—not holding him slavishly to it, but looking at it in a fair and reasonable way—to wipe out almost the whole of this Bill. Where I differ from him is in believing that regard should be had to the old county lines. The hon. gentleman will see the force of this more clearly when I point out, as he himself did, that from 1867 to 1882 the county lines were very little disturbed. They were disturbed seriously in 1882. The hon. gentleman regrets that; but as they were he says that it is better not to disturb them again. If there was any force in this argument it would consist in this: The disturbance of electoral bounds in 1882 was wrong, but though it was wrong, we shall be doing another wrong if we disturb them again. Logically, then, he believes that it would have been better if they had not been disturbed in 1882 at all. If that be the case, he is absolutely shut up to utterly condemn any disturbance of the electoral bounds in the Pro-

vince of Quebec which have not been disturbed before. That is where his argument inevitably brings him. I need not go any further than I did the other night to show where I differ from the hon. gentleman in regard to interfering with the bounds in Ontario. I pointed out that a gross iniquity was perpetrated there, and that there was a feeling of bitterness in the breasts of the people of Ontario, and that they were not yet reconciled to that measure to this day, and I held that you could not do right by not remedying the wrong then done, but aggravating it and carrying it still further in the same direction. As the hon. gentleman has offered his assistance to have any wrong remedied which might be pointed out to him, I would suggest that, when he made the division of the Province of Ontario by a line between the County of York and the County of Peel, and when he saw that the population of western Ontario was as he alleges represented according to the political views of the people, he should have looked to see how the eastern portion of the province is represented. There he would have seen great discrepancies. He would have seen that there was scarcely any Liberal representation in comparison with the popular vote cast. I would point out, if he has forgotten it, that there were as iniquitous attempts made to gerrymander some of the very few ridings which the Liberals carried in the eastern part of Ontario. If I remember rightly, in 1882, east of Toronto, there were only four or five seats held by Liberals out of 30, though the popular Liberal vote was very little short of the aggregate Conservative vote. Notwithstanding that, our opponents went into the County of Lanark, where we had one Liberal member, and added to North Lanark two townships taken out of Carleton in order to make North Lanark Conservative, knowing that Carleton would still be safe without them. When that Bill was in committee, the people who were being put into Lanark from the townships of Carleton resented being taken from their county and put into another. They were not far from the capital, and rumours reached the ears of the Government that it was not safe; it was rumoured that even with that iniquity perpetrated, it was doubtful whether they could carry North Lanark, so indignant were the people, and so we saw the strange scene of one of the two Conservative townships taken back and put into Carleton and a larger one taken from Carleton and put into Lanark to make a more sure thing of that attempted iniquity. The scheme succeeded, and from that day to this the Government have held that riding by virtue of that gerrymander. If hon. gentlemen opposite should point out that they have a Conservative majority there now without the added townships it may be because the Liberals have felt that they were fighting a battle impossible to win. In the County of Brockville there was a Conservative township put there, if I remember aright, and so it has been in a few of the counties east. And when the hon. gentleman talks of the representation in western Ontario, he should note how small the representation is in Parliament in comparison with the numbers in the eastern part of Ontario. When you remember that there was a gross attempt made in the few counties held by Liberals to make them Conservative, he must see more and more the iniquity done in 1882; and I ask the hon. gentleman how he can say it would be better to base representation upon the iniquity then done, augmented as it is by this Bill, rather than go back to the state of things that existed before with which the people of this country were satisfied, with which all who believe in a fair, manly and open fight were satisfied, and adjusting the representation of the counties within county lines as they have existed since Confederation. This is the point, and this is where I differ with the hon. gentleman. I think his logical mind must see from the position he has himself laid down, even his own position of not departing from the electoral lines as now formed, that he is estopped from supporting this Bill in any one of the changes proposed in the Province of Quebec and also, to a large extent, those in Ontario. He might perhaps say that the city of Montreal should have another member or two, but I think the hon. gentleman himself, who has given this matter some serious consideration, could find one or two counties in Quebec which could be united without the feelings of the people being injured thereby, without dismembering the counties, forming new ones of such shapes as those help up for the inspection of the House by the gentlemen who had taken the trouble to prepare them not long ago. I have only to point this out to the hon. gentleman to show him that the Opposition have reason to expect they will receive his active aid and support, judging by the principles he has laid down himself, in combating this Bill and trying to get a measure more consonant with all that is just and fair.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. member for South Brant tell us what the popular vote is, and how it is divided between the parties in eastern Ontario?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I cannot give you the exact figures. I was speaking with reference to what it was in 1882, when, according to my recollection, it was very little different, but the proportion of representation was very much different. I would have asked the hon. member for Albert that question when he was speaking but I did not like to interrupt him, I dare say he has gone into the matter himself and may have the figures. If so I would ask him to say what, in 1882, were the figures?

Mr. McMULLEN. I just desire to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). When I addressed the House on this question on the occasion referred to, I drew its attention to the course that had been taken by the hon. member for Albert since he became a member of this House. I drew attention to his desire to make an outward show of the spirit of fairness, and showed how on all occasions he managed to get up a sufficient argument to enable him to side with the Government and give them his unswerving support. I criticised the division he had made of the Province of Ontario and the manner in which he had tried to persuade the House that he felt justified in saying we should leave the constituencies in Ontario, which were gerrymandered in 1882, as they are, simply because he wanted to maintain things in their present position least any further changes might be considered inconvenient. Now, he applied his argument to the western section of Ontario, and stated that we have on this side from that section 26 representatives while in reality we

are only entitled to 23, but he did not follow his argument out to the eastern portion of Ontario. I dare say when he commenced to examine into the number of Reformers in the eastern portion of Ontario, he found that his argument would not suit the object he had in view, and consequently he dropped that portion. No doubt the hon. gentleman felt a little sore after the carding I gave him, and to-night when I interrupted him he gave a very uncourteous and unparliamentary reference to myself.

Mr. WALLACE. What was it ?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, he made a very uncourteous and unparliamentary reference to myself, a reference such as would not be indulged in by any gentleman on that side or on this side with reference to another gentleman unless he were a half-cured lunatic. I shall take another opportunity of giving the hon. gentleman the dressing down he deserves.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This is the proper time to refer to the argument advanced on several occasions, not only by members of the Government but by their supporters, with regard to the advisability of maintaining in force the gerrymander created in 1882. The only argument I have heard presented to this committee to sustain the idea that the gerrymander of 1882 ought not to be interfered with is based on the assumption that an injustice would be done to the various counties and constituencies which were gerrymandered then if the lines were now rearranged according to county boundaries. That was the argument which was made use of by the Minister of Justice, and it is the argument which is being used by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and by a large number of members supporting the Government, who have concluded that although they cannot possibly justify the gerrymander of 1882, still no change should now be made because the people have been voting under it for ten years. They argue that we ought not now to right that injustice and go back to county lines, because the people have become accustomed to work together in the gerrymandered counties. Now, Mr. Chairman, I contend there is no foundation for that statement whatever, and I will give this committee, and the Minister of Justice, and the hon. member for Albert, positive proof that they can have no foundation for that argument at all. In 1882, when the County of Brant was gerrymandered, I was elected to represent the north riding, and that county, as at present constituted, is composed of the township of Ancaster, which was taken out of the County of Wentworth in order that South Wentworth might be enabled to return a Conservative representative to this House, the townships of East Brantford and South Dumfries, and the township of Blenheim, from the County of Oxford. The result of that was that the people in the township of Ancaster, which was largely a Reform township, were taken by force from their old associations with the County of Wentworth. The electors of Ancaster, who had been accustomed to associate with the electors of other portions of the County of Wentworth in all their transactions, men who had been accustomed to meet together in counsel to arrange county matters, men who had been accustomed to meet together in county councils, as representatives of the various townships of the county, to elect their representatives and attend to all matters and business of that kind, men who had been accustomed to meet together in social gatherings, agricultural gatherings, at farmers' institutes, and to discuss questions of importance to that section of the community—all these ties that bound these men together were broken asunder, and from that day to this it has been impossible to unite the township of Ancaster with the other portions of the electoral districts of North Brant in this regard. The same statement may be made with regard to the township of East Brantford and the township of South Dumfries which form part of the north riding of Brant. There people have nothing in common with the people of the township of Ancaster, which ought to be a part of the County of Wentworth, and is part of the County of Wentworth for judicial and municipal purposes. They are as far apart as it is possible for men to be from one another. Take the township of Blenheim which forms another portion of the north riding of Brant. Three counties were cut up in order that a hive might be formed in that constituency where the Grits could be kept together. We have the township of Blenheim belonging to the County of Oxford, we have South Dumfries and East Brantford belonging to the County of Brant. The townships of East Brantford and South Dumfries have all their connections with the County of Brant, and their county council meets in the city of Brantford, while the people of Ancaster have their council meeting in the city of Hamilton. When we go further west, we have the township of Blenheim taken from the north riding of Oxford and placed in North Brant, the result of which is that the farmers and others in the township of Blenheim have nothing to bind them to the people of Ancaster or East Brantford or South Dumfries. They have a county council which meets in Woodstock, and they have no connection whatever with the people of any other section of the gerrymandered riding of North Brant. The argument of the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), which was also dwelt upon by the Minister of Justice the other night, has no foundation whatever in reference to the north riding of Brant. The Minister of Justice talked the other night about the men in these gerrymandered constituencies having associated together, having met on the streets and talked about the politics of the day. Nothing of that kind can take place in North Brant, because the market town of the western portion of the riding is the town of Woodstock, the market town of the centre portion is the city of Brantford, and for the eastern portion it is the city of Hamilton and the town of Dundas. These men can never be associated together. If this gerrymander is kept up for a hundred years, they will never have community of interests in that riding. To add to the iniquity, it is now proposed to take another township, the township of Beverley, from North Wentworth, a township which gives a Reform majority of from 250 to 350, and to place that in North Brant to swell the Reform majority there. The Reform majority there was 1,116, and they have now added 300 more Liberal votes to that riding, and dissociated the people of Beverley from those with whom they have been connected for 40 years or more. The market towns of that township are Dundas and Galt, and the city of Hamilton. What have those people to do with the other portions of the north riding of Brant? They never can be assimilated

together, and this is only a fair specimen of the injustice which is being done in the gerrymandering of these constituencies. In educational matters it is the same. In North Oxford they have a superintendent of education who has jurisdiction over all the schools in the township of Blenheim. In the centre they have one who has jurisdiction over all the schools there, and in the eastern part they have another inspector of schools who has jurisdiction over all the schools in that section of the riding. The Minister of Justice declared that it was necessary that these men should be kept together because they were put in that position ten years ago. They are no nearer now than they were ten years ago. I can say truthfully and without fear of contradiction that the electors of North Brant never meet together except just previous to a general election, when they meet somewhere in the centre of the riding in order to get some sort of organization to hold the party together, but in other matters they are now as far apart as they were before the gerrymander of 1882, and they will continue to be that far apart because it is utterly impossible to have a community of interests in a constituency of that kind. I am speaking of my own riding, but I have no doubt there are other gentlemen representing hives and gerrymandered constituencies—because they were 54 of them gerrymandered—who could tell the same tale as to community of interests growing up in these constituencies. There is no truth in that argument and it will not stand ventilation either here or in the constituencies so cut up. I would like to see the Minister of Justice going into the north riding of Brant and standing either in the township of Ancaster or in South Dumfries or in East Brantford or in this new portion now to be added and making that statement even if every man in his audience were Conservative. He knows that he could not convince the electors in any one of those townships that it would be possible in a hundred years to establish a community of interest in that constituency. It was a great injustice to these people to put them in that position and if the Government desired to do justice to the people of western Ontario, they would return to the old county boundaries which were kept up for 40 or 50 years, and which resulted in the people there being bound together by every tie that unites people in carrying on their municipal affairs and every other matter in which they are associated. The argument of the Minister of Justice, the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), and every other man as to the principle which guides them in passing this Gerrymander Act, is unsound. It is no defence that because, in 1882, the Gerrymander Bill was passed, and these new lines were formed and these new alliances were set up, this should be continued. If justice is done, this iniquity should be wiped out, and the old county lines should be re-established, so that the people might act together as they would, and should not be pulled apart as they are in these gerrymandered constituencies, and prevented from having the intercourse they ought to have, not only in regard to Dominion politics, but in regard to every other matter which tends to the welfare and happiness of the people who reside in these constituencies. I say there is no justice in this Bill as far as the gerrymandered constituencies are concerned, and the only justice that can be done to western Ontario is to repeal the gerrymander of 1882 and return to the old county boundaries as indicated by the resolution proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). In this matter, as has been said, we ought, as a Parliament, to rise above party prejudices and a desire for party advantage, and no man who sits on the Government benches to-day and supports the Government which is trying to force this measure through Parliament, can claim that he is acting in an unprejudiced and fair way, or in an honourable manner in dealing with his opponents in trying to pass this legislation. I hope the Government will yet reconsider this matter, and for once during their career of 14 years act fairly by their opponents. They have, in many ways, secured advantages over the Liberals, and I say that no British Minister would stoop to do the things that have been done by members sitting upon the Treasury benches in order to keep themselves in power.

Mr. BOYLE. I do not rise to help play the game of obstruction, which seems to be the policy adopted just now by the Opposition. I cannot help but be surprised at some of the arguments presented since the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell was submitted to the House. Prior to that amendement objections were taken to this Bill; now hon. gentlemen appear to have dropped that line, and they are now asking the Government to undo what they call the mischief caused by the Act of 1882. The speakers who addressed the House last evening, and those who have spoken thus far on the Opposition side this evening, have all taken that line: they have apparently dropped their objections to the Bill as regards Ontario, and they ask that the mischief be undone which was done in 1882. Well, Sir, some two or three evenings ago I heard some very substantial arguments presented against this course, I think that no less than 60 good, solid objections were presented by members of the Opposition against any such step being taken. They were presented in this form. The member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) moved in amendment:

"That the said Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be resolved, that in the opinion of this House the readjustment of the representation of the people in Parliament should, for the present, be confined to those provinces where it is rendered necessary by the recent census."

No less than sixty hon. members of the Opposition voted for the amendment, and in favour of leaving unrepaired the alleged wrong done in Ontario by the Act of 1882.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman forgot the words "for the present" in that resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think that the charge made by the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle) that the Opposition are obstructing legislation, is justified; that hon. gentleman, at all events, is not the one to get up and lecture this House about obstruction, since he has addressed the House four or five times to-day already on this very subject. For those hon. gentlemen to get up and charge us with obstructing legislation in this House, is very unfair indeed. Let them stop their obstruction themselves before they begin to lecture other people about what they should do. Now, I beg you to notice, Mr. Chairman, that there is hardly a member on

the other side of the House who has not condemned the measure that was passed in 1882. It is true that very few hon. gentlemen opposite have, until to-day, spoken much upon this question, but those who have spoken have all condemned that Act of 1882. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) was especially severe. He says it was an unwise measure, it was a measure which reflected no credit upon the party that passed it, that the measure did a great injustice to the people of this country; and yet that hon. gentleman is not man enough to get up in this House and undo the act which he considers a most unjust act, a most unwise measure, and a most discreditable measure to his party. Now, if this measure was as bad as he says it was, would it not be the noble and manly course for him to do, as the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) did, and right the wrong that was then committed? But he says that to do so now would bring about great changes, and that inasmuch as this iniquity has existed for ten years, it would now be unwise to remove it. He says the people in these counties have been associating together in their political contests for the last ten years, and, therefore, although there was a wrong done then, he thinks it would be a greater wrong to undo it now. Now, Mr. Chairman, we know that those people have not been associating together very much. There have only been three occasions since the Act was passed that the people of those particular constituencies have associated together in any way; but on the other hand they have been associating with their former colleagues every year, in their township councils, in their county councils, in their schools and collegiate institutes, in their agricultural associations —in all these ways they have been associating together. Yet the hon. member for Albert, because on only three occasions the people have been brought together for Dominion elections, says it would be unwise to disturb the arrangement made in 1882, which he considers was so unwise. I think his reason is a very poor one indeed; it will not bear discussion at all. He takes great credit to himself, and he refers to the men who have discussed this question thoughtfully, and I suppose he includes himself amongst those who have discussed it thoughtfully. I take it there have been a good many on both sides of the House who have not discussed the Bill thoughtfully. From the hon. member's highly moral and impartial stand-point, from his great legal knowledge and fair judgment on all occasions, by which he judges men's motives and actions in this House, he appears to have decided that some hon. members discussed it thoughtfully and others unthoughtfully. I do not think the hon. gentleman's conduct since he entered this House qualifies him to criticise the motives of hon. members of this House. But I agree with the hon. member for Albert on one point, that the British Parliament cannot recognize parties. I admit that no Parliament in any British colony, except Canada, recognizes party; but the whole object of this Bill is to legislate into this House a lot of Conservative members who cannot get here in any other way. The reason the Minister of Justice does not accept the amendment is that it might be the means of returning 15 or 20 additional Ontario Liberals. Is that not a condition which should be considered and a result that should follow? I agree that party should not be considered, no matter whether this Bill will increase the Reform numbers by 20 or the Conservative numbers by 20. We have nothing to do with that matter; we should do right though the heavens fall. Taking the statistics of hon. gentlemen, it is apparent that although the Reform party in Ontario polled 182,000 votes, while the Conservatives polled 186,000 or 187,000, or in other words a Conservative majority of 4,000 or 5,000, the Conservatives hold 26 more seats than do the Reformers.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the Reformers got seats they could not hold them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Hon. gentlemen opposite try the gerrymander. It is however pretty hard to hold seats against the means employed by hon. gentlemen opposite, against the boodle fund distributed, when $112,000 have been distributed in 18 or 20 counties. In Pontiac to-day the appeal made to the electors is: Vote for Bryson and get something for your county; vote for Bryson and you will not pay the bonus; vote for Murray and you will have to pay the bonus for the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway. I heard the candidate make that statement, and I heard a gentleman read a letter from a prominent member of this Government addressed to the electors of Pontiac asking them to vote for Mr. Bryson, the Conservative candidate, and stating that the interests of their county would be best served by voting for him. It is most deplorable that the politics of this country have got down to such a low ebb. What business is it of the Government as to who becomes the representative of Pontiac? The letter read was from a prominent Minister of the Crown, and it amounted to a huge bribe to the electors. The present Minister of Customs is the Minister who wrote it. It is most degrading that such tactics should be resorted to in order to carry an election. If there had been no money expended on either side, the bye-elections would have been carried by the Reformers; but when such an exhibition is made as that contained in the Toronto *Globe*, in which members of the Conservative party are charged with boodling and having committed perjury and yet dare not open their mouths or take any action, it is apparent that a deplorable state of affairs prevails. I do not wonder at hon. gentlemen opposite carrying the bye-elections; the great wonder is that we elected any member in Quebec. The revelations made speak volumes for the honour, integrity and good faith of the people of that province, who, in spite of the boodle and corrupt means employed by this corrupt Government, were sufficiently manly to resist the temptations offered and vote for the men they considered would best serve them. The great wonder is not that the Government were successful, but that we elected one-half the members we did elect. The same state of things is going on in Ontario. If the committee asked by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) last year had been granted, and an investigation made into section B contract, I have no doubt that revelations would have been made that would have startled the people more than they were startled by the McGreevy scandals. I sometimes wonder how long this state of things is going to prevail. When we find prominent members of the party and the Government charged with boodling, charged with spending $112,000 to corrupt, bribe

and debauch the electors of certain counties, when we find charges made in this House by an hon. member and a committee asked to investigate these charges, and when we find the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Public Works and members of the party voting upon the motion for a committee of investigation, it is a sad state of affairs. But when they find public opinion so strong against them, they emasculate the charges, and make a pretense of sending them to a tribunal of judges selected by themselves. They make their own charges, try their own cases, and bring in their own verdict, and that is the end of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I know that this is perhaps not very palatable to some hon. gentlemen: but strong cases require strong medicines, and members of the Government who are receiving $7,000 or $8,000 a year can swallow a good deal. Now, I think the hon. Minister of Justice gave the true reason why the Government were not in favour of the amendment, when he said:

"The hon. member for Bothwell will realize that when I repeat the observation I made a few moments ago, that in the brief recital we were able to catch of the distribution according to counties as outlined by the hon. gentleman there would be a gain to the Liberal party, according to his redistribution within county lines, of fifteen or twenty members in Ontario."

That is the true reason why he opposes it: he is afraid that doing right by the Province of Ontario would result in a gain to the Liberal party. As I stated before, I do not think that should be taken into consideration at all. We should so adjust the counties that both parties would be fairly represented, and the fact that where to-day the Conservatives have a majority of 4,000 they have 26 more members than the Liberals, is not right and is not in the interest of the country. We should not consider the interests of parties at all, but the interest of the country, and the interest of the country is not being considered when a small majority of votes on one side will return a large majority of members. Now, the hon. Minister of Justice gave another reason why this amendment should not be adopted, that is, that without disturbing county lines they could so readjust the constituencies that they might make a gain of twenty members for the Conservative party. I do not know whether they could or not; but they could not do it unless they perpetrated an outrage on the counties, and violated every principle of honour, and justice, and fair-play; and, moreover, if they undertook to outrage public decency by violating these principles, the effect would come so clearly under the notice of the voters in the counties that it would operate to the detriment of the party guilty of it rather than to their gain. Now, the principle upon which the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell is based is that county lines shall not be disturbed. What would be the result of adopting that principle? It is true, there would have to be considerable changes in Ontario, while in Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and the other provinces, I do not think county lines have ever been disturbed. Ontario would be the only province where very great changes would take place, and those changes could be easily made, so that no undue advantage could accrue to either party. If the Conservative party have a majority of the votes, they should have a majority of the representatives, and *vice versa*, and if the Liberal party have a majority of the votes, they should have a majority of the representatives. But it is not in the interest of the country that either party, having a small majority of the votes, or in some cases a minority, should be able to return a large majority of the representatives; that should not be tolerated by anybody. Now, let us see what would be the chance of a gerrymander such as the hon. Minister of Justice fears if he did adhere to county lines. I find that there would be 19 counties in Ontario in which there would be no division at all, and in which, therefore, no gerrymander in any shape or form could take place. There would be 15 counties in which one division would have to take place, and it would be quite impossible for either party to make any grave gerrymander in those counties, because it would come so immediately under the notice of the electors that it would damage the party perpetrating it rather than benefit them. Then, in eight counties there would be only two divisions, and in these there would be a chance for some little manipulating, but not to any great extent, because the same thing would hold. So that it would pay the party making the division to do it fairly, and in a way that would conduce to the happiness and convenience of the people. Then in only two counties would three divisions have to be made, the Counties of Simcoe and York, where the same rule would apply. I am sorry that the Minister of Justice advanced such a poor excuse as that, and I think he must have been judging others by himself. No other party has perpetrated such an injustice, and, judging from the past, there is nothing we may not expect from these gentlemen. The plan of adhering to the county lines is one that commends itself to every lover of fair-play and justice. I did expect that, after the stand taken by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who are recognized as perhaps two of the ablest men in the Conservative ranks to-day, and certainly two of the men who stand highest in the Province of Ontario among that party for independence and honour, we would have found hon. gentlemen opposite more amenable to reason. Having said so much with reference to that Bill, I want to call the attention of the House and the Government to what I think they should do. I think they should adopt the English system. I see my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) here. He is a great stickler for British precedent and practice, he loves to talk about the glories of England and the times he used to have in the House of Commons when reporting there for some of the newspapers; he is a loyal man, he always speaks up for the old flag, he poses in this House as a constitutional lawyer, one who understands the British constitution better than any man in the House, and he certainly is the last man I would have expected to imitate the lowest and most contemptible feature of the American system rather than the noble and just example set by the English Government. The plan adopted by the British Government, when they redistributed the seats, was a most fair plan. They did not undertake, as these gentlemen have done, to redistribute them in such a way as to deprive their opponents of every chance they could, and stifle the free ex-

pression of opinion of the people. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) said he was responsible for the division in the Province of Quebec. He selected a few of his colleagues, they went into a room by themselves, they locked the door, they spread out a map of the constituencies before them, and they deliberately set to work to arrange the counties so as to politically kill a number of their opponents. Now, Sir, I want to show you a picture of the County of Chambly in the Province of Quebec. You will notice here that a parish is taken out from the very centre of this county and attached to Rouville, and that this parish is twenty-two miles long by four miles wide. What was the object of taking out that parish? I am sure the Minister of Justice never could have examined this map, or he would not have failed to see the iniquity of it. I have another map here which I could venture to say any man could lie down and worship and not break any of the commandments, and that is a map of the County of Laprairie. You will notice its shape, and how many horns there are on it. Then I want to show you a map of the County of Bagot, the like of which is not to be found in the heavens above or the earth beneath. Here is the County of Chateauguay which looks as if it were suffering from spinal disease. I ask you if it is not simply outrageous that such an iniquity should be perpetrated on the people? Had the proper plan been adopted, had we followed British precedent, does any hon. gentleman suppose we would have had such a monstrosity presented to us as this Bill. It is done simply and solely for the purpose of enabling a minority of the electors to return a majority of the representatives. My friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville) referred to South Wentworth. It is the same there as in these other counties. You cannot get from one part of the county to another without going through another county. You have either to go through North Brant or the city of Hamilton or across the bay. Instead of adding East and West Beverley, which adjoin South Wentworth and naturally belong to it, they jump over that and take in another township which forms no part whatever of it, simply because the townships they desire to add give a Conservative majority and thus the majority of the sitting member may be increased from one to 400 or 500. They violate every principle of truth and honour to gain a party advantage. If a commission had been appointed, as I think one ought to have been appointed under the British North America Act, to agree upon the lines upon which we should divide these counties, and if we would adopt the amendment now before the House and revert to the county lines and say that in no instance should they be disturbed, then there could be no grievous gerrymander by either party, then the people who associate together in their churches, their schools, their township councils, their county councils, their agricultural societies, and in every other way in which people mingle together would remain in the associations they have had for years and years past. It seems to me that this is the only fair and proper way to divide a county, but they have adopted the plan they did in 1882 when every principle was violated and some 50 or 60 counties in Ontario were torn and disturbed and detached from their natural affinities and portions of them placed in other counties for party interests. What is the Government to gain by this? Surely, if the Government cannot stand upon its own merits and appeal to the country upon its record without tying the hands of the Opposition behind their backs and hampering them and gerrymandering them out of all proportion, then the Government should go to the wall and should not have the support of the people. But they evidently fear and know that the record they have made for themselves during the last few years has been such as will not meet with the approval of the great electorate of this country, and so they are afraid to appeal to the people on just and fair grounds, but want to steal a party advantage and muzzle the great electorate of this country. The instructions which were given to the commissioners in the old country seem to me to be such as ought to commend themselves to every man who loves fair-play and truth and justice. Their instructions were so precise and were so well defined that the convenience of the people was to be looked after, and the boundaries could not be, as we have them under this Bill, of a very irregular and objectionable character. There was nothing tolerated like that county outline which I have shown under those instructions. The divisions were to be kept as compact as possible. I venture to say that, if you go through the whole work of the commission, you will not find anything so hideous in its shape as the county I have shown. Take the County of Chateauguay. My hon. friend who represents that county would not know it at all. It is not compact, and there is every principle laid down to guide the commissioners in England violated there. Yet I venture to say my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), with all his love for British institutions and British practice, will defend the perpetration of an outrage of that character. I believe that is one of his weaknesses. The instructions given to the English commissioners were very precise with a view of consulting the convenience and the desire of the people. After the commissioners had determined upon the boundaries they did not become law until notice had been given, so that any one who had any objections to make to the Bill was afforded an opportunity of stating them, and having them rectified by the commissioners if the objections were well founded. One of the commissioners was instructed to attend at the place named by advertisement and hear the objections. Now, it seems to me that that is a wise provision. No party ought to break up a county, or to disturb the relations that have existed for so many years between the residents of a county, without good reason, and if sufficient reason can be advanced why these changes should not be made, then it is only right that the desires of the people should be listened to. But in the Bill under consideration no opportunity has been afforded, no notice has been given, no commissioner ever attends to hear objections, and no opportunity is afforded to those so deeply interested, to set forth their objections against the change. Therefore, I think that the instructions given, and the *modus operandi* adopted by the British Government, affords us a precedent which might well be adopted by this Government. I do not see that there is any pressing need for passing this Bill during the present session. It is a time of the year when every member of the House ought to be at home,

and I sincerely hope, either that some modification will be made to this objectionable Bill, or, better still, that the Government will allow it to stand over until next session, when we can take it up again, and fight it out during cold weather. I see no chance of the Government having to go to the country before next session. There will be plenty of time next year in which to deal with this matter. There is a great deal of work yet to do. The Supplementary Estimates have not yet been brought down, and I am told there will be a good many items in those Estimates that will have to receive a good deal of attention from the members of the House. Therefore, I think it would be wise if the Government would allow this Bill to stand over and take it up early next session.

Mr. LOWELL. I would like to offer a few remarks on the Bill now engaging the attention of the House, more especially as it effects the district in which I live, the Niagara Peninsula. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle) a few evenings ago was exceedingly complaisant in his concluding remarks upon this Bill. He stated:

"I would be glad if it could be so arranged that the constituency of Monck, which has existed since Confederation, and which with the exception of two sessions has given an unswerving support to the Conservative party in this House, could be maintained as at present; but, Sir, if in the public interest it is necessary that that constituency should disappear from the representation in this House, and that the townships which now make it up should be divided between my hon. friend from Wentworth, who I am sure is not sorry to receive them, and my hon. friend from Haldimand, and if it should happen in consequence that I shall have to disappear from Parliament, it is a matter of minor consequence to myself."

The hon. gentleman for Monck forgot to mention that the remaining portions of the constituency which he represents to-day, the remaining townships in his constituency, which were graciously given, probably without his consent, to my hon. friend the member for Lincoln and Niagara——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is about the first time this hon. gentleman has spoken in the House, and I hope those hon. members opposite who are old members of the House will appreciate the position and show him the respect they would claim for themselves.

Mr. LOWELL. No apologies are necessary on my account. They will all hear me before I get through. I would like to enquire of the Government why it was necessary to carve up the Niagara Peninsula in the manner they have done? Why did the member for Monck so meekly submit to this carving? From my personal regard for the hon. gentleman I would rather see him taking a bolder stand, and I would have preferred to hear him ask the Government why he should be legislated out of political existence and be ignominiously kicked out of this Parliament. I would like to ask the members of the Government in whose interest they have wiped out this constituency? In the eastern portion of Ontario there are constituencies with 12,000, 13,000, or 14,000 of a population. Why were not some of these ridings doubled up if they wanted to find two more members for Toronto and Algoma? I should like to enquire why the constituency of Monck should be obliterated for the benefit of Haldimand, and for the advantage of the representative of that constituency? Is he a man of greater weight than the hon. member for Monck? He is no better man than the hon. member for Monck. Was Monck wiped out of existence for the purpose of equalizing the population? Under the new arrangement Haldimand and Monck will have a population of 21,474, or 1,326 below the unit, while South Wentworth, with a population of 26,325, will have 3,525 above the unit. This is what the Government calls equalizing the population. As regards the county I have the honour to represent, the population of Welland is 25,131, or 2,331 above the unit. The proposition under this Bill is to add the village of Merritton with a population of 1,813, making the population of the county 26,944, or 4,144 above the unit. The Minister of Justice perhaps desires to compliment me on my ability by giving me such a large constituency to represent. Take the County of Lincoln, the population is 21,806. It is proposed by this Bill to add a portion from the defunct County of Monck, if this Bill carries, the townships of Pelham and Gainsborough. The total population then will be 25,230, or 2,430 above the unit. That is including the township of Niagara, which I observe the Minister of Justice has entirely left out of this Bill. It may be an oversight, but probably the hon. gentleman intends to attach that township to Haldimand in order to bring that constituency up to the unit of population. By the addition, Haldimand would have 519 above the unit, leaving Niagara and Lincoln with 585 above the unit. It would be just as sensible to add the township of Niagara to the electoral district of Haldimand as it would be to add the townships of East and West Flamborough to South Wentworth. The most northern portion of the county is added to the electoral district of South Wentworth, and the whole is called South Wentworth, and in order to reach one portion of the riding the people will either have to swim across Hamilton Bay or go over the ice in winter. I desire, however, especially to draw attention to the position of the village of Merritton, which it is proposed to place in the County of Welland. Merritton is a portion of the township of Grantham in the old County of Lincoln. It never was in any other county, the people never voted anywhere else, and I should like to know if this village is placed in Welland to equalize the population. The Minister of Justice does not like the term "gerrymander" applied to this measure. If he can give me some other word that can properly be applied to this Bill in so far as regards the placing of Merritton in Welland, I should like to have him do so now. It is truly a gerrymander first and all the time, nothing more and nothing less. For 20 years past the average population of Welland has been 23,921, and of Lincoln 22,116. The village of Merritton was formerly a portion of the township of Grantham, but for 12 years it has been a separate municipality. Many of the proprietors of the various industries at Merritton live at St. Catharines, transact all their business there, and the village has always been a portion of St. Catharines in fact. Municipally it is part and parcel of the County of Lincoln. The people elect a reeve who holds a seat in the county council, and there is community of interests between Merritton and Lincoln; so that it would be an outrage to remove Merritton from Lincoln and place it in another county. It would be an outrage. I ask the Minister of Justice to do nothing more than grant common justice and British fair-play to the

people of the village of Merritton, and let them remain where they are, where they have always been, and where they should remain for all time to come. I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House any longer; but I must say, although I do not complain personally, that if you place the people of the village of Merritton in the riding which I have the honour to represent, yet it is a most unjust measure—unjust because the people there are connected municipally, socially and in every other way, with the people of the County of Lincoln, to which they have always belonged.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is after twelve o'clock, and a number of gentlemen on this side would like to address the House on this subject, and I think it is not unreasonable to ask that we should adjourn now. Hon. gentlemen on this side to-day have been speaking to the question. I am sure it will not delay the consideration of the subject.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think we must go on a little longer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister of Justice and a good many other hon. gentlemen seem to consider that the Opposition on this side, so far as regards the Province of Ontario, have no grounds for complaint. Now, there may be a very great deal of difference as to the details of some of these proposals; but there are two or three plain facts as to which there can be no doubt at all. There can be no doubt whatever, from the returns laid on the Table of this House by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, that in the last three elections, in 1882, 1887 and 1891, the Reform party have never received in Parliament, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, a representation in the slightest degree proportionate to the votes they polled. The facts are briefly these: In 1882 the Conservative party had a total majority of 4,585 votes in that province, and they had a majority of seats in this House of 28 or 29—I am not sure but it was more. In 1887 the Conservative party had a majority of 5,466 votes, and the majority of either 25 or 27 seats, I am not certain which. Now, Sir, mark, when the position was reversed, when in 1891 the Reform party had, according to the statement of Mr. George Johnson, a majority of 7,262 votes, or, according to the statement which was admitted to be correct in the view laid down by the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle), a majority of 4,600, had they a majority of 27 or 28 seats? No, Sir; they were in a minority of four, although they had an equal or larger popular majority than the Conservative party had in 1882 or 1887. The statement of these facts alone ought to show every man who has the smallest desire to see fair-play, that there is a very solid and substantial grievance existing as regards the proportionate representation between the two parties. The hon. Minister of Justice will observe that I speak with regard to Ontario alone. I am not advised how far the same thing may exist with respect to the Maritime Provinces; but, so far as the figures have reached me, there does not seem to be any similar injustice there. In Ontario, in 1882, the Conservative party polled 141,087 votes and the Liberal party 136,502; in 1887 the Conservative party polled 181,648 votes and the Liberal party 176,182 votes; and yet when these positions were reversed, and the Liberal party had a majority of four or five thousand at least, so far from having an equal majority in Parliament to what the Conservatives had in similar circumstances, they were in an absolute minority of four. Now, Sir, whatever may be said as to this or that particular constituency, there is no possibility of denying that the general result has been a most gross injustice and unfairness to the Reform party; and that, no doubt, is the reason why my hon. friend beside me feels so very much aggrieved with regard to these Gerrymander Bills, and why my hon. friend from Bothwell has laid before the House a plan which cannot possibly do any injustice to the Conservative party, especially as he does not at all insist on any subdivision of the counties, but only desires, to some small extent, to restore the just proportions which ought to exist between the total number of votes polled for one party and the other in the Province of Ontario. Now, as regards the objection raised by the Minister of Justice that the possibilities of gerrymandering are as great even under the restrictions proposed by my hon. friend and by the hon. member for North Simcoe as under the present scheme, that is absurd on the face of it. I do not pretend to say that you could not take such a proposition as my hon. friend lays down, and erect upon it a gerrymander which would favour one party or the other; but I do say that you would greatly diminish the chances of it. Every limitation that you put on the absolute power now held by Government or the majority of this House does not to a certain extent diminish the probable injustice. That is all my hon. friend contends, and that is I think a self-evident proposition. The hon. gentleman may disregard everything; he is fettered by no rule, principle or restriction of any kind whatever. My hon. friend beside me proposes to import one restriction, and one only, and it is hardly worth while to multiply words to show that, to a certain extent at any rate, this must diminish the chances of an unjust gerrymander being practiced. Now, I am inclined to think myself, looking at what has been done in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that where the Minister of Justice was personally cognizant of the facts, he was reasonably disposed to act fairly. I have heard no special objection as regards his conduct in Nova Scotia, his own province, or in New Brunswick. It may be partly due to the fact that the hon. gentleman is in possession of an overwhelming majority in both those provinces and does not see his way to improve it; but I will give him the credit at any rate for that. But as regards Ontario, which I do know well, it is quite evident on the face of it, that no principle has guided those who advised him in the framing of the measure. They have utterly disregarded county lines and population; they are not uniting counties which are the smallest by any means; and they have entirely disregarded the still more important matter of the proportion which exists between the two great sections into which Ontario is divided. All this goes in the strongest possible way incidentally to prove the reasonableness of the contention of my hon. friend beside me. It goes to show there was a danger known to the gentlemen who framed Confederation which they desired to guard against, and it goes to show that there is a great deal in the contention made by two or three gentlemen who sat at Westminster that they feared the dangers arising

from the American system and desired, to a moderate extent at any rate, to prevent those by introducing the very words to which my hon. friend has called attention. Otherwise I must say I do not believe fair-play would be practised by either side. I do not believe either side, even ourselves, if we were on the other side, would be able to devise, under the lines now laid down, a perfectly fair scheme. I hope we would do a great deal better than has been done to us, but I am bound to say that we would take a reasonable advantage after the way we have been treated. But I say this, that, as regards Ontario, I defy the hon. gentleman or any of his colleagues to state any conceivable principle on which the proposition now before the House can be defined or defended. Every principle laid down by the Minister of Justice himself has been utterly set at nought, not perhaps by design on his part, but certainly by design on the part of those who advised him in the course he is now pursuing.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for South Oxford, in the remarks he has made, has claimed that in the elections of 1891 there was a popular majority for the Reform party, but he has not been able to give the figures to substantiate his statement. It is true he gave this afternoon some figures which were an insult to this House. He claimed that the great Conservative County of Carleton, where two Conservatives ran, where no Grit dare show his face at all, has a Conservative majority of only 41. That was the difference between the two Conservative candidates. The Conservative candidate defeated was a gentleman who sat for four years in this House, and never gave a vote against the Government, and who was pledged up to the hilt to support the Government. His opponent had a majority of 41, and the hon. member for South Oxford quotes that as an example to show that the Reform party had a majority in the general elections of 1891. If the hon. gentleman will go back to the elections of 1874, when the Reform party was in power and he was Finance Minister—not it is true for the country's good at all—and if he will study up the Aurora speech made by the Hon. Edward Blake, he will find that Mr. Blake gave the Reform party a majority of eleven in the House of Commons. You will find also that the *Globe* claimed at that time they had in the House of Commons a majority of 101. I think that was a little exaggerated, but say they had a majority of 90 at that time. By the same rule those gentlemen lay down to-day, their majority in the House of Commons should have been only 11. Why, if their majority had been only 11, the bye-elections that took place in the next two years after that would have wiped them out of existence, because there were 18 bye-elections, in which the Reform party was defeated, thus giving 25 of majority of the Opposition. But those hon. gentlemen were in power then, and they would have had to take this side of the House, according to their argument to-day. Did they do so? No, Sir. They had a popular majority against them in the bye-elections, but they clung to this side of the House because they had a majority here, and the people, on the first opportunity, showed their want of confidence in them. But I say that the popular majority and the majority of members in this House from the Province of Ontario and all the Dominion, since the Conservative party came into power in 1878, have always been side by side. The hon. member for South Oxford said that, in 1882, the popular majority for the Conservative party was 5,000—141,000 Conservatives and 136,000 Grits. In the election of 1887 he said the popular vote for the Conservatives was 187,000, and for the Grits 176,000, making a majority for the Conservative party——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Nonsense, I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. WALLACE.—187,000. I have it down here. But the hon. gentleman makes so many contradictory statements that it is impossible to follow them closely. In the election of 1891-92, according to the statement of hon. gentlemen themselves, the Conservative majority was 4,300. It was more than that, taking the result of the bye-elections, but even putting it at 4,300, their own figures, we have 26 of a majority in the Province of Ontario. That would be about 170 for each constituency, which is a pretty fair majority. Any gentleman in this House who has 170 majority in his own constituency is doing fairly well. Now, take the County of Carleton to which the hon. gentleman has referred, I would like to know if the hon. member for South Oxford considers that it is an honest statement to make to the people of this country that the Conservative majority in the County of Carleton was only 41? He will not answer that. I do not suppose he finds it very convenient to answer. But there is a gentleman behind him, who always poses as the great purist of the House of Commons, the hon. member for South Brant. I would like to know if he endorses the figures quoted by the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who told you I posed as a purist?

Mr. WALLACE. All the speeches the hon. gentleman has made in this House show it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the hon. gentleman is no judge of what is pure and what is right.

Mr. WALLACE. I can gauge a conventional purist by theory, and more than this, on every occasion, in this House and out of it, the hon. gentleman puts himself up on a high pedestal as a great moralist.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You will never get there.

Mr. WALLACE. He always puts those who do not agree with him in the lowest possible position, and has always claimed for himself a very high position.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I deny it.

Mr. WALLACE. Higher than the people of the country are disposed to allow him.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Are you the people of the country?

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask again if the hon. member for Brant endorses the figures, and whether it is a fair, honest and upright statement to make that the Conservative majority in Carleton is only 41?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do you want an answer from a gentleman whom you stigmatize as a hypo-

crite, to confirm the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford ?

Mr. WALLACE. I want to prove him wrong by his own words.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do not talk to me, you are too low down to bother with.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman is afraid to state his opinion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You can have such thing as contempt without hate.

Mr. WALLACE. The House will have its opinion of a gentleman who is afraid to state his views when a question is put straightly and plainly before him. Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to mislead the people by stating that the Conservative majority in Carleton is 41, and in East Durham 61, and in East Middlesex 155, where two Conservatives ran in 1891, and one Conservative had a majority of 155 over the other, when in the previous election the Conservative majority over a Reformer was 758. We want to know whether those men deliberately endorse the figures they are endeavouring to palm off on the people of this country. We had not the opportunity of scrutinizing these figures until this afternoon, but they stated that according to the figures given by Mr. Johnson, the Dominion statistician, the Reform majority in the Province of Ontario was 7,268. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated in his first speech that he had those figures under the hand of the Dominion statistician, Mr. George Johnson. I disputed that statement and asked him to produce the figures. He has not done so. He cannot do so. I venture to say there are no such figures over the signature of Mr. George Johnson, and that these gentlemen had no such figures and could not produce them, and therefore they were endeavouring to mislead the people of this country——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE.—or they had the effect of misleading the people. We are in duty bound to call upon these gentlemen to produce these figures over Mr. Johnson's signature or to recede from the statement they made. If those figures were given by Mr. Johnson or any one else, they are subject to the scrutiny of any one, and we can prove that there was a Conservative popular majority in Ontario in the elections of 1891, when we had a majority of four members in this House, while in 1892 there was a majority of many thousands from that province and a majority of many Conservative members in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I must ask the indulgence of the committee in addressing them at this late hour. I would be perfectly willing to speak on another occasion if the leader of the House would permit an adjournment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will not press it upon the hon. gentleman to speak now, though I must confess that I am very much disappointed that we have not come to a conclusion on the amendment, as we hoped, after devoting the whole day to it, we might be able to go into some of the details of the Bill. However, it would not be very reasonable to ask the House to sit late into the night without having given notice of an intention to depart from the practice we have been adopting of adjourning at about 12 o'clock. As this is the close of this week, I may state that next week we shall have to ask the House to sit very late into the night, and also, commencing on Wednesday, to have daily sessions at 11 o'clock in the morning so that we may go on day and night in order to proceed with the business. I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Committee rose and reported progress.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 95) further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 20th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY ELECTION.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I laid on the Table two or three days ago the evidence taken in the controverted election case for Chicoutimi and Saguenay. I presume that the members of the House who have taken an interest in the question have had time to consider whether the evidence required any action on the part of the House other than the issue of the writ. Having examined the evidence myself, I have come to the conclusion that no further action upon the subject is necessary other than a motion for the writ to be issued, especially in view of the report of the judges who presided at the trial in which they state that no further investigation is necessary. I think that the evidence would not warrant the Government in inviting any action on the part of the House in the direction of depriving the constituency of the representation even for any further period. For that reason, I move that Mr. Speaker do forthwith issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the electoral district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Mr. LAURIER. For my part I certainly agree to this.

Motion agreed to.

I. C. R.—RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.

Mr. FRASER asked, 1. What have been the receipts and expenditures of the Intercolonial offices at Montreal and Toronto for the last five years, giving each year separately? 2. Have the Government a contract with any news agency on the Intercolonial Railway? If so, for what amount? Were tenders called for? If so, how many were received and the amount of each? What is the amount the Government received from the agency which has the right to sell on the road? Why is coal being hauled over the Intercolonial Railway to Ste. Rosalie on the Grand Trunk Railway, and

thence delivered to the Canadian Pacific Railway? Is the distance less or more than by the Canadian Pacific Short Line?

Mr. BOWELL. The receipts and expenses of the Intercolonial Railway offices at Montreal and Toronto for each of the last five years were as follows:—

1887..	Montreal	receipts,	$ 33,886 08	Toronto,	$ 2,441 10
	do	expenses,	4,300 00	do	2,928 11
1888..	do	receipts,	33,248 71	do	2,334 72
	do	expenses,	4,577 21	do	3,212 21
1889..	do	receipts,	20,535 10	do	1,955 53
	do	expenses,	4,654 83	do	3,157 43
1890..	do	receipts,	10,783 92	do	721 26
	do	expenses,	4,220 60	do	3,049 86
1891..	do	receipts,	15,159 56	do	838 14
	do	expenses,	4,245 62	do	3,335 11
Total	Montreal	receipts,	$113,613 37	Toronto,	$ 8,290 75
	do	expenses,	21,989 26	do	15,682 72
			$91,624 11		$7,391 97

The Government have a contract with the Canadian News Company. The amount paid per annum is $1,418.96. Tenders were called for. The tenders and papers in connection therewith are in the general office at Moncton and cannot, therefore, be given now; but the contract was let to the highest bidder. The coal is hauled over the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway at Ste. Rosalie. It is because the Canadian Pacific Railway desires it so hauled. The distance *viâ* the Intercolonial Railway through Chaudière, is 668 miles. The distance *viâ* the Intercolonial Railway through St. John, is 584 miles.

TELEGRAPH LINE IN VICTORIA, N.S.

Mr. FRASER asked, What was the cost of building the main telegraph line from Broad Cove, Ingonish, to Meat Cove Bay, St. Lawrence, in the County of Victoria? What was the price paid per pole? Were tenders called for? If so, how many were received, and did the lowest tenderer get the contract? How many tendered, with their names, and the amount of each tender? Who did the work?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The total cost of reconstruction of that telegraph line was $2,136.87. The price paid per pole was 66 cents, delivered at the holes. The telegraph agents at North Sydney, Ingonish and Meat Cove were asked to obtain tenders, and only one was received, that of W. Hellen, which was accepted. The poles were delivered at the holes by W. Hellen. The work of reconstruction was done by day's labour, under the supervision of the telegraph agent, D. Dunlop, at Baddeck.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That on and after Wednesday next, for the remainder of the session, the House shall meet, each sitting day, at 11 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman contemplates a continuous sitting from 11 a.m. to 6 p.m., but that there will be an adjournment some time during the day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose that we shall have it understood that the Speaker will leave the Chair at one o'clock and resume it at three.

Motion agreed to.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House again resolved into Committee on Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation of the House of Commons.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When the committee rose on Friday night, I was about to make some observations in support of the amendment which I have submitted. I desire now to say a few words in reply to the observations addressed to the committee by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), who complained he had been misrepresented, that his speech had been garbled and his position misstated. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman intended these remarks to refer to anything I said in the discussion, but I am sure nothing was further from my mind that to misstate or misrepresent any opinion which the hon. gentleman had expressed on the subject of this Bill. I do not think the observations made by the hon. gentleman were misinterpreted by me; certainly, if the hon. gentleman intended to put any other construction upon his words than that which I placed upon them, I would have been only too glad to have accepted his argument in the form he intended it should be given to the House. The hon. member for Albert on 7th June, in addressing the House on this subject, said:

"It does not seem to me a matter of importance that the counties should all number something between 20,000 to 30,000 population, but it seems to me very advisable, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) argued so convincingly, that we should have our constituencies fixed and stable, that we should cultivate in this country that proper pride in their county traditions which the people in the old country take in their own historic boundaries."

I certainly supposed, when the hon. gentleman made those observations, he coincided with the opinions I expressed in favour of the permanency of the boundaries of municipal counties, and I think that in so interpreting the hon. gentleman's words I did him no injustice. The hon. gentleman subsequently in discussing the subject pointed out that the permanency he referred to was the permanency of electoral divisions and not municipal boundaries. But the hon. gentleman will see that over a very large portion of the Dominion the boundaries of municipal counties and the boundaries of the constituencies are the same; and what I desire to call attention to is that the only way we can obtain anything approaching permanency in the electoral districts is by recognizing the permanency of municipal boundaries. Under the original provision of our constitution Ontario was given 82 members; in 1872 that number was increased to 88, and in 1882 to 92 members. The hon. gentleman will see that in giving additional representation to any province in the readjustment of the representation of the province as required by the British North America Act, it is necessary to find a locality in which to place a particular constituency, and the hon. gentleman will further see that if he undertakes the establishment of constituencies distinct from the boundaries of municipal counties he will find a very great difficulty in undertaking to secure anything approaching permanency of electoral districts. Let the hon. gentleman look at what is being done now, and he will see that in order to give a particular district an additional represent-

ative the Government are undertaking to alter a large number of constituencies, no less than 8 or 10 constituencies in Ontario and Quebec are being changed and broken up in order to find sections of country in which to place new electoral districts. If the hon. gentleman undertakes to apply the rule he has adopted, he will find it absolutely impossible to do so. Take a large county, one with three ridings : if you undertake to give an additional representative to that county, if you treat the county as a unit to be divided into four ridings where three existed before, you have its territorial limits within which to operate : but if you undertake to treat the electoral district as permanent, how are you going to give additional representation ? The attempt would be an attempt to divide a district which has perhaps but a few hundreds or at most a few thousands of people beyond the population required for a single constituency. You have two districts where you had one before, but it may be part of a county composed of three or four ridings, every one of which may have nearly the same claim to an additional representative as the one upon which you propose to bestow that additional representation. So the hon. gentleman will find that the only way to preserve anything approaching permanency is by recognizing the permanency of the municipal boundaries and by giving an additional representative to the county and not an additional representative to an electoral district. The hon. gentleman will also find that if you undertake to enquire into the question of permanency, or the historic continuity of a particular district, that it is not the fact that it returns a member to the House of Commons, that alone gives it continuity. It is the fact that there are bonds of unity already existing independent of its representation altogether, that ought to induce this House to preserve its unity. The people act together within a county for municipal purposes and in their local associations. They act together in the discharge of their judicial functions ; there are a dozen ways in which they are one community ; and you undertake to preserve county boundaries and to form your ridings within the limits of the county on account of this unity. The unity is not created by the fact that you have established the electoral districts, the unity is not based upon the fact that these people meet once in four or five years to vote for a representative in the House of Commons. The unity exists independent of that, and if that was the only thing upon which anything approaching unity rested, the breaking up of municipal boundaries in order to form electoral districts would not be so serious an evil as it is. I speak of what I know when I say that where you put distinct municipal peoples together into one electoral district, they are not one after a period of ten years. I take, for instance, the west riding of Elgin. In 1882, Parliament took the townships of Orford and Howard and the town of Ridgetown from the County of Kent and attached it to the riding of West Elgin. Are these people, after three elections, a united people to-day ? They acted together in 1882, in 1887 and in 1891 to elect a member to this House, but they never meet in any large numbers except at the period of a convention for a choice of a candidate. They are as much two separate peoples to-day as they were at the time they were put together, and I venture to say, if the hon. gentleman were to leave to these people who formerly constituted a part of Bothwell and made them a part of the riding of West Elgin, and who were taken from it violently by Act of Parliament, if he were to leave them the choice to-day, they would with scarcely a dissenting voice vote to have that union broken up and to be put back with those with whom they have social affinities, and with whom they are co-operating for other purposes. You cannot make them one community, and if you were to continue this system for another decade they would still be as much two peoples as they were the day your Act came into operation. There is no such thing as creating a unity of sentiment or a united community in that way. These organizations in a large measure grow up. In the first instance they are a matter of convenience. You associate people together in a certain district as one township. They are associated in their schools, in their county councils, in their agricultural societies, and so they are in a political sense one organization, and the business of this House ought to be to recognize these facts. You ought to leave intact these people in all their subordinate political organizations. and to unite them into one for certain specific and distinct purposes. You come here and by your Bill you undertake to break up these municipal and subordinate organizations and to deal with the whole community as if they had no organization below that which you create. I say, Sir, that that is a very improper course to pursue. It is one that cannot be otherwise than mischievous in its consequences, and I am sure that what I have said with regard to the effect of your changes in West Elgin will apply with almost equal force, and in some cases with greater force, in every organization where you create an artifical constituency and where you disregard these political organizations which exist independent of the action of this House. People are not made a unit by simply voting together. Every hon. gentleman who has had any experience where an artificial constituency has been created and formed of parts of different municipal communities, knows that the statement I make is accurate. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) said that "I wished to give something like permanency to existing organizations. I am not going back of 1882. I will begin with 1882. and upon that as a foundation I will undertake to establish a system of permanency." Let us see how the hon. gentleman is succeeding by supporting this Bill, and I am speaking now solely of the Province of Ontario. I look at the provisions of this section which are now under consideration and I find that the counties of Renfrew, north and south, are broken up ; the relations of the County of Lincoln and Niagara are broken up, the County of Welland is broken up, Haldimand and Monck are broken up, South Wentworth and North Wentworth and North Brant are altered in their boundaries ; South Norfolk and North Bruce and West Bruce are altered ; it is proposed to change East Middlesex. Nipissing is to be changed, Algoma is to be changed, West Toronto is to have an additional member and if divided into two constituencies there will be a further change there. Ottawa City is to be altered, London is to be altered, and Ontario, south and north, is to be altered. Here are twenty changes proposed in order to change the location of two mem-

bers. There are 92 constituencies in Ontario, and hon. gentlemen do not propose to make them more or less than 92. They are to remain just what they are now. It is proposed that there shall be a departure from the principle of permanency laid down by the hon. member for Albert, on account of the relative changes in the location of the population of the country. Well, Sir, I am not complaining of a readjustment being made to meet the wants of the population, and to give to the people fair representation on the floor of this House; but I am pointing out that both the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Albert spoke in favour of permanence, in favour of making as few changes as possible, while here, in order to give to two districts an additional member each, it is proposed to disturb the boundaries of 21 constituencies. Now, I say that that additional representation can be given without anything like so many changes. If the hon. gentleman is not disposed to accept my amendment, which is perfectly simple and easily worked out, all he has to do is to unite into two constituencies four of the smaller constituencies, leaving the boundaries intact, and to give to West Toronto an additional representative and to the Nipissing district an additional representative. So that, whether this House is disposed to agree with the view expressed by the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Albert or with the view expressed in the amendment which I have proposed, in either case there is no necessity whatever for this extraordinary breaking down of the boundaries of constituencies and the creation of new constituencies out of those which are destroyed. Referring again to what was said by the hon. member for Albert when he proposed to rest the principle of permanency upon the boundaries of electoral districts as they were established in 1882, I think that he gave up the case altogether, because I have shown that you cannot upon that principle readjust the representation of the people in Parliament as may be required by the census without a wide departure from the principle which he himself said should be respected. The hon. Minister of Justice also expressed an opinion in favour of the principle of continuity of constituencies; but how does the hon. gentleman propose to carry that principle out? Why, Sir, by bringing in a Bill that makes something like 60 changes in the boundaries of constituencies in the provinces east of Rat Portage. There are a larger number of changes proposed in this Bill than there were in the Gerrymander Bill of 1882. The hon. gentleman, as I have pointed out, proposes to abandon two of them; but there remain 20 changes in the Province of Ontario alone, and there are, I believe, over 25 in the Province of Quebec; the whole Island of Prince Edward is revolutionized; and there are changes in Manitoba, British Columbia, and the North-West Territories besides. Well, Sir, there is another way in which the constituencies might have been readjusted, if the hon. gentleman is opposed to dividing a county into ridings. The hon. gentleman has not proposed to divide the city of Ottawa, or the city of Halifax, or the city of Hamilton; he has not proposed to divide Pictou. He leaves these constituencies double constituencies, so that in them the half of the population plus one can elect both representatives, and the other half may be without any representation whatever. If that is a proper principle, the hon. gentleman might apply it to the counties. In a county entitled to two, three or four representatives, he might give to the people two, three or four votes, as the case might require, and allow them to elect the whole delegation from the county. In that case, he would have no gerrymandering of the county boundaries, and he could take the risk of one party electing all the representation from one county being balanced by the other party electing all the representatives from another large county. That would be far less objectionable than the scheme which he proposes, because, in that case, if there were any advantages at all they fall on the one side, possibly, as well as upon the other; but that is not what the hon. gentleman is ready to accept. The hon. gentleman wants a division which will give to the Government a decided advantage in the election of members to this House. The hon. gentleman gave as a reason for paying no regard to the municipal boundaries in Ontario, although some regard is had to municipal boundaries in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, that in Ontario very great changes had been made at times in the boundaries of counties. Now, I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. I believe, considering the fact that there is a large section of Ontario which is comparatively new, in which settlement is in progress, and which as settlement proceeds must be carved out into new counties, that in Ontario the boundaries of counties are quite as permanent as they are in any other portion of the Dominion. I do not know where any of those revolutions have occurred of which the hon. gentleman has spoken. It is true, in 1867, when the British North America Act was adopted, there were certain electoral districts formed out of parts of two counties. There were three of this character—Bothwell, Monck and Cardwell. I do not know how it was in the cases of Cardwell and Monck, but I know that at the time the district of Bothwell was formed, there was a disposition to form Bothwell into a county. Mr. Brown was proprietor of lands in the town and its immediate vicinity, and I think the Government of which he was a member, were disposed to concede to his wishes and organize there a municipal county; but when he parted with his interest in the property and left the Government, this scheme was abandoned, and I know that except in the immediate vicinity of the town nearly the entire population were opposed to it. Those who belonged to the County of Lambton wished to remain a part of that county, and those who belonged to the County of Kent wished to remain a part of Kent. I remember very well that when I proposed that Kent should be given two representatives and Lambton two, in 1872, when the first redistribution took place, the First Minister who then led this House, said that he did not favour the plan of uniting parts of different municipal counties together, and that as soon as the population warranted it the union between parts of Kent and Lambton should disappear, and ridings would be established in Kent and Lambton. So that in 1872 the principle for which we are contending to-day was the accepted doctrine on both sides, and it is a perfectly just and fair principle. I know that there are parties in Canada, as well as in the United States and in the United Kingdom, who are in favour of cumulative voting. Speaking for myself, I am not in favour of that system, but prefer single con-

stituencies, because I think that system is, on the whole, the most easily understood by the population, and the most convenient when an election, especially a bye-election, takes place. It is the one which gives to the majority in each locality the power of electing representatives to Parliament; and the minority in one constituency is fairly represented by the success of the candidate of the same way of thinking, in another constituency where that party is in the ascendant. That being so, it will be only fair that the principle laid down in 1872, and the principle which is recognized in the United Kingdom, should prevail here. The Minister of Justice, in speaking on this subject a day or two ago, said:

"If there is any province in Canada, in respect to which it may be said that the county lines are mutable, it is the Province of Ontario."

I think the hon. gentleman was mistaken in making that statement. There is as much permanency in the boundaries of Ontario as in those of any other province. The hon. gentleman went on further to say:

"I understand that the effect of the amendment, if carried out in the lines suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell, would be the most extreme system of gerrymander that was ever presented to Parliament; that it is a scheme by which the Liberal party of the Province of Ontario, regardless of the popular majority of votes, would increase their representation by some twelve or fifteen or twenty members, and if operated on lines which would be available to the majority, it would result with equal disaster to the Liberal party and equal success to the Conservative party."

What authority has the hon. gentleman for making that statement?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was referring not only to the scheme proposed by the resolution but to the lines, as the hon. gentleman gave them to the House, as regards division of townships.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I gave an illustration as to how the division would work out. I mentioned Essex and the present division. Does the hon. gentleman complain of that? If that was a matter to be complained of, the hon. gentleman must see that he ought to have made a proposal to change those boundaries, but he has not done so. And then, so far as Essex is concerned, he will find that there is nothing to be complained of in that case. Then I mentioned the divisions that might be made of Kent. I did not mention them as ones that ought to be adopted, but as divisions I thought convenient and fair; but the hon. gentleman should not expect that the county should be divided so as to return a Conservative member when there is but one municipality in it that gave a Conservative majority. I defy the hon. gentleman to take the vote of 1891 and make a division of the County of Kent in such a manner as would give to this House a Conservative representative. It cannot be done unless the hon. gentleman were disposed to take up isolated voters here and there. He cannot put together the County of Kent into three divisions in such a form that with the vote of 1891, a Conservative member could be returned; as I have stated, except in the village of Blenheim there is not a municipality in the whole county that gave a Conservative majority. If that works out in favour of the Liberal majority in that way, I cannot help it. It may not always be so. In the County of Lambton I mentioned a division which would give one Liberal, one Conservative, and I cannot, at this moment, say which the other would give, because I did not take the trouble to enquire. I looked at the geographical division and the equality of numbers, and I think the division was perfectly fair. Then, if the hon. gentleman will take the County of Elgin, my impression is that, under that arrangement, while it would give a Reform member for East Elgin it would give a Conservative member for West Elgin. I have not added up the votes, but that is my impression. So, when the hon. gentleman spoke of my proposition being a gerrymander scheme, I I think he made what was hardly a candid statement to the House, because I am perfectly willing, if the hon. gentleman accepts the principle of preserving inviolate the county boundaries, to accept that principle and then to see how it may be fairly worked out. It is surely possible for the members of the majority in this House to protect themselves under that scheme. It is surely possible, if the two sides of the House are so unfair that they cannot trust each other, then let a commission be appointed, as in England, to make a fair division of the counties requiring division. Then, the hon. member said, in his second speech:

"What I stated to the House was that a redistribution made in the Province of Ontario, in accordance with the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell, and therefore within county lines, might be made a complete gerrymander in the interests of either party."

I admit that it would be possible to favour one party or the other. I never denied that, but I say it would be utterly impossible to do so to the extent to which it was done in 1882, or to which it can be done when you disregard the county boundaries altogether. Every person knows that limitations and restraints are imposed by the recognition of county boundaries, and that those are taken away when the hon. gentleman proposes to make a constituency composed of municipalities taken from several adjoining counties. The hon. gentleman said further on in the same speech:

"But the fault I find with the principle stated by the hon. member for Bothwell and embodied in the amendment, whether brought forward in opposition to the second reading of the Bill or in committee now, is that if you keep within county lines everything is justifiable no matter how atrocious the gerrymander may be."

Who maintained that proposition? I did not, neither did any hon. gentleman on this side. Why, we complained of two cases of gerrymander in 1872. The one was in the County of Haldimand and the other in the County of Huron, when the township of Tuckersmith was taken out of one riding in the County of Huron and put into another, and when the township of Dunn was taken out of Haldimand and put into Monck; and I remember well the defence made by the First Minister, that he had Mr. Thompson's consent, the representative of Haldimand, to the change. I am not going to say whether that was an actual statement of the facts or not, but I say that it was contended on this side of the House that that was an unfair division. No one undertakes to argue that a Government or an Opposition ought to be at liberty to carve a county just as it pleases, unless it pleases to do what is right and fair, but we say it imposes a great restraint upon a majority and puts impediments in the way of wrong-doing that are altogether wanting when the county boundaries are altogether disregarded. I wish to say a

word or two with regard to a statement made by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) that the Reform party were more than adequately represented west of Toronto, and there was an intimation made on the floor of this House that we were not suffering from the Gerrymander Bill of 1882, that there was nothing for us to complain of, and that we might fairly commence with that as a basis for the present distribution. I have looked at the votes cast for the respective parties in the Province of Ontario at the election of 1891. I have left out of view the revision that might be made by the bye-elections, because it is the application of the principle to which I refer, and if I had conveniently at my hand the returns for the bye-elections, they would more conveniently represent the principle to which I want to call the attention of the committee. West of the eastern boundary of the County of York, following that boundary up to Lake Simcoe and then following the eastern boundary of the County of Simcoe to the Georgian Bay, and counting Algoma as being west of this line, the Reformers polled about 120,000 votes and elected 34 members. The Conservatives polled 113,000 votes, or nearly that, and elected 22 members. East of that line the Reformers polled 60,000 votes and elected 10 members, and the Conservatives polled 62,000 votes and elected 26 members. Now, if you were to put these together, you would find that we were under-represented. We polled more than 4,000 of a majority and elected 44 members. Our Conservative opponents elected 48 members with 4,000 fewer votes. East of Toronto, it took 6,000 votes to elect one Reform candidate, and it took 2,383 Conservative votes to elect a candidate, so that one Conservative vote east of Toronto counted for something more than two Reform votes. The hon. gentleman will, therefore, see that the effect of the Bill of 1882 has not altogether disappeared. On the contrary, it places the Reform party in the Province of Ontario at a very great disadvantage. If the Minister of Justice adheres to the doctrine he laid down in the last speech he addressed to the House, he cannot continue to press this Bill in its present form upon the attention of the House. He is proposing 20 changes in the Province of Ontario which are wholly unnecessary. He is pressing upon the attention of the House more than 25 changes in the Province of Quebec which are wholly unnecessary. He is completely destroying the county limits in the Province of Prince Edward Island, which is wholly unnecessary. So that, if we were to accept the doctrine the hon. gentleman lays down, the position which he takes is as inimical to the Bill he is now pressing upon the attention of the House as the principle embodied in the amendment I have put in your hands. I am not going further to press this amendment upon the attention of the committee. I have stated what I think is necessary to elucidate fully the principle involved, and the fairness of this principle when applied. I believe it would give to each party in this House very nearly representation in proportion to its strength. I admit that a party which has a large majority will have on the floor of Parliament a representation out of proportion to the popular vote, unless it be under the cumulative system, and I do not object to this result. I know very well that, if we were to poll 3 per cent more votes than we did, we would carry nearly every constituency in Ontario, and that would be true to a large degree of the other side, but the point I am impressing upon the attention of the House is the principle of permanency as far as possible in the constituencies, and recognizing those boundaries that we did not make, over which we have no control, which are independent of us, and then we have a protection against that system of manipulation which in a great measure destroys the essential features of representative government.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) gave us the benefit of his calculations as far as they related to the western part of Ontario west of the eastern boundary of the County of York. I find that west of that line there were no less than 36 changes in the Act of 1882, there being altogether 53 changes, or gerrymanders, in that Act. The reason why the hon. gentleman stated that he confined his remarks to that portion of the province west of the line he drew from north to south was that he found, after a careful criticism and analysis of the votes cast in 1882, that the Reformers had as many representatives or a little more than the Conservatives had. I shall not challenge that statement. There is a small percentage of votes, but I should like the hon. gentleman from Albert to have carried out his calculations as far as the eastern section was concerned. Taking the part east of the line he drew himself, we had no less than 17 changes made in all. So that if the calculation that he presented to the House is good with regard to the west, if it is founded upon fact as regards the entire province, in order to back up that calculation, he should have extended it to the east. However, I will give the number of votes polled, so far as I can gather them from the statistics within reach. The Conservatives polled in the western section 85,356 votes, and elected 22 members, which makes 3,879 votes for each member. The Reformers polled 80,448 votes, and elected 25 members, being 3,578 votes for each member. As regards east Ontario, I have listened attentively to the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell, and it comes into line with the figures I am about to present to the House, except that the line he drew is not strictly in accord with the line I am following. I am following out the line drawn by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in order to show that his statement, if applied to the eastern portion of Ontario, involves a very serious reflection upon the change that was made in 1882. Now, in eastern Ontario the Conservatives polled 65,627 votes, and elected 34 men, giving each member 1,930 votes. The Reformers polled 57,184 votes, electing 10 members, and giving each member 5,718 votes. Now, following out the same argument that has been presented by the member for Bothwell, allowing 1,930 Reform votes in the eastern section of Ontario electing one member, the same value as 1,930 Conservative votes electing one member, there are 27,884 voters unrepresented on the floor of this House in east Ontario. But it is better to take the entire province, because then you can form a better opinion of how the two great political parties in the Province of Ontario are represented here. Now, the entire Conservative vote polled in 1882 immediately after the gerrymander, so far as I can make it out, with one single exception where the election took place by acclamation, and allowing for another

constituency where two Conservatives ran—the entire Conservative vote was 151,783, and the Reform vote was 146,632. Now, in the entire province the Conservatives elected 56, and the Reformers 35 members, and one by acclamation. Each Conservative member represented 2,710 votes in the entire province, and each Reform member 4,189 votes. But allowing that each group of 2,710 Reform votes should have the same representation in this House as each group of 2,710 Conservative votes, there are in the Province of Ontario 51,782 Reform votes unrepresented on the floor of this House. That calculation, I think, shows very clearly the effect of the gerrymander that took place in 1882. It is quite clear that it was the means of preventing one of the political parties in that province from sending to this House their proper quota of representatives in proportion to their number of votes. These figures are plain evidence that the gerrymander of 1882 committed a gross injustice upon that province, and they show, on the other hand, that it is not fair that we should continue that condition of things. Now, the hon. member for Albert gives as a reason for continuing this injustice, that he is anxious that the principle of continuity should be maintained, that the people have become so accustomed to the changes that were then made, that no alteration should be made. Now, if that is a good argument to apply to the Province of Ontario, we earnestly hope that when the committee reaches the Province of Quebec the member for Albert will give us his assistance in maintaining the principle of continuity so far as Quebec is concerned, because if, in obedience to the principle of continuity, those grave cases of injustice are allowed to remain in the Province of Ontario, certainly the same principle should be applied to the Province of Quebec; therefore we should expect the valuable assistance of the hon. member for Albert in resisting the changes that are proposed in Quebec. In the changes that took place in 1882 there were many county boundaries violated, and it appears that in the Bill before the House the county boundaries are entirely ignored. Nothing is recognized but the boundaries of townships. Now, I think that the evidence that has been brought before the committee in favour of respecting county boundaries has been very strong, and I should very much have preferred that the Minister of Justice had seen his way clear to go back to the county boundaries. He himself has stated to the House that the Conservative party cannot lose by returning to county boundaries. I think it would meet the wishes of the people of this country if he consented to do that. I think it would be very much better to return to county boundaries, and then we would not have anything to complain of. But as long as the present condition of things are maintained it will be a continual cause of complaint, and the gerrymander of 1882 will always be a source of irritation, and a feeling of injustice will pervade the entire Reform party unless the Minister of Justice consents to return to the old county boundaries, even supposing the Government might derive an incidental advantage from putting the municipalities back in the counties where they belong. I do not wish further to detain the committee, but I wished to make these statements in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell. I considered it my duty to draw attention to the statement that has been made by the hon. member for Albert, and to show that if he applied the argument to eastern Ontario that he applied to western Ontario, it would be found that he would not, by any means, carry out the principle that he advocated so far as western Ontario is concerned, because in eastern Ontario Reformers have been, and are, unrepresented in this House in proportion to their voting power.

Amendment (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) negatived: Yeas, 27: nays, 51.

2. In the Province of Ontario—

(*a*.) The electoral district of Prescott shall consist of the townships of Alfred, Caledonia, Clarence (including the village of Rockland), Hawkesbury East, Hawkesbury West, Longueuil, Plantagenet North and Plantagenet South, and the villages of Hawkesbury, L'Orignal and Rockland.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Drop.

(*b*.) The electoral district of Russell shall consist of that part of the city of Ottawa known as New Edinburgh, and of the townships of Cambridge, Cumberland, Gloucester, Osgoode and Russell.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Drop.

(*c*.) The electoral district of North Renfrew shall consist of the town of Pembroke, that part of the village of Eganville north of the river Bonnechère, and the townships of Ross, Bromley, Westmeath, Stafford, Pembroke, Wilberforce, Alice, Petawawa, Buchanan, South Algona, Fraser, McKay, Wylie and Rolph.

Mr. BOWELL. This sub-section takes from the north riding of the electoral district of North Renfrew the townships of Head, Maria and Clara. These are three townships which lie on the Ottawa River and adjoin the Nipissing district, and it is proposed to add them to that district, to which they more legitimately belong. The vote is not very large.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the hon. gentleman the vote and the population?

Mr. BOWELL. They are stated on the map. I think as regards political complexion, the majority is 15 to 17, but I forget on which side. The village of Eganville is divided by a river, that portion of it lying to the north of the river being attached to the north riding, and that portion lying to the south being attached to the south riding.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then Eganville must be an incorporated village?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). It is not incorporated.

Mr. LAURIER. It is an incorporated village divided by the river Bonnechère. If it is an incorporated village, there must be a bridge over the river; and, at all events, it will be very inconvenient to have one portion of the village in one riding and one portion in another riding.

Mr. SPEAKER. The village of Eganville has been recently incorporated. One part of it, which lies to the north of the river Bonnechère, was formerly within the limits of the township of Wilberforce. The other, lying to the south of the Bonnechère, was formerly within the township of Admaston. The people ask that the limits that formerly existed, separating the township of Admaston from Wilberforce, should be maintained, and that the portion of the village which lies within the township of Wilberforce should still remain in the north riding, and that portion which formerly laid

within the limits of the township of Gratton should be retained in the south riding. The river was the boundary between the two ridings at that time; and it is the boundary between the two townships.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the population of each section of the village?

Mr. SPEAKER. 330 odd in that part of the village that lies north of the Bonnechère, and 395 in that portion lying south of the river. The population is not quite 800, which is the number I understand to be necessary to entitle a village to incorporation; but a special census was taken about the time the Act of incorporation was passed by the Local Legislature of Ontario, and I think the village was incorporated by special Act, although I am not quite sure about that point; but, at all events, the special census taken at the time the incorporation took place showed there was about sufficient number of inhabitants to justify them in being incorporated as a village. The census returns do not, however, show those figures, but they give not quite 800 as the number in the village on both sides of the Bonnechère.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the number of the polling subdivisions?

Mr. SPEAKER. There is Wilberforce on one side and Grattan on the other. By the census returns that portion of Eganville within the township of Wilberforce has a population of about 330, and that portion within the township of Grattan has a population of 395.

Mr. LAURIER. If I understand the state of the facts correctly, the Bill makes no change in this respect?

Mr. SPEAKER. No change in the limits as they existed previously at those particular points.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is there not a bridge over the Bonnechère?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And there is no difficulty in one side communicating with the other?

Mr. SPEAKER. No. The object is simply to maintain the lines as they existed before the incorporation of the village. Hon. members will underderstand that prior to the incorporation of the village of Eganville, part of it formed part of the township of Wilberforce and part of it formed part of the township of Grattan. It was incorporated as the village of Eganville, and the representations that have been made to me from both of these parties who are living on the south and north side of the Bonnechère, is, that it is their desire to maintain the limits as they existed before the incorporation of Eganville.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In which division—north or south?

Mr. SPEAKER. Under the local Act of the Legislature the whole of the village will go into that riding in which the greatest part of it lies; and it will therefore be in the south riding of Renfrew. The people on both sides of the Bonnechère asked that the old limits shall remain with regard to the elections for the Dominion.

Mr. LAURIER. This Bill so far as Eganville is concerned does not make any change, and, considering the character of its provisions, I wish that the changes did not apply elsewhere

(e.) The electoral district of Lincoln and Niagara shall consist of the town of Niagara, the city of St. Catharines, the townships of Grantham, Clinton, Louth, Pelham and Gainsborough, and the villages of Beamsville and Port Dalhousie.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a clerical error here. The words "the township of Niagara" are omitted, and I move that they be inserted.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I move that Merritton be taken from Welland and put back into the County of Lincoln and Niagara. Merritton is a part of the County of Lincoln: it has no association whatever with the County of Welland, and why should it be broken in upon? Hon. gentlemen have just this moment allowed an incorporated village to be divided at the request of the villagers, as we are informed by the Speaker, although we have no petition to the House to that effect. Here is the village of Merritton, that is a part of Lincoln, and is not required by any consideration of population or anything else to be added to the County of Welland.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think there is something in what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says. There is a community of interest between Merritton and the city of St. Catharines and the township of Grantham, as was referred to by the member for Welland (Mr. Lowell). There is, however, also a community of interest between the town of Merritton and Thorold, as they are contiguous towns and their main street is almost a continuous street. However, if it is wished to change Merritton to Lincoln and Niagara I do not think there can be any objection.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The village of Merritton, as I understand, now lies in the County of Lincoln, and while the change of population, by transferring it to Welland, would make Welland a little over the unit, no equalization is practically effected by the transfer, and for that reason as well as for those which have already been urged to the House, I accept the proposal to leave Merritton in Lincoln and Niagara.

Motion agreed to.

(f.) The electoral district of Welland shall consist of the townships of Bertie, Crowland, Humberstone, Stamford, Thorold and Willoughby, the villages of Chippawa, Fort Erie, Niagara Falls, Merritton and Port Colborne, and the towns of Niagara Falls, Thorold and Welland.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The village of Merritton should be transferred to Lincoln and Niagara.

Motion agreed to.

(g.) The electoral district of Haldimand and Monck shall consist of the townships of Oneida, Rainham, Seneca, North Cayuga and South Cayuga, Canborough, Dunn, Moulton, Sherbrooke and Wainfleet, and the villages of Caledonia, Cayuga, Hagersville and Dunnville, and shall return one member.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the population of this reconstructed riding?

Mr. MONTAGUE. 22,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I submit to the Government, for the reasons that were given by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and others on this side of the House, that these proposed changes ought not to be made. By this change you propose to abolish two constituencies in the Niagara Peninsula, and you leave the weaker section of the province with the full repre-

sentation which it now possesses. You are proposing to make a great many changes in this district which would be altogether unnecessary if you were to unite two constituencies in the east. Why not unite Addington and Lennox, or Frontenac and Lennox, giving the town of Portsmouth to Kingston, to which it belongs? Why not unite Leeds and Grenville? It is quite possible to unite these constituencies without bringing them much above the present unit, leaving the Niagara district as it is, and scarcely disturbing the present municipal boundaries. By uniting these eastern constituencies, you would take the representation from the section of the province which is thinly peopled, and give it to the city of Toronto and the Algoma district, into which large numbers of people have gone since the previous census. That would be a simple process, and would render unnecessary all these changes which you propose to make. It would be fair to the west and to the east, and would give no party advantage.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The population of Haldimand is now but 16,300, and the population of Monck 15,300. I am afraid that we cannot agree to the changes proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford with respect to the union of other counties. I think they would altogether change the plan of redistribution as proposed by this Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that the population of the constituencies I have mentioned is less than that of the constituencies to which he refers. If the hon. gentleman is going to equalize the population, it ought to be done in the way I have mentioned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We do not propose to equalize the population in the whole province.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not asking the hon. gentleman to equalize the whole population. The hon. gentleman said that he wished to give something like permanence. He is not doing that by making all these changes in the Niagara Peninsula. If Leeds and Grenville were united, their united population would only be about equal to the unit.

(*h.*) The electoral district of South Wentworth shall consist of the townships of Saltfleet, Binbrook, Barton, Glanford, North and South Grimsby, Caistor, East and West Flamborough, the town of Dundas, and the villages of Grimsby and Waterdown.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In this riding there is this difficulty, geographically if not otherwise, that the town of Dundas and the townships of East and West Flamborough will be separated from the other portion of the riding altogether. My recollection is that a portion either of the township of Ancaster or of the city of Hamilton intervenes.

Mr. McKAY. The part of North Wentworth which has been added to South Wentworth touches the former South Wentworth.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Where does it touch it?

Mr. McKAY. West of the city of Hamilton.

Mr. CHARLTON. How large a touch is it?

Mr. McKAY. I have not had measurements taken, but quite a little part of it touches.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Separated by the bay?

Mr. McKAY. No, a land contact.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like the hon. member to point out where the two parts touch. I never could get from Dundas or from Flamborough to the old riding of South Wentworth without going through the city of Hamilton. Is there a road there?

Mr. McKAY. I cannot say that there is a main road, but you can go by land.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). You would have to go by water, either crossing the Desjardins Canal or the inlet through which it passes.

Mr. McKAY. It is part of the Burlington Heights, and there is only about twelve feet of a canal. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that quite a large part touches by land, though there is not a main road.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). After you pass the township of Ancaster you do not get into West Flamborough on that side of Hamilton, but on the north side of the Desjardins Canal, and the part of Barton that runs down to the city boundaries is still cut off by the marsh and the canal that intervenes. The township of West Flamborough has a small strip that is joined to the town of Dundas on the south side of the canal, but it is a long distance before you reach the boundary of Barton. If the Government really want to make a compact constituency of South Wentworth, what they want to do is to put the township of Ancaster into South Wentworth and put East and West Flamborough into North Brant, and then the town of Dundas and the township of Ancaster would join, each contiguous; but it is utterly impossible to go from the one part of that riding to the other except by water-stretch. It cannot be done by land except by going through the city of Hamilton or a portion of North Brant in the township of Ancaster. They have no connection with each other at all, because the corporation of Hamilton takes in the bounds on the north side as far as the land goes.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a section which the House should not endorse, and in our opposition to which we ought to have the support of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). If I understood him rightly the other day, he said he never was enamoured of the Bill of 1882. If he had been here in 1882 he would probably have voted against it. At all events, he said, in reply to the hon. member for North Simcoe, that the only reason why he voted against the amendment then moved was because the Act of 1882 had received the sanction of time, because it had become *un fait accompli*. My hon. friend will see that this section is a gerrymander upon that gerrymander of 1882. By this section we are proposing, not to accept what was done in 1882, but to mutilate it, and we, therefore, ought to have the hon. gentleman's support.

Mr. WELDON. I would like to ask the leader of the Opposition what is the proposition he asks me to support?

Mr. LAURIER. That the riding of North Wentworth should be kept as it is at present.

Mr. WELDON. And what alternative plan does the hon. gentleman propose to supply the member who is set free by the union of these two constituencies?

Mr. LAURIER. Unite Addington to Lennox or Frontenac.

Mr. WELDON. From the study I have given the matter, I have come to the conclusion, and I express my opinion with great modesty about the geography of a county so far from my own, that the taking out of the township of Ancaster ten years ago was the most censurable move made in the whole Bill. If you will look at the map, you will not find any reason for taking out the township of Ancaster, on any general principle, ten years ago. I would like the leader of the Opposition to say precisely what his proposition is before the committee.

Mr. LAURIER. As far as practicable the Act of 1882 ought not to be interfered with as regards the County of Wentworth.

Mr. WELDON. I think the hon. gentleman has made his appeal on the weakest point in the whole Province of Ontario, when he wants to perpetuate the ridings of Wentworth. According to the map of Ontario of 1889, which I have before me, the two Wentworths seem to me to be connected by a single point on Lake Ontario, and the township of Ancaster comes in like a sharp wedge between the two.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The whole of the Niagara Peninsula is broken up by this Bill. Here are two constituencies being obliterated, and the remains of two constituencies are divided among the surrounding counties. If the hon. gentleman will look at the map he will see that there are smaller constituencies left than either of those obliterated. Why not take the smaller constituencies and unite them with those immediately adjoining, which can be done without making either of the two as large as many that remain under the Bill. The hon. gentleman himself strongly objects to gerrymandering at present, but a gerrymander is being most effectually carried out in the Niagara Peninsula. He refers to the township of Ancaster. The old County of South Wentworth was nearly cut in two by that. It was put in one riding of Brant, it was taken out of South Wentworth to defeat, if possible, the Liberal candidate, Mr. Rymal. That was a most unfair proceeding. There can be no doubt of that, but if you take and put the township of Ancaster back, as perhaps ought to be done, we must recast all these provisions with regard to Brant that were introduced before. If my hon. friend had seen his way to support the proposition lately voted down, all those things would have fallen into their place as before, but that not being the case I contend that the Niagara Peninsula ought to be left alone and that we ought to unite four of the constituencies into two. That can be done, and it is perfectly fair, and the hon. gentleman need not attack the smallest constituencies. What justification is there for going into a district that is not over-represented, when we take it as a part of the surrounding country, and leaving untouched a district that is over-represented? It seems to me, if hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed to do what is fair, they ought to insist upon the union of four constituencies into two in the eastern section of the province, and leave the Niagara Peninsula as it was. Let me take the case I mentioned. Take Frontenac and Lennox. I understand they are municipally one. There is the town of Portsmouth, which is a suburb of Kingston. Why not annex that suburb to Kingston, and you have two constituencies which are nearly equal and very nearly up to the unit?

Mr. WELDON. What size?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). 23,000 or 24,000, or something in that neighbourhood. 13,000 is the one and 14,000 is the other, and with Portsmouth taken in, I think it makes a constituency of about 23,000 and increases Kingston some 2,000 or 3,000. Then, if you unite Grenville and Leeds you have another constituency of about 24,000. Why should not that be done and let the Niagara Peninsula alone? I have no objection to the Niagara Peninsula being dealt with if you are going to establish county boundaries, but the House has refused to approve of that, and here is an arrangement that will equalize the constituencies and will produce scarcely any disturbance, while at the same time it will be perfectly fair.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not very well acquainted with the geography of North and South Wentworth, but the County of Wentworth was divided into north and south under the Act we are now working under. In the last Redistribution Bill, the township of Ancaster was put into North Brant, the result being that the County of Wentworth was divided into two by a sharp point. Whatever disturbance there is in that is to be found in the Bill of 1882. Now, the two are put into one, and one township, Beverley, is taken out and put into North Brant. There is no attempt to gain political influence by that.

Mr, MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I am not sufficiently acquainted with the geography of Wentworth to express an opinion upon it, but I am very much astonished to hear the proposition of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), as to replacing the seat which will have to be provided by uniting the city of Kingston and the village of Portsmouth and throwing the County of Frontenac and part of the County of Lennox in together. In an early part of this debate, the hon. gentleman was very much in favour of county boundaries being preserved, but this suggestion of his would break through any rule of that kind, because Portsmouth has no connection municipally with Kingston at all. It has always formed part of the County of Frontenac, and there are no interests in common between the city of Kingston and the village of Portsmouth. I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman state that Frontenac and Lennox are united for municipal purposes. They are not united, and, if they ever were, it must have been before I was born. Although it is true that a portion of the County of Frontenac forms part of the County of Addington for political purposes, no part of it forms part of the County of Lennox. They are as distinct as the Counties of Brant and Wentworth. I would greatly prefer that the Bill as introduced should carry than that any change of that sort should be made.

Mr. BOYLE. The trouble is, when a measure of this sort is under discussion, that any change seems to be plausible at first, but when it is discussed new difficulties present themselves. In this very matter, if I understand the scheme of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), it is to make the County of Wentworth one constituency. Would not that create some difficulty? Part of the county

would be on one side of the city of Hamilton and the other part would be on the other side.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The city does not break it up at all.

Mr. BOYLE. Then, as to the emasculation of the representation in that district, I very much regret that the constituency of Monck has disappeared, and I think that an arrangement more equal and fair might be devised. I would support any well-devised scheme to preserve the County of Monck, but the proposition of the member for Bothwell would go further than this, because it would remove three members from a locality about the same as that from which two are being taken now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I may inform the hon. gentleman that my motion has been voted down, and now we are considering another motion.

Mr. BOYLE. Assuming that the Bill before the House is the best the Government can present, and the amendment is the best the Opposition can present, we have to choose between the two, and I prefer the scheme the Government present.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The member for Monck is altogether wrong in supposing that, if North and South Wentworth were united, they would be separated by the city of Hamilton. It is true that the city of Hamilton is in the township of Barton, but Ancaster adjoins Barton and Binbrook, and then the constituency runs continuously east so that the city of Hamilton only takes a portion of the township of Barton and does not interfere with the connection between North and South Wentworth at all. It would be a continuous united county.

Mr. TISDALE. I understand the suggestion to be that we should take two counties in the east and unite them together. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very generous. They have passed the parts of the Bill which tell in their favour, such as that in reference to Lincoln, except that they desired to add Merritton to it, to which the Government did not object. I would much prefer that the change did not take place in my constituency, but the Government have made the fairest division and with the least disturbance that can be made in the Province of Ontario. Two seats have been taken from the western part of the province to supply the two seats which, I believe, it is conceded ought to be given to Toronto and the large northern part of the country. The proposition in regard to the Niagara Peninsula should be taken as a whole, and it is not fair to take it piecemeal. I do not agree with the proposition of some hon. gentlemen of taking the two new members from the eastern half of the province, because it would be taking from one-half the province and giving to the other half instead of equalizing. Now, coming down to this particular proposition about Wentworth I cannot see any unfairness in it at all. The proposition, as a whole, politically, is extremely fair. It equalizes population in every one of those ridings, and that is one of the things that should always be borne in mind; if anything, we give our opponents a political advantage. So far as I am concerned in South Norfolk, I want to say that taking in the 5,000 of Walpole, if I had my choice, so far as any political advantage is concerned, I would leave the riding as it is. But if the Government carry this whole proposition out that would be extremely unfair, because, by adding that 5,000 to South Norfolk, they equalize the population fairly and improve it in the whole of those ridings. So far as Wentworth is concerned they add only one more township from North Wentworth to Brant; that is all the change they make; so that there is no more disturbance than existed before, because any excess has been taken out of North Wentworth and put into Brant. I have been surprised to hear it claimed that we are gaining a political advantage there. I wish to deny that, and I shall give my reasons. Lincoln in its old shape, has always been Conservative since Confederation until now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No; Capt. Norris represented it in two Parliaments, from 1872 to 1878.

Mr. TISDALE. I think it has always been Conservative with the exception of one Parliament, until the hon. member who now represents it (Mr. Gibson) was elected. Now, that is being strengthened by the townships that are being added to it, so that it is pro'ably safe for the Reformers if you take things as they are. Monck, except two sessions, has always been Conservative since Confederation. Welland, up to within a short time, has also been Conservative, and we are not making any changes in Welland that would affect the hon. gentleman who now holds the seat. I believe we have dropped all the changes except the name of one municipality. Then Haldimand and Monck we hold, and South Norfolk we hold. South Norfolk, I do not think, has been strengthened at all. The township of Walpole is one of those doubtful townships and generally gives a very small Conservative majority. I think it gave the doctor either 47 or 52 the last time. It has a population of 5,000. Lincoln is made safe. Haldimand and Monck are made safe, South Wentworth is left about as it was; Welland is left as it was. I mean to say that no fair-minded man can complain of this arrangement, taking a group of constituencies, since no more changes have been made than were necessary in order to find two more seats for Toronto and Algoma. It is true that an amendment has been moved that would cover the question in another way, but I am not answering that because now we are discussing the Bill item by item.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I want to say a word with regard to the plan of taking members from western Ontario. I have gone over the figures and I find that western Ontario is largely unrepresented now. The unit of representation for Ontario, west of the city of Toronto, was 22,850; and the representative unit east of Toronto, not including the city, was 19,700. Now, there must have been some reason why the Government went west of the city of Toronto for the purpose of getting two members, rather than east. If the principle was to endeavour to arrive at an equalization of the population, as the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) says, I do not see why they have gone to the west of Toronto rather than to the east for the purpose of getting two members. I am strongly opposed to taking the two members from the portion of Ontario that is now under-represented. I did not hear the Government give any reason why they went west rather than east. Now, if the representation could be made upon county lines, it would have this result, that one representative would be taken from the west of Toronto and

two from the east of Toronto, which would enable us to give the three extra members, two to the city of Toronto and one to East Algoma, which it is now proposed by the Government to do. I think that would have been far more just than the arrangement now proposed. We have a population west of Toronto of 1,119,000, which territory sends 49 members, or one member for every 22,850; east of Toronto we have 630,000 in round numbers, and from that section of country we get 32 members, or 19,710 for each member. A question arose here the other day as to whether we were over-represented in western Ontario or not. I have gone over the figures since that time, in order to ascertain whether the statement made by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) was correct or not. I have taken Toronto as the pivotal centre and have not included it in the calculation; but the member for Albert took a line some distance west of Toronto and made his calculations on the figures he derived from that line.

Mr. WELDON. I began west of Essex and added up the populations until I got an exact half, and I ran the line between Peel and York northward. As a matter of fact that western portion is somewhat over-represented.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I have no doubt the hon. gentleman did what he could in order to arrive at a division of the population; but his division leaves Toronto in what we call eastern Ontario. It is well known by every one that Toronto is generally considered the pivotal point, and in order to make a fair calculation I leave it out in the meantime, and take the counties lying east and west of the city, and I find the Liberal party polled at the last general election 4,856 more than the Conservative party in the western section of the province. The Liberals have returned to this House 27 members and the Conservatives have returned 27 members. It is thus apparent that the Liberals are represented by the same number of members, although they had a majority of 4,856 votes. Look at the other side of the shield—take the eastern section of Ontario. The Liberal-Conservatives polled in the eastern portion of the province 4,480 of a majority. How do the two parties stand as regards representation? The Liberals returned 6 members and the Conservatives 29 members to this House. It is evident there is something wrong if the Conservative party can obtain 29 members with a majority of 4,480 of the popular vote and the Liberals can receive only the same number of members with a popular majority of 4,856, or over 400 above the Conservative majority. If any honest man will look at these figures, he will find the figures to be correct, and he must admit that this Redistribution Bill is based on a principle that is not just, but is one that gives an advantage to the Conservative party in its representation in this House. Looking at the whole matter, and again omitting Toronto as the focal point between the east and west, the Liberals had a popular majority of 376, and they are represented in this House by 33 members, while the Conservatives are represented by 56 members, leaving out the three members now representing Toronto. In view of these figures, of which I challenge contradiction by any hon. member, will not hon. gentlemen opposite see, as the people of the country will see, that the redistribution of 1882, in connection with the redistribution now about to be inflicted on the people, was directly opposed to the interests of the country, as well as of justice and fair-play. If that be so, why should hon. gentlemen opposite now hesitate to admit that the figures show that eastern Ontario is over-represented and western Ontario is under-represented, and that as there are many small electoral districts in eastern Ontario we can afford to strike out one or more of them, or unite two or more of them, and thus bring to a closer equality the unit of representation. Would that not be an honourable way of looking at the subject? Hon. gentlemen opposite have invited a suggestion from the Reform party. Here is the suggestion now. Let hon. gentlemen opposite leave the Niagara Peninsula alone, and come to the east, say to Leeds and Grenville. It is not a county; the electoral district has only about 13,000 inhabitants; and if hon. members will look over the list of constituencies east and west of Toronto they will observe the large disproportion that prevails between the population of different constituencies. Let me submit the figures of some east and west districts to show the disparity between the population:

East Districts.		West Districts.	
Lennox	14,902	Essex North	31,523
Brockville	15,855	Essex South	24,022
Prince Edward	18,892	Kent	31,434
Frontenac	13,445	Bothwell	25,595
Grenville South	12,931	Oxford North	26,131
Leeds and Grenville	13,523	Perth North	26,900
Northumberland W.	14,947	Waterloo North	25,325
Peterborough West	15,808	Waterloo South	25,148
	120,330		216,087
Average	15,038	Average	27,011

In the face of these facts, it is patent to every hon. member that there are no just grounds on which the Government should have selected the Niagara Peninsula for the purpose of securing two members to give to another portion of the province. I hope the Government will accept the suggestion offered from this side of the House, and will leave Niagara alone, and come to the smaller electoral districts east and make the changes necessary so as to secure two or three members, and give one or two additional members to Toronto and one to Eastern Algoma.

Mr. WELDON. The leader of the Opposition has made a strong appeal to myself, and I will say, from what acquaintance of Ontario constituencies I have been able to obtain during the last five or six weeks—and I put forward my opinion with much modesty—that my own view as to what would be most desirable as regards the distribution of seats in the Province of Ontario, would be to have taken two of the smaller counties and united them, and united two other counties, and made no other change of any importance, except in regard to Wentworth. If the hon. gentleman had moved that as regards Leeds and Grenville, the townships should be added to the adjoining riding so as to increase the population to 26,000 odd, that would have been an excellent suggestion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is our suggestion now.

Mr. WELDON. And if coupled with that, he had made the suggestion that the two Wentworths should be united, and the whole settlement

ended there—and by this means you would have procured two members—I would have supported such a suggestion as being a fair one.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Regarding Wentworth, there seems to be an impression abroad in the committee that in placing the townships as proposed, we are doing violence to some community of interests existing between those townships, or rather we are not regarding community of interests. It appears that the Bill as regards the Niagara Peninsula shows that the object of the Government was to secure two members in that well-represented district, which might be given to less represented or entirely unrepresented districts in other portions of the province. Having agreed upon that they would naturally say: We will abolish these constituencies which are the smallest in the district, and make the least possible changes and at the same time equalize population as well as we possibly can. Now, so far as the population is concerned, there is not a word said here to the effect that there is not an honest attempt to equalize the population of all these constituencies, an attempt not made without success. Under the present law, North Brant has a population of 16,933. Abolishing North Wentworth, and placing it with South Wentworth, without moving this township to Brant, which is proposed in the Bill, would leave North Brant with a population of 16,993, and would leave Wentworth with a population of about 30,000. Under the Bill as proposed, you have North Brant with a population of 21,629 and South Wentworth with a population of between 25,000 and 26,000. Now, so far as the changes in constituencies are concerned, there is only one change made in the Wentworths, and that change is to take the township of Beverley out of North Wentworth, or out of the united Wentworths, if you like, and place it in the constituency of North Brant. That is the least possible change which will in any sense equalize the population under the new order of things. Then the other argument is, that there is a want of continuity between these two constituencies. I am not prepared, because I am not able by my knowledge of the locality, to decide as between the arguments of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. McKay) and the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain). However, the best information I can secure says that there is a strip of land, however dry or however travelable it may be, connecting the parts of this one constituency. Whatever the opinion of the hon. gentleman may be upon that matter, it will not be denied by my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Paterson) or by my hon. friend from North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) that there is a community of interests between the people who are added to South Wentworth on the north, and the old constituency of South Wentworth on the south. Hon. gentlemen know that they are portions of the one county, and that the people meet in all those associations that were referred to here the other day as sacred, and which should not be interfered with. Hon. gentlemen know also that their representatives go to the one county council, that the city of Hamilton is their one market, and though geographically the constituency may have rather a carved-up appearance, yet it still cannot be denied that the two portions of the County of Wentworth are portions of the county, and that they have a common interest, a common market, and a common county council. In other words, they are being put back together again as constituent portions of that one county. I just wish to speak for a moment on the population of that district and to show how it has been equalized. I will give the figures in round numbers. Under the old system the County of Welland had a population of 25,000; Haldimand, 16,000; Monck, 15,000; North Brant, 15,000; North Wentworth, 14,000; Lincoln, 21,000; South Wentworth, 16,000; and South Norfolk, 17,000. Under the new system the population of these counties will be as follows:—Welland, 25,000; Haldimand, 22,000; North Brant, 22,000; Lincoln, 26,000; South Wentworth, 26,000; and South Norfolk will be a little over 21,000. I think that hon. gentlemen will see that it is a fair equalization so far as the population is concerned, and that no violation has been done the geographical districts. So far as the politics of the Niagara Peninsula are concerned, I believe sincerely that the advantages are with hon. gentlemen opposite, and that there is no particular advantage to this side of the House in the changes that have been made.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman refers to the equalization of population in that district.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That was the original question raised.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not going into the discussion of the manner in which that equalization has been brought about, but I will call the attention of the committee again to the fact that the district of country lying west of Toronto is not over-represented at the present time, that the district lying east of Toronto is over-represented by about five members; and that if you were to distribute these five according to population you would give three of them to York and the city of Toronto, and you would give one to Simcoe, and one to the new Algoma district. These are the districts to which these five members would go if you were to equalize the population over the entire province, leaving the west with the inequalities that exist at the present time. But when it is proposed to take two members from the Niagara district, if you are undertaking to equalize the representation in the different parts of the province, and if that is the ground upon which you attempt to justify the taking of two representatives from the two Niagara districts,—then you ought to give these two representatives to the western portion of the province which is not sufficiently represented. Kent at the present time has a larger population than the County of Hastings, and yet you give to the County of Hastings three members, and you do not give two to the County of Kent. Lambton is entitled to three members as well as the County of Hastings, yet you do not give them. If the Niagara district, which may be considered as belonging to the western portion of the province, is to have its representation diminished, that representation should be taken to the west, and you still must undertake to equalize the electoral districts by drawing from the east to supply Toronto and the district of Nipissing.

Mr. BOWELL. When you speak of Kent you refer to its municipal boundaries and not as an electoral division. It is not fair to compare it with

Hastings under these circumstances, because a part of Kent is now represented by the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). One half my county is part of Kent, and the eastern section was cut off and put in the County of West Elgin. Count that another half ; but it is not, and you still have only two representatives for the municipal County of Kent, and yet Kent has a larger population than Hastings. You gave Hastings three members and you gave to Kent, anyway you have a mind to consider it, but two members. Lambton, with about the same population as the County of Hastings, is also entitled to receive three members, and yet Lambton has only two and a half members. The hon. gentleman will see that if you commence to argue in favour of disturbing the district of Niagara in order to equalize population, he has a good deal more to do than to take two representatives from Niagara, for Toronto and Nipissing. He ought to take Nipissing as in the eastern section of the province, and he ought to take from the eastern section, which is over-represented, in order to give a member to Nipissing. Why should not Leeds and Grenville be united ? If you take the western extremity of Leeds and Grenville and attach it to the district of Brockville ; if you wish to equalize that district, or to raise the population something near to the unit, you would then have three members where you have two members now, and you have not an over-population for either of them. If you undertake to justify what you are doing by saying you are equalizing population, why not go to the districts with the sparsest population, take a portion of the representation from them, and give it to the districts which are already over-populated in proportion to the representation they have. I say that Toronto ought to have more representation. I do not object to what you propose to do in regard to Toronto, but I do object to taking the representation from the Niagara district to give it to Toronto instead of taking it from the eastern portion of the province. Then, again, why should you withdraw a representative from the Niagara district to give a member to the district of Nipissing, instead of withdrawing a member from the district of Kingston ? You have over-representation there. Taking the whole section of the province east of the County of York, the electoral districts will not average up to the unit by nearly 4,000. Why, then, should a whole section of the province remain over-represented, while you go into the western section which is not adequately represented and diminish its representation ? The County of Simcoe has 84,000 people, and yet it is not given more than three members. If hon. gentlemen are disposed to undertake to equalize the representation of the various sections of the country, they require to do something more than they propose to do by this Bill ; but if they will leave the Niagara district alone and take from the eastern section of the province two representatives, one for Toronto and one for Nipissing, I am content to accept that as a compromise so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned. I think that is a reasonable proposition. At the last general election the Liberal party polled 60,000 votes and returned 10 representatives in the section east of the County of York, while the Conservative party polled 62,000 votes and returned 26 representatives.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How did you count those counties where two Conservatives were running ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There was only one riding, the County of Carleton.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There were Carleton, East Durham and South Leeds.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will not succeed in imposing on the committee by that statement. He knows that the candidate in South Leeds against the present member committed himself to the commercial policy enunciated by the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He did not do that. He pronounced himself as a supporter of the right hon. leader of the Government, since deceased, and he said further, on the public platform, that if Sir John Macdonald were defeated in Kingston, he would be willing to give him South Leeds for a constituency.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman, I suppose, denies that there are any Reformers in the County of Leeds.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not at all ; take the previous vote.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will not contend that the hon. member for South Leeds was elected by Liberal votes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was sent here with a majority of 106, but, had there been a straight Liberal running against me, my majority would have been 550. The Liberals would not put a man in the field, saying that they would not do so unless they got a break in our party. My opponent stated that he would support Sir John Macdonald's Government, and he also stated on the platform that if Sir John were defeated in Kingston he would resign and give his seat, but the Liberals supported him all the same and reduced my majority.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman knows that his opponent committed himself as being in favour of unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. TAYLOR. He did nothing of the kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was so announced in the papers. I do not know the candidate, but the hon. gentleman will not deny that it was a Reformer who ran against him on the previous occasion when his majority was over 400 more.

Mr. TAYLOR. 416.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then there is a very large Reform vote in the constituency. Let the hon. gentleman arrange the sum total as he likes, and see whether the representation in this House fairly represents the strength of the Liberal party east of the County of York. The hon. gentleman knows that it does not represent half the strength, or anything like it. If you had a cumulative vote, the Liberal party would have seventeen seats, instead of ten, as at present.

An hon. MEMBER. Why do you not advocate it ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Because I advocate a different system. I think the system of single constituencies, in case of resignation or death, or a vacancy, is a more convenient and less expensive system ; it enables the majority in a constituency to express its opinion. I have never been able to see, and I have never met any one who

has been able to show, under a system of cumulative voting, in case of the death of the representative of the minority, how that minority could elect a successor. So I prefer to allow the majority in one electoral district to be virtually the representative of the minority in another. It is not well to take the two representatives from the Niagara district, because, if you are going into a large and general scheme of redistribution, those taken from that district should be given to the more westerly portion of the province. It has already been pointed out that North Essex has over 30,000, West Kent over 30,000, and Bothwell something like 26,000; so that if you would give these districts their full representation you would be obliged to provide them with two or three additional members. I am not calling for that; but I say that if you wish to take representatives from any portion of the province in order to give additional representation to Toronto and Nipissing, you ought to take them from the east. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has pointed out how one principle may obtain. I accept that proposition. I am ready to support it so far as that one is concerned, and I think the Government ought to adopt it. When you look to see the way those figures work out, and when you look at the population in those various districts, it is not asking what is unreasonable to take representation from the districts that will now divide less than 20,000 to the constituent body altogether and to give advantage to the district that you propose shall have additional representation. That is a reasonable proposition and one perfectly fair to the Administration. The hon. gentleman said that we are taking one member from the Niagara district who is Reform, and one who is Conservative——

Mr. MONTAGUE. How many times did it elect a Liberal in the last twenty years?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell)—and one that is occasionally Conservative; it depends on who the candidate is. I repeat that for nearly twenty years——

Mr. MONTAGUE. Monck?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; Haldimand.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We were not speaking about Haldimand. The hon. gentleman is mixed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that he has obliterated Monck and put a part of Monck into the County of Haldimand, and he is saving Monck by putting a part of Haldimand into Monck on a former occasion. You expect you will have a Conservative constituency in Toronto.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has been considering the political effect in every instance, despite his assertions to the contrary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have been looking at numbers and geographical position, and that is what we have admitted is the right and proper principle, leaving out of view, for the time being, the political effects. But the hon. member for South Norfolk and the hon. member for Haldimand, on every occasion and in every speech, show that they have gone into minute details to see how the votes have stood in every polling division; and that has been their governing consideration in dealing with this subject.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Your making these remarks compels us to answer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not preventing the hon. gentleman from making his answer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then do not complain if we do.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not complaining. If I have any complaint to make it will be after the hon. gentleman has spoken and not before. I am calling his attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman has gone into the Niagara Peninsula, which is in the western section of the Dominion, and which is at present without adequate representation in this House, as far as numbers are concerned, and I say that you ought to have gone to the east, where the population is fewer in numbers, and where the electoral districts are smaller, and where you can unite two into one without even creating a district as large as Kent or North Essex.

Mr. BOWELL. It seems to me, and I say it without any desire to be offensive, that the policy of the Opposition is one of fault-finding, no matter what is done. The hon. gentleman and those who preceded him on his side have told the House that their propositions are fair and equitable, but every proposition they have made has been one which, in their belief at least, enure to their own political advantage, and to that alone. Now, we have been told during the last two or three weeks that the principle of representation by population was an absurdity; that, in fact, representation in this House ought not to be based on that principle. I could not help reflecting that the Liberal party of Canada nearly drove this country into rebellion some years ago on that very question of representation by population. It is true that the Confederation Act has based representation to a certain extent upon that principle, and hon. gentlemen opposite say now that that is the correct principle upon which to act so far as it applies to the provinces.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL. But when you come to constituencies, then it should not be applied when you are dealing with the constituencies in one of the provinces. Now, if the principle be good in one respect, I cannot well see how it can be bad in another.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You do not apply it; you do not pretend to apply it.

Mr. BOWELL. Who said that we did? I am replying to the contentions of hon. gentlemen opposite, and am not laying down any proposition as to what should be the basis of representation. I am simply pointing out that in discussing this question on the main motion, they ignored the principle of population altogether; whereas in the present instance some of them base their argument upon that principle, others upon the votes which were given at the last election, and others again upon the population in the different districts. The hon. member for Bothwell contends that if the representation should be reduced, it should be reduced in the eastern section of the province. My hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) pointed out what he believed to be a fair dividing line as between the west and the east. The hon. member for Huron does not accept that proposition because it would not answer his purpose or his argument. You can base any argument you please upon the division of the province, provided you will divide it

to suit the arguments. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) laid down a very fair and equitable and just division, because he pointed out that section of the country which, when divided, would show an equality of population between the east and the west, and adopting that line he showed that the west has quite as much representation in this House as that to which it is entitled.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But you are taking two members from that district the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) referred to.

Mr. BOWELL. I will approach that point in a moment if the hon. gentleman is not in too great a hurry. I admit that you take two from the south-western peninsula, but it is also true that those two representatives are given to that portion of the country which you claim to be in the western section, that is Toronto and north-western Ontario, eastern Algoma and the Nipissing district. Now, if you deprive the eastern section of Ontario of two representatives, as proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, then you give them to the western and the north-western section of Ontario. You claim that Toronto belongs to the western section of Ontario.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL. When you left the Chair at six o'clock, I had pointed out the difference of opinion that I thought existed and had been defended by members on the Opposition side. It was intimated to me by an hon. gentleman that I had misrepresented the figures given by the hon. member for Huron. I am not aware that I referred in any way to the figures given by that hon. member except to state generally that, by dividing the province in certain places, hon. gentlemen could arrive at any conclusion they chose. If the hon. gentleman did not include Toronto in his figures as belonging to the western section of the country or to the eastern section, then he ignored that very important city altogether, and that only proves the position which I took, that by dividing the province in any way you think proper, you can arrive at any result you desire. I am not going to discuss the figures which have been given over and over again as to the redistribution in the Province of Ontario. Every point that has been discussed in committee has been laid before the House repeatedly on previous occasions. The member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in pointing out the difference between the representation given to the County of Hastings and the representation given to the County of Kent, scarcely did justice to one of the representatives from that section of the country. He argued that, though a portion of that county was attached to the county which he represents, it could only be considered to be represented in this House by two members. As I understand, a portion of the County of Kent is attached to Bothwell and a portion to West Elgin. If that be the case, then the interests of Kent are represented very ably by the hon. gentleman who represents the county proper, Mr. Campbell; and another portion is represented by the member who has sat here for nearly a quarter of a century for West Elgin (Mr. Casey).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then you may count it as three members.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman argued as if there were only two, but he must not ignore himself. Kent is represented in its entirety by one member, and other portions are represented by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). I do not believe in the principle of adhering to municipal or county lines in dividing the country for representation in this House. The interests of an adjacent county or township, though in a different electoral district, are identical on the great principles upon which this House is asked to legislate. I might point to counties where, although they are divided according to county lines, there is no community of interest. In the county in which I live, the north riding of which I have been the representative for nearly a quarter of a century, has interests which are not identical with those of the people in the south, but when it comes to a question of whether a certain policy shall be inaugurated or put in force, fiscally or commercially, their interests may be identical, so it matters not whether a man lives in the township of Huntingdon, which adjoins the east riding of Hastings, or on the other side where it adjoins the west riding.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then you might have parts of a riding 100 miles apart.

Mr. BOWELL. What has that to do with the broad question of the National Policy? Could not a gentleman living 100 miles distant from the place where I live entertain the same views as I do and record his vote in the same manner?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then you might put a part of Essex in Russell County.

Mr. BOWELL. Even that, on the principle I have laid down. It matters not if you equalize them, and I believe in adhering to the principle of representation by population as nearly as you can.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But you do not do it.

Mr. BOWELL. I say we do it as nearly as it can be done without interfering with every electoral division in the whole Province of Ontario. Speaking from my own individual opinion, I would have no objection to begin at the east of the province, take the whole population of Ontario, and divide the whole province equally so far as it could be done without interfering with township lines. One would suppose, to hear the arguments which have been advanced by members on the other side who have opposed this scheme of distribution, that the votes in the country were stationary. An hon. gentleman suggests that they must be petrified, that they never change, no matter what question may be submitted to them for their consideration. Take the eastern section of Ontario as an illustration to which allusion has been repeatedly made, owing to the fact that it has sent to the present Parliament a larger number of Conservatives than the other portions of Ontario. After Confederation, taking eastward from East Durham, the great majority sent to this Parliament were Conservatives, and that was repeated in the election of 1872. In 1873 the parties in this House changed sides. An election took place in 1874, and that great Conservative section of country that it is said

is not now interfered with on account of its political complexion, returned a great majority supporting hon. gentlemen opposite; from the Bay of Quinté eastward to the province line, scarcely one Conservative was returned to this House from the whole of the St. Lawrence counties. It is true that as opportunity presented itself, after the hon. gentlemen had been governing the country for five years, those electors returned, if I may so say, to their former allegiance, having learned from five years experience that hon. gentlemen opposite did not legislate in the interest of the country. Not only did the eastern section of Ontario return a large majority in 1878 to support the Conservative party, but the western section of Ontario also reversed its vote of 1874—I do not say because they admired particularly the hon. gentlemen who were leading the Conservative party at that time; but a great issue was presented to the electors, and they changed their allegiance from the party in power and supported the late leader of the Government and his colleagues. Thus it appears that the electors of this country are men who think, and when they think they act; that is as it should be in all self-governing free countries. People should vote, not for the man who presents himself, but for the principle which he represents for the time being. We see that very clearly across the lines, at every election when new issues are presented to the people, and I am glad to see that such is the case also in this country. The figures which the hon. member for Bothwell gave to the House were all based upon the election of 1891, as I anderstood him. If he had applied his reasoning powers and his calculation to the vote that was given in the elections which have lately been held, he must have come to a different conclusion. It is astonishing for me, and it must be to the electors who reflect for a moment, that a gentleman of his ability should present such statements and figures and reason from them in the manner he has done, knowing, as he must know, that the people of this country are as well acquainted with passing events as he is himself. Take every county in the eastern section of the country, and also in most of the west, where there has been an election, and for some cause, which I believe to be a want of confidence in the policy advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite, the people have supported the present Government. We had a bye-election in the County of Glengarry, the Conservative majority was increased; we had an election in North Lanark, and the majority for the supporter of the Government and the principles upon which they are governing the country, was also increased. It is true that the majority in the city of Kingston was reduced, but that was for reasons well known to every elector in the country. Then pass on a little westward, and Lennox was redeemed—true, not by a large majority, but the Liberal majority was reversed. Then take East Hastings, adjoining the County of Lennox, a Liberal majority of 55 was transformed into a Conservative majority of 448. If you cross the bay to Prince Edward, you will find that the majority of the hon. gentleman who now represents that county was increased from about 32 to 240. Then take the counties a little westward, and you have West Northumberland, where the majority was reversed from 20 or 30 to about an equal number. Go to the two electoral ridings north of it, and you have a majority of 25 in South Victoria increased to between 200 and 300; and in the north riding you have another illustration of the change in public opinion shown by transferring a Liberal majority of about 350 into a Conservative majority of over 400. I might go on in this way from one end of the Dominion to the other. Mark you, there has been no redistribution or gerrymander between 1872 and 1884, nor can the changes in public opinion or in the representation in this House be at all attributable to the redistribution in the Province of Ontario. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) told us the other night that he is stronger to-day than before his county was readjusted, or gerrymandered, if he prefers to use the term. He gave as a reason that the Conservative electors in that county were so disgusted with the changes that were made that they turned from their former allegiance to join his party. If that has been the result throughout the Province of Ontario, surely the hon. gentlemen should not object to a further redistribution in order that they may secure more seats in this House. There has been but one instance during the whole of this debate in which it has been shown that any advantage accrued to the Conservative party, and that was in the north riding of the County of Lanark. That has been pointed out as a case in which the Conservatives obtained a seat which they would not otherwise have had. But beyond that, whatever may have been the effect of that redistribution, the hon. gentlemen have not pointed out any other change. With regard to the Bill now before the House, the Government had to consider that the whole district of Nipissing was unrepresented; it was necessary that a constituency should be so constituted as to enable the people to vote in a constituency of their own. It was believed that the Niagara Peninsula was not at all likely to increase in population, from the fact that almost every lot is now settled; and the Government thought it would be just and equitable so to redivide the southern peninsula of Ontario as to give representation to the north-western portion of territory which was unrepresented in this House, and also an additional member to the populous city of Toronto. Had the population been such as to require an additional member or two to the Province of Ontario, the Government would not have interfered with any of the constituencies except making the minor changes which they have suggested, such as taking the Island of Scugog out of one constituency and adding it to another, and Port Elgin from North Bruce and adding it to West Bruce, in which the town is situated, and one or two other small changes. But they had this problem to solve, how to redistribute the representation in the country so as to give Nipissing and a portion of Algoma, which is very extensive, another representative. I should have liked, if the population of the province had justified it, to see the district of Nipissing get a representative by itself, the same as it has in the Local Legislature, and to divide Algoma into two. The hon. member for Bothwell says that the Government expected to secure a representative in the Nipissing district. Upon what basis he came to that conclusion, I am at a loss to know. I am of the opinion, from the votes recorded in the Nipissing district at the last Ontario election, that it is largely Liberal. It is well known that the part of Algoma attached to the Nipissing district remained for a great number of

years Liberal, and was represented by Mr. Lyon, and it was only at the last election it was won by a Conservative, Mr. Campbell. Taking this redistribution as a whole, it is, I believe, the most equitable that could possibly be made, and the Government, to show they were quite willing to meet the wishes, as far as possible, of the Opposition, consented to two of the propositions which they have made. It has been said that we did so because those sections were iniquitous in their character. We did not so consider them, nor do I now. The addition of Clarence to Prescott was simply the bringing together of people whose thoughts and actions were very much alike. The adding of Merritton to Welland was done for the purpose of equalizing the population as nearly as possible, without doing violence to any great principle. We were willing to meet hon. gentlemen opposite on these points, not because they were exactly right, for if we consider the interests of the parties involved we would come to the conclusion that they could be fairly attached to the counties to which the Bill originally attached them. I think we have conceded to the Opposition as much as could reasonably be expected. The changes which have been suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell and others who have discussed the question would simply go to make the constituencies in the west more dissimilar than at present. If I were to adopt the views of hon. gentlemen, I would say that they have allowed the changes respecting Lincoln and other constituencies to pass because they thought it was their political interest to do so: but just so soon as the committee reaches a section which hon. gentlemen opposite think will interfere with them politically, they desire to readjust and gerrymander that so as not only to secure the two seats they have already obtained, but to obtain the whole Niagara Peninsula. I repeat that the Bill, so far as it affects Ontario, is as equitable as it can possibly be made, unless it is desired to enter upon a redistribution of all the counties of the province. But as hon. gentlemen opposite have ignored in their speeches the principle of representation by population, it certainly comes with very ill grace from them to advocate the abolition of certain constituencies in the east simply because they have not as large a population as constituencies in the west. It is as well in discussing a question of this kind to be as nearly consistent as possible, without resorting to opposition simply for the love of it or with the intention of securing every constituency in the Dominion. The Government have yielded, I repeat, as far as they can go, and I am not at this moment prepared to say, until the suggestions are made, how much further they will be prepared to go; but when hon. gentlemen opposite reflect, they will come to the conclusion that they are asking the Government to go a little too far in the propositions submitted by them in regard to the Niagara Peninsula.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hon. gentlemen opposite have invited suggestions; they have declared that they desire as far as possible to have a fair and just redistribution measure; they have laid down several principles; they desire, as they tell us, to have a minimum of disturbance; they desire to have as few constituencies meddled with as possible. The Minister of Militia has just expressed his regret that he was obliged to disturb some of these constituencies now under consideration, and he would have preferred to have given the members to those constituencies which required them, had the growth of Ontario permitted, without any disturbance. I am going to make a proposition to hon. gentlemen opposite which will be, I think, on the face of it, in accordance with all the principles they have laid down, which will be perfectly fair and just, which will equalize as far as may be the representation, and which will meet in one word as nearly as possible all the conditions laid down on several occasions by the Minister of Justice, repeated on the present occasion by the Minister of Militia and advocated by a good many of the hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this subject. The blot on this measure, as everybody knows perfectly well, is this: that the constituencies, as a mass, which lie west of the city of Toronto are scarcely represented in accordance with their population. The 35 constituencies which lie east of Toronto are at this moment represented utterly disproportionately to their numerical strength. Those 35 constituencies, as I pointed out a few nights ago, contain some 688,000 people. They have 35 members. On an average 19,700 people east of Toronto have as great a voice in the representation of this country as 23,200 people west of Toronto. That, I submit, is a blot and a very great and palpable blot on the scheme of redistribution proposed. What is overlooked all through this discussion is the very great discrepancy which is apparent, a great many instances of which I gave a few nights ago, between the western and eastern sections. All sorts of absurd attempts have been made to equalize the population and account for the discrepancy, but the bare fact remains that east of Toronto you have a population of less than 700,000 with 35 representatives, that east of Toronto the average constituency has a population of 3,200 below the unit, while west of Toronto the constituencies have populations several hundreds above the unit. I grant that hon. gentlemen opposite, if they disturb the representation at all, are justified in adding a representative to Toronto and a representative to Algoma: but if they refuse to adopt the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to go to the root of the matter and have a reasonable distribution, which would do away with the iniquities of the gerrymander of 1882, then, on every ground of fair-play, they are bound to take the two additional representatives wanted for Toronto and Algoma from the district which lies east of Toronto, which is to-day represented to the extent of 20 per cent more than it is legally entitled to. The suggestion which I am about to propose is briefly this: Let us take the four smallest constituencies in Ontario, which as it happens lie contiguous to one another, and let us unite those four 2 and 2. Thereby we will obtain with a minimum of disturbance and perfect equity and fairness the two representatives desired for Toronto and the district of Algoma. Let us not interfere or meddle with any other of the constituencies in the province. In that way the only disturbance will be in connection with those four constituencies and the granting the two members to Toronto and Algoma. It is perfectly well known that there are in the east four constituencies containing smaller populations than the constituencies which hon. gentlemen opposite propose to disturb. There is North Leeds and Grenville, with a population of

12,900, and South Grenville with a population of 13,000. I propose that you should unite those two constituencies into one, which would have a population of 26,000 at the outside. They are not by any means growing counties and are not likely to increase in population.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, according to the last census.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will even then have constituencies very considerably smaller than a very large number of the constituencies in the west. You would have a constituency smaller than Essex South, smaller than Kent, smaller than East Simcoe, smaller than North Simcoe, smaller than East York, smaller than West York, smaller, in fact, than a dozen of the constituencies that lie to the westward. That would give you one of your members, and by uniting the Counties of Frontenac and Lennox, one with a population of 14,000 and the other of about 13,000, you could obtain another out of these smaller constituencies, while if you chose to unite the suburb of Portsmouth to the city of Kingston would give you a constituency very little in excess of the unit. I point out to the House that in that way you will have the minimum of disturbance, and you will redress partially the enormous inequality that now exists between these two sections of the province which are east and west of Toronto. You will also have an opportunity of giving effect to all the declarations that have been made that the Government desire to do only what is fair and just. Nothing could be fairer or more just than to take these two seats from these 35 constituencies, which are very much over-represented. After these two seats are taken away from the territory east of Toronto you will still have 33 members for a population of 688,000 —that is to say, the unit will continue to be at least 2,000 and more below the regular unit upon which representation ought to be readjusted. You will do no injustice in that way to the territory west of the city of Toronto, and you will avoid the injustice which is now being committed in wiping out my hon. friend from North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), and disturbing the condition of some eight or nine constituencies in the immediate vicinity. There, Sir, is a proposition which ought to commend itself to all hon. gentlemen who desire, as they tell us, to have simply and solely a fair and equitable redistribution, and I propose, therefore, that the whole of this clause 2 shall read as follows :—I move :

That sub-section 2 of section 2 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—

1. That the electoral district of West Toronto shall be divided into two divisions, each of which shall return one member.

2. That the electoral divisions of Frontenac and Lennox shall be united and shall return one member.

3. That the electoral districts of South Grenville and North Leeds and Grenville shall be united and return one member.

4. That the electoral district of Algoma and Nipissing shall be divided and shall each return one member.

The Government can divide West Toronto as they please, having due regard to a reasonable numerical proportion. I submit that this is a fair and reasonable proposition, worthy the consideration of this House, meeting all the conditions which the hon. gentlemen opposite have set forth, doing no injustice either to east or west, and supplying two members at the minimum of disturbance, which is always an object in this case. I do not desire to waste the time of the House by further arguing what I think ought to commend itself to the good sense and to the feeling of equity of every hon. gentleman present who desires to see a fair and equitable measure of redistribution. I call the special attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that the four constituencies which are proposed to be united : the constituencies of North Leeds and Grenville, and South Grenville, and the constituencies of Lennox and Frontenac—or, if he likes, let it be the constituencies of Lennox and Addington which would not affect the principle, and if the Government like to select them they can do so—I call his attention to the fact that these are four much smaller constituencies than the ones he proposes to disturb. That these could work together with the most perfect ease, that there is no disturbance of county boundaries, that everything which has been laid down by hon. gentlemen as a question of equity and fair-play is met by the proposal that I now make. I trust that that proposal will, at any rate, have a reasonable discussion at the hands of the House before the matter is disposed of, and if hon. gentlemen see fit to refuse the proposition that we shall have some reasonable grounds for that refusal.

Mr. BOWELL. If that amendment be adopted it necessitates the recasting of the whole Bill, and it involves a general principle rather than an amendment to the question before the House. It seems to me that the amendment ought more properly come, either to the second reading, or as an instruction to the committee to change the Bill in that particular. If it were adopted now, it would involve changes which I do not suppose gentlemen opposite would wish to make.

Mr. LAURIER. It is intended as an amendment to sub-section 2. My hon. friend was not in the House when the previous part of the Bill was passed, but he proposes to consider the paragraphs which have not been passed, and to substitute the scheme which he has laid before the House for the whole of sub-section 2.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentlemen are disposed to agree to this—and it is the same as I suggested verbally early in the discussion—then it seems to me that it would be a very short job indeed to adjust the other portions of the Bill in accordance with the requirements of that amendment. The amendment, as my friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has just stated, still leaves the average population for the constituencies east of Toronto below that of the constituencies west, and it is uniting four of the smallest constituencies into two. These constituencies are contiguous to each other, it leaves the boundaries unbroken, and it has the advantage of avoiding further the disturbance which the hon. gentleman proposes to make in the Niagara district.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This amendment alters the whole of clause 2. We have been four weeks getting down to sub-section (*h*), and I should be very sorry to go back.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that this amendment proposed by my hon. friend accomplishes two things. It increases the average unit of the constituencies east of Toronto, which will still be 2,000 or more below the average

of those west of Toronto. It also provides the seats which are required by the city of Toronto and the district of Nipissing. The minor changes which the Government propose, this amendment does not touch.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am afraid that the hon. Minister of Militia has not listened to the full discussion which has taken place on this question, or else he would have said that we had not presented any argument to show that the Government are reaping an advantage from the proposed changes. We have endeavoured to show that they are, and I stated myself that hon. gentlemen opposite could not point out any other constituencies in the Province of Ontario that would give the Government greater advantages than the two which they are proposing to divide in the Niagara Peninsula. The statement that the section east of Toronto is over-represented will not, I think, be challenged by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for East Huron has clearly set out the population and the members elected from the two sections; and I have endeavoured, taking the dividing line given by the hon. member for Albert, to show that east of Toronto the number elected to support the Government was some 20 in excess of the number elected to support the Opposition. Now, the hon. Minister of Militia says that it is impossible to make a more just distribution than the one proposed in the Niagara Peninsula. I have pointed out that in cutting up the County of Monck, one portion is put into Haldimand, making it safe, another portion, which is virtually Reform, is put into Lincoln, which is now represented on this side of the House, and the balance is put into South Norfolk. I do not charge that the hon. member for South Norfolk was particularly in need of that; yet it adds to the Conservative complexion of his riding. Therefore the component parts of that riding have been disposed of to the best advantage of the Government, Then, North Wentworth is wiped out, and its component parts are also disposed of to the Government's best advantage. South Wentworth is made safe by the addition of Dundas, which gives a Conservative majority of 168, and the balance is put into North Brant, which has already a large Reform majority, so that those townships are practically buried where they can do no harm. If the hon. Minister of Militia can find two other constituencies the component parts of which can be utilized more to the advantage of the Government, I ask him to name them. Now, if the amendment proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford is adopted, Leeds and Grenville, which are now Conservative, will in all probability continue Conservative, only they will elect one instead of two; and Lennox and Addington will be in the same position. The proposition is fair on its face. I am rather disposed to think that the hon. Minister of Justice did not anticipate a gerrymander. The manner in which he has accepted the propositions made with regard to Clarence and Merritton, evinces a disposition on his part to do what is fair. I am glad to recognize justice and fair-play when I see it; and had the proposition made by the hon. leader of the Opposition been carried out, and had hon. gentlemen opposite met say the hon. leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for South Oxford in a conference with the view of coming to an amicable arrangement with regard to this whole business, I am satisfied that Parliament would have been closed long ago, and we would all be now at our homes. There was a compromise reached between Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury, and there would undoubtedly have been a compromise reached in this case. Now, I do not wish to detain the committee further. I merely rose to reply to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Militia because the measure does bear on its face the character of an advantage to the Government in these two ridings which are to be wiped out. Hon. gentlemen say that they are wiping out one of their own constituencies, but they are making sure of one that is exceedingly doubtful, and they are helping two others; and the balance of the votes which have been recorded to elect my hon. friend, who has been a creditable representative in this Parliament for a quarter of a century, are buried in North Brant, where they are not wanted, and where they cannot be heard of. That is what we complain of; and if the proposition made by the hon. member for South Oxford is accepted, it will bring this discussion to an end, and we shall be able very soon to get away to our homes.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 34; Nays, 68.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Before the sub-section is adopted, I would like to refer for a few moments to the discussion on this particular clause which took place before recess. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), whom I regret not to see in his place, referred to the peculiar difficulty which affected the redistribution of 1882, in so far as the south riding of Wentworth was concerned, and he pointed out that, taking out the township of Ancaster from the south riding and attaching it to the north riding of Brant, certainly gave that constituency a very peculiar outline. And the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), referring to this question a few minutes afterwards, while admitting there was not the desired community of interests between the two portions of that riding, as now proposed to be connected in this Bill, while admitting that the constituency was slightly disfigured in its form, yet claimed that upon the whole it made a very plausible adjustment. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the township of Ancaster, which it is proposed shall remain attached to North Brant, runs down nearly to the city of Hamilton, and is at least within a mile and a half of the headquarters of the county, the court house in the city of Hamilton, which has been the headquarters of that county and district for the last seventy-five years.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Three-quarters of a mile.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). My hon. friend says three-quarters of a mile.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He is wrong.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Well, it is not over a mile and a quarter, and it projects right down into the centre of the riding; and out of Ancaster lies, half way west on the boundary, a portion of the town of Dundas, now which it is proposed by this arrangement to attach to the south riding of Wentworth. Notwithstanding the statement of the hon. mem-

ber for Hamilton that the two sections of the riding are connected, I must say, if he undertakes to travel from the one section to the other without either going through the County of Brant or the city of Hamilton, he will require to have a very prolonged pair of boots and a boat handy as well in case he should not find bottom at all, because he will have to cross the inlet through which the Desjardins Canal runs, and which has been open for navigation for a long time. But what I suggest, as in a line with the proposition of the hon. member for Albert, was that, instead of leaving the township of Ancaster as now proposed, attached to North Brant, if they want to restore the continuity of the County of South Wentworth, they should replace the township of Ancaster in the south riding of Wentworth, so that the county will be connected by some tangible connection instead of coming through a separate riding. Then South Wentworth will form again a united whole with the addition of the town of Dundas out of the north riding, which lies now partly in the township of Ancaster and the balance immediately adjoining, alongside the boundary lines between North and South Wentworth ridings. I do not propose this with the view of saying that it will completely fulfil the idea of preserving the associations of parties.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What would you do with the Flamboroughs?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I will tell you in a moment. What I suggest is this: that it would give South Wentworth a much more respectable outline, and make it a more compact constituency. But I am free to admit at once that, so far as the town of Dundas goes, their interests are not in any form allied with the balance of the south riding of Wentworth or could be called a community of interests. My hon. friend from Haldimand knows very well that a town lying within five or six miles of the city of Hamilton has a local interest of its own. It is connected with the township of Ancaster on the one side and on the other side with the township to Beverley and West Flamborough, and that it is not possible to replace the town in the new relation proposed and be satisfactory to the people of Dundas. My hon. friend asks me what I proposed to do with respect to the townships of East and West Flamborough and the village of Waterdown. I say, attach them with the township of Beverley to the north riding of Brant. I do not claim that there would be community of interests, but I do claim that the geographical position, as relating to North Brant, would be quite as convenient to that county as the township of Ancaster, and in respect to the relative population of the two ridings, as then constituted, would be more equal. Let me give the committee the actual figures as they are proposed in both cases North Brant, according to the last census, including Ancaster, had nearly 17,000 population, 16,993. As proposed in the Act, the addition of Beverley would make 4,636 bringing it up to 21,629, under the proposed Act. With respect to South Wentworth, as proposed by the Act, the old population was 16,770 at the last census. They propose to add the town of Dundas with 3,546, East Flamborough with 2,661, West Flamborough with 3,079, the village of Waterdown with 669, total 26,725. But another section of the Act provides that the city of Hamilton shall include the present municipal boundaries of that city, and deduct say 2,400 from Barton.

Mr. McKAY. 1,700, not 2,400.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I am quoting the figures from the Hamilton *Spectator*. In that case South Wentworth would have a population of about 25,000, with that reduction from the city of Hamilton. Now, by taking the township of Ancaster from South Wentworth, we would reduce the population by 4,098, and would add the town of Dundas, and taking Ancaster from North Brant would make the population of the new South Wentworth 22,714. The population of North Brant, which is now 16,993, would be reduced 4,098 by taking Ancaster out of it, leaving a population of 12,895. Adding to that the township of Beverley, 4,636, Flamborough East 2,661, Flamborough West 3,079, and Waterdown 669, would make the new North Brant 23,940, and the new South Wentworth 22,714. That would give them a greater equality in regard to population, it would make the territorial boundaries more compact, it would give them a greater community of interest, and the township of Ancaster would be united with its old county with which it has been associated for 45 years down to the Gerrymander Act of 1882. I do not claim that the other townships would be so closely united with North Brant, but the adjustment would be territorially more equitable and would place them in a more natural position. I therefore move that sub-section (*h*) be amended by striking out East and West Flamborough and the village of Waterdown, and adding the township of Ancaster.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. In the gerrymander of 1882, three counties were cut up to make the constituency of North Brant which I represent, and the township of Ancaster was ruthlessly taken away from its old associations in Wentworth and placed in the north riding of Brant. I know that the feeling of the people in Ancaster is and has been in favour of being replaced in the south riding of Wentworth where their associations had been for half a century. I would like at the same time to do justice to the township of Blenheim in the west of my riding, which properly belongs to the County of Oxford, but it would be better to do justice to a portion of the constituency even if it cannot be done to the whole. If any one will look at the map he cannot but arrive at the conclusion that the township of Ancaster ought to belong to the south riding of Wentworth, and, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. McKay) as to the possibility of getting from East and West Flamborough into South Wentworth, I say his statement is not correct, and that, if he goes over the ground when he gets home, he will see that the contention of the member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) and myself is correct. It is utterly impossible for the member for Hamilton to pass from the town of Dundas or from East or West Flamborough and get into the south riding of Wentworth without passing through the township of Ancaster, which is now a portion of North Brant, or taking a boat or swimming. I think the Government should take this into consideration, and, if they are not prepared to do justice to the whole of North Brant in regard to the township of Blenheim, they should do justice at all

events to the township of Ancaster. I agree with the member for North Wentworth that probably it cannot be said that the townships of East and West Flamborough and Beverley will assimilate with North Brant more than Ancaster has done, but this at all events will be correcting an injustice which was done to the township of Ancaster and the population will be better adjusted than it is under this Bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I sincerely hope the leader of the Government will accept this amendment. Two parallel cases are contained in the Bill, one taking Port Elgin out of the north riding of Bruce and putting it into the west riding, and the other taking the island of Scugog out of the north riding of Ontario and putting it into the south. They are precisely similar cases. They are geographically in the ridings where the Government are putting them, and the Government are right in doing that. The two townships of Flamborough and the village of Waterdown are geographically completely separate from the south riding of Wentworth, and Ancaster is a part of that riding and should never have been taken out of it. There is now an opportunity to put it back and make two decent looking ridings. Why should the Government hesitate? If the Government refuse to do this I am sure they will be ashamed of it afterwards when they see the shape of the constituencies they have made. Then there is a consideration in reference to equalizing population. I know the Government have not adopted that basis and that the plan advocated by hon. gentlemen on this side did not look to equalizing the population, but, other things being equal, that also ought to have some weight. North Wentworth and Brant, as proposed by the Bill, totals up 21,629, while South Wentworth, as it is proposed to be fixed by the Bill, has a population of 26,725.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is a portion of the township of Barton which comes out.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. None of us, I suppose, know what the exact figures are.

Mr. MONTAGUE. 1,700 or 1,800.

Mr. ARMSTRONG Very well, these are to be taken from the township of Barton and to be put into Hamilton. But even allowing that to be the case, there would still be a large discrepancy between the two, there would still be something like 3,000 more in South Wentworth than in North Wentworth. If you take the amendment proposed by the member for South Wentworth, you have the constituency of North Wentworth with 23,940, and the constituency of South Wentworth with a little over 24,000; so it would really make them almost equal, and would do away with that anomaly of the peculiar geographical feature of the case; and the Government, I am sure, would feel pleased afterwards with what they have done, and if they fail to do it, I feel certain they will be ashamed when they come to look at it afterwards.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood, when the Ministers proposed that amendments should be offered, that they would discuss them. There has been no discussion on this amendment that has been offered, and it seems to me there should be some answer given on the other side to the arguments that have been advanced in its favour. In the first place, if you look at it from a geographical point of view, it is proposed in the Bill that the riding of South Wentworth should be cut in two, and it has been pointed out that you will have to pass through another riding, or come in by water, to get from one part to the other. I think hon. gentlemen will admit that is objectionable. They have only two clauses in the Bill that propose to rectify deficiencies in existing electoral divisions so far as the situation of different municipalities is concerned.

Mr. BOWELL. Suppose that to be correct, it does not affect the individual voter. The one who lives on one side of the marsh would not have to pass over to the other to vote.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the Minister takes that ground, as the member for Bothwell pointed out, you would be departing from anything like preserving the geographical connection of the ridings. Of course under the line the Minister lays down, you could unite a township in Ontario to a township in Quebec where the same issues are being discussed and voted upon in both ridings; the Minister surely will not argue that. It has been argued that the amendment does not secure geographical precision. Then if there was objection in the matter of equalizing the population, the one might counterbalance the other. But when you come to look at it, you find the Bill proposes to make North Brant have 21,629; it proposes to make South Wentworth have 26,725, less the 1,700, or about 25,000. Taking that 1,700 off and there is a difference of 4,000 in the ridings as proposed by the Bill, in addition to this terrible geographical objection. Now, according to the proposition of the hon. gentleman, without giving details, North Brant would have 23,940, and South Wentworth 22,714; so that by his proposition you would do away with the absurdity of having the county cut into by another county; you would have the County of North Brant and the riding of South Wentworth more symmetrical, geographically speaking, and you would almost equalize the population; while, as I have said before, there is a discrepancy in the division of three or four thousand. It does seem to me that the case is so strong in that respect that it is worthy of explanation by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Haldimand pointed out with some little force that if you were putting the Flamboroughs into North Brant you were cutting them from their county associations. That is true, but that is the difficulty with this Bill, and members will understand the position. In discussing this Bill we are taunted with departing from principles we have advocated before. We have tried to observe county bounds, but the committee has said: No, we will not do that; and now, with that decision in view, we are trying to remedy it as well as we can under the circumstances. It is only on that account that we consider these changes. The member for Haldimand will observe that while he is right with reference to putting the Flamboroughs into North Brant, he severs their interests as a part of the county from the rest of the county. He is putting back Ancaster, which, under the present Bill, is separated from its local interests, its municipal interests, with the County of Wentworth; so that while his argument holds good with reference to the Flamboroughs, it is counterbalanced on the other hand by the restoration of Ancaster to its proper neighbouring townships, and its county interests; so that

not a complete answer that the hon. gentleman has given to say that you are dissociating the townships of Flamborough from their connection with the County of Wentworth. It is true you are doing that, but it is one of the inevitable consequences that hon. gentlemen opposite force upon us in insisting upon breaking up counties. But that is counterbalanced by taking a township that has for ten years been severed from its county connections and placing it back. I think, at any rate, enough has been said to show that this is a reasonable proposition now before the Chair, and it requires some explanation from hon. gentlemen opposite why they oppose it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I fancy the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, saw the weakness of his position, because he consumed the greater portion of his time in half apologizing for going back upon the principles which they have advocated for the last three or four weeks. The hon. gentleman makes the admission that the resolution now before the Chair does break county lines by the addition of the townships of East and West Flamborough to the County of Brant, but he justifies himself on the score that he is putting Ancaster back into the County of Wentworth, and that if he is doing one evil, he is at least doing one good thing. But I must say to him that while he is putting back the township of Ancaster into the County of Wentworth as I understand the geography of the district, he is taking away from that constituency a township which lies contiguous to the greater portion of the County of Brant: but he is adding to the County of Brant two townships which are very far indeed from the boundary line of Brant, and have, therefore, much less community of interest with the County of Brant than has the township of Ancaster which now forms a portion of the constituency. Now, what are the principles we have heard from the other side of the House for the last three or four weeks? The first principle we have heard enunciated is that we should leave county lines intact. The hon. gentleman has admitted--and in that admission he has shown the weakness of his amendment, because it is contrary to the principles he has advocated in his amendment—that he is breaking county lines just as much as county lines were broken in any other portion of Ontario. So far as population is concerned, not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite has said that the redistribution in the Niagara Peninsula has not been a fair and honest one. You cannot, without dividing municipalities, get an absolute and fair division of constituencies upon the basis of population. But I say that no gentleman, however opposed he may have been to the redistribution in that portion of Ontario, would claim that the redistribution upon the score of population has not been a fair and honest one. Now, I remember reading a debate upon the redistribution of Brant on the Bill of 1882, and I remember the holy horror with which those gentlemen looked upon the length of the constituency of North Brant, stretching, as they said it did, from the city of Hamilton almost to the town of Woodstock in the centre of the great Province of Ontario.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear;" yet I venture to say he will vote for the amendment of the hon. gentleman for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), which increases the length of that constituency ten or fifteen miles or more.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I say yes. Instead of going to the eastern boundary of Ancaster, you propose to go to the eastern boundary of the township of Flamborough. I hope the hon. member for Bothwell will note that the length of the constituency would be increased from eight to eighteen miles.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. About eight miles.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, accepting that, that is eight miles too far in a township already too long. The hon. gentleman has admitted that there is no community of interests between the north portion of the County of Wentworth and the township to which it is proposed to add those constituents in North Brant, while he has not argued against the statement I made that there is a community of interests, a community of interest increased and intensified by the long associations during all the history of Wentworth as a municipal county of Ontario, in the arrangement proposed in the Bill; and yet in violation of that principle, which hon. gentlemen opposite have held sacred in this House, it is intended to drag away the townships of East and West Flamborough and carry them to North Brant, with which they have no community of interests whatever. I consider that every principle has been violated, whether it be the one of permanency, because more changes are proposed by this resolution than in the Bill; whether it be the principle of population, because the population will be no more equalized under that proposition than under ours; and changes, therefore, are not justified, whether it be the principle of community of interest or historical continuity, all the principles so loudly proclaimed and so often dinned into our ears during the past four weeks are violated in the amendment proposed. I submit, therefore, that the amendment should not pass but be rejected.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The only principle which the hon. gentleman and those associated with him observe is the principle of interest. It is the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite to pay some regard to that principle, and that is the only one indicated by the speech which the hon. gentleman has delivered and by the work done on the ground. The hon. gentleman has told us we are departing from principle. What principle does the hon. gentleman complain of? The hon. gentleman has started out, not simply in the speech he has just made but in the several short addresses he has delivered——

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not intend to charge the hon. gentleman with any departure from principle. I would have been wrong if I had done so, because this would make a gain for the Liberal party, and that is the principle which controls hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman judges others by himself. The hon. gentleman says it would be a proper thing to do. In 1882, they say we made a "hive" of the constituency of North Brant, we gave the hon. gentlemen that constituency by over 1,000 majority, but we are not satisfied with that and we make another invasion with the view to increasing the majority to 1,300. That is the principle which hon. gentle-

men opposite say is perfectly fair to both parties. Anything is fair to the Liberal party. "You know," said the wife of St. Clair, "you cannot reason from the niggers to the white people;" and what was perfectly fair to us they would not for one moment consider when applied to them. So hon. gentlemen opposite think that we on this side of the House are a species of nigger of a former generation, and that they can deal with us just as their majority enables them to do. The speech of the hon. Minister of Public Works, the speeches of the hon. Minister of Justice, show that while they held out their intention of paying due consideration to every observation and every reasonable proposition made from this side of the House, they are not prepared to consider any propositions that will not promote the interests of the Tory party. That is what hon. gentlemen opposite labour for, and they hope to accomplish by legislation in this House what they think they might not be able to accomplish outside of the House. That is the position taken, and it is just as well for hon. gentlemen to come out and frankly avow their intentions. They intend to legislate the Liberal party, so far as they can, out of Parliament, and not satisfied with what they did in 1882, they propose to continue their course and accomplish this result, as far as possible by the present Bill. Hon. gentlemen opposite declare they do not want to regard municipal boundaries, and they do not think those boundaries should be respected. In this Bill they have disregarded municipal boundaries. The Minister of Militia has addressed a speech to the House which would warrant the Government in putting part of Essex and Russell together. He affirmed that it did not matter whether a constituency was composed of territory contiguous or symmetrical, that we were voting for great principles, and he would rejoice to see personal considerations left out of view and the people voting solely with respect to the political questions placed in issue. The public do not vote in that way; they have some regard for the standing, ability, social qualities and various other characteristics of the member who represents them. All these qualities will have their weight so long as human nature is as it is at present, and they will have a certain influence on the election, and from my point of view, taking into consideration the character of representative government, I think the public judge more wisely than hon. gentlemen opposite. But the fact remains that no proposition that would be fair to us would for a moment be considered by hon. gentlemen opposite. We ask them: Will you respect county lines, will you return to that principle, will you agree to the division of counties into ridings? Hon. gentlemen opposite by their votes said no. They declared they would not agree to anything of that sort, for they respected population and they wanted equal electoral districts. We then proposed something which more tended to equalize population than the proposition which the Government brought down. We proposed that the four of the smallest counties should be abolished or united. Did hon. gentlemen opposite accept it? No. What ground did the Government give for rejecting that proposition? No ground can be given, except that they are determined to legislate the member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) out of the House. What hon. gentlemen opposite are aiming at is to fix the Niagara Peninsula so as to put out the hon. member for North Wentworth and keep in the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). That is the aim of the Bill, that is a provision of it, and that is its high and noble object. That is the noble object that the Administration have placed before the House in this measure. The Government have told us that when we got into committee they would accept any reasonable proposition. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made a reasonable proposition. He put two constituencies together, both of which when united are several thousand smaller than the County of Kent, several thousand smaller than two of the ridings of Simcoe; several thousand smaller than the riding of North Essex, and did the Government accept it? Not at all; there is not an approach to an acceptance of a reasonable proposition. The Government say: Why you will reduce the number of representatives in the section of the country where we are at present strong, and although these constituencies are several thousand below what they should be in population, yet we will not attach any weight to that matter, but we will legislate some of the members of the Opposition out of the House; and so they adhere to the scheme. It is just as well that we should consider this subject on the merits that the Government put before us. They do not exhibit that courage that we would have a right to expect under the circumstances, and declare that that is their object, but every act accepted and every act rejected, shows that nothing will be done where party interests are in the smallest degree to suffer, no matter what may be required by what is just and fair.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) speaks very brave words; but I do not think that his arguments had very much force. The fact of my recognizing that the two Flamboroughs belonged to the County of Wentworth, and the charge that therefore I am severing county bounds, might apply if I had voted as he and his friends had, that county bounds should not be respected. But having voted that they should be respected, and having been voted down by hon. gentlemen opposite, and seeing that nothing further can be done in that direction, does it carry any weight for him then to say: that you shall not transpose townships belonging to a county that you are tearing to pieces, after you have affirmed that it is out of our power to go back. While the injustice to the Flamboroughs is an equal injustice to Ancaster, we say we will remedy other injustices and inequalities and transpose these townships. In the Counties of Lincoln, Welland, Haldimand, Monck, Wentworth, Brant, Oxford and Norfolk, and the city of Hamilton, giving you the benefit of the majority there, the Liberal party according to the last general election returns, varied a little by the bye-election,—and I claim they would come out about equal so far as that is concerned if elections were held in all these ridings to-day,—I say that in these counties the last election returns show that there was 5,349 Liberal majority, while there was only 1,203 Conservative majority. In the face of this state of things the cool proposition made by hon. gentlemen opposite to wipe out a constituency represented by a Liberal, who can carry it I venture to say as long as he chooses to run, and yet they see

no injustice in that. Then the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) takes care that that which was a very doubtful seat indeed for him is in his judgment made a perfectly sure seat. There is no advantage given to the Liberals in this respect, but a Liberal seat is to be wiped out in the face of the fact that there is over 4,000 of a Liberal majority in these ridings, even giving the Conservatives the benefit of the large majority they had in the city of Hamilton. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite talk about fair-play and about their doing what is right. It does not lie in the mouth of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) to say much with reference to the arrangement of these constituencies in the Niagara Peninsula, That is what I have to say meanwhile, and if it is necessary to reply to the hon. gentleman again I shall endeavour to do so. We object, and we do not want Wentworth torn to pieces. Hon. gentlemen opposite have voted that it shall be, and they say we will put portions of these pieces into one riding and portions into another riding. We objected to the partition of the county but you have carried it, and now we object to the still greater iniquity of your violating all that is decent in geography, and violating all that is decent in the way of equalization of population. You have voted to divide these townships, and your having done the iniquity of separating them, we on this side now propose that we shall arrange it so as to wipe out as far as possible this geographical iniquity and this inequality of the population. That is done by the proposition of the hon. member, and that is the reason I support it. If the Government and the member for Haldimand are willing to reconsider their decision and say that they will allow us to maintain county bounds and preserve the County of Wentworth, why of course my hon. friend will withdraw his proposition. He has proposed it because of the determination of the Government to carve up the constituency, and we support it because we are forced into it by the action of the Government. In the face of the figures I have quoted showing that in these counties I have enumerated,—and giving the Government the benefit of the majority in Hamilton—there is some 4,000 more of a Liberal majority, I ask is it just or fair that they should propose to wipe out a seat that is held by a Liberal in this House, and that they should refuse to rectify that which they themselves must see is a crying injustice as far as geography and lack of equalization of population is concerned? Perhaps they take this course because it might endanger a seat they hold in this House, the sitting member having a majority of one, and because they wish to strengthen his position. I think that the proposition made from this side of the House, is a reasonable and fair one. Even if South Wentworth passed over from the Conservatives by virtue of this, and I do not know whether it would or not, it would only be taking the place of North Wentworth. The hon. gentlemen may say: We wipe out Monck. True; but the Liberals have held Monck and the Liberals have held Haldimand too.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When did you ever hold Monck?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We held it last session, did we not?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. MONTAGUE? You got it, but you did not hold it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We held it for that time, and Monck would have been held a great many more years than that, only that I think it is a county—if I remember right, and I will not be positive about it—that has been strengthened for the Conservatives by the gerrymander several times. My hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) who represented that county, can tell something, perhaps, with reference to that matter.

Mr. EDGAR. I beg to inform my hon. friend (Mr. Montague)—which was not Monck at that time—that I held that county as a Liberal during the whole of a Parliament; not a very long one.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That was about three months, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDGAR. That shows how very little the hon. gentleman from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) knows about Canadian history. I held the county of Monck during the whole of the session of 1872, and during the next session, long enough to assist materially in turning the Conservative Government out of power, and then there was a new election.

Mr. BOWELL. May I ask the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) if he has included in the calculation he has just made of Liberal majorities, the Counties of Oxford and one of the Norfolks?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, Oxford and Norfolk both. I did not mention them in ridings; I took the whole counties.

Mr. BOWELL. Why take the majorities in counties that are not interfered with in this Bill, and add them to your calculation in order to make a strong case. I want to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that while he very indignantly denounced the wiping out of North Wentworth, he had not a word of commiseration for Monck. I suppose that was all right, it having been represented by a Conservative, with the exception of two or three sessions, since Confederation.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have not the slightest objection myself to the restoration of Monck, but I fancy that the hon. member for Haldimand has a very decided objection.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not at all. Like the hon. gentleman, I had to gain some votes, but I have no reason to suppose that my constituency will discard me.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not say that it will, but I am quite willing to have Monck restored. The reason I have put in Oxford is that I consider that gentlemen living in Oxford are just as good as gentlemen living in any other riding, and they ought to have as much importance attached to their votes. My proposition is simply to show that in that part of Ontario where the preponderance of Liberal sentiment is so great, instead of giving it anything like its proper voice here, you are taking steps, by this iniquitous act to still further reduce its voice in this House.

Mr. BOYLE. In the discussion which has taken place on this change, the only expression of sympathy in regard to Monck which we have heard, is that which has just fallen from the lips of the hon. member for South Brant. We are now discussing the question of the reconstruction of South

Wentworth, and it is easy for one side to bandy words with the other in regard to political advantage. Perhaps one side looks through blue glasses and the other side through green glasses, and the consequence is that to one side everything looks blue and to the other side everything looks green. It may be that to me things look green or possibly blue. Now, if any proposition has been made on the Opposition side of the House in amendment to the Bill, which would have any other effect than to strengthen that side politically, I would like to know what it is. The proposition to adhere to county lines would have done that most effectually. Taking the counties forming the Niagara Peninsula, I find that one member would be given to Wentworth, two to Brant, one to Lincoln and Niagara, one to Welland, one to Norfolk and one to Haldimand, under the arrangement proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell; and every-one of these counties except Haldimand would elect a Liberal member, according to the votes given in 1891, in fact according to the votes given in the bye-elections in 1892. That is, though the aggregate vote given in the last election in these counties was 16,667 Conservatives and 18,654 Liberals, the Liberals had 10 per cent of a majority, while they would have had 90 per cent of the representation. Now, if the arrangement proposed in the Bill becomes law, the Liberals, on the basis of the vote in the last election, will be entitled to North Norfolk, North and South Brant, Welland and Lincoln, and the Conservatives to South Norfolk, Haldimand and South Wentworth—5 to the Liberals and 3 to the Conservatives; and yet this is denounced on the other side of the House as a very unfair arrangement to the Liberals. That is not all. The constituency of South Wentworth is not by any means a safe Conservative constituency. It will be fair fighting ground, and if the Bill carries, I venture to say that the present member for North Wentworth will be a candidate for the representation of South Wentworth, with a strong expectation of carrying it.

Mr. McKAY. It has been said by some hon. gentlemen who have spoken, that the Government were actuated not by principles but by interests in framing this Redistribution Bill. It will be admitted, however, that if they were actuated by interest they could have made a measure far more advantageous to themselves. In regard to the objections so strongly urged by hon. gentlemen opposite to the redistribution of the Wentworths, it is somewhat peculiar that while the other portions of the redistribution of the Niagara Peninsula were under discussion, hon. gentlemen did not raise these strong objections. They were evidently satisfied themselves that they were to their advantage politically, and they were perfectly willing to accept them. It has been alleged by hon. gentlemen opposite that the townships of Ancaster and Beverley have a community of interest with Hamilton. I deny that partially. Their community of interest is with Brantford and Galt.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think you are wrong.

Mr. McKAY. A great part of these townships are contiguous to Brantford, and their community of interest is with that city, and partially with Galt. With respect to the townships of West and East Flamborough, which hon. gentlemen propose to add to North Brant, they have not a single interest in common with that county or with Brantford. Their interests lie entirely with the city of Hamilton, and to join them to North Brant on the ground of community of interest would be absurd. It cannot be truthfully said that the Redistribution Bill is in the interest of the Conservative party. I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite are going to be the greater gainers by these changes. There is no doubt that the Conservative party in another general election will return weaker from the Niagara Peninsula than we are at present. Now, I would like to say just one word in reply to what the hon. member for North Brant said about Dundas. When I made my remarks this afternoon I did not mention Dundas. I said that Barton and East and West Flamborough were in contact with each other, and that the township of Barton lay to the west of Hamilton, and through it you could get to those townships from the other parts of the riding; but I did not mention Dundas.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to correct the hon. member for Hamilton with regard to the township of Barton being connected with the townships of East and West Flamborough. It is not connected with either. As I said before, in order to get to the townships of East or West Flamborough you have to cross the Desjardins Canal and the marsh.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the discussion to-day and the action of the committee must show the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Justice how unpractical the proposition is which they laid down, that this Bill would be considered in detail, and that any representation made would be taken into consideration while we were in Committee of the Whole. It is quite evident that there are not, in addition to the two or three members who live in the locality interested, any who have the first idea of the merits of the case? The consideration of a Bill of this description in Committee of the Whole by men who have any desire to do what is right has been proved impracticable. I am not going to take up the time of the committee by discussing the details, because I do not think it is possible at present for the House to understand and appreciate the arguments for or against the proposition before it, but I would just like to call the attention of the committee to this fact. There is one proposition which has been laid down and which has never been answered, and that is that in the western section of Ontario the people are under-represented as compared with the eastern section which is over-represented. The figures to prove this have been submitted so often and are so evidently unanswerable that I need not refer to them again. I was surprised to hear the argument of the hon. member for South Norfolk this afternoon. He argued that the two additional representatives to which the city of Toronto and Nipissing district are entitled should be taken from the Niagara Peninsula. And why? Because the western section, including the city of Toronto, had a much larger population. Now, the Minister of Railways the other evening, when he was arguing against the proposition of this side, drew a line dividing the province, in which he included the city of Toronto and the district of Algoma in the eastern section, to show that there was not such a great difference of population between the two

sections of the province. I think that a fair way to discuss this Bill would be to leave out the city of Toronto and that portion of the province north of Toronto altogether from the division. Any one who wishes to discuss it from a fair stand-point must admit that would be the proper way to divide the province in order to find how the people are represented in this House. It has been clearly shown that east of Toronto there is at present a representative in this House for every 19,000 in round numbers of the population, while on the other hand in the western section each member represents over 23,000. That proposition is one which has been entirely unanswered; and as far as the details of the Bill are concerned with regard to Ontario, it is impossible to believe that this cutting up of constituencies in the Niagara Peninsula was not done with an object other than the proper redistribution of the seats. Appeals are made to fair-minded men, that because one constituency, represented by a Reformer, is wiped out, and another represented by a Conservative, therefore it is a fair division. To a person who knows nothing of the district or the situation, that might appear plausible and fair, but those who have studied the question know that the Government, by the changes they are making, are strengthening constituencies which are not at all now safe for a Conservative, and only increasing the strength of one which might be called a fighting constituency. The hon. member for South Norfolk referred at great length to the additional Liberal vote that is being put in the County of Lincoln, and it was evident by his eagerness to discuss the matter from a party stand-point, that this cutting up would not have taken place in that district at all, if it had not been the fact that after two severe contests in that constituency it is represented by a Reformer by a very large majority. However that is a matter of very little importance after all. So far as my judgment goes, I do not believe the Government will gain very much by their gerrymander, if this Bill is to be carried, I believe that the great injustice done by taking these representatives from the now under-represented section of the country and leaving the over-represented section as it is, will more than outweigh in the minds of thinking people anything the Government can gain by doing away with the Counties of Monck and Wentworth. When it was decided to give this extra representative to the city of Toronto and to give an extra representative to that section north of Toronto, the Government should at least, to be fair, have taken and united some of the small constituencies in the east, even if they had been disposed to take one of the representatives from the west. There still would have been a great difference between the populations of the two districts. It appears to me if something of that kind had been done, there would have been an appearance of at least fairness. It is not necessary or desirable before this committee, to undertake to discuss the details, because we have heard members on the one side and the other quoting figures and making representations with regard to the party political strength of those constituencies, which any person who knew anything about the matter knew to be perfectly erroneous. It is easy enough to take the figures at a certain election and try to make an argument out of them, but it has no bearing at all upon the general case. I would like very much if the Government had taken this matter more into their consideration and been inclined to do fairly by the people. It is a matter of very great indifference to me, in considering a question of this kind, as to which party is to gain the advantage, but I do think it is of great importance to the people to feel that the men representing them, not only in the Government but on the floor of Parliament, are willing to pass legislation founded on permanent principles of right and justice, and I would say to the Minister leading the Government that I do not believe the people of western Ontario feel that he was inclined to deal with this Bill in a fair manner, since he has not taken into consideration some of the propositions made before the House. A great deal has been said in regard to the principles which should have governed the committee and Parliament in dealing with this question. The Minister of Militia this evening stated that he was opposed to confining the constituencies to county lines. It is possible that some other principle might be laid down which would be more in the interest of the country. Personally I am not wedded to that principle, but I think the principles laid down in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), taken altogether, were very fair. The Minister of Militia stated that it would be right to start at one end of the province—I think he should have said at one end of the Dominion—and divide it into districts, and give due consideration to the population and also to the convenience of the electors. I would ask the committee why the Minister of Militia and his colleagues in the Government did not adopt some such principle as that before they introduced this measure, so that, when we appealed to the country, even if the Conservative party had the advantage in the distribution of seats, we might at least know what to expect and upon what principle any changes would be made. In my own section there is a growing feeling that the legislation which is taking place is not fair. In days past we used to appeal to the people on the ground that in Canada we had a better system than they had across the line, that our public men were more honest and more sincere in following out the principles that should govern a country, but there is a great change in regard to that, and I know that, in that section of the country, they feel, from the legislation that has taken place, that their confidence has been weakened, and it will continue to be weakened by the passing of such legislation as this. I would appeal to the members of this House to say whether any small party advantage which is supposed to be gained by a gerrymander of this sort is not small compared to the wrongs which are done by it to the people of the country by passing such legislation. I think the amendment which has been offered by my hon. friend from North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) is very fair. If we are going to adhere to the doing away with two constituencies in the Niagara district, it is only fair that, after strengthening one or two constituencies in the interests of the party, they should at least adopt the suggestion offered in this amendment, which is not, as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) said, making that a Reform constituency, for, if he knows the constituency at all, he must know that it is a fighting constituency, as North Wentworth has been for years, varying from one or four upwards, and never within my recollection exceeding

a majority of 100. I believe this would give some satisfaction to the people there.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman states that in the distribution of seats he has taken into consideration that Toronto should be left out altogether. Leaving that out, the 46 members to the west of Toronto would represent a less number than the 43 members in the east. If the hon. gentleman will make the calculation, he will find that the 46 members from the western peninsula represent 40,000 less than the 43 members in the east. If he takes in the city of Toronto, he will find that the members represent as much population from the east as they do from the west.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. State the figures.

Mr. HAGGART. I stated them the other day, and, taking the line between the Yorks and Peel and leaving Simcoe to the east, dividing Ontario into two, with 46 members from the east and 46 from the west, I say that there are 40,000 people to the east in excess of those who are represented in the west. I believe the numbers are more than that, between 40,000 and 60,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is that leaving out Toronto?

Mr. HAGGART. No, it is taking in Toronto. I find that the 46 members that represent the western peninsula have from 40,000 to 60,000 less population than the 46 members who represent the east, including Toronto Leaving out Toronto and its three members and its population, you will see that each member who represents the eastern district has as many people as those who represent the western district.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman is altogether astray in his figures. We have only 33 members west of Toronto, while the Conservatives have 56 east of Toronto, and giving them three members for the city of Toronto, that gives them 59 members. All you have to do is to look up the official report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has not, in the least degree, met the question which was put. The Minister of Railways has entirely ignored the fact that, of the 35 constituencies which lie east of the County of York, leaving that county out of the question, the average population is barely 19,700, that 15, at least, of these constituencies have between 15,000 and 16,000 each, and that four or five of them have only 12,000 or 13,000. Now, it is perfectly absurd to include the city of Toronto with eastern Ontario. The city of Toronto is infinitely more closely associated with western Ontario, it has far more connection with western Ontario, it has far more business with western Ontario than it has with eastern Ontario. A very large section of eastern Ontario has exceedingly little to do with the city of Toronto, save with respect to law business. I entirely deny the propriety of the division the hon. gentleman has made. I say that the true and natural division, as you want to increase the metropolitan city of Toronto, is to leave out Toronto and the Yorks, and if you leave out Toronto and the Yorks, which may properly be said to belong neither to the east nor to the west, you have 35 constituencies lying east of the County of York and the city of Toronto, with a total population of 688,000. Now, the hon. gentleman cannot deny, nor has any member on that side ventured to deny, that this 688,000 have to-day 35 representatives, being at least 5 more than they are properly entitled to, were numerical representation to enter into the question at all. Nor has the hon. gentleman ventured to deny that leaving out of consideration the County of York and the city of Toronto, the other constituencies which belong properly to western Ontario, have very little connection with the east. The hon. gentleman has not ventured to deny that those lying west have an average population of 23,200, and that, therefore, they are considerably under-represented; at any rate, they are each of them several hundred above the actual unit of representation. There is no doubt that if any desire to equalize population existed, the representatives they want for the city of Toronto and Algoma would be taken from those exceedingly small constituencies, the smallest in the Province of Ontario, which lie in the vicinity of Kingston and east of Kingston. They are by several thousands smaller than the unit of representation, and the whole 35 constituencies I have referred to, collectively, are very much smaller; there are barely five of these 35 constituencies which exceed the 22,900 which forms the unit of representation; 30 of those 35, as I have shown, are below the unit of representation, and most of them are very much below it; they are below by 9,000, by 8,000, by 7,000, by 6,000, by 5,000—in fact that is the section of the province in which there is the most decided disproportion (and it is visible to every body who will look at the census return) between the representation now accorded and the representation which they would have if any regard whatever were paid to the massing of population. Now, I do not want to detain the committee, but I must recall to the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite what the population of these counties is. I gave the figures some time ago, but they have apparently passed from the minds of these hon. gentlemen, and, therefore, I am under the necessity of refreshing their memories. One of these, as I have pointed out is Brockville, which has 7,000 or 8,000 below the unit of population. Another of these is Dundas, which is several thousands below; another is Durham, which in one riding is 6,000 below, and another 8,000 below; another is Frontenac, with 13,445, one of the smallest counties in the whole province; another is South Grenville, which has 12,900. Not one of the Hastings comes up to the unit, most of them are several thousand below it. Kingston has two or three thousand below; North Leeds and Grenville is nearly 10,000 below. So you go on all through the lot until you find that only five out of the 35 equal the unit of the representation. Now, the hon. gentleman has not disputed the central fact on which this whole discussion is based, that east of the city of Toronto, lying between the boundaries of the County of York and the province line, there are 35 constituencies which, collectively, fall 112,000 below what they ought to have to be entitled to 35 representatives. The proposition which we have maintained from the first is that in all equity, and reason, and justice, if you want representatives for Toronto and Algoma they should be taken from that section lying east of the County of York.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I want to say that if the Minister of Railways can show that the figures I

referred to were wrong, I am prepared to withdraw from the position I took and support this Bill, for the reasons I explained in the remarks I made. The proposition I make is a very simple one, and easy to be understood. We in Ontario understand the difference between eastern and western Ontario, just as you understand the difference between Upper Town and Lower Town in the city of Ottawa. The district west of Toronto is spoken of in all matters social, legal or political, as western Ontario, and the district east of Toronto is spoken of as eastern Ontario. I think I was perfectly fair in referring to these two districts; I said that leaving out Toronto and that portion north——

Mr. HAGGART. You did not say that portion north, you said Toronto alone.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I said that portion north: it is a new district, and is always spoken of as the district north of Toronto. I said that the population west of Toronto is, in round numbers, 1,199,000, while the eastern district contains 670,000. I think if any hon. gentleman in this House will take the trouble to look up the figures, he will find I am correct. Now, leaving out the portion I refer to, I think that is a very fair proposition, and it would strike the minds of people as being fair. However, the most important point after all, I think, is the one that I and others have tried to point out that there should be some principle governing legislation such as this, that would make it permanent, and give people confidence in our institutions.

Mr. WELDON. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to repeat those figures which describe the population of Western Ontario?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. 1,199,000.

Mr. WELDON. Did you include any part of Simcoe in western Ontario?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The County of Simcoe is included.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) a few evenings ago, quoted figures which he asserted were given by Mr. George Johnson, Dominion statistician, to prove that the popular majority in the Province of Ontario was Reform by 7,268. I notice that he did not dare to endorse the figures that he professed to quote from Mr. George Johnson; but he went out and produced a number of figures which he quoted to this House, cunningly or shrewdly giving the House to understand that those figures were the figures of Mr. George Johnson, and that they footed up a popular Reform majority of 7,268. I have taken the trouble to add the figures given by the hon. member for South Oxford, which he professed gave such an enormous Reform majority in Ontario, a majority of 7,200. But on adding those figures, I find that no such majority existed, that even taking the hon. gentleman's figures, which I showed the other day and I will endeavour to show now were wrong and misleading, the Reform majority in Ontario was exactly 1,962, instead of 7,268. But when we analyze the statements made we find that perhaps the strongest Conservative constituency in Ontario, South Simcoe, was left out of the hon. gentleman's calculations. The Conservative majority at the previous election in South Simcoe was 1,085, but this riding the hon. gentleman entirely omitted. Placing the majority at 1,000, that number would reduce the Reform majority to 962. Then there is the County of Carleton, which gave a majority of 1,060. At the election of 1891 the Reformers had no candidate in the field. The contest was between two straight Conservatives, one of whom had a majority of over 43 votes. The hon. member for South Oxford placed the Conservative majority in Carleton at 43 votes. The majority of the Conservative candidate at the former election however was 1,063 votes. Placing the number at 1,000, we have the 1,962 Reform majority wiped out by these two constituencies alone. Even taking the erroneous figures of the hon. gentleman, we have a popular Conservative majority in Ontario instead of a Reform majority, as alleged by the hon. gentleman. That, however, is taking into account only two constituencies, one of which was entirely ignored, and the other misrepresented. Let me now glance at other constituencies. In South Leeds no Reformer dared show his face as a candidate, and there were only two Conservatives in the field. The majority of one over the other was 115, but the majority would have been 500 or 600 if there had been a straight fight. Then in East Middlesex there was a majority secured by one Conservative over another of 116: but at the previous election when there was a straight party fight, the Conservative candidate had a majority of 758. Take the riding of East Durham, where the majority at the last election was 61 because two Conservatives opposed each other, at the previous election the Conservative majority was between 400 and 500, and if there had been a straight party fight at the last election there would have been a similar majority. I have prepared the figures relating to these majorities, and I submit them to the House in order to be placed on record. I have taken the returns for the last election except in cases I will mention. The table is as follows:—

Constituency.	Sir Richard Cartwright's Figures.		Official Figures.	
	Tory.	Grit.	Tory.	Grit.
Addington	.....	61	2,246	2,307
Algoma	430	.....	2,251	1,813
Bothwell	.....	550	*2,161	2,182
Brant, North	.....	1,116	613	1,729
Brant, South	.....	542	1,421	1,963
Brockville	178	.....	1,815	1,637
Bruce, South	30	.....	1,862	1,832
Bruce, West	.....	530	1,085	2,015
Bruce, East	.....	114	1,931	2,045
Cardwell	248	.....	1,628	1,380
Carleton	43	.....	*1,691	606
Cornwall	218	.....	2,152	1,934
Dundas	60	.....	2,086	2,026
Durham, East	61	.....	*1,667	1,275
Durham, West	.....	198	1,764	1,962
Elgin, East	46	.....	2,740	2,694
Elgin, West	.....	682	1,653	2,335
Essex, South	.....	57	2,333	2,390
Essex, North	.....	849	2,043	2,892
Frontenac	205	.....	1,427	1,222
Glengarry	321	.....	1,953	1,632
Grenville	111	.....	1,414	1,303
Grey, South	.....	3	2,281	2,284
Grey, East	19	.....	1,977	1,958
Grey, North	247	.....	2,511	2,264
Haldimand	78	.....	1,896	1,818
Halton	104	.....	2,441	2,337
Hamilton	654	.....	4,186	3,532
Hastings, West	360	.....	1,955	1,595
Hastings, East	.....	54	1,897	1,951

* Those figures marked by an asterisk (*) are the returns for general election 1887, as in 1887 there was no party vote

Constituency.	Sir Richard Cartwright's Figures.		Official Figures.	
	Tory.	Grit.	Tory.	Grit.
Hastings, North	206	.....	1,686	1,480
Huron, West	.....	379	1,820	2,190
Huron, East	.....	308	1,729	2,037
Huron, South	.....	855	990	1,845
Kent	.....	476	2,662	3,138
Kingston	483	.....	1,784	1,301
Lambton, West	.....	598	1,766	2,364
Lambton, East	566	.....	2,636	2,070
Lanark, North	301	.....	1,723	1,422
Lanark, South	630	.....	1,894	1,174
Leeds and Grenville	146	.....	1,311	1,165
Leeds, South	106	.....	2,294	2,188
Lennox	.....	57	1,580	1,637
Lincoln and Niagara	.....	48	2,162	2,212
London	.....	183	1,854	2,037
Middlesex, East	165	.....	*2,624	1,865
Middlesex, North	6	.....	1,965	1,959
Middlesex, West	410	.....	*2,110	2,005
Middlesex, South	.....	624	1,282	1,906
Monck	.....	260	1,614	1,874
Muskoka	140	.....	1,909	1,768
Norfolk, South	412	.....	2,051	1,639
Norfolk, North	.....	468	1,902	2,370
Northumberland, West	.....	37	1,554	1,590
Northumberland, East	236	.....	2,495	2,259
Ontario, North	254	.....	2,206	1,952
Ontario, South	.....	33	2,007	2,039
Ontario, West	.....	999	*1,301	1,900
Ottawa	1,083	.....	3,029	1,946
Oxford, North	.....	1,534	1,010	2,544
Oxford, South	.....	734	1,287	2,021
Peel	.....	54	1,613	1,667
Perth, North	.....	81	2,449	2,520
Perth, South	.....	177	2,186	2,363
Peterborough, West	233	.....	1,447	1,215
Peterborough, East	29	.....	1,832	1,803
Prescott	.....	661	*1,223	1,414
Prince Edward	39	.....	2,264	2,225
Renfrew, North	444	.....	1,497	1,418
Renfrew, South	79	.....	1,642	1,198
Russell	.....	413	1,895	2,308
Simcoe, North	296	.....	2,417	2,121
Simcoe, South	.....	.....	†1,834	774
Simcoe, East	.....	207	2,643	2,850
Toronto, West	1,752	.....	5,048	3,291
Toronto, Centre	502	.....	2,414	1,912
Toronto, East	1,465	.....	3,520	2,056
Victoria, South	25	.....	2,055	2,030
Victoria, North	.....	202	1,412	1,614
Waterloo, North	.....	30	2,204	2,289
Waterloo, South	.....	312	1,916	2,228
Welland	.....	447	2,279	2,726
Wellington, North	.....	136	2,300	2,486
Wellington, Centre	.....	156	2,299	2,455
Wellington, South	.....	376	2,134	2,510
Wentworth, North	.....	200	1,317	1,517
Wentworth, South	1	.....	1,773	1,772
York, North	.....	363	1,968	2,331
York, East	.....	26	2,977	2,003
York, West	806	.....	3,434	2,628
	14,228	16,190	181,221	179,543

† Election by acclamation in 1891.

In the case of Bothwell I have adopted the same plan as I followed in the case of West Middlesex, where three candidates were in the field, one of whom was a candidate of the Patrons of Industry. I might have placed the large Reform majority in Bothwell as against the large Conservative majority in West Middlesex, which would have pretty nearly balanced each other; but I preferred to adopt the more honest course of going back to the election of 1887. In the case of Carleton I have gone back to the returns of the previous election when there was a straight political fight between the late Sir John Macdonald and Mr. Stewart, in regard to which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said the other night that the Reform candidate had not lost his deposit and was not 1,000 votes behind. These figures show that he lost his deposit, and was in a minority of 1,085. In the case of East Durham, I have taken the returns of the former election for the reason that both candidates at the last election were Conservatives. In the case of West Ontario, I have taken the figures for the election of 1887, as in 1891 there was no Conservative candidate, the only candidates being the present member and Mr. T. B. White, who was a far stronger Reformer than the hon. gentleman who now sits for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). There was no thance for the Conservatives to put in their votes at that election, so I have taken the figures of the straight party fight in 1887, when Mr. Milliers opposed Mr. Edgar. For the County of Prescott I have also taken the figures of 1887, as in 1891 there were three Conservative candidates running, and their votes put together would exceed the Reform vote. I have also taken the figures for South Simcoe in 1887, a county which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) omitted altogether from his calculations, because it was an election by acclamation. Now, Mr. Chairman, these figures give the Conservatives 181,221, as against 179,543 for the Reformers, or a majority for the Conservatives in the elections of 1891 of 1,678 votes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Allow me to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the figures he gives for South Grey. There the ballot boxes were stuffed, and he takes advantage of that to only allow my hon. friend (Mr. Landerkin) three of a majority.

Mr. WALLACE. I would inform the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that I am taking the same figures as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) gave to the House with regard to South Grey.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. WALLACE. I say yes, and I will quote the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) from page 4002 of the *Hansard*:

"Mr. Landerkin was returned from Grey in the first instance by a majority of 46, but thanks to certain manipulation of the ballots by certain zealous partisans, that majority appears to have been reduced to 3.

"Mr. WALLACE. Which do you count—the 46 or the 3.

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I count the 3."

Mr. McMULLEN. I may say that my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) was robbed of his majority by the ballot boxes being stuffed. The figures are wrong.

Mr. WALLACE. Then your leader is wrong as he generally is. You disputed the figures and now you have to admit them. The court was open to prove the robbery and there was no robbery proved.

Mr. McMULLEN. It was proved and the judge admitted it.

Mr. WALLACE. More than that, I may tell tell that the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) was mighty glad to get out of the court himself, and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) considered himself very luck too to have escaped.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If you had been in the election courts you would have gone down for eight years.

Mr. WALLACE. Now, Mr. Chairman, as the results of the bye-elections that have taken place since the elections of 1891 the Conservatives have had an increased majority. We had in the general election a majority in the Province of Ontario of the popular vote, of 1,678.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would the hon. gentleman allow me, as he has made reference to my constituency? I would like to make a quotation from the returning officer in South Grey.

Mr. WALLACE. Let your chief read it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I know the hon. gentleman is desirous to give a correct statement.

Mr. WALLACE. I have to ask the member for South Grey to sit down.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I want to make a personal explanation. Just allow me, it will only take a moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down; order.

Mr. WALLACE. If the doctor would learn to take his medicine as he gives it, it would be a good deal better. In the general elections of 1891 the Conservatives had a popular majority in Ontario of 1,678 votes. In the bye-elections we have gained 11 seats in Ontario which counts about 22 on a division, and we gained in the popular vote in these bye-elections 3,967 votes. This, added to the 1,678 votes that we had after the general elections, makes the total popular majority of the Conservative party in the Province of Ontario 5,645. I believe we have a majority of 26 members from that province, and this leaves about 220 of a majority for each, which is a pretty fair majority and which is more than the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) or the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has ever been blest with. These figures cannot be disputed, because they are the official returns for the elections of 1891, and in the case where two Conservatives ran, taking the former elections of 1887, and in the case of South Simcoe where the Reformers were afraid to put a candidate in the field, again taking the returns for 1887. Now, Sir, figures which were quoted by the hon. member for South Oxford as being Mr. George Johnson's figures were: for the Government, 171,595; for the Liberals, 178,871; purporting to give a Liberal majority of 7,276. As I said before, neither the hon. member for South Oxford nor the hon. member for North Norfolk dare to assume the responsibility of saying that these figures are correct. The hon. member for South Oxford goes so far as to say that there was a popular majority of four or five thousand for the Reform party. Why, these figures that he quoted only showed a majority of 1,962; and yet from these he has omitted altogether South Simcoe with its thousand majority, and he has misrepresented and misstated the majority in the County of Carleton as 43 instead of 1,060. But, Sir, in the last speech he made on this subject on Friday evening last, after quoting these figures, he had the audacity to say:

"And yet when these positions were reversed, and the Liberal party had a majority of four or five thousand at least——"

I challenge him to produce the counties and show where that majority exists.—

—"so far from having an equal majority in Parliament to what the Conservatives had in similar circumstances, they were in an absolute minority of four."

And they were in a minority of 1,678 votes after that election. Now, one of the striking features of the fairness of previous Redistribution Bills is this. We have had three elections since the Redistribution Bill of 1882, and the popular majority and the majority in this House have always gone together. In the United States, from which the hon. member for North Norfolk is fond of quoting rules, we find that the president is frequently elected by a majority of the popular votes; but in the Province of Ontario, as well as in the other provinces, the Conservative party have not only had a majority of the seats in this House, but on every occasion they have had a majority of the popular vote, so that the Redistribution Act, whatever fault it may have had, has worked itself out very well.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I want just to read what the returning officer says about the ballot boxes in the riding which I have the honour to represent, so that there will be no mistake about it. In making his report to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, he says:

"I have also to report, that at the said recount, it appeared that some seven of the ballot boxes had been tampered with, and the ballots altered, but by whom or when they were so altered, I cannot say. Should you desire any further information as to the said alteration of the ballots, I will be pleased to give you the information in my power as to the same.

"G. LEFROY McCAUL.
"*Revising Officer.*"

At that time 26 ballots of mine were stolen, and 26 forged for my opponent and at the recount I gained 8, which gave me a majority of 61.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. About two hours ago, I somewhere got the impression that the question before the committee was whether section *h* should be amended by an amendment proposed by my hon. friend from North Wentworth, but for the last hour and a half I have not heard a word about it. That amendment has been urged, and urged strongly, on two particular considerations. In the first place, it is shown that without the amendment the geographical features of the ridings would be somewhat absurd, and such as the Government themselves would be ashamed of; it was also shown that the populations were not equal; and the amendment was intended to rectify both of these defects. Now, I do think that, in a matter of this kind, the Government or some member to speak for the Government, should give some reason why the amendment is not accepted. No member of the Government has attempted to give anything like a reason why it should not be accepted. Are we therefore to infer that they are ashamed to give a reason? I have a strong suspicion that that is the only explanation—that they cannot justify the Bill and that they do not want to stultify themselves by trying to justify a thing that is absolutely unjustifiable. The only member on the other side who attempted anything like a justification, or made any objection to the amendment, was the hon. member for Haldimand, and the only ground on which he attempted to do so was that the members on this side of the House were not logical because they had advocated an adherence to county boundaries, while this amendment was in contravention of that principle. Well, Sir, we did vote that county lines should be respected; but gentlemen opposite voted not to

equalize on that principle; so that the ground is cut away from us, and the most we can do—and can you blame us for attempting it—is to try to have as little injustice done as possible in the arrangement which the Government say they will compel us to adhere to. Now, I submit that the Government ought to give some reason why they reject this resolution, or accept it. I was a good deal amused to-night by the reasoning of my hon. friend the Minister of War. I always listen to him with a great deal of pleasure. He laboured a long time to convince this House that it made but little difference how the constituencies were arranged, for you had no reason to assume that the people of this country were going to continue in the same track in which they have always travelled—that, in other words, you had no right to judge from the present political complexion of a constituency what it would be two or three years hence. Well, it is strange to me how much objection the hon. gentleman has to taking any of his own medicine. You do not catch him defending the arrangement of any constituency on that ground. The fact of the matter is the hon. gentleman has no faith in his own doctrine and I think he is right. I have no doubt he is a fair specimen of the Conservatives in the country.

Mr. BOWELL. A very poor one.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No, I think he is a very fair one. I wish they were all as good as he. But fancy for the moment the hon. gentleman voting against his party on a question of right or wrong. Why, the very idea of the thing carries with it its own refutation. Has he any reason to suppose the members of the party throughout the country are actuated by any higher motive? It may be that they are. I am inclined to believe that to a certain extent they are. Reference has been made to-night to the effect which the gerrymander of 1882 had upon the representation of this House. It was shown that the hon. member for South Brant had been elected in spite of the efforts of the Government to keep him out. Others were elected in the same way, and I firmly believe that in the great Conservative party, scattered all over this Dominion, there are some at least who have a little regard for honesty and honour; and if this measure is carried through, with all its unjust and hateful features, I believe that there are Conservatives in this Dominion who will resent any attempt to gain a mean advantage by Act of Parliament. I submit again that the Government ought either to accept this amendment or give some valid reason why they reject it.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I am glad the hon. member for East Middlesex drew the attention of the House to the fact that there is this amendment before it because we have wandered very far from the question. I wish to draw attention to the fact, that, with the exception of the hon. member for Haldimand and the senior member for Hamilton, no one has attempted to deal with the merits of the amendment affecting only two ridings in this redistribution. I credit the hon. member for Haldimand with the activity and zeal he displayed in discussing everything except the question. I did not claim in moving this amendment that it was a remedy for all the difficulties, or that it maintained county boundaries, but I claim for it that it is a partial remedy of the evils since the resolution to maintain county boundaries was defeated. How did my hon. friend meet the issue? Did he take a glance at the length and breadth and shape of the present constituency of South Wentworth, as proposed to be constituted under this Act? Did he realize that it extends from the south-east portion of the township of Caistor which used to belong to Lincoln, away up through the city of Hamilton, an independent constituency, and north until it reaches the County of Wellington. He paid no attention to that feature. What are the facts in connection with the matter? Why, the township of Ancaster runs within 200 or 300 yards of the city of Hamilton; and we have it asserted that taking that municipality out of Wentworth and attaching it to North Brant, which is now about 45 miles long, is an equitable adjustment of the County of Wentworth. The hon. member for Hamilton undertakes to justify this by saying that the people in Ancaster do not trade with Hamilton to any extent, and he points to the western part of that as being within a short distance of the city of Brantford. Why, the nearest angle of the townships of Beverley and Ancaster is at least seven miles from Brantford, while Ancaster extends to within a few hundred yards of Hamilton and is seven miles away from Brantford, so that its attraction will be especially to Hamilton, a city of 40,000 inhabitants, and not to Brantford a city of only one-third that at the other end. With respect to the relative position which the people of East and West Flamborough and Waterdown will be placed in under this arrangement, my hon. friend says truly their business connections are with the city of Hamilton, but I would remind him that the Government do not propose to attach them to the city of Hamilton for electoral purposes, but to the county which lies beyond the city of Hamilton and they have little in common with these people, and yet the Government propose to attach them to what is a portion of the judicial County of Lincoln which lies still more remote, so that while I frankly admit that placing those municipalities in North Brant does not equalize and place them with the people with whom they are otherwise socially and by business relations attached, yet they are quite as much connected with them as they are with the portion of South Wentworth to which they are proposed to be attached by the Act, and that the adjustment of geographical relations is better than the proposition in the Act. Has anybody attempted to deny that replacing the township of Ancaster in the south riding of Wentworth and along with it the town of Dundas, a portion of which lies within the bounds of the township of Ancaster, would be an improvement on the Act? The thing cannot be defended, and I can understand why the hon. member for Haldimand did not touch that particular question, but confined his attention to the relations the people in the two Flamboroughs would have with the County of Brant. Again, let me call the attention of this House to their relative population. Under the adjustment proposed by the Act, South Wentworth will contain 25,600 and North Brant 21,600. Under the arrangement proposed by me South Wentworth will have 22,700, and North Brant would have 23,900, and South Wentworth geographically would be much better placed. I admit frankly if I were asked to readjust the whole arrangement, I would not place these parties in

that position, but in so far as the geographical boundaries of South Wentworth are concerned, the amendment is infinitely preferable, and that it places the other portion which will be attached to North Brant in no worse a position than they will be in under the adjustment in the Act. It is for these reasons I support the amendment.

Mr. McKAY. I do not think the hon. gentleman would mis-quote what I said. I did not say that the people of the County of Ancaster traded with the city of Brantford. I said that those people living in the western part of the township, and in the vicinity of Jerseyville, would likely trade with the city of Brantford, but did not say that they must do so.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I do not wish to be unfair to the hon. gentleman, but I think the case will stand on its merits. But what is the position of the two ends of that municipality? The eastern end of the township of Ancaster lies within a few hundred yards of the city of Hamilton, and the western end is at least seven miles from the city of Brantford. It is clear that a very limited proportion of the people in the township of Ancaster or in the township of Beverley will do their business in the city of Brantford. It is a purely rural population there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If hon. gentlemen will look at the map, they will see that the County of Wentworth would be entirely separated by this provision. The township of Ancaster is much more closely connected with the County of Wentworth than the two townships lying to the north. These are as closely geographically connected with the County of North Brant as the township of Ancaster is. Then it is reasonable that the township of Ancaster should be included in South Wentworth, and that the other townships, if either is to be removed, should be connected with North Brant.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 21; Nays, 46.

(*i.*) The electoral district of North Wentworth and Brant shall consist of the townships of Ancaster, Blenheim, East Brantford, South Dumfries and Beverley, and shall return one member.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Since the last redistribution, the city of Brantford has been altered as to its area. It is therefore necessary to re-enact the provisions in reference to the two ridings in order that the city shall be as it is now constituted, involving an addition of about 1,400 persons.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand there are two townships of Brantford.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I move in amendment that:

The electoral district of North Wentworth and Brant shall consist of the Townships of Ancaster, Blenheim, East Brantford, South Dumfries and Beverley. The south riding of the County of Brant shall consist of the townships of West Brantford, Onondaga and Tuscarora, the city of Brantford and the town of Paris.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The proposition of the Minister, so far as Brantford is concerned, is made for convenience, I suppose, and that is right. But what does the Minister think now, when he is mentioning the south riding of Brant, of remedying some of the iniquities of 1882, the two townships of Burford and Oakland? It could be done just as easily by putting in these words now as not. It would be a matter of convenience to the people in those townships who are not at all connected with the County of Oxford. One of those townships is a little three cornered township, it just squares out the township of West Brantford, and is not within ten miles of the County of Oxford. Of course I can speak freely on this matter because every township that is in Brant is Liberal now. But those people feel that an injustice has been done, and it is only right and proper that they should be placed back. The hon. gentlemen have not even the object of strengthening themselves in reference to the matter. All the interests of these people are with the county, they do not feel any more satisfied now than they did before.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the suggestion of the member for South Brant might be considered by the Government, inasmuch as there is no political consideration in it at all. South Oxford is largely Liberal now as well as South Brant, so I think they might do an act of justice to the township of Oakland by placing it back to its original position in South Brant.

(*j.*) The electoral district of South Norfolk shall consist of the townships of Houghton, Walsingham, Charlotteville, Woodhouse and Walpole, the town of Simcoe, and the villages of Port Dover and Port Rowan.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is necessary to make a little change here. The township of Walsingham has been divided, and it is necessary to say the townships of North Walsingham and South Walsingham.

(*k.*) The electoral district of West Bruce shall consist of the townships of Saugeen, Bruce, Kincardine and Kinloss, the town of Kincardine, and the villages of Tiverton, Port Elgin and Lucknow.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I beg to move that this section be amended by adding the township of Huron.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is this change for?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Port Elgin is taken out of the south. It is five miles distant from the constituency.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But the Minister of Militia says that is no objection in the world.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. But I understood the member for Brant to say there was.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If you want to equalize, put Port Elgin in the west riding of Bruce and the township of Saugeen in the north.

(*l.*) The electoral district of North Bruce shall consist of the townships of Arran, Elderslie, Amabel, Albemarle, Eastnor, Lindsay and St. Edmunds, the Saugeen and Cape Croker Reserves, and the villages of Southampton, Wiarton, Chesley, Tara and Paisley.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This is the same, with the exception of Port Elgin.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I move the following:—

The electoral district of Bothwell shall consist of the townships of Sombra (including Walpole Island, St. Anne's Island and the other islands at the mouth of the river St. Clair,) Dawn, Camden, Chatham and Zone, the villages of Wallaceburg, Dresden and Thamesville and the town of Bothwell.

This amendment is merely to include islands which are not in any constituency now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I hope the hon. gentleman will allow the amendment to stand for the present. I propose to offer a suggestion with respect to certain changes in the boundaries of Bothwell. The township of Sombra is naturally

connected with West Lambton. It is within two hours' drive of the county town, and it has no affinity with the County of Bothwell. I propose that the township of Dawn should go into East Lambton, and that certain other townships should go back into the county to which they formerly belonged, so that Bothwell will be wholly in the County of Kent, and will be more compact than at present. The Minister of Justice can equalize the County of Elgin by transferring St. Thomas into the west riding. As a matter of fact, Walpole Island has never been in any constituency. However, the returning officer has always counted it in Bothwell, as part of the township of Sombra. It is regarded for municipal and judicial purposes as part of the township of Sombra, although I know that in the census returns they have counted it as part of the township of Chatham.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman write out his amendment and send it to me, and the section will stand for the present.

Section postponed.

(*m.*) The electoral district of East Middlesex shall consist of the townships of London, West Nissouri, North Dorchester and South Dorchester, the town of London East, and the village of Springfield.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose that this section be dropped.

Motion agreed to.

(*n.*) The electoral district of Nipissing shall consist of the temporary judicial district of Nipissing, as defined by the Act 47 Victoria, chapter three, of the statutes of the Province of Ontario, and the townships of Head, Clara and Maria, and shall include that part of the district of Algoma bounded by a line running along the western boundary of the townships of Long and McGiverin, thence northerly to a point intersecting the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Ridout station, thence to the northern boundary of the Province of Ontario, and the said electoral district shall return one member.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A large portion of this district is as yet unsurveyed and uninhabited. Would it not be well to fix the boundary on the north. Then it might be extended, if any actual settlement occurred; but the present arrangement would place the returning officer under the necessity of enquiring with respect to any exploration party or unwarranted settlement in any portion to the north, however distant.

Mr. BOWELL. No difficulty has occurred for want of northern boundaries. In 1867 at the time of Confederation the north riding of Hastings was described as being composed of certain townships and all to the north of them. As the free grant territories were settled they became a part of the county, and not only part of the county municipally but part of the electoral division of North Hastings, and since that period townships 30 miles north of the most northern portion in 1867 are thickly settled, and there are probably 1,000 votes in that region. It is only by this Bill that the northern boundary has been defined by adopting the southern boundary of Nipissing as described by the Ontario Act as the judicial district of Nipissing. No difficulty can possibly arise under the proposed arrangement, and it would be somewhat difficult to define the northern boundary unless you went to Hudson Bay or James Bay.

Mr. LAURIER. The description is rather vague. Would Ridout station be in Nipissing or Algoma?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is intended to be included in Nipissing. The starting point on Georgian Bay is a line dividing two townships, and it is that line proceeding north in the same direction as the township line that will be the western boundary line, and that will include Ridout station, for it will run a little west of Ridout station.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). This addition will place Ridout station in Nipissing.

(*p.*) The electoral district of West Toronto shall consist of the wards, as constituted on the fourteenth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two, of St. Andrew, St. George and St. Patrick, and shall return two members.

Mr. DENISON. As several of the members on the opposite side of the House have suggested that this riding should be divided into two, I have just now prepared a suggestion which I think will meet that view. I may tell the hon. members opposite that it was with no idea of any political advantage that the Government made the proposition contained in the Bill, because looking at the last election returns, in every polling subdivision of West Toronto, except eight out of eighty-six, I happened to have a majority. Consequently, no matter how you arrange the sub-divisions you cannot possibly arrange them so as to make a Reform riding out of any portion of West Toronto. I may say that in St. Andrew's ward, there was one polling subdivision, in the present St. Stephen's ward, there was one, in St. Patrick's ward, three, in St. George's ward, three subdivisions, with majorities against me. You cannot make a combination by which you can turn any portion of West Toronto into a Reform riding, according to the last election returns. I therefore beg to move, that:

The electoral district of West Toronto shall consist of a portion of the wards as constituted on the 14th June, 1872, of St. Andrew's, St. George's and St. Patrick's, being that part lying west of Bathurst street and including the Toronto island.

That West Centre Toronto shall consist of the balance of the said wards of St. Andrew's, St. George's and St. Patrick's lying east of Bathurst street.

That East Centre Toronto shall consist of St. John's ward and St. James's ward as constituted on 14th June, 1872.

You must bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that what I speak of now as the St. Stephen's ward, is a portion of St. Patrick's that was cut off during the last ten years. It does not appear in the Bill as St. Stephen's ward, nor do I mention it in this motion as such, because Toronto has recently been divided into six wards numbered from 1 to 6. The best plan I think would be to take this arrangement of 1872 dividing it at Bathurst street, west of which shall be West Toronto, and east of which shall be West Centre Toronto, and then Centre Toronto shall be called East Centre. I might say that I am just conjecturing that that was the arrangement in 1872 as regards East Centre. I have not got it before me, but I am quite satisfied that St. James's and St. John's were the two wards that constituted Centre Toronto then, and that constitute it now. This division, which I propose, leaves West Toronto somewhat less in population than West Centre Toronto, but not very much. I make it up that in one there will be 41 polling subdivisions, and in the other about 45. But, as the smaller division is the part of the city with a large amount of land yet unbuilt upon, it is most likely to be the division which will increase in population. I have no doubt that before four or

five years that will possibly be a good deal larger than the present division, which I call West Centre Toronto.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will that include Parkdale and West Toronto Junction?

Mr, DENISON. No; they are in West York.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If you added these two would you not have the unit?

Mr. DENISON. If you give us six members in Toronto we will be glad to accept them, and have one for each ward, and take that part of Toronto which lies north of Bloor street, and that part which lies east of the Don and west of Dufferin.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In looking at the map of Toronto and the division into wards, I find that the hon. gentleman's constituency consists of St. Patrick's ward, St. Andrew's ward, St. George's ward and the Island, and St. Andrew's and St. George's wards lie immediately south of St. Patrick's ward. According to the census St. Patrick's ward contains 27,000, and St. George's ward and St. Andrew's contain altogether about 22,000; so that if the hon. gentleman were to divide the constituency by putting St. Patrick's ward in one division, and St. Andrew's and St. George's wards in another, we would have Toronto divided into two nearly equal divisions with the same opportunity of having these divisions growing westward if the city should grow. If the hon. gentleman were to tell us what the population is of his proposed divisions we would be better able to speak as to their propriety. If the hon. gentleman is making a large west central division and a comparatively small western one, I am afraid he is counting on a growth that may not take place.

Mr. DENISON. It is only a difference of some five subdivisions out of 86. I put 45 in one and 41 in the other. I have not the exact population of these.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The divisions I suggest would, I think, be fairly equal in population and very similar in size.

Mr DENISON. No, you would have 21,000 odd population in the two southern wards and 52,000 odd in St. Patrick's ward.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would like to let this stand until to-morrow.

Section postponed.

(q.) The electoral district of the city of Ottawa shall consist of the city of Ottawa, except that part thereof known as New Edinburgh.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is New Edinburgh taken in?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is exactly the same as before, except that the bounds of the city of Ottawa have been enlarged by Stewarton being taken in from the County of Carleton.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman not propose to divide Ottawa into two constituencies?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that this is a very objectionable method of voting. Some of the hon. gentleman's friends objected to a triangular constituency with two votes to each elector; but it seems to me that a double constituency with two votes is very much more objectionable. It would be easy to divide Ottawa into two electoral districts, and it would be much more satisfactory.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is not New Edinburgh now a part of the city of Ottawa for municipal purposes?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; I think it is.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As its community of interest is more with the city than with the County of Russell, would it not be a good thing to put it into the city? The city is not up to the unit, and great complaints have been made that the County of Russell is away above it. That would be a means of equalizing these constituencies and placing the people of New Edinburgh in a constituency to which they belong.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There seems to be a great objection to interfering in any way with the County of Russell.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman object to dividing the city?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, we think that should be maintained as it is. It is in the same position as many other constituencies, for instance, Halifax, Pictou and Cape Breton.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think all these ought to be divided.

(s.) The electoral district of the city of London shall consist of the said electoral district as at present constituted, together with the village of London West.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We propose to drop this.

Motion agreed to.

(t.) The electoral district of South Ontario shall consist of the townships of West Whitby, East Whitby, Reach, and Scugog, the towns of Whitby and Oshawa, and the village of Port Perry.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the change here?

Mr. BOWELL. It is simply removing the Island of Scugog from the north riding to the south, where it legitimately belongs.

Mr. MADILL. The Island of Scugog really belongs to South Ontario. In going from the other parts of North Ontario to the Island of Scugog, we have to go into South Ontario. The change makes no difference politically.

Mr. BENNETT. I beg to move:

That the electoral division of Muskoka and Parry Sound have added thereto the township of Monck and the united townships of Medora and Wood, now in the electoral district of East Simcoe, and also, the township of Macaulay and the town of Bracebridge, now in the electoral district of North Ontario.

Also, that the electoral district of North Victoria have added thereto the townships of McLean, Ridout and Oakley, now in the electoral district of North Ontario;

And also, that the electoral district of North Ontario have added thereto the township of Muskoka and the town of Gravenhurst, now in the electoral district of East Simcoe.

Mr. MADILL. This change would take 60 or 70 votes from me; but the population of East Simcoe being some 36,000, the transfer of a portion of this to Muskoka and another portion to North Ontario would reduce the population of East Simcoe to 31,308 and make that of Muskoka 30,469. The township of Muskoka and the town of Gravenhurst, being taken from East Simcoe and added to North Ontario, will increase the popula-

tion of the latter by 2,645. Whilst politically this change will be against me, I think it is only fair that the population should be more equally apportioned.

Mr. BENNETT. As has been frequently stated here in the course of the discussion on this Bill, the County of Simcoe is entitled by population to four representatives. I beg to call the attention of the committee to the fact that in that county there is a population of 84,834. That is divided as follows :—35,800 in the east, 28,206 in the north riding and 20,827 in the south. Now, the riding of East Simcoe, as constituted, goes beyond the county boundaries, so that I will have the support of hon. gentlemen who believe in the maintenance of county boundaries, and I trust I shall have the good-will of hon. gentlemen who are in favour of equalizing the population. The proposition will have this effect. As at present constituted, East Simcoe consists of the townships of Tiny, Tay, Medonte, Oro, Orillia, Matchedash, Medora, Wood, Monck, the towns of Orillia, Gravenhurst, Midland, Penetanguishene and the township of Muskoka, having a population of 35,801. Now, the townships of Medora, Wood, Muskoka and Monck lie altogether in the district of Muskoka, They have no community of interest ; they are separated for municipal purposes, having each a county council of its own; they are separated for judicial purposes, each having a judicial district of its own ; so that in no way is there any connection at all between East Simcoe proper and the Muskoka portion of it. By this proposition there would be detached from East Simcoe the following: Muskoka, with 797 of a population; Gravenhurst, with 1,848 ; Monck 854, and Wood 921 ; making a total detached of 4,420 from the population of East Simcoe, 35,800 ; leaving the population of East Simcoe proper at 31,380, which would then be far above the average, and very far above the unit of population. The effect on Muskoka would be to increase its population to 30,469, and my amendment would have the effect, by another part of it, of detaching the town of Bracebridge and the township of McAulay from North Ontario, and adding to North Ontario in their place the townships of Muskoka and Gravenhurst, which are now in East Simcoe, placing Bracebridge in the proper district to which it belongs. The portion of East Simcoe which is now in Muskoka proper is a wedge dividing the district of Muskoka and Parry Sound. There is another change in this, that the townships of McLean and Ridout and Oakley, formerly in North Victoria, would then be detached from North Ontario and placed again in North Victoria. The population would then stand as follows :—North Ontario, 20,726 ; North Victoria, 17,769 ; Muskoka, 30,469 ; East Simcoe, 31,380. I submit that the carrying out of this proposition would result in detaching from East Simcoe, already over-burdened, as the hon. gentleman must admit, a sufficient number, and still leave its population, thus reduced, at 31,380, far above the unit, while the people living there would find themselves in a constituency in which they are interested by all the associations that can possibly interest people in a riding. It must also be considered that in the riding of East Simcoe the townships of Tay, Medonte, Orillia, are all comparatively new townships. In the past ten years there has been in the riding an increase of 7,615 in population, and there are three largely increasing towns which have grown a great deal in the past decade, and in the next 10 years the riding is bound to increase considerably. If hon. gentlemen are sincere in wishing to equalize the population and maintain county lines, it must be plain that this proposition should be carried out. As I have already said the population will be nearer what it should be, and those who are interested in the different ridings will be brought much more closely together than they are at present. It must be plain that something ought to be done to equalize the population and preserve, if at all possible,—although it is difficult to do so on account of the jagged lines made by the indentations of river and lake—something like geographical symmetry.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 21st June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation of the House of Commons.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. I rise to move, Mr. Chairman, that the whole of the section covering changes proposed in the Province of Quebec, be omitted from the Bill. At the outset of this discussion, I ventured to suggest that in a matter of this kind it was advisable that a conference of the two parties should take place in order to determine the principle on which a measure of this description should proceed, and indeed not only on this occasion, but on all similar occasions. I fortified my position with the precedent established by Mr. Gladstone's Government in 1884. The validity and the force of that precedent has been seriously contested by hon. gentlemen opposite. I assert with great confidence that everything that has occurred since, every argument that has been adduced in this House has only confirmed the wisdom of the position which I affirmed should be taken by both parties in dealing with this questior . It has not been disputed by hon. gentlemen opposite that the action taken by Mr. Gladstone resulted in a conference, that a conference actually took place, and that the conference was productive of good, since the result was the adoption of a measure which has given full and complete satisfaction to all parties concerned. The only fact disputed was the motive which animated Mr. Gladstone in the course he pursued. It was asserted by hon. gentlemen opposite that Mr. Gladstone had not been led to

take that course by a desire to do justice, but that he had been compelled to take that course from the position taken by the Opposition led by Lord Salisbury. We did not think it opportune to controvert in any way the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite; we did not think it opportune to dispute as to whether Mr. Gladstone had acted on his own impulses, or under compulsion, because after all whatever may be the truth with respect to the motives which animated Mr. Gladstone, we still believe that his reputation has not been seriously affected by this attempted abrasion on the rock of his fame. Nor even if it be true that the contention of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House is the correct one, the fact still remains that whatever may have been the motive which induced Mr. Gladstone to act as he did, his action was eminently wise and judicious and productive of much good; and, moreover, even if the position of hon. gentlemen opposite is correct, and it is one we have not deemed it wise to dispute, it simply shows that the minority are not without some power in the reserve powers of parliamentary government to extract from the majority that justice which may be denied to them. But, after all, I am disposed to take the position laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite. And what was it? In 1884 Mr. Gladstone introduced a Bill for the extension of the franchise. He carried the measure successfully through the House of Commons, where he controlled a very large majority. When the Bill went to the House of Lords it met with very serious opposition in that Chamber, where the Conservatives were in the ascendancy. But the principle of the measure was not disputed, nor the opportunity which was presented for its introduction, but Lord Salisbury simply contended that this measure should be accompanied by a Redistribution Bill, that the two measures should be concurrent and go on together. I need not repeat what was stated by the Minister of Justice on former occasions, that the Bill was postponed, or defeated, as he stated: the amendment moved by Lord Cairns, while disputing no provision of the Bill, simply asserted that the Bill should not go by itself, but that it should be accompanied by a measure of redistribution. The hon. Minister stated that after this motion had been carried, the Bill being defeated or postponed, there ensued a dead-lock, and that Mr. Gladstone had either to abandon his Bill or resort to the extreme course of creating new peers. Well, I have no hesitation in asserting that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice when he made that statement had not studied the record with his usual accuracy. There was no such thing as even the possibility of a dead-lock. There was a dead-lock after the first Reform Bill of 1832, when the House of Lords, in spite of the verdict of the House of Commons twice maintained, asserted that they would persist in their position. On the occasion I am referring to, far from the House of Lords asserting that they would persist in their position, Lord Salisbury stated that if the verdict of the people were in the contrary direction, he would submit to the verdict itself. Let me quote the language of Lord Salisbury on this point. In concluding the debate raised on the motion of Lord Cairns, Lord Salisbury spoke as follows:—

"In the presence of such vast proposals, we appeal to the people. We have no fear of the humiliation with which we are threatened. We do not shrink from bowing to the opinion of the people, whatever that opinion may be. If it is their judgment that there should be enfranchisement without redistribution, I should be very much surprised; but I should not attempt to dispute their decision. But now that the people have in no real sense been consulted, when they had, at the last general election, no notion of what was coming upon them, I feel that we are bound, as guardians of their interests, to call upon the Government to appeal to the people, and by the result of that appeal we will abide."

Therefore, Sir, here is the direct language of Lord Salisbury, that by the result of the verdict of the people he would abide. There was no such thought, therefore, as the possibility of a dead-lock. But now it may be asked, what was the reason which impelled Lord Salisbury to take the course which he did and to oppose a measure as to which he found no fault in itself? The only thing which impelled him to act as he did was, that he feared there would be foul play in the redistribution, that he would not get fair-play if he allowed his opponents to carry the measure for the extension of the franchise, while there was no pledge as to the character of the redistribution. Lord Salisbury was confronted by Lord Grenville, and the latter said:

"The noble Marquess did not use the word 'gerrymandering' in the House, although he did so in the country: but his whole insinuation was that it was the intention of the Government to deal with the question of redistribution in a manner to serve party purposes."

Lord Salisbury did not deny the imputation, but, on the contrary, his very language showed that although he had not used the word "gerrymander," still he made use of language just as effective:

"My Lords, what we want is not only a Redistribution Bill, but a Redistribution Bill that we can handle: something which, if manifestly unjust, we would be able to modify. But how should we be able to modify it, if we had this pistol put to our heads—'Unless you pass this Bill, you shall have no Bill at all; and you go to the country with a new enfranchisement, on the old constituencies?' We shall have no power over such a Bill, and, therefore, not even if they were able absolutely to promise, they would not, if they once allowed this measure to pass out of their and our hands, engage to us that we should have a free hand in modifying the details of redistribution. But, my Lords, when we are told that terrible evils are to result from the course of events, we are tempted to ask whose fault is it? If all those horrible things are to come in consequence of this Bill not passing, why does not some member of the Government get up and say: We will put a clause into the Bill which shall prevent this measure coming into operation until the Redistribution Bill is passed? If they did that, then the difficulty would be at an end, and if they refuse to do that, on them, and not on us, the responsibility of any consequences will rest."

Therefore, Sir, here you have the motive. These views prevailed in the House of Lords; the Bill was defeated simply, as pointed out by Lord Salisbury, to ensure the Conservative party, who were in Opposition, that they would have in the Redistribution Bill a measure guided by principles of fairness and justice. There was then no possibility of a dead-lock. In the following session the measure was reintroduced by Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone met his opponents and consulted with them and wanted to know what they required. A conference took place, and the consequence was that the Bill did give satisfaction to all parties concerned. Let me read here what was the commentary of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice upon that feature of the case. He spoke of Mr. Gladstone, and this was his language:

"Having had a conference to remove the difficulties of the dead-lock, the result was a scheme for redistribution which he proposed to his opponents. He made the concessions which he was obliged to make, and those conferences occurred, not in the progress of the Redistribution Bill, but the sole purpose of securing, as far as he was

concerned, the passing of his Franchise Bill. So far as he was concerned he had not submitted, and did not propose to submit, to his opponents the consideration of the principles on which redistribution should be based, as adopting a new principle in British legislation, as adopting the principle that the relaying of the foundation stone should not be undertaken by political hands, but for the purpose of getting the promise of his opponents to allow the passage of his Bill for the extension of the franchise. The stipulations that were exacted from him were stipulations that he was obliged to concede in order to secure not only the passage of his Redistribution Bill, but primarily the Bill for the extension of the franchise."

Now, I will not dispute with the hon. gentlemen on the other side, the satisfaction that they manifestly enjoy of believing that the facts were as they represented them, and not as we represented them, and that the concession made by Mr. Gladstone was a concession wrung from him by Lord Salisbury, and not granted by Mr. Gladstone to Lord Salisbury. Let us assume the facts as hon. gentlemen opposite represent them, and let us assume that this conference was a victory of Salisbury over Gladstone, a victory obtained through parliamentary tactics. Even if that be the case, does that remove from the force of the precedent? Does it remove from the character of the precedent the spirit of justice and fair-play? No one can venture to assert that, and, therefore, I ask hon. gentlemen: Why not follow the precedent? We have been told by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), and by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) that the situation was not parallel, that the condition of things was not the same, that it would not be parliamentary for the Government to be just and fair of their own motion, though they might be obliged to be fair and just upon compulsion. They said it was parliamentary for Lord Salisbury to compel Mr. Gladstone to be just and fair, but that it would not have been parliamentary for Mr. Gladstone to be fair of his own motion. What logic and what statesmanship is this? It is proper to say that if gentlemen have the force behind them they will carry to the extreme length the advantage which they have. Well, Sir, there would be a method to compel this action which the Government says is not parliamentary. We could make it parliamentary, and the action which we suggest would have been parliamentary in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite if they had been in the position of Lord Salisbury, and if we had been as strong as Lord Salisbury was in the British Parliament. But there was as was stated, and so far it was true; there was this difference. Lord Salisbury was weak in the House of Commons, just as weak almost as we are here; but he was strong in the House of Lords; and although we are weak in the House of Commons here, we are no stronger in the other branch of the Legislature—the Senate. The Senate like everything else has been distorted from its intended functions by the party in power for party purposes. It was intended that the Senate should be a representative body which should represent both parties struggling in this country, but instead of that what is its character now? It has been reduced to such a plan that at the present time you can almost count on the fingers of your two hands the members of the Liberal party therein. The members of the Liberal party are ostracized from the Senate with a high hand, and the object of this Bill, I repeat, is to ostracize the Liberal party from this House, not by a high hand but by an iniquitous hand. This is the state in which we are now. The hon. gentleman stated, also speaking in answer to myself, that he could not accept the proposal we had made for a conference, because he said that I had laid down a principle which was an obnoxious one, and to which he could not agree; the principle, as he stated, I think, that the redistribution should take place so as not to disturb the equilibrium of parties. It may be, Sir, that my language was not sufficiently guarded; but I certainly meant to say that in a redistribution measure the equilibrium of parties should not be disturbed at the expense of one party by giving an unfair advantage to the other. So far I meant to express myself, and no further. But I fully recognize that in such a measure the guiding principle should be as far as possible to equalize the population in all the constituencies. This is the principle that was stated as the guiding principle of this measure in the speech in which the hon. member introduced it; yet this principle is not to be found anywhere in the four corners of the Bill. Though the hon. gentleman stated that the object he had in view, so far as the Province of Quebec was concerned, was to equalize the population in the constituencies, I venture to say that he will not find one constituency in that province in which the principle has been maintained. Now, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) said some time ago that I had qualified what I had stated on the floor of this House, that this Bill was a gerrymander. If the hon. gentleman were here, I would call his attention to two or three features of this Bill, and I would ask him, in view of those features, if the language I used, strong as it was, was not fully warranted by the facts. The pretense of the measure, so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, is to give increased representation to the city of Montreal. Three new constituencies have been created in Montreal and its vicinity, that is to say, two in Montreal and one in Hochelaga, which is part of Montreal, and another in the County of Ottawa; in all, four constituencies have been created in the Province of Quebec. As that province is limited to 65 members, the creation of these four new constituencies rendered it necessary to wipe out four existing constituencies. Instead of simply wiping out those four constituencies, the Bill goes on to modify no less than 25 constituencies. Now, is there anything at all which can justify such a proceeding as this? Is there any state of facts by which it can be warranted? The object should be, as stated by the hon. member for Albert, to have the minimum of disturbance; but instead of that, which could have been done easily by uniting eight counties—four counties are united by the Bill, and I do not seriously complain of that—25 constituencies are disturbed. That is not all. There is another feature of the Bill upon which I rely for the fair judgment of every man on either side of the House. Four new constituencies are created. Of these, three are obviously Conservative, those in Montreal and Hochelaga, while the constituency in Ottawa County is presumably Liberal. Then, would it not have been fair, in wiping out four existing constituencies, to wipe out three Conservative and one Liberal? Instead of that, the Bill wipes out three Liberal constitu-

encies and one Conservative. It wipes out the constituency of Three Rivers, which is Conservative; but it wipes out the constituency of St. John, the constituency of Napierville, and the constituency of Verchères, all of which are Liberal. But I may be told, in fact we have been told: We were not guided by any such consideration; we did not consider what was the political complexion of this constituency or the other; we simply considered what was the population. That has been said, but all the facts proclaim another language. All the facts proclaim that the object was to give an unfair advantage to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. If I am told that the constituencies wiped out are the smallest in population that could be found in the province, I answer that that is not the case. On the contrary, the three Liberal constituencies wiped out have the following populations: Verchères, 12,257; St. John, 12,282; Napierville, 10,101; or a total of 34,640. Now, let me cite the populations of a certain number of other constituencies. Laprairie has a population of 10,900; Laval, 9,436; Montcalm, 12,131; Soulanges, 9,608; Vaudreuil, 10,803. Let me take three which could be very well united—Laval, Soulanges and Vaudreuil; they would have a total population of 29,847; but instead of wiping out these constituencies, you wipe out three others which have a total population of 34,640. Under the circumstances, it cannot be said that the principle of this measure, if it was meant to be non-political, has been at all carried out. The only argument of any consequence which I heard in favour of it, and it was an argument which at first blush struck me to some extent, was adduced by the hon. Minister of Public Works. He stated that the object of the Bill was to remedy a state of facts that was not desirable, because at the last general election the Liberal party carried a majority of the seats by some 10, while they had a minority of the popular vote. This is not exactly true. It will be true if we include the four constituencies of Montreal East, Montreal Centre, Montreal West and Hochelaga. But leaving these aside, the Liberal party had a clear majority in the province. There are 65 constituencies in the Province of Quebec. Deducting those four, there are 61 constituencies left. Of these, there were 55 in which there was a direct party fight; the remaining six being Quebec East, Lotbinière, Gaspé, Dorchester, Pontiac and Montcalm. Those 55 constituencies gave a total vote for the Conservative party of 74,828, and a total vote for the Liberal party of 76,090. Now, the six constituencies which I have excluded require some words of comment. In Quebec East there was an election by acclamation; but in 1887 when there was an election, the Liberal vote was 695, and the Conservative vote 2,622. In Lotbinière there was also an election by acclamation; but the figures in the election of 1887, were 955 Conservative, and 1,464 Liberal. In Gaspé, which was also carried by acclamation, there was an election in 1887, when the Conservative vote was 1,219, and the Liberal vote 1,145. In Dorchester, which was also carried by acclamation, the figures in 1887 were 1,089 Conservatives and 1,565 Liberals. In Pontiac there was a three-cornered fight. The Conservative candidate was Mr. Bryson and the Liberal candidate Mr. Murray. Between the two there was an independent candidate, who it may fairly be presumed received as much support from one party as from the other. In that case the vote of the Conservative party from Pontiac would be 787, and the vote of the Liberal party 1,100. In Montcalm there was also a three-cornered fight; but there I am bound to say the three candidates were all Conservatives. There were about 2,800 votes polled. In that county the force of the Liberal party is about one to three, so that I presume the hon. gentleman who now represents the county received the larger portion of the votes. At all events, I have put the total Conservative vote in Montcalm at 1,120 against 700 for the Liberals. That would give a majority for the Conservatives of 420, and I believe those figures are correct, because in the last election in which there was a party fight, the election of 1886, the Conservative candidate received a majority of about 450. So that in those 61 constituencies, the total Conservative vote was 80,693 against 84,615, giving the Conservative party a majority of nearly 4,000. But the figures of Hochelaga and Montreal West, East and Centre lowered those figures, and gave a net majority of 3,000 to the Conservative party. This is obviated, I presume, by giving an extended representation to Montreal. So far, so good, but there the argument ceases, because, certainly giving an increased representation to Montreal should not alter the figures in the rest of the province. I do not dispute that, under certain circumstances, there might not be an increased representation given to the city of Montreal. This is not the case at present, however. At present we stand by the principle that if there is to be any redistribution at all, it should be effected by preserving county lines. Upon this, I appeal to what was stated by hon. gentlemen opposite. The principle of this Bill is an affirmation of the principle laid down in 1882, and then applied to the Province of Ontario, and which now, for the first time, is sought to be applied to the Province of Quebec. There has not been a single voice heard on the opposite side of the House in favour of the Bill of 1882. No one has risen in his place to say that he approved of the Bill of 1882. The only thing said in favour of it was that it had become the law of the land, that three elections had been held upon it, and that it would not be right to disturb the established state of things. Let me quote the language made use of by the hon. member for Albert:

"If the Act of 1882 was unfair, as I think it was, it brought at all events punishment on those who perpetrated it for their unfairness. And that is the reason why, as practical working men, it would be better for us to put our feet upon the basis we have, although I feel a wrong was done in establishing that basis, rather than attempt to right that wrong, because, if the figures I gave are true, in the districts where most complaint was made the party which that Act was intended to benefit suffered.

Then he went on to say:

"Suppose we repeal the Act of 1882 and go back to the *status quo* of 1872, which is practically the *status quo* of Confederation—if we could now, as reasonable men, discard altogether the changes made in 1882, that would be going back to a sound basis. But can we do it? Would it be wise to undertake to do it? Is it not a more proper suggestion that we should put our feet upon the basis of Ontario, divided into districts as she stands, with her present boundaries, and try and take care that some sound rule is laid down to guide us in dealing with this Bill?"

This is exactly what I propose, that we should plant our feet upon the basis existing to-day in the Province of Quebec and not disturb it until we decide on some sound rule to be applied to the case.

All the arguments made against the Act of 1882 apply with equal force to this Bill, as far as the Province of Quebec is concerned. We have many hon. gentlemen opposite declaring that if they had been here in 1882 they would probably not have supported the Bill, and yet the very thing which took place in 1882 is now to be applied to the Province of Quebec, and they are prepared to support it. I appeal to the conservative sentiment of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is so much of the conservative in me that I would not like to see any interference with the old historic constituencies in the Province of Quebec. If there are changes at all required, they should be made by joining counties together, and not by hacking up boundary lines as contemplated by this Bill. You propose to unite three counties in the district of Three Rivers; so far I do not object to that. You propose to add two counties to the district of Iberville; at present I make no objection to that. Why not follow the same principle with regard to the other counties? Why not unite counties? If you are to wipe out counties, wipe them out by uniting counties which can be fairly united. Nothing prevents the union of the Counties of Laprairie and Soulanges and Vaudreuil, whose population combined does not exceed 20,000. These counties form a peninsula by themselves bounded by the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Rivers and Ontario. Is there any reason why Laprairie and Napierville should not be united, whose united population does not exceed 22,000? Is there any reason why Laval and Two Mountains should not be united now? The County of Laval is an island next to the County of Two Mountains, and the two counties together would not exceed in population 22,000. Why not unite those two counties if you must wipe out any constituency? The reason for my amendment is that there is no necessity for proceeding with the Bill at present, so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned. There was necessity to proceed with it as far as Manitoba is concerned, because that province is entitled to additional representation by the census. There is reason to proceed with it as far as New Brunswick is concerned, because New Brunswick, according to the census, must have a decreased representation. The same reason exists with regard to Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, but there is no reason whatever why the Province of Quebec should be interfered with. I, therefore, beg to move in amendment:

That section 3 be omitted from the Bill.

Mr. OUIMET. It would be amusing if we had the time, and I suppose if we should stay here another month we will be able to appreciate that enjoyment in its full measure, to follow the hon. gentleman in the different positions he takes upon this Bill. His proposition now is that there should be no redistribution in the Province of Quebec. That is a long distance from the first proposition he presented to this House, when he moved that the Bill be not now read a second time but be referred to a committee, to be composed of members of both political parties, to agree upon the lines and principles upon which a Redistribution Bill should be drawn. If I am not mistaken, that resolution implied that a redistribution ought to take place, and the only difficulty was to find what rules and principles should apply. The hon. gentleman, I see, has not been converted by the arguments presented against his proposition. I urged, and experience has proved that I was right, that these numerous rules which the hon. gentleman proclaimed as the rules of equity which we should follow, were contradictory and could not be applied to every case. I argued that it would be better for the whole House to be present when these debates were discussed, so that every member should be able to give the House the benefit of his knowledge of the localities affected, and in this way the Government and the House could join in establishing the basis upon which we could act. The hon. gentleman's first amendment was rejected. Then hon. gentlemen opposite looked for some saviour elsewhere, and in the shape of a saviour came the hon. member for Simcoe, who tendered to them the olive branch, and who laid down, as his experience as a lawyer enabled him to do for them, the principles and rules which in his mind should be followed in this matter. These principles were several in number. I shall show that this Bill is based as far as practicable on the equalization of population. Hon. gentlemen should wait until they can discuss the details of the Bill, and we will see if we cannot apply all these rules, or some of them, to all the provisions of the Bill. The hon. gentleman also contended that county and city boundaries should be followed as far as possible, and I say that this rule has been followed as far as practicable in the Province of Quebec. It was not possible in that province to make new counties, because we are only entitled to 65 members, and if we are to give four additional representatives to Ottawa County, Hochelaga and Montreal, we had to take them from other constituencies, and in doing that we had to regard race, religion, nationality and interest in that province. We have made these provisions with a view to preserving the condition of things which existed in the Province of Quebec, which is due to the diversities of race in that province. I will give an instance as an answer to one suggestion of the hon. gentleman when he said the County of Two Mountains should be united with the County of Laval. There is no more community of interest between Two Mountains and Laval than there is between Laval and Montmorency. The Counties of Pontiac, Ottawa, Argenteuil and Two Mountains form a group with an aggregate population of 116,305. By giving these four counties five members, we have given them just about the unit of a representative for the whole province, and we could not disturb Two Mountains, because Argenteuil, which was one of the English-speaking counties reserved by the Act of Confederation to give them the privilege of electing an English-speaking member, was placed between the County of Two Mountains and the County of Ottawa. If you want to give Ottawa County its full representation, you will nearly have to give it three members, but, in order to keep the unit, you must take a part of Argenteuil, and join it to Two Mountains so as to give those counties five members with an average representation of 23,000. In that case, however, the County of Argenteuil would have to disappear. What the hon. member for Argenteuil, representing the English-speaking population of Quebec, would in that case have rightly said, would have been that we had broken one of the pledges contained in the British North America Act, and assented to by the French-speaking population.

In that way we have a group of four counties with a population entitling them to five members, and we have given them the five members, though we have been obliged to leave Ottawa County with one member for about 32,000, while Argenteuil has one member for 14,000, and Two Mountains one member for about 15,000. That, however, is necessary in order not to break the harmony which has always existed between the two races in the Province of Quebec. I said it was the duty of the Government to preserve the integrity of the County of Argenteuil, and I hope we will meet with the approval of the majority of the House in doing so. Take the district of Quebec. There are 12 counties, with a population of 366,405, which gives as a unit of population for each member about 22,200. Was it desirable to disturb the counties in that district except when it was absolutely necessary? These counties were divided in 1854, and I will show the difference in population which has taken place since. I say that in doing fair justice to those counties which have increased the most in population, we have been very careful to disturb as little as possible the constituencies as they now exist. I have spoken of the English counties which were reserved; they are eleven in number. Now, mark, here is another instance where we have been trying to preserve in their integrity the rights of the minority in our province. Here are eleven counties whose bounds cannot be changed. The reservation only applies to representation in the Local Legislature, but I think it is only fair that they should have the same rights as regards their representation in the Federal Legislature. These eleven counties contain 266,405 inhabitants. This gives them, according to the unit of representation, eleven members and a fraction over, the eleven members, according to the unit, representing 250,976, leaving a balance of 15,000 unrepresented. I think we ought to be credited with doing justice to the minority in the Province of Quebec by preserving the present bounds of their constituencies. These 12 counties are: Pontiac, with a population of 22,084; Ottawa, with a population of 64,056; Argenteuil, with a population of 15,158; Huntingdon, with a population of 14,385; Missisquoi, with a population of 18,359; Brome, with a population of 14,709; Shefford, with a population of 23,233; Stanstead, with a population of 18,072; Compton, with a population of 22,779; Richmond and Wolfe, with a population of 31,347; Megantic, with a population of 22,333, and Sherbrooke with a population of 16,500. If one additional member is given to Ottawa County, these 12 counties will be represented by 13 members. Now, the hon. leader of the Opposition has quoted once more the great precedent of Mr. Gladstone's action in framing a Redistribution Bill for England. Well, I think we might fairly apply to these precedents coming from a distance, the old French proverb: *A beau mentir qui vient de loin.* It has been demonstrated by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and more especially by the figures given by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), that this precedent cannot fully apply to Canada. I say that the rules which were followed by that commission in England have been followed here. As I say, we have been trying to equalize the population, and to remedy certain inequalities which had arisen since 1854 by the movement of population.

Mr. OUIMET.

I have just been examining the census of 1861, and I find that the city of Montreal, according to that census, had 90,253 inhabitants, and Hochelaga had 16,474, making together 106,697 for Montreal and its environs. This population was represented by four members, or a little over 25,000 for each member. Since then the population of Montreal and Hochelaga has risen to over 260,000. Was it fair that the people should continue to be represented by only four members? The hon. gentleman challenged my figures the other day as to the majority represented in this Parliament by the Conservatives, but he was very careful to take out Montreal. Why should he take out Montreal? Is it because in Montreal we have the largest industrial and manufacturing interests? Is it because Montreal is the great shipping port of the Dominion of Canada? Are these people to be partially disqualified because they have such large interests at stake in this country? Then, Mr. Chairman, is not Montreal the largest centre of mechanics and artisans in this Dominion? Are these mechanics, according to the principles of the Liberal leader, to be deprived of their fair share of representation in this House because they live in the city of Montreal? Are the carpenters of some little country village to be represented in this House, and are the thousands of mechanics of the great city of Montreal to be unrepresented?—this is the logical result of the argument of the Liberal leader. If that is the doctrine of the Liberal party of this country, it is well that the people should know it, and they will henceforth appreciate the doctrines of that party at their real value. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will not feel greatly flattered when he goes back to Montreal and meets with the inhabitants of that city of which every Lower Canadian ought to feel proud.

Mr. CURRAN. Every Canadian.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman is right, every Canadian. The population of Ottawa County, as I said, was in 1861, 26,757, and it has heretofore been represented by one member. Since then the population has increased to 64,000. Is it not fair that this county should have an additional member? If it were not to preserve the English-speaking County of Argenteuil as it is, the County of Ottawa should have 3 members, adding to it a few parishes from Argenteuil in order to have as far as possible representation according to population. I come back to the representation of the different groups simply in order to remind hon. members of what I said the other day. Ottawa County requires an additional member. I take it from the group to which it belongs, the northern group, which is composed of 13 counties with an aggregate population of 275,712, and entitled to 13 members only. We leave them with 13 members. Is it not going pretty far in the direction indicated by the leader of the Opposition when he declared that the country constituencies ought to be a little more represented that the cities? Taking the group south of the St. Lawrence, it is composed of 13 counties with a population of 182,523; these counties are entitled only to 9 members, a fraction numbering 2,005 votes remaining unrepresented. We give those counties 10 members. These are the counties in which the Liberals are in force. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been very careful, when they have

canvassed for sympathy among members on this side of the House, to mention to some Protestant members that by doing so I was crippling Protestant interests,——

Mr. LAURIER. Not at all.

Mr. OUIMET—that I was crippling the Liberal influence in order to get the counties entirely into the hands of the hierarchy and of the priests of Lower Canada. That was the common rumour.

Mr. LAURIER. I deny that statement absolutely.

Mr. OUIMET. I say I have learned it from several parties.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name one.

Mr. OUIMET. I need not name any. My word will go for what it is worth. If the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) is not satisfied, he will not believe it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I do not believe it.

Mr. OUIMET. It makes no difference to me. Let him believe it or not; it is not for him I am speaking, if he wants to know.

Mr. LAURIER. That is cowardly.

Mr. OUIMET. These counties form a Liberal stronghold. They were represented by 13 members when they were only entitled to 9. Is it fair to take away from Ottawa County and Hochelaga representatives in order to give representation to the small counties on the other side of the St. Lawrence, when they possess 30 per cent more members than they were entitled to? We have reduced the number to 10. Is it unfair when we give one more member to the northern counties than they are entitled to, and one more to the southern counties than they are entitled? I now take the central group, and there again I have followed to a reasonable extent the rule enunciated by the leader of the Opposition, that is, we have given Montreal 5 members, each with an average representation of over 38,000. We have given Hochelaga 2 members. We have taken from Hochelaga some population in order to increase the populations of Laval and Jacques Cartier, and we leave Soulanges and Vaudreuil as they are. If Soulanges and Vaudreuil should be united, this additional county would not go to the southern group, but to Montreal. This would give justice to Montreal by furnishing it with six members, for Montreal now has a right to complain. If we assume, and I hold the people of Montreal will agree with us in this, that the interests of the surrounding counties are similar to those of the city, for, in fact, a part of Vaudreuil is a suburb of Montreal—if we assume that there is community of interests between Vaudreuil, Soulanges and Montreal, we hold that Montreal has no right to complain as its interests will also be advocated by the representatives of those two constituencies. Besides, it will, perhaps ten years hence, enable us if we are here again, or enable hon. gentlemen opposite or their successors, to give an additional member to Montreal without disturbing the rest of the constituencies as they are cut out to-day. I say, therefore, that this representation by groups is the most equitable method that can be adopted as regards representation, and we have followed it out. I admit that we have in the division made of counties to the south of the St. Lawrence been obliged to divide two counties into several parts; but this was done because we could not do otherwise in order to give those counties that fair representation to which they are entitled. I will only add one word. When we asked gentlemen opposite for suggestions, what did we receive? We were here for three long days listening to speeches declaring that a monstrous iniquity had been perpetrated by the Government in introducing this Bill. No language was sufficiently strong to condemn us, and to tell us that we had been guilty of doing the greatest crime known to civilization. But hon. gentlemen opposite have come down since that time. Now they appeal to the fairness and justice of this Government to give them concessions, to listen to their suggestions in order to make the Bill as fair as possible. I repeat that, although we have received all kinds of strange compliments, we have not lost all patience, and we are yet ready to listen to suggestions and do what is fair, and if it can be shown that these propositions are more equitable than those contained in the Bill, we are ready to adopt them. The suggestion has been made to divide Ottawa County by a line running from south to north, equalizing population on both sides, rather than by a line drawn from east to west as we had been advised to adopt. I am ready to accept that suggestion. The Minister of Justice will do, as he has already done, he will listen to every suggestion offered. But is it fair that when we go so far, we should receive what the Minister of Railways has received in the way of vituperation, when he was accused of having taken Clarence from Russell to place it in Prescott? It was discovered that it would be better to leave the constituencies as they were. It was only fair it seems to me for the Opposition to recognize that fact, and to give us credit for having done what they suggested, but they were not generous enough for that. In fact I should have said that it was not done precisely at their suggestion, but was done on suggestions which are generally more pleasant and more agreeable than those we receive from them. At all events we have taken that course in this matter, and the country will give us credit for it, and any concession that will be made, will be made in the same spirit of fair-play. I have no doubt that if hon. gentlemen opposite do not give us credit for doing this, the people of this country will give us the thanks which we deserve.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) It is to be regretted, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Public Works does not seem inclined to accept any of the suggestions which have been made to him in the matter of the redistribution of the seats in the Province of Quebec. Had it pleased him to listen to the speeches which were made on the occasion of the second reading of this Bill, I think he would know that there were suggestions made then by the hon. members of the left, and he would not state to-day that we have made so far no suggestions. Indeed, we repeatedly argued that changes should be made in the Bill so as to equalize the population and do justice to both parties. It is true that at the same time we have inveighed against the way the redistribution was made in the Province of Quebec, but I think the hon. Minister is satisfied that we were quite right in speaking so strongly. The hon. Minister is wrong, I hold, in saying that we have refused to make suggestions,

when the fact is that we spent two days at offering him suggestions, at showing him the injustice of his Bill, and at putting before him the means of rectifying them. I think that, under the circumstances, it would be dangerous to continue forcing the redistribution of the seats in the Province of Quebec. It would be creating a precedent apt to raise serious difficulties, which could later on bring about much trouble in the province. I might say, from the start, that we have been made aware of the opinion of eminent legal men, in this House and outside, which shows that the Bill proposed by the Government is unconstitutional. In presence of such opinions, I would like to know whether it is reasonable for the Government to proceed with this redistribution, when it would be liable to be set aside by the court of justice. Should this redistribution be declared illegal, to what anarchy would not the province be given up? I will state briefly in what respect this Bill is unconstitutional. I will at the same time give the reasons why the Government should not proceed with it, at least in respect to the Province of Quebec. According to the British North America Act this province is to have 65 members of this Parliament. In 1867 as well as to-day we had similar inequalities in the population of the counties. There were counties with large population, quite disproportionate with the population of other constituencies. The representation was therefore not perfectly equal. In 1867, as well as in 1871 and 1881, when it was found necessary to make new redistribution of seats, no Government ever dreamed of changing the limits of the counties in Quebec. I doubt that posterity will be grateful to the Minister of Public Works, who must be credited with this new departure. I believe that the future will show him that his present course, instead of being equitable and just, instead of fostering harmony in the province, has but caused trouble and perturbation. He will find—too late, it is true—that he was wrong in proposing this measure as respects the Province of Quebec. I therefore say that it is dangerous to proceed with it. We find in the resolutions of the Quebec Conference, resolutions which form the basis of the British North America Act, and notably in section 23, that the redistribution of the seat shall be made, not by the Federal Parliament, but by the Provincial Legislatures. It is true, that in the course of the discussion of those resolutions, it was stated that the Federal Parliament should have the right of redistributing the seats. When the Bill was presented in the House, in England, this power was given the Federal Parliament; but it was declared that the redistribution was to be done by a tribunal to be appointed by the Federal Parliament. Consequently there could be no doubt that, after reaching England, it was found that this was giving too much power to the Provincial Legislatures. It was then resolved—as with almost all the other clauses of the British North America Act—to limit the powers of the Provincial Legislatures. However, it was not thought proper to put the exercise of this right fully in the hands of the federal authorities. A compromise was adopted, and it was decided that the Federal Government would have the right to constitute the authority which should be entrusted with the redistribution of the seats. In my estimation there could be no doubt that according to section 51 of the constitution—

which is formal in this respect—the Federal Parliament has not the right to effect directly the redistribution of seats, to determine the county boundaries, but that it has only the right to create the authority to be entrusted with the changes. But, it will be said, it would be absurd that the Federal Parliament should not have the right of making a redistribution of its seats? To this I will answer that there are many other absurdities in that Act of British North America. It is enacted in that Act that the quorum of this House shall be twenty members. Is it not reasonable that the House should have the right of saying that the quorum should be forty or fifty? Yet it has not that power. Why? Because the constitution formally provides that the quorum shall be twenty. It is a constitutional enactment which we have no right to change, however absurd it may seem to be. Let us look at another instance. The Provincial Legislatures have the right to abolish their Legislative Councils, while we have not the right to abolish the Senate, because the constitution does not give that right to the Federal Parliament. There is in this constitution a number of enactments which seem absurd; we are, however, bound to submit to them. There is another point to which I will call the attention of the House: the Federal Parliament as well as the Local Legislatures, have the right to make laws within certain limitations of subjects. These laws must be submitted to the courts for their interpretation. That is to say, the judiciary power, according to the constitution, is not in the hands of Parliament, but must be exercised by judges appointed by Parliament. We, therefore, have the right to make the laws, to appoint the judges, and yet the judiciary is not in our hands. And why? Because, by the constitution the judiciary power is vested in the judges. I say that we are in the same position as regards the redistribution of seats. Instead of giving the Federal Parliament the right of saying what shall be the county boundaries, the constitution simply states that this Parliament shall have the right to say how the redistribution shall be made. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in the intention of the framers of the constitution, we were only to have the right to appoint a competent authority to do the work according to rules adopted for Parliament. It seems to me that there is a perfect analogy between the judiciary power and the power of redistributing the seats, so far as regards the action of Parliament. In either case is Parliament denied to act directly. Should we usurp the judiciary functions, our sentences would be illegal and could not be executed. Likewise, if we attempt to redistribute the electoral colleges, we usurp powers which according to constitution are to be exercised by others, and consequently our law shall be null and void. Let us see what would happen, if the House should adopt this Bill? The next elections would take place in accordance with the new county boundaries, these elections would certainly be protested, on the ground that the persons returned were not elected by constituencies legally constituted. I have no doubt that the courts of justice would maintain such a view, and would declare that the redistribution was not made according to the constitution. Should the courts take this view, all the constituencies which we are now constituting would be set aside, and such a state of anarchy would follow as we have never witnessed before. We therefore see how just,

equitable and fair the proposition made by the leader of the Opposition is. He wants to ward off all perturbation which could take place in the Province of Quebec in the event of the Bill being adopted. He wants to ward off such anarchy. He wants to ward off such disturbances, which would probably not be very favourable to those who are now urging such an upturning of the Province of Quebec. I hope that the appeals made by the Minister of Public Works to a certain element of the population of Montreal may have no response, and that on the contrary those appeals will be considered as an insult by those citizens. It is not necessary to appeal to the prejudices of any. The citizens of Montreal are too intelligent for such appeals to prejudices. They know that they are already sufficiently represented, and that the Government have no call to increase the representation of that city. In this connection I must say that, had I not been obliged to be away the other day, I would have voted against the proposition made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who wanted to give every constituency a number of representatives proportionate to its population, that is to say, give every city a representation based on its population. I do not admit that Montreal, for instance, should have a number of representatives based only on the figure of its population, as it should be for the other constituencies; and this on account of the influence which that city exercises on the rural districts through its papers, its great commercial houses, its industries and above all by the number of its citizens elected to represent rural constituencies in Parliament. Another consideration must have its weight also,—and I draw the special attention of the House to it, for I regard it as important. I refer to the fact that out of twelve senators to which the district of Montreal is entitled, seven are citizens of the city of Montreal, while according to its population its representation in the Senate should be much less. Why, here is a Government having constantly ignored for the benefit of Montreal, the rights of the rural districts in the appointment of senators, and they come and propose that the influence of that city should still be increased by raising the number of its representatives in the House of Commons. There is no mistake to be made in this, the senators have as much influence as we have on the legislation of the country, nay, each senator has as much influence as three of us. According to its population, Montreal should hardly be entitled to two senators. Instead of that it is given seven, and the Government not satisfied with this proposes to still increase the influence of Montreal in giving that city a larger representation in the Commons. I say that, taken in connection with the representation of Montreal in the Senate, the proposition by the Government is a most iniquitous and unjust one. The second reason for which I claim that this Bill should not be adopted, so far as it relates to Quebec, is that the Government stated that their measure was based on the data of the last census. Now, I hold that this census does not give an exact idea of the population of the Province of Quebec. Under the instructions given to the census enumerators, it appears that they were to proceed according to the principle called *de jure*, that is to say, that they were to register the people domiciled here, although they may have happened to be absent on 6th April, 1891, the day on which the census was taken. So that there be not the slightest misunderstanding on this point, I will read the instructions given to the enumerators in this connection:

"The principle adopted for the registration of the population is that which is called by statists the *population de droit* or *de jure*; that is, the population legally *domiciled* within the territory of Canada, and including all persons who may be temporarily absent from their places of abode, whether at the fisheries, at sea, or in the forest, &c., on 6th April, 1891.

"As considerable doubt has been expressed respecting the accuracy of returns where no time-limit is established, it is proposed to make a change in this regard for the census of 1891. There are many persons who are absent from Canada, about whose right to be counted in our census there is no doubt. Thus, seamen away for one, two or three years, whose wives and families are in Canada, and consequently whose domicile is in Canada, should be taken by the enumerator. In the same way, children abroad for their education, though absent for two or more years, are to be taken with their parents. There is, however, a large class of persons who are away from Canada about whom their parents may reasonably be in doubt whether it is their purpose to return to Canada. In these cases, after exhausting enquiry without satisfactory result, the enumerator is to ask: 'Have these persons been away for *twelve months*?' If the answer is 'Yes,' then these are not to be taken in the census; the presumption being that they have abandoned Canada and settled elsewhere.

"All persons are to be registered in the province and particular locality in which their census home, family-dwelling, or place of abode is situated, although they may happen to be absent, as is said above."

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that when made under such instructions, the census cannot give an exact idea of the population of each county, and this is the reason why. In the County of Rouville, for instance, a large number of families have been in the United States for the last two or three years, while they are still owners of lands which are cultivated for them either by farmers or otherwise. These persons are really domiciled in the county, but they have to be absent owing to the straitened circumstances to be met everywhere in consequence of the fatal policy of the Government, which causes this emigration. These families have been obliged to desert their lands for a time, but they have them cultivated in their absence. These families were not counted in the census under the instructions given the enumerators. For their registration, the head of the family or the wife and family should have been in Canada, while in these cases the whole family was absent. I have no hesitation in saying that I personally know of 20 or 25 families in my county who are thus situated. These people have gone to the United States to make a little money in order to pay their debts. Should prosperity come back in the province, should better days come back, they would come back, and then we could have a correct idea of the population of Quebec. Therefore, I say that under such circumstances, the census does not give an exact return of the population in every county. I am satisfied, from the statistics which I consulted in this regard, that the same applies to 15 or 20 counties in the Province of Quebec. This is why the next census will probably show a large increase of population. It will then be seen that an injustice will have been done to those counties in altering their boundaries, and new changes will then be necessary if justice is to obtain. This reason alone seems to me sufficient to render inadvisable the proposed changes in the Province of Quebec. Now, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to another point. It seems that, if

they had wanted to be just towards us, they would have brought a map conformable to the facts, a map representing accurately the boundaries of the counties such as proposed by their Bill. I had an opportunity the other day of drawing the attention of the Minister of Public Works and of the Government to the discrepancies which are to be found in the map deposited on the Table, compared with the Bill proposed by the Minister of Justice. I showed that the map was inaccurate, and that it would be unfair to ask the House to pronounce with a map so incorrect. The Minister of Public Works found my words a little strong, when I told him that the map is false. It was by inference, showing that he did not know how inaccurate the map was. So much the better; but it seems to me then that he ought to have tried, during the two weeks which have since passed, to furnish us with a map representing accurately the boundaries of the counties.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Can the hon. member tell me what are these inaccuracies? Can he give the name of the parish? Is it in the County of Rouville?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) In the County of Rouville and in many others. It seems to me that it would not have cost so much to obtain a copy of the cadastre of the counties to be disturbed. In this way, we could have had an accurate idea of the boundaries of these counties. Here are some of the inaccuracies which I find in this map. It would seem that the hon. Minister did not understand the discrepancies which I pointed out to him the other day, probably because he was under the influence of anger, but I am going to point them out over again to him, hoping that another time he may pay more attention to the remarks which are addressed to him in this House. Let us take Laprairie. I am going to dot the i's for him, so that he may not pretend that I have not been clear and precise enough. The Bill reads as follows:—

"The electoral district of Laprairie shall consist of the villages of Laprairie and Sault St. Louis (Indian village of Caughnawaga) and of the parishes of Laprairie, St. Constant, St. Isidore, St. Jacques le Mineur, St. Philippe, St. Michel Archange, St. Joachim de Chateauguay and Ste. Philomène."

If the hon. Minister has taken the trouble of looking over this map,—and he must be acquainted with it, since it is his own work—he must have seen that on the map. Sherrington is represented as being a part of Laprairie, while according to the Bill this parish is put in Chateauguay.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) Sherrington is not in Chateauguay.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) By the Bill now before us Sherrington is put in Chateauguay.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) It is perhaps a photograph of what some had in their minds.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Really I do not wish to take up the remark of the Minister of Public Works, but I am surprised that he treats so lightly a matter of this gravity. The map is inaccurate, he says, and it represents the illusions of some visionaries. Well, since the hon. Minister admits that this map is incorrect, he should at least postpone the consideration of the redistribution of seats for the Province of Quebec. I call the attention of the Minister of Justice to this point. As I believe him gifted with a judicious mind, I am sure that when he is convinced, as is the Minister of Public Works, that this map is incorrect, he will admit that we cannot discuss this Bill with such a map. Is it not ridiculous to ask us to vote for a Bill illustrated by an inaccurate map? When it was put on the Table of the House, I pointed out to some Conservatives of the Province of Ontario, how these counties were to be upturned, and what a monstrous map they were to make. They answered that it could not be so, that the Government would never do any such thing. If the Government want to deal the tiniest amount of justice, let them produce a correct map, and I am sure that the members of the Province of Ontario will be ashamed to vote a law constituting such a distortion of the counties. The hon. Minister might pass this as a simple error. But I will point out to him a great number of others of the same kind. By the Bill, the parish of Napierville is put in the County of Chateauguay. However, in order to show a fine square on the map with what is to be converted into the united Counties of St. John and Iberville, the parish of Napierville was included in the united Counties of St. John and Iberville. The fact is, that if the counties were mapped out accurately, I say that there is not one Conservative who would wish to call himself the author of such a law. Here is another error to point out: The map puts St. Edouard de Napierville in Laprairie; yet the Bill puts it in Chateauguay. The parish of St. Michel is inaccurately indicated on the map; it ought to be represented in the County of Laprairie, and it is shown in that of Chateauguay. The parish of Notre Dame de Bonsecours, according to the Bill is in Rouville; according to the map, it is in Chambly. If the map showed accurately the parishes of St. Dominique and St. Pie, in the County of Rouville, I am convinced that the Conservative members of this House would ask the hon. Minister to take back such a Bill, and devise one that would allow of a reasonable looking map to be drawn of the proposed constituencies. The hon. Minister must now feel satisfied that there are many discrepancies in his map. I could point out to him a great number of others; such as parishes which are incorrectly represented, and which are squared into shape, when in reality they dart into neighbouring counties. I trust that the Minister of Public Works will not insist on the Bill being adopted as it is, or that at least he will tell us why he wants to force the House to vote a Bill illustrated by a map altogether inaccurate. I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is a veritable breach of privilege to furnish the House with a map so replete of such gross inaccuracies as those which I have called attention to. If such a thing happened in England, where the privileges of Parliament are held in respect, and where the dignity of the people's representatives is appreciated, the Minister guilty of it would be marked for public contempt. But here a Minister of the Crown can allow himself little irregularities of that kind, and before a full House joke the matter off, and continue insisting on the adoption of his Bill. If, therefore, the census, as I showed a few moments ago, does not give an accurate idea of the population, and if the map placed before us with the would-be object of informing us on the geographical effect of the Bill, is not correct, I will ask, is it reasonable to expect us to vote this Bill? Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Public Works has contended that the Liberals only represented the

minority of the popular vote, although they were a majority in this House. I only refer to the Province of Quebec. I wish to be frank and sincere, and I mean to discuss the point loyally. I admit that the statement of the hon. Minister is true. We had, at the beginning of this Parliament, a majority of the Quebec representatives, while we had a minority of the votes polled. But I say, if we had the minority of the popular vote while having a majority of the representatives, this anomaly was not due to the inequalities to be found in the population of the counties. It was simply due to the fact that in the city of Montreal and in the County of Hochelaga we had made no very serious campaign. In consequence the Conservative candidates there were elected by enormous majorities. Under the circumstances, I say, even had the population of the rural constituencies been perfectly equal in all the counties, the result might have been the same. It would, nevertheless, be possible for a party to come back with a majority of representatives while having had but a minority of the popular votes. This apparent anomaly is due to the fact that in certain counties the fight is not carried on very vigorously, while in others the majorities are but small. As an illustration, and in order to made my thought more easily understood, the Conservatives might carry 25 constituencies and have 25 members in the House, and yet have majorities aggregating 10,000, 20,000, and 30,000 of the popular votes, while their opponents, with the other 40 members might only aggregate a polled majority of 5,000 or 6,000. Suppose that Montreal be given such a representation as it would be entitled to if only the figure of population was to be considered, that is to say, one representative per 23,000 souls; now suppose there is hardly any fight there, as was the case at the last general election, or that there is no fight at all, the ten Conservative members could roll up a majority of 30,000. Now, let every one of the rural constituencies be contested and carried by the Liberals, a majority of 8,000 votes may be all that these counties may give them. Now let us look at the result from the stand-point chosen by the Minister of Public Works. The Conservatives with their majorities of 30,000 would have only ten members in the House, while the Liberals would have fifty-five members with a majority of 8,000, being of course a decided minority of the total popular vote. Therefore, it is easy to see that even if the county populations were to be equalized, the same phenomenon could be reported. What happened in 1891 was not due to the inequality of the county populations. It was simply due to our electoral system, to our mode of voting by county. I hold that the redistribution of the electoral districts in the Province of Quebec by the Government, was done with the sole object of hiving the Liberals in constituencies where they will be returned with immense majorities. Now, with this system we will infallibly arrive at the same discrepancy between the proportion of the party votes given and the proportion of the party representation. We have the proof of that in this very Parliament. In Ontario, our friends have the majority of the popular vote and the minority of the representatives. This was due to the fact that the Conservative party had grouped a certain number of Liberal counties so as to form immense Liberal majorities. The Liberals came back from the elections with a majority of the popular vote, but found themselves a minority in this House. Therefore, I say that, with the proposed system, we may look, in this respect, for the same result as in the past. Let me take my county for an example. I am to get a majority of 800 to 1,000 votes of majority.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Eight hundred thousand votes of majority?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) If the hon. Minister had been able to fix things so as to reach such a result, he would have done it with pleasure, had he been thereby enabled to make safe the election of Conservatives in the neighbouring counties. You form constituencies where the elections will be very hotly contested, and where the majority of the candidate elected will be very small, while in the next county a Liberal will get from 800 to 1,000 votes of a majority, as in Rouville. Thus, the latter county, with such a strong Liberal majority will only give one representative, while three neighbouring Conservative counties will barely give altogether a majority of 400 to 500. This is what is proposed to be done by this gerrymandering. It will bring about precisely the anomaly spoken of by the Minister of Public Works, and that for the benefit of the Conservative party. The Minister of Public Works began his speech by saying that there was a contradiction between the proposition made to-day by the leader of the Opposition and that which he made on the occasion of the second reading of the Bill. The first proposition was that there should be a conference between the two political parties, so as to reach an understanding as to the best means of redistributing the seats, while to-day he proposes that there should be no redistribution of the Quebec seats, as no such redistribution is required by the constitution. I will begin by pointing out that the leader of the Opposition said, when he moved his amendment to the second reading of the Bill, that the redistribution should not extend to the Province of Quebec. He, therefore, took the same position as he does to-day on the occasion of the second reading, and I maintain that there is no contradiction in his course. But I will go further. The hon. Minister said: "You proposed a conference between the two parties in order to reach an understanding; and now you propose to put aside all that which refers to the Province of Quebec." When this proposition was made by the leader of the Opposition, the question was then the redistribution of the seats through the whole country, and the leader of the Opposition never contended that there was no occasion to touch the representation of the Maritime Provinces, of Manitoba and of British Columbia. But when he proposed his amendment to-day, he said that in the Province of Quebec no change was necessary, as there was to be no change of the number of the representatives of that province, which is fixed at 65 by the British North America Act. Therefore, the hon. Minister was wrong in saying that there was contradiction in the contentions of the leader of the Opposition. The position taken by the latter to-day is identical to that he held the other day. And his proposition is only the realization of his words on the former occasion. The hon. Minister then contended that his Bill rested on the principle of the equalization of the population. I would have liked to hear him give figures in support of such a statement. I think that if he had consulted

the census he could not have said that. Thus, for instance, I take the County of Chateauguay. Before the redistribution this county had a population of 13,864. The new Bill will give it a population of 19,681; since a change was wanted in that county, why not have given it at once the standard population? Why this half-way measure? Laprairie had a population of 10,900; it is made 15,184. This is a county the population of which has decreased during the last ten years, and will still decrease, notwithstanding the post office which was provided for it. I am confident that in ten years from now, the operation will have to be done over again. Why not give it at once the required population. The hon. Minister asks for suggestions. I will make one. Why not unite Napierville and Laprairie? These two counties have an aggregate population of 21,000 souls. This would not give the exact standard, but it would be a step in the right direction. The inhabitants of these two counties live together; they have common interests; they are all given to agricultural pursuits. Such a union would have given almost the standard population. I will explain later on why it was not done. St. John and Iberville, united, form a population of 24,175. Rouville had a population of 16,012 souls; by the proposed change it will have 18,789. This is another county the population of which decreased within the last decade. I hope that this emigration will cease, but since they wanted to change the boundaries of the county, why not have given it at once the standard population? Chambly had a population of 11,704; the new Bill makes it 19,882. St. Hyacinthe had the required population; and yet this county is gerrymandered, and why? I would not make any malevolent insinuations against any one in this House, but I think this is the most cowardly, the most wretched piece of work in the whole Bill. This county had a population of 20,497: it is now made 22,867. Bagot—we have had occasion to call attention to what marvel of equilibrium had been accomplished in that county—Bagot had a population of 21,695; the Bill gives it 21,655. Richelieu had 21,354; it is made 22,086. Yamaska had a population of 16,058; it is raised to 18,539. Three Rivers and St. Maurice, united, will have 21,101. Laval had a population of 9,436; it is made 16,504. L'Assomption had 13,674; it is given 14,661. Berthier had 19,836; the new Bill will give it 18,849. The population of this county has therefore been reduced by 987. Montcalm had a population of 12,131; it is made 13,616. Joliette had a population of 22,921, that is to say, the exact standard; it is reduced to 21,436. Jacques Cartier had 13,832; it is raised to 19,282. In face of the figures which I have just quoted, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has not the right to contend that the changes he proposes are based upon the idea of equalizing the population. The hon. Minister has also stated that the Bill he proposed was, to a certain extent, a consecration of the principle involved in the motion of Mr. McCarthy. Had the hon. Minister consulted not his map, which is calculated to give a pretty plausible showing of the counties, but which is incorrect—had he gone over his Bill, he would have found that, instead of leaving the county boundaries as wanted by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), he would have found, I say, that he was upturning 25 counties, without any reason. I now come to another point touched by the hon. Minister. The hon. gentleman, incapable of defending his Bill on its merits, is obliged to appeal to prejudices. In order to put a good face on his work, he challenges the leader of the Opposition to go and discuss the proposed Bill in Montreal with him. Well, we have already met in Montreal over this Bill. There has been the press which discussed the Bill in Montreal, and although a certain number of newspapers may have favoured the change as to the representation, all the independent papers, such as the *Star* and the *Witness*, have been unanimous in denouncing this measure as the most iniquitous and unjust. The hon. Minister made an appeal to the prejudices in connection with the County of Argenteuil. We might, he said, have changed Argenteuil, but that would have taken from the English a county in the Province of Quebec; the constitution gives them the right to keep this county intact, and it would be a crime of high treason to touch it. I will first tell the hon. Minister that he is wrong in saying that the constitution forbids the changing of the boundaries of the County of Argenteuil. Had he read section 80 of the constitution, he would have convinced himself, on the contrary, that the County of Argenteuil might be changed as well as any other. I do not want to say that it should be, but I say the Minister was wrong in saying it could not be. In fact the law states that the County of Argenteuil and eleven others, shall not be altered, not for the purposes of federal representation, but for the purposes of provincial representation.

Mr. CURRAN. (Translation.) That is what he said.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I beg your pardon; he spoke of the Federal Parliament.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) He said it was not proper to do so, because that county was one of those reserved by the constitution for the English in the Local Legislature.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I believe that the Minister of Customs has not properly understood what I have said. The Minister of Public Works stated that the constitution guaranteed the English twelve counties in the Province of Quebec, and that those counties should not be disturbed.

Mr. CURRAN. (Translation.) He distinctly stated what you said yourself, that for the Local no change could be made, but that the law did not prevent changes for the Federal Parliament.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) All right. If I have misrepresented the words of the Minister of Public Works I am willing to stand corrected. But, nevertheless, why raise prejudices in this matter? I will go further. If you so treat Argenteuil, why make a French county of Chateauguay, which is an English county? Why is the county, which is equally divided between the French and the English, and which until the last election had an English representative in Ottawa, a French-Canadian in Quebec, why is Chateauguay made a French county? Since appeal is made to prejudices—a thing which I infinitely regret—I am forced to make these remarks. Why is this English county made a French county?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Chateauguay is not one of the twelve counties reserved by the constitution.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Does the constitution forbid the changing of the limits of those counties?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) It does not forbid it for federal purposes, but it does for provincial purposes.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Then there is no need of speaking of that here. We are not making laws for provincial purposes.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Chateauguay is not disturbed. We could have taken away St. Malachie d'Ormstown, which is a very English parish, but it remains in the county.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The hon. Minister should add that he annexes four parishes altogether French. That is the way he means to keep the race equilibrium in the county. The discussion of such matters is to be regretted, but it was forced upon me by the remarks of the Minister of Public Works, who began his speech by appeal to race and national prejudices. I am going to show now, Mr. Chairman, that this Bill is not based upon any principle of equity or justice, no more towards the English than towards us, French-Canadians. My hon. friend, the member for Chateauguay, will be debarred from being elected again in his county if the Bill is adopted, because the majority of the county will be French. If the Minister of Public Works wants to preserve the English counties as they are, why does he not unite the Counties of Laprairie and Napierville? By this means, he would leave intact the County of Chateauguay. In answer to the suggestion made by the leader of the Opposition to join the Counties of Laval and Two Mountains, the Minister of Public Works said that these counties could not be united because they were separated by a river. A fine answer, indeed. As if these gentlemen had respected the counties separated by rivers! What did you do in Richelieu? Is it not true that you have annexed to this county parishes separated from it by rivers? Indeed, there is a river between Laval and Two Mountains, but there is also a bridge over that river, and the people on either side are in constant communication. These people go to Montreal every day to sell their produce. There would be nothing but what would be very just and equitable in joining these two counties. The river spoken of by the Minister of Public Works is not navigable. It can be crossed on a little flat boat. Rouville, St. Hyacinthe, Richelieu, Iberville, are as many counties to which additions were made, without minding whether rivers had to be crossed. This weighty consideration has not been respected in the case of Iberville and St. Hyacinthe, and yet there is a river there, twice as large as your stream of Ste. Rose. In Chambly, you annexed to this county a part of a county which is separated from it by a river, and which has no connection whatever with Chambly. Rouville itself will have added to it parishes from Verchères situated on the other side of the river. St. Hyacinthe, which already had the standard population, is made to stand annexations, and for that purpose, no scruple has been shown as to the crossing of the Richelieu River in order to take in a part of the County of Verchères. These facts make it evident that the excuse alleged by the Minister of Public Works is worth nothing against the suggestion made by the leader of the Opposition, to unite Laval and Two Mountains. The Minister of Public Works has put before the House, a well-seasoned project. He contended that this redistribution was made according to a system of groups, which he unfolded to the House. For example, he said that such and such counties would form a certain group, other counties would form other groups, and those groups would be entitled to so many representatives. I believe the Minister of Public Works would have saved himself much work in this connection, if he had simply followed the grouping adopted by the census commissioners. He told us that the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil form part of a group which comprises the city of Montreal, as these counties are but suburbs of that city. I do not know upon what the hon. Minister bases such a view. According to the census Soulanges and Vaudreuil form a separate group. But this grouping does not suit the hon. Minister. Soulanges and Vaudreuil are no more suburbs of Montreal, than Belœil is. If the Minister of Public Works means to justify himself by the fact that many citizens of Montreal have property in those counties, and go there to spend the fine season of the year, the same could be said of Belœil. A great many Montreal families spend the summer there, but that does not make Belœil a suburb of Montreal. I, therefore, say that the hon. Minister should have adopted simply census group No. 2. These two counties—Soulanges and Vaudreuil—are only entitled to one member, because their aggregate population is only 20,411. The hon. Minister has said that we have offered him no suggestions. I am going to offer him some which I hope he will accept. The proposition which we make is perfectly just and equitable. It is just and equitable from the stand-point of both political parties. The only principle which should have been adopted for a redistribution, since an increase in the Montreal representation was to be had, should have been that grouping six or eight counties by twos. The thing could have been done very simply. Here are ten counties, which could have been paired, and have hardly given the standard population. All this proposed gerrymandering would have been avoided. For instance, Soulanges and Vaudreuil united would only have a population of 20,411; Laprairie and Napierville would have an aggregate population of 21,000; Three Rivers and St. Maurice, the union of which is indeed proposed by the Bill, give a figure of 21,101; Verchères and Chambly united would have a population of 23,961; St. John and Iberville, 24,177. Why has not the hon. Minister taken this course which would have been much simpler and much less expensive? But in adopting it, the Liberal party would have been deprived of only one county, and that did not suit the hon. Minister. He must needs take away from them eight or ten seats. Thus in joining Soulanges and Vaudreuil the Conservatives would have lost a county. By the union of Three Rivers and St. Maurice they also lose one. By the union of Verchères and Chambly the Liberals would lose a county, and again one by the union of St. John and Iberville. So the sides are even. Now in joining Laprairie and Napierville, the two parties have an even chance of success. The Conservatives

have even a small majority there, since at the last elections the Liberal majority at Napierville was 18, and the Conservative majority in Laprairie 54. This would have been equitable. But the hon. Minister did not find that enough, and then was elaborated the iniquitous law which we have now to discuss. I do not want to dwell longer on the Bill. I will only say a word or two in regard to what I have stated above. The Conservative party by the Bill before us, will not content themselves with causing us to lose one or two counties, but they will succeed in making us lose some ten seats. As to Laval the hon. Minister had there at the last elections a majority of 534; he now makes it 645. It is true that the Liberals had not much chance in that county; but, nevertheless, he felt better for strengthening himself. L'Assomption gave the Liberals at the last general elections a majority of 78. The parish of Lavaltrie, which gives a Conservative majority of 37, was added to it. The chances of the Liberal party in the county are thereby about destroyed. True, L'Assomption has since returned a Conservative by acclamation, but there is no need of saying how that happened. However, why reduce the majority of the Liberals by changing the limits of that county? Joliette used to interfere with the sleep of the member of that county, he had twinges of remorse on account of promises of a railway which he had made at the last election, and thanks to which he had been elected. These promises not having been fulfilled he thinks, the best means to make secure his seat is to throw into another county from his own, a parish which gives a Liberal majority of 218, securing, thereby, for himself, a Conservative majority of 278. Berthier had a Liberal majority of 157. It is increased by the removal of the parish of Lavaltrie and made 194. My hon. friend for Berthier, had no need for that, but on another hand, a Conservative majority of 837 was very desirable for the County of L'Assomption, and, consequently, the parish of Lavaltrie was made to pass from Berthier to L'Assomption. The member for Jacques Cartier had a majority of 276. By an addition of 280, it was made 556. West Hochelaga will give a Conservative majority of 678. East Hochelaga a Conservative majority of 381. The St. Mary's division will give a Conservative majority of 483. The St. James division will give 97 to the Conservatives. The St. Laurent division will give the Conservatives a majority of 1,093. The St. Antoine division will give them 2,688. The hon. member for Laprairie did not feel safe in his county. Yet he is a young man with courage and energy, and I thought him ready to fight as vigorously as possible, but he has not felt strong enough, even with his post office. He is given 102 Conservative votes, which will bring his majority to 161. St. John and Iberville united will have a Liberal majority of 712. Rouville, where the Liberal majority was 69, will now have 812. Chambly is made a Conservative county, and will now have 155. St. Hyacinthe, which gave the Liberals a majority of 496, will only give them, hereafter, a majority of 230. Bagot, the Conservative majority of which was 53, will now give 244 to the Conservatives. There, in a few words, are the changes proposed in the Province of Quebec, such is the injustice which is done to the Liberal party. By uniting the counties as I have indicated, an act of justice would have been done. But the Government had no such desire. They wanted, on the contrary, to take advantage of the Liberal party. Therefore, I say, in conclusion, that the Government should not force the adoption of this Bill first, because it might be declared unconstitutional by the courts of justice. Then all the elections which would have been made under this law would be void, and we would be obliged to hold them over again, which would make considerable perturbation in the province. The adoption of the Bill should not be forced, secondly, because as I have shown, the map furnished us is not conformable with the Bill. Now, if the Minister of Public Works wanted to accept the suggestions that I have offered him, and join the counties as I proposed, it is true that this would cause the loss of a county to the Liberal party, but this would be preferable to a loss of ten. If he has any spirit of justice, he will grant us what I ask.

Mr. BÉCHARD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has said almost all I have to say on this subject, and as he has travelled over most of the ground I intended to travel myself, it leaves me but a few remarks to make. A few days ago, when I had the honour to address the House on this question, I made the suggestion that this measure of redistribution was needed only in those provinces where the increased population entitled them to increased representation, or where the decrease of population necessitated a decrease of the representation, and on this occasion I can only reiterate that statement. I find with satisfaction that this principle is involved in the amendment which has been submitted to the committee by my hon. leader. Now, the Province of Quebec, according to the British North America Act, is entitled to be represented in this House by 65 members, and whether its population increases or decreases the number of its representatives cannot be changed. If that number cannot be altered, I ask what is the reason to interfere with the present boundaries of the counties now existing in that province? We are told by the Minister of Public Works that he intends to equalize the population between the constituencies; but when I look at the Bill I find that it creates only four new constituencies, and does not in any way equalize population. This disposition of the measure creating new constituencies cannot take effect except by the suppression of our old constituencies. The Bill before us provides that we must give two more representatives to the city of Montreal and one more to the County of Hochelaga, which is a portion of Montreal, so that in fact three additional members are given to Montreal by this Bill. We objected the other day, and we object now, to this increase of representation given to the city of Montreal, for the reason that the population of that city is already sufficiently represented not only by its three members now sitting in the House, but also by other hon. gentlemen representing rural constituencies who at the same time are residents of Montreal. It appears, that including the members actually representing Montreal, there are 12 or 13 hon. gentlemen in this House who are residents of that city and who really represent the interests of the population of Montreal and its suburbs; because, Sir, in case any interest concerning that population is under discussion in this House, every one of these hon.

gentlemen would rise in their seats to speak in favour of that interest.

Mr. CURRAN. Then what does the hon. gentleman think of the argument of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar)?

Mr. BÉCHARD. I was probably not in the House when he spoke and I did not hear him, but however that may be I intend to make my own argument without regard to the arguments of others. I strongly object to this increase in the representation of the city of Montreal, because it can be done only at the expense of the representation of the rural districts. It is true, however, Sir, that this is in accordance with the commercial policy of this Government, and of the Conservative party, to protect Montreal and to protect the great manufacturing centres, and neglect entirely the population of the rural districts. The hon. Minister of Public Works has told us that there is a great difference between the proposition which was made by the leader of the Opposition the other day when the discussion of this Bill was commenced, and the proposition which he makes now. I distinctly deny that there is a contradiction between the two. My hon. friend was perfectly consistent in making the proposition which he did to adopt the English precedent which he quoted in order to come to an arrangement as to the adoption of some principle for the distribution of seats in this House, and he committed no sin against logic, when, that proposition of his not being accepted, he to-day submitted to this committee the proposition to leave the Province of Quebec untouched, and to allow the county boundaries in that province to remain as they have been up to this day. The Minister of Public Works stated also that the County of Argenteuil could not be touched because it is one of the 12 counties which have been reserved by the British North America Act. As has been truly asserted by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Brodeur), there are no 12 counties reserved so far as this House of Commons is concerned. They have been reserved only for the Local House, and there was no reason whatever to introduce that subject into this debate. The hon. Minister mentioned in this connection the Counties of Argenteuil, Shefford, Megantic and others, and he said it was convenient not to touch these counties. Why is that? Is it because there is an English-speaking population there, or is it because they are supposed to be represented in this House by English-speaking gentlemen? The hon. Minister forgets, I suppose, that in some of these counties there are already large majorities of French-speaking people, and he must not think that that majority will always be bound to select as a representative to this House, a gentleman of the English-speaking race. This can be considered only as an act of courtesy on their part. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister also told us that his Bill was intended to equalize population. I ask how does it equalize population? If the Government desired to make a general revision of the boundaries of the counties in the Province of Quebec, they could perhaps succeed in making a fair equalization of the population in the different constituencies. But, Sir, this Bill is confined to a small portion of the province. It creates only four new constituencies, and in order to do that it was only necessary to suppress four old constituencies; therefore, the Government's interference is useless in counties like Rouville, Bagot, Berthier and Joliette. There is no general revision of the boundaries of counties, and consequently it cannot be contended that this Bill is for the purpose of equalizing the population of the various constituencies in the Province of Quebec. This Bill has no other purpose than to give an increased representation to the city of Montreal. It is true, it also gives an increased representation to the County of Ottawa. I have already admitted that the population of that county is large enough to justify its being given another representative; but so far as the city of Montreal is concerned, there is no necessity of giving it increased representation. There are various counties in the Province of Quebec which are left untouched, although their population far exceeds the unit of representation—counties like Beauce, with a population of 37,000; like Drummond and Arthabaska, with 43,000; like Chicoutimi, with over 30,000; like Rimouski and several others that I could name with very large populations. Why is it that the hon. Minister of Public Works has not made the least attempt to equalize the population in those counties? Why does he find reasons for interfering with the boundaries of other constituencies, such as St. John, Iberville, Napierville, and Verchères, and not with these other counties which I have named? The hon. gentleman said that his Bill was in conformity with the principle suggested by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that county boundaries should be preserved. He contended that the county boundaries were preserved by the Bill. How are they preserved? Is it by the dismemberment of Napierville? Is it by the cutting up of Verchères? Sir, when we suggest to the hon. gentleman the union of Soulanges and Vaudreuil, in order to obtain one of the four new constituencies which this Bill provides for, he is seized with a feeling of indignation; he cannot hear the suggestion. He said that Vaudreuil was a suburb of Montreal. Does he contend that Soulanges is also a suburb of Montreal? These counties he is not willing to touch, although their united population does not exceed 20,000. Why, it seems to me that they are the very counties that should be united, because they are in the neighbourhood of Montreal. The hon. gentleman wants to give three more representatives to Montreal, and naturally he should have taken them from the neighbourhood of Montreal. He should have taken the nearest counties, the population of which was very small, such as Vaudreuil and Soulanges, and united them. That would have given him one of the new constituencies he wants. But the hon. gentleman does not forget that those two constituencies are represented in this House by two faithful Conservatives, and he does not want to reward them for their past services by uniting their two counties. He thinks it is more fair to cross the St. Lawrence and suppress the County of Napierville, which has as large a population as either of the counties I have just mentioned, giving one part to Chateauguay and the other part to Laprairie; and yet all the while the hon. gentleman maintains that he is preserving the county boundaries. Then, the hon. gentleman thinks it fair to unite counties on each side of the Richelieu River, and he speaks of the river he has to cross to go from one part of his new constituency to another. Sir, it is only a small river, on which you can see nothing but small fishing canoes; but what would

he say if he had to cross the broad, navigable Richelieu River, which divides Iberville and St. John? However, the hon. gentleman thinks that his legs are long enough to jump over that river, and so he is satisfied to unite these two counties. It is well known that the whole district of Napierville has been the bulwark of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec. It is well known that even in the darkest days of the Liberal party that stronghold has never struck its flag to the enemy's banner. The people of that portion of the province have remained faithful to their first trust, and although their party have been defeated in several battles, they have never felt discouraged; and, Sir, they intend to continue their allegiance to the old Liberal party.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BÉCHARD. When the committee rose at six o'clock I was alluding to the fact that the Counties of Iberville and St. John had always been strongly Liberal, even in the darkest days of the history of the Liberal party. Perhaps it is on account of this fidelity to their political principles that the Minister of Public Works thought he would not miss the opportunity of suppressing one of the representatives of these counties in this House. The hon. gentleman preferred to unite Iberville and St. John, which are separated by a broad, navigable river, one of the noblest rivers in the Province of Quebec, or even in the Dominion, rather than to unite the Counties of Vaudreuil and Soulanges, although the latter united would have a population less than the population of St. John and Iberville together. St. John and Iberville united would give a population, retaining the parish of Lacolle in these counties, of 24,175 souls; and, excluding the parish of Lacolle, their population would be 21,396, while that of Soulanges and Vaudreuil united is only 20,411. When speaking on this subject the other day I told the hon. Minister that this provision of the Bill had created great dissatisfaction, not only amongst the Liberals, but even among his own political friends of St. John and Iberville, and I took the opportunity to read a small extract from the St. John *News*, which has always been a Conservative paper. Since then the St. John *News* has published another article on the subject, with the reading of the whole of which I will not trouble the committee, because it might be somewhat long, but a part of which—that relating specially to the union of Iberville and St. John—I will, with the permission of the committee, read. Here is what the paper says:

"There are certain inequalities in the Bill which ought to be amended. Not to go further away from home than our own district, we object strongly to the amalgamation of St. John and Iberville and to the suppression of Lacolle from the county. The Richelieu River forms the natural boundary between the two counties; and if St. John had to be strengthened, this could have been accomplished more logically and conveniently by the addition of Napierville than by the union with Iberville. Besides this, as Mr. Béchard pointed out in his speech, it will destroy the Conservative party in this county and render futile any attempt in the future for the party to carry this constituency. We do not think that the friends of the Government in St. John have been courteously treated in this matter, but as we are accustomed to be ignored in Ottawa by those we have served most loyally, we suppose we must only swallow this slight with the same complacency as has characterized us in the past."

This is the manner in which this union of the Counties of Iberville and St. John is regarded by the newspaper which may be rightly considered as the organ of Conservative opinion in that part of the country. But if I am well informed, Sir, within a couple of weeks the Minister of Public Works had occasion to ascertain from the mouth of some of his warmest political friends in that part of the country that this union had created a feeling of great dissatisfaction there, not only amongst the Liberals, but amongst his own political friends. However, let that be as it may, I take this opportunity of submitting this article of the St. John *News* to the benevolent consideration of the Minister of Public Works. That hon. gentleman told us several times that the principle of the Bill was that of equalizing the population. To provide for his four new constituencies, he has united Iberville and St. John and Three Rivers and St. Maurice and dismembered the Counties of Napierville and Verchères. But the hon. gentleman is not of the opinion that his mission ends there. For the purpose of applying his principle of equalizing the population, I suppose he invades the boundaries of Rouville by removing from the very heart of Rouville some parishes which he annexes to the County of Chambly, whilst, on the other hand, he takes from the Counties of Verchères, St. Hyacinthe and Bagot, parishes which he places in the County of Rouville. Let us see the result. The County of Rouville to-day has a population of 16,012 souls, but by this new arrangement it will have a population of 17,072 souls, a difference of about 800, which leaves that population far below the unit of representation. This is the result of the change obtained by the dismemberment of that constituency, and by that result this old Conservative constituency is converted into an almost entirely Liberal constituency. The hon. gentleman no doubt remembers that by an Act of 1882, the Government pretended they had hived the Grits in Ontario, and I suppose he thought that was a noble example to follow in the Province of Quebec. In Rouville he has been attempting to hive the Liberals. Then he goes to Bagot, and changes the boundaries of that county in such a way as to make its geographical appearance perfectly ridiculous. And with what result? The result that the population of Bagot will be 40 less in number than it is within its present boundaries. The hon. gentleman continues always on his principle of equalizing the population, and let us see how he deals with Berthier. Berthier has a population of 19,826. By the change it will have 18,849, considerably below the unit of representation, while L'Assomption, which has now 13,754, will have a population of 14,461. The hon. gentleman, always faithful to his principles, goes to Joliette, which has a population of 22,921, and he takes a parish from that and annexes it to Montcalm, which now has a population of 12,231, but which with this annexed parish will have 13,615, which is far below the unit. In these constituencies the changes are hardly perceptible. These are the pitiable results of all this trouble and all that work. This, indeed, recalls to one's mind the mountain that was in labour, and after great pain gave birth to

a mouse. The Minister, speaking in answer to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and referring to the proposed increase in Montreal, said with emphasis: Is it not in Montreal that the wealthiest men are found, is not Montreal one of the great manufacturing centres, one of the great centres for mechanics and labourers? Yes, we know that. We know that it is in Montreal, and cities like Montreal, that are found the rich monopolists who have been enriched by the commercial policy of this Government. We also know that a large part of the population is composed of labourers who are under the control of these monopolists. The hon. gentleman seems to have very great sympathy and special solicitude for the population of Montreal, and especially for the labouring class of Montreal. Why I would not be surprised if very soon we were to see him favouring the movement to establish a working day of eight hours for the workingmen while they are to receive the same pay as if they worked ten hours a day. I would not be surprised to see the hon. gentleman very soon in the foremost ranks of the Knights of Labour. It is fashionable for some politicians to exhibit great sympathies for the working classes of manufacturing cities. Special legislation is resorted to in some quarters in order to give them special privileges. I am not in accord with such conduct. The Minister asked my hon. friend if it was in accordance with the views of the Liberal party to do injustice to the labouring classes. The Liberal party profess it to be one of their duties to be just and fair to all classes, and not to further the views of any particular class for political purposes. I hold in abhorrence that special legislation which may be sometimes in favour of the mechanics, which shelters them from the obligation of paying their just debts by placing their property beyond the reach of judicial proceedings. I abhor that kind of legislation, which has a tendency to inculcate in the minds of the labouring classes subversive principles, and to develop an anarchist element in this country. I am proud to be a Liberal, but I scorn to be a demagogue. The Minister doubtless thought he could not finish his speech without dealing a blow under the belt at the Liberal party. He said that there was a rumour that some one from this side of this House had gone to some one on the other side and said we were opposed to this distribution of seats because it would give too much power to the hierarchy. That is what I understood him to say. I never heard of that until I heard it stated by the hon. Minister. When called upon to name who it was from this side who had made the statement, he refused to state who it was. I do not mean to be offensive to the hon. gentleman, but I strongly believe that this rumour found its origin in his imagination. It is true that, in days gone by, the Liberals were not always looked upon with a friendly eye by the hierarchy, but those days are passed, and within a certain number of years we have not as a party had to complain of the interference of priests in elections, with a few exceptions. The Liberals of the Province of Quebec respect the hierarchy. They are, as well as the Conservatives, sons of the Catholic Church, and they never appeal to the priests for their assistance in times of election. I may admit that I have always had more respect for the priest who has confined his functions to his action as a priest than for him who transformed the pulpit into a tribune for political harangues. Sir, we never appealed to the priests for assistance; we were always satisfied when they remained neutral, and in doing so I think we showed more respect and veneration for the sacred character of the priests than has been exhibited by those Conservatives who constantly solicit their interference and their assistance in political struggles. The hon. Minister also said, in the debate on the second reading, that the House had been waiting three days for suggestions without receiving any from the other side, and that they had heard, instead, only harsh words and strong terms applied to this measure. Surely the hon. gentleman must have forgotten the speech which I delivered on the very first day of the debate. Does not the Minister remember that, in the course of my imperfect remarks, I suggested to him that instead of dismembering the Counties of Napierville and Verchères, it would be preferable to unite Napierville with Laprairie, which together would have a population of 21,001 souls, still under the unit of representation? Does he not remember that in the same breath I suggested that instead of dismembering Verchères, it would be preferable to unite it with Chambly, as by this way he would preserve the county boundaries, and that community of interests which exists between the municipalities of each of those counties? Surely the hon. gentleman ought to remember that I suggested that by the union of Napierville and Laprairie, Chambly and Verchères, Iberville and St. John, and Three Rivers and St. Maurice, he would then have made room for the four new constituencies which he wants to obtain by this measure. In view of these facts, therefore, I think the hon. Minister was wrong in saying that he had been waiting three days without receiving suggestions from this side of the House, although he had expressed a willingness to receive them and to accept them if they were reasonable. Now, Sir, the Minister at the close of his speech, referred to the part that the Minister of Railways had taken in the preparation of this measure, and he blamed those members on this side of the House who had ventured to direct an attack against the Minister of Railways, because he said the Minister of Railways was the author of that part of the measure which proposed to remove the township of Clarence from the County of Russell and annex it to the County of Prescott. Sir, if such was the case, as I believe it was, permit me to say that the Minister of Railways justly incurred the attacks which were made upon him. I am not going to discuss that part of the measure, but I will say that it was well known that the population of the township of Clarence is mostly French-Canadians, and the only reason alleged by hon. gentlemen opposite for its removal to Prescott, was the fact that the voters of Clarence would then be joined to a population of their own origin, speaking their own language; that is to say, in other words, the purpose was to hive the French in that part of the Province of Ontario, and destroy the influence they had in the County of Russell. It is well known that the population of Clarence has been Conservative in years gone by when the County of Russell returned a Conservative member for this House, but since they changed their political allegiance the County of Russell returns a Liberal

member. I make these remarks only to show that the Minister of Railways has brought these attacks upon himself, if he was really the author of that part of the Bill, as I believe he was. The Minister of Public Works, in the opening of this debate, assumed the paternity of this Bill. I never could believe that he was the author of that portion of the measure which provided for the removal of Clarence from Russell to Prescott ; I never could believe that an hon. gentleman, a member of the Government, who is supposed to be the defender of his French-Canadian fellow-countrymen, would have been so forgetful of his duty towards them as to frame that odious provision of the Bill. It was already too much, on his part, to have accepted it. Now, this question has been settled, and Clarence will remain where it is, a part of the County of Russell. But this concession is not due to the Minister of Railways, and if I am correctly informed it is due to the sentiments of fairness of the hon. Minister of Justice who leads the Government in this House.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Owing to the importance of this debate, Mr. Chairman, and as the county which I have the honour to represent is directly interested in this Bill, I think it my duty to offer a few remarks on this question. The County of L'Assomption is enlarged by this Bill. This is a sufficient reason to induce me to take the floor, but I will not be long. I have listened with much attention to the arguments offered by the hon. members on the other side of the House, and what surprised me most, in all that was said, was the manner in which they criticised the Government's measure. In fact, have they discussed it in the interests of the citizens of the province in general, or in the interests of their party? What seemed to me the clearest was that the interests of the citizens were put aside to make room for those of the party. If I made no mistake of the sense of the speeches made by the members of the left, their object is only to swell the ranks of the Liberal party, without any concern for the other interests which should claim their attention. Such considerations seem to me only secondary, for it is well known that, in the course of events, political opinions will change very much in a few years, and that counties which elect Conservatives will choose Liberals to represent them, as has already happened. I am a citizen of Montreal, but I represent the county where I was born. I know perfectly well what are the requirements of the rural population, for I have lived among that population. I know its position, and, although I now live in Montreal, I think that I will be able perfectly to defend the interests of those who did me the honour of electing me as their representative. The hon. members of the left made it a great crime for the Government, and in fact it was the only great crime which was mentioned, to have increased the representation of Montreal at the expense of the rural constituencies. However, when the Liberals were in power in Quebec, they increased by three the number of representatives for Montreal; and what did we see? Did the Conservatives who were in the Opposition criticise the Mercier Government for that? No, Mr. Chairman ; not a single Conservative criticised the act which gave Montreal a larger representation. They had not a word of blame for the Government who proposed that measure. And it was nothing but just, because that increase of representation was due to Montreal. Montreal is the centre of commerce, of navigation, of industries, of manufacturing, of riches, and I may add, owing to the immense resources at its disposal, of science. When the Liberal party proposed to render justice to that city, by increasing the number of its representatives, we Conservatives applauded that proposition, and loudly proclaimed that the act was one of justice. We did not utter a word of criticism against that measure; but when the Conservative party here propose a similar measure to that passed in Quebec, when this Government proposes to increase the representation of Montreal, the Liberals, having probably forgotten what took place in Quebec a few years ago, have nothing but fault to find with the Government. These gentlemen complain that Montreal has too much influence. Far from sharing their fears, I say that the more rich and prosperous Montreal shall be, the more benefit the rural districts will reap therefrom. I remember that in 1875, during those terrible years of poverty which we all know of, the country people had much produce to sell, and when they came to Montreal to dispose of it, the citizens of that city, reduced to poverty by the fatal policy of the Liberal party, would say to the farmers : If you will give us your produce for nothing or on credit, we will take it, for we have no money to pay for it. The people from the country had so little confidence in the prosperity of the citizens of Montreal, that they would not trust them. When Montreal grew rich and prosperous, owing to the National Policy, the ruralists sold their produce to Montreal and became rich and prosperous in turn. The rural districts spend very little money in enterprises of a public character, and that for two principal reasons : the first is that there is little money to be spent, and the second, that those who have it do not spend it, as they prefer to hoard it carefully and loan it at a high rate of interest. On the contrary, when in the cities we have rich citizens who spend from $15,000 to $20,000 a year, it turns to the benefit of the people of the country, for rich people do not mind paying much for the produce they buy ; this also suits the manufacturers who on another hand give a living to the working classes. But the working classes vote for the Conservative party, and in the eyes of the Liberals, that is a crime. If the Liberal party lost the votes of the workingmen, it is its own fault ; it did not know how to keep it. When there is no money, when there is no bread in the house, the interest of the hearth is then stronger than that of the party. In 1875, when the workingmen had to depend on soup kitchens to obtain a living, they understood that in order to prosper, they needed a truly National Policy, and ever since the inauguration of that policy we prospered. Large sums were spent in public improvements, and the rural districts have benefited by the progress made. I did not intend to speak long, but owing to the position I find myself in as a newly-elected representative of the County of L'Assomption, I thought it was my duty to say a few words in this debate. In concluding, I congratulate the Government for having increased the representation of the city of Montreal, for what makes the city prosperous also makes the

country prosperous. I thoroughly approve of the Government's measure, and I believe that by continuing to serve the interests of the cities and rural districts, they will retain the confidence of the great majority of the electors of Canada.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of taking part in this debate, as I had had a few days ago the honour to explain my views on this Bill; but I could not allow the remarks of the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte) to pass unnoticed. I find in them the strongest argument in support of the position taken by my friends of the left and myself in this matter, namely, that the city of Montreal is too much represented in this House. The hon. member has just shown us that as a citizen of Montreal, although representing a rural county, he loses no time on his arrival here, in throwing the grossest insults to the rural population for the benefit of the Montrealers. Personally, I greet with pleasure his arrival here, but I regret that the County of L'Assomption, which is an agricultural community, remote from the city of Montreal, should have returned him. However, it is known under what circumstances he found his way here. It is known that the object was to have the Government assume a debt of the County of L'Assomption. I say that he represents here rather the city of Montreal than the County of L'Assomption, since the very first remarks he uttered in this House were insults thrown in the face of the rural population, which he accuses of lacking in intelligence, of lacking in spirit of enterprise, and of being addicted to loaning money at high rates of interest, while he says that it is from the cities that come light, intelligence and examples of progress. Well, I represent an agricultural county, I live in the country, and I believe myself to be quite as intelligent as this hon. member, who lives in town; and I may add that in the country business is carried on quite as intelligently and honourably as in the cities, and we do not lend upon usury. Another point to which I wanted to refer, and which shows plainly that the hon. member is still young in this House, and that as he only reads Conservative papers such as *La Minerve*, he is not quite well informed yet as to what takes place in the political parties. The hon. member stated that on the occasion of the redistribution of seats in Quebec, we had approved of the increase made in the representation of the towns without protest. It is true. But there was a great difference which he overlooked. Hon. Mr. Mercier increased the number of Montreal representatives by three, but he also increased the rural representation by five, having given eight more representatives to the province. If the hon. member had read *La Minerve* a little less and the Liberal papers a little more, he would not have said what he did. What are the Conservatives doing by this measure? They increase by four the number of representatives of Montreal and Hochelaga, and decrease the rural representation by three. We approved in Quebec the increase in the Montreal representation, because the country was given at the same time a proportionate increase. Thus, out of eight new seats, Montreal had three, and the rural districts five. It is possible that a member representing an agricultural constituency should have, I will not say the audacity, but the *naiveté* to state here that we are inconsistent when, after having increased the rural representation in the proportion of five against three, we object to the increase in the representation of the city of Montreal as it is proposed by the present Bill? The hon. gentleman boasts of giving his support to the Government on the very first day of his presence here. This shows that already his hands and feet are bound to the Administration of which he sings the praises. Although a rural representative he lauds the Government for wiping out four rural constituencies. I protest in the name of the rural electors. I especially protest on behalf of the electors of the County of L'Assomption, who had no freedom in the choice of their representative—for it is known how this election was made, and that had they been free from undue influence they would have returned the former and worthy member for that county, who would have protested as we do against this iniquitous and unwarrantable measure.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I desire to say a few words before the vote is taken on this question. I congratulate my hon. friend from L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte) not only on the way in which he has addressed the House on the first opportunity which presented itself of doing so, but I congratulate him—if I may do so without discourtesy to my other hon. friends from the Province of Quebec—upon having presented to the House some argument upon the question before it, which I have failed to hear from the other side. The hon. gentleman drew attention to the reasons which called for action on the part of this House, in increasing the representation of the city of Montreal, and so far the hon. gentleman was speaking to the question before the committee, because while the clauses of the Bill which we have now reached and which we hope the committee will proceed with, give that additional representation to Montreal as well as to Hochelaga and to the County of Ottawa, the proposal before the committee in amendment is that we should go no further with the Bill, that we should not touch the representation of Quebec, and should leave, therefore, the additional representation called for by the city of Montreal out of the question entirely. We have had a good deal of interesting discussion on this asmendment this afternoon, and I have listened, a well as I have been able, with great attention and interest to all that has been advanced, not only by the leader of the Opposition, but by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur), the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), and the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), who has just sat down, but I failed to see that they advanced any argument whatever as to why the clauses with respect to the Province of Quebec should not be proceeded with. The argument of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) was based on objections to the Bill which he stated to the House at a previous stage. The hon. gentleman urged the constitutional question. That will be available, for all it is worth, whether the clauses with respect to the Province of Quebec are proceeded with or not, and it will be quite as applicable to other provisions of the Bill as it will be to the provisions regarding the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman made a fresh attack, although I should have supposed what he said previously would have satisfied him,

with respect to the correctness of the plan which has been laid on the Table of the House representing the new distribution proposed for the Province of Quebec. I have only to say on that subject that, while the hon. gentleman always, when referring to that plan used very strong invective, not only as to its inaccuracy, but as to its falsity, there was not the slightest intention on my part to misrepresent the redistribution proposed for Quebec by the plan on the Table, and I found on making enquiries immediately after the hon. gentleman stated his objections the other evening as to the accuracy of the plan, that with respect to one constituency, I think his own, the representation on the plan did not conform to the description given by the Bill simply on account of a clerical error in the Bill, and otherwise the plan was correct. If it be found not to be so, it will be very easy to lay an amended plan on the Table of the House, and in the meantime there has been no intention to mislead the committee, and no one has been misled by any inaccuracy that may appear in it. The leader of the Opposition made reference again to what he has called the British precedent on this question, for the purpose of stating to the committee, it seems to me, that in the observations which I addressed on that subject on a former occasion I had been inaccurate, although I must say I think the hon. gentleman failed to point out to the House wherein I had been inaccurate. I can only say that I have read not only all that has been published as to what occurred in the course of the debate on that question which relates to redistribution, but I have also had the advantage, as I presume he has of reading works which give the collateral history of that question, as it appeared in the various phases of public discussion which took place before the celebrated compromise and afterwards. I refer not only to the discussions in public, during which the British electorate was profoundly agitated, but likewise to the more candid explanations of the compromise which were given at the party assemblages of both parties in the nature of caucuses which took place immediately after the compromise had been effected. I fail to remember anything in that history which would justify the withdrawal of aught I said with respect to the way the compromise was brought about. The leader of the Opposition challenged my statement that that was the result of a dead-lock between the two Houses. It may be a question of opinion as to how far the use of the word "dead-lock" was justified; but this is what took place: Before the Redistribution Bill had been introduced, before it was drawn or drafted, the Bill for the extension of the franchise had been practically defeated by being postponed until after the expiration of the session, by a resolution of the House of Lords, and postponed upon the distinct ground, as the leader of the Opposition stated this afternoon, and with his statement of the fact I have no fault to find at all, but merely on the opinion he arrived at as the result of that statement of fact, that the Bill should not be proceeded with until the scheme of redistribution had been placed for consideration before the leaders of the Opposition party, who held a majority in the House of Lords. Let us withdraw the expression "dead-lock" and put something in its place—an accurate narrative of the facts. The Bill, which was all-important as regards the measure of reform, which came down in 1885, the Bill extending the franchise to upwards of 2,000,000 Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen, was held by the throat until the Redistribution Bill was submitted to the consideration of the minority, and Mr. Gladstone found beyond dispute that he was not able to pass a Redistribution Bill, or a Bill even for the extension of the franchise—because the Redistribution Bill had not been drawn—until concessions were made on the redistribution scheme satisfactory to the Opposition of the day. I am sure my hon. friend will not dispute that statement of the facts, and whether it amounts to a "dead-lock" or not we can at least agree as to what the facts were. Under these circumstances my hon. friend attributes to us this argument: that what it was right to do under those circumstances it is wrong to do unless coercion of that kind is pressed upon us. My hon. friend attributes to us the desire to detract from the fame of Mr. Gladstone, and says that the precedent does not lose any force even if it be shown that he submitted to the will and power of a majority which he could not resist. My hon. friend has entirely mistaken the argument we presented to the House as against that precedent. The argument we presented was that that was not a precedent changing the English practice on the subject of redistribution, that it was not even an acknowledgment, as had been contended on the other side of the House, that redistribution in Great Britain could only be proceeded with after a consultation had been held between the two parties; but we contended that it was simply an isolated case from which no precedent could be drawn, which established no practice and varied no principle which existed before, and that it would be quite within the lines of British practice if redistribution were attempted next year by either of the great parties in Great Britain, for the Bill to be introduced and pressed as any other Government measure, and if the precedent of 1885 were thrown in the face of the Government, you would find the answer would be given, as we are claiming it might be, that it did not establish any new principle or any new practice, but that it was simply a plan adopted to meet an emergency which was quite unavoidable. Then, have we not illustrations of the same kind which have never been claimed to be precedents? It has not infrequently happened that in the course of a session a Government in the United Kingdom has met with defeat, and by the patriotic practice which exists in that country, the Government is always allowed to carry on the public business for such a time as will enable the public service to be well provided for, and until the administration can be placed in the care of those who have the confidence of the House. It has sometimes happened that, defeated in the middle of a session, the Government has claimed a dissolution. In other cases it has been necessary that the Opposition should have time to organize a new Cabinet. Supplies have had to be voted in the meantime in order to carry on the public service, and these have always been carried forward by the concurrence of the Opposition, and after a conference between the two political parties. Not only is this so as regards supplies, but also with regard to other important measures which have been pending, and which, by the assent and concurrence of the Opposition, the Govern-

ment of the day has been allowed to carry forward. It might just as well be contended, that because that has sometimes been done in England, that it establishes a precedent here, and that we ought to bring forward no measures now, even to vote supplies, which will not be concurred in by the Opposition. The answer to an argument of that kind—if the illustrations were attempted to be applied—will be that these were cases of emergency, and that no general rule of practice is to be drawn from such cases. That is precisely the argument we made in answer to the hon. gentleman's citation of the English precedent of 1885, and it was not at all the contention that the Government of the day was justified in yielding to force, and that this Government could only yield to superior force on the present occasion. The Prime Minister of England was spoken of to-night, and to some extent reflected upon by the fact that he had been obliged in 1885 to yield. Nothing of the kind was thought of here, any more than we shall think of imputing the want of credit to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition when he finds, as I think he shall find, that he will have to succumb to the majority of members, and that the majority of the representatives of the two Houses of Parliament contains a force which every public man has to recognize as the force which is and ought to govern the country, and which must govern the country. If he contended for any other principle, he would not only detract from his fame, but would introduce that state of affairs into legislative proceedings which his hon. friend on his right so often refers to as revolutionary. Now, Sir, I shall not undertake to follow the observations which the hon. leader made as regard the Senate, because I think they were quite uncalled for upon the present occasion. Nothing that has occurred in the history of the other House justified these observations, and certainly nothing that has occurred in regard to this Bill, or any other Bill within recent experience, calls for any reflection upon any action which the Senate may please to take upon the present occasion. The hon. gentleman, however, was, I think, called upon to state to the committee why he proposed to stop at this stage and refuse to proceed with the redistribution in the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman and his friends have intimated that it is not called for. They made precisely the same argument on the second reading of the Bill against going on with the redistribution of the Province of Ontario. They have gone on with the Province of Ontario, and the majority of the House is resolved to go on, and finish the redistribution for the Province of Ontario, recognizing that other principles called for the redistribution in that province than the result of the census; as, for example, the additional representation required by the city of Toronto and the district of Nipissing. But the committee and the House having been pledged to give additional representation to the city of Toronto and the district of Nipissing, now, forsooth, we are to stay our hand and to say, that when we come to the Province of Quebec, the immense increase of population in the city of Montreal, in Hochelaga and in the County of Ottawa, are not to be recognized as giving any additional right to additional representation there. I think that any such proposition on the part of the committee to-night would be absolutely unjustified by everything that the leader of the Opposition or his friends have advanced in support of that proposition, and would be utterly inconsistent with what we have already done in redistributing in the Province of Ontario. The hon. Minister of Public Works has answered the hon. gentleman's observations as regards the details of the Bill in relation to the Province of Quebec. I should have supposed that my hon. friend's answer was sufficient upon that point, and that if anything further had to be urged, it might well be urged when the committee take up the several sections relating to that province. In the meantime it strikes me as unreasonable to be told, that at this stage we should stop because something that we see in advance is distasteful to a certain number of the members of this House, and is not likely to elicit their confidence and support. I think it unreasonable that we should be told at this time that we are not to pursue this principle or that principle. Any principle that he may lay down, with regard to the redistribution of electoral districts, could, if carried to an extreme, result in absurdity. When hon. gentlemen opposite taunt us in one breath with not equalizing population and carrying that out to an extreme, they fail to see that in the next breath they are countervailing all that, by the argument that we are not adhering to county lines and that we are not adhering to community of interests, or anything of that kind. We cannot, Sir, fulfil the great object of this Bill, of giving additional representation where the increase of population demands it, without disregarding to some extent county lines and municipal divisions; but we respect the other principles. We do not violate them, we do not intend to violate them needlessly, and we think that the provisions which are contained in this Bill with regard to the Province of Quebec will be amply justified in committee when they are taken up in detail. The Minister of Public Works has answered the observations which the hon. gentleman has made with regard to the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil, and the same answer may practically be given in regard to the County of Laval. In mentioning the small population of the County of Laval, my hon. friend opposite enquired: Why was not Laval obliterated? The population of Laval is proposed to be greatly increased, it retains the old name, but it is no longer simply the population of the County of Laval; yet we are told in the one breath, you are violating county lines by increasing the population of Laval, and in the next breath you are not adhering to the equalization of population in retaining the County of Laval at all, and you should abolish it. Well, Sir, I think we comply with both principles when we say that the additional population which is found to a great extent in Hochelaga, shall some of it be diffused in the County of Laval, and that at the same time the county retain its old name with simply the addition of the population which requires new representation, and which Hochelaga can afford to give. I repeat what was said by my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) on the second reading of the Bill, as to what hon. gentlemen opposite said in reference to the rearranging of counties in the district of Quebec. I repeat that if we did go there and make a redistribution according to population, as the leader of the Opposition has challenged us to do to-night, we would do so with great advantage to the political interests which we

represent: and when that distribution according to population would be made, instead of being satisfied, our friends on the other side would call the attention of the public to the fact that we had departed from the Bill which we originally proposed for the purpose of getting at least three new supporters, which we would get from the district of Quebec if any alteration were made on the lines of representation by population. We have refrained from exercising that power and have confined the redistribution to the district of Montreal, because it was in that district that we desired to increase the representation for Montreal, for Hochelaga, and for Ottawa. As regards the two Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil, as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works represented, these are adjacent to the city of Montreal, and if we combined these two counties it would make a strong claim on the part of the city of Montreal for at least one additional representative. While all this can be urged against anything my hon. friends opposite can present, as against the fairness of the redistribution which we propose, I do submit to the committee that hon. gentlemen opposite have given no practical reasons whatever why we should refuse to go on with the redistribution of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Chairman, I think that my hon. friend's amendment, which is now in your hands, is perfectly justifiable and reasonable under the circumstances. The Bill, if it is to be regarded as an honest expression of the intentions of the Government, shows a want of consideration of the subject generally, that makes it in the public interest that the measure, so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, ought not to be proceeded with. The Government are not proposing to dissolve Parliament immediately upon the passage of this measure through the House. There is no pressing necessity for its being adopted this session. On the contrary, it is an express provision of our constitution that Parliament need not be dissolved on account of any inequalities or changes that may become necessary after the census is taken until the ordinary time for the expiration of the Parliament. The hon. gentleman cannot plead, then, that there is a necessity on account of the expiration of the period for which this Parliament has been elected. It is just as important that there should be a fair franchise as that there should be a fair redistribution of seats, and the Government themselves have proposed that there should be no revision of the franchise this year—an act which is wholly incapable of justification, if there was any intention of dissolving Parliament. So there is no pressing necessity for proceeding with this measure this session. If there is any constitutional obligation resting on the House that obligation rested on the House last session and not this session, for last session was the session when this subject ought to have been dealt with, according to the strict letter of the constitution. Well, the hon. gentlemen, having a whole year to consider the subject beyond the time the law allowed them, have introduced this extraordinary scheme, which indicates either an intention to pervert parliamentary institutions in the interest of a party or great haste and want of care in the preparation of the measure. The hon. gentleman says that Vaudreuil and Soulanges are suburbs of Montreal. I believe they are rural districts about 25 miles distant from the city, and it is an extraordinary declaration that a rural district with a comparatively sparse population is to be regarded as a suburb of the city. But, Sir, are Soulanges or Vaudreuil nearer the city of Montreal than Napierville or Verchères? Are these constituencies farther from the city of Montreal than those over which the hon. gentleman has extended the ægis of his protection? If the hon. gentleman wished to apply that rule to any constituency every consideration of generosity, every consideration of chivalrous dealing with an old member of Parliament ought to have induced him to extend his protection to the constituency of Verchères, instead of to Vaudreuil or Soulanges. There is nothing in the argument addressed to the House by the hon. Minister of Public Works or the hon. Minister of Justice in that particular. If it was necessary to protect Soulanges with a population of 9,000, or Vaudreuil with a population of 10,000, was it not equally necessary to protect Verchères with a population of 13,000? If the object was to respect county boundaries, the hon. gentleman ought to have united whole constituencies, if he united any at all. If his object was to equalize the population of constituencies, he ought to have united Vaudreuil and Soulanges. But the hon. gentleman has said that Montreal has a Conservative population which is not adequately represented in this House, and he proposes to give it additional representation; but he ought not to give Montreal the representation of a rural district. He ought not to propose, though in fact his argument and the argument of the hon. Minister of Justice both point in that direction, that both Vaudreuil and Soulanges shall act vicariously for the city of Montreal. We are to give Montreal additional representation, but not all the representation that simple numbers would entitle it to; but we will do the next best thing for Montreal—we will allow Vaudreuil and Soulanges to vote vicariously for the city of Montreal, and we will protect them in the rights they possess as constituencies at the present time—not on their own account or for any merit they have in themselves, but because they are neighbours of the city of Montreal. That is the argument of the hon. gentleman. Well, let us look at the facts. The hon. Minister of Public Works told us that he was going to invade this particular district because a number of counties there taken together were small, and it was the proper district from which to provide representatives for the city of Montreal. It was Liberal and Montreal was Conservative, and it was necessary to even matters up, to invade a Liberal section of the country and deprive it of a portion of its representation, and give that representation to the city of Montreal. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman forgets that the County of Ottawa is Liberal and has 64,000 people, entitling it to three representatives, while he is giving it but two. The County of Ottawa has 8,000 more population than the County of Hastings in Ontario; and yet you are giving the County of Hastings three members also.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are not giving it any members.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It has them. The hon. gentleman is dealing with the subject of representation, and he proposes to leave the County of Hastings with the three members it now possesses,

though it has a population of about 55,000, while the County of Ottawa has 64,000. Why does not the hon. gentleman give Ottawa County three members?

Mr. MONTAGUE. You propose to give it only one.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman does not pretend to say that we propose to give it only one.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Certainly; you are supporting the resolution of the leader of the Opposition, which is that Quebec shall be left as it is.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friend's resolution asks for delay, because the Government have brought in an imperfect measure, one that is unfair and will not bear investigation. What is the effect of that measure, read by the vote of 1891? You go into a district where out of five constituencies four returned representatives to the Opposition side of the House, and you undertake to manipulate them in such a way that there will remain four constituencies three of which will return representatives to the Government side of the House with the same vote; and you propose in addition to give the representatives of whom you have deprived that district, to what you regard as a Conservative district. Does any hon. gentleman believe that is fair? Does the hon. gentleman think that the people of this country are so dull that they do not understand the object of a measure of that sort? Is it not obvious to any person that if you take a district which returns to the Opposition side of the House four out of five representatives, and so change it as to make it return a majority of Conservatives with a minority of votes, you are committing a breach of trust to the public of this country? That is the result of the measure you have submitted to the House, and that is not discharging your trust fairly in the public interest, but it is betraying your trust and using your power in the interests of party. Men who are disposed to act fairly will not countenance a measure of that sort. It is a cowardly proceeding; it is wanting in courage and fair-play; and it is impossible to believe that the Minister of Justice and others of his colleagues examined the work of the Minister of Public Works before submitting it to this House. Why, look at the features of the Bill. The Minister of Justice told us a day or two ago that in dealing with this subject he did not wish to disturb county boundaries more than was necessary; he told us that he wished to give continuity and something like permanency to the constituencies. How have you done that in the case of Verchères? Why, you have distributed that county among four constituencies. You have sent parts of it in a direction in which the inhabitants never go; you have associated parts of it with people with whom the people of Verchères have no associations of any kind whatever; and yet you wish to have the House believe that you are dealing fairly with the people of the Province of Quebec. Let me say that when the Minister of Public Works desired to give additional representation to Montreal, it would have been fair had he acted as my hon. friend suggested. You want to give three Conservative votes to the city of Montreal, for that is what it means. Unite six Conservative constituencies into three in other portions of the Province of Quebec. You can do it without trouble. You can unite Vaudreuil and Soulanges; you can unite Three Rivers and the adjoining constituency; you can unite Laval and Two Mountains. You then accomplish the task, you break no boundaries, and you give to that city its additional representation. Why was that not done? But you say: Oh, the Conservative population of Montreal is large, and we ought not to withdraw from the Conservative section of the province the additional representation we propose to give to the city of Montreal. Well, how is it with regard to Drummond and Arthabaska? There is a constituency which you leave as it is. It has 44,000 people, a population sufficient for two constituencies. Why have you not given it two representatives? Why have you left Drummond and Arthabaska as large as four of your Conservative constituencies in the rural districts? When you are considering the large Conservative population of Montreal, you ought to consider the large Reform population in Drummond and Arthabaska. That you have not done. Then, I say again, if you wish to give Montreal what you require as a fair representation for a city population, you ought to give to the large territorial County of Ottawa, with its 64,000 people, three representatives. If you wish to unite two Reform constituencies into one, and two other Reform constituencies into another one, you ought to give the two representatives you took away from these constituencies to the constituency of Ottawa. It is as much entitled to additional representation as Montreal. You do not pretend to say that a city as large as Montreal should have the same number of representatives, in proportion to its population, as a rural district. You have admited that by your action, and yet you wish to count man for man in the city of Montreal, where the population is concentrated, against the population of the County of Ottawa, scattered over a territory as large as one of the Maritime Provinces. Either this measure is a measure conceived in a spirit hostile to representative institutions, a measure unjust in itself, or it is a measure which has been ill-considered. We have taken the most charitable view for the Minister of Public Works by treating it as an ill-considered measure; and we have said to the hon. gentleman: Withdraw that portion of the Bill relating to Quebec and bring forward a scheme that will do you more credit. Why, Sir, the proposition of the Government is a monstrous one, one not capable of being defended. The hon. gentleman knows that he has put together parts of constituencies separated by broad rivers; he knows that he has put together in one constituency parishes which are separated by intervening parishes that belong to another constituency. He has made up constituencies of shreds and patches taken from counties that have no connection with each other of any kind whatever, and he has done so with special reference to the interests of his party. Why, the hon. gentleman might prepare a directory for the Province of Quebec and put all the names beginning with B in one or two constituencies, without reference to the districts in which the people reside, and he would have as rational and as defensible a scheme as the one before us. My hon. friend's proposition is, under the circumstances, a reasonable one, one justified by the measure the Government have submitted to us, because that measure is utterly incapable of being justified on any principle.

You cannot say that it respects county boundaries or that it establishes symmetrical constituencies; you cannot say that it unites people who have community of interests; you cannot say that it equalizes the population. It is an unprincipled measure, proposed by a Government not over-burdened by any regard for political principles which may in any respect conflict with their party interests.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) lays down two propositions. He lays down the proposition, which has been again and again reiterated in this discussion, that we should have absolute regard to population, and he takes no note whatever of what has been demonstrated by the Minister of Justice and by one speaker after another, that with regard to the Province of Quebec, if the Government respected the principle he thinks should guide us, namely, the exact scientific representation of population, the result would be something very different from this Bill and very different from what he and his friends would welcome. But I rise to call attention to a circumstance which will interest my hon. friend and the committee. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very strong on following English precedent. Well, I can assure them that in their extravagant and unreasonable fault-finding with this Bill, they are actually following an English precedent, but not a Liberal precedent. They are following the course of some of the Conservative party in 1832. In looking over the debate on the Reform Bill of 1832, a Reform Bill which was carried out on lines which the leader of the Opposition would like to have adopted here, that is to say, the appointment of commissioners, I find that Lord John Russell said:

"In the first place, commissioners were sent out against whose characters I have never heard the slightest imputation, men whose politics were of various kinds, many of them men in the service, in the Artillery or Engineers, who took no interest in party politics at all."

Well, what was the result? Did the Opposition in that House, or leading members of the Opposition in that House, receive the Redistribution Bill in the manner which they should, if there is anything in the arguments which have been advanced, by which we would be led to suppose that the report of commissioners sent by us would be received? Not at all. They criticised the Redistribution Bill which was founded on the report of the commissioners just as adversely as my hon. friends opposite have criticised this Bill. I desire to call attention to the language which was used by the Right Hon. Mr. Croker in regard to the Bill of 1832. That Bill was a great measure of enfranchisement. It withdrew the control which an oligarchy had over the people, and placed power in the middle class of England. Mr. Croker said:

"I have already said that the general rule has been to take adjoining parishes; and one would have thought that, whenever it was necessary to do more, some guiding principle would have been adopted. Now, without attempting to charge individual partiality in different cases, I must say that, if you see a different practice adopted in similar cases, you may reasonably suspect that there is some reason for it which is not avowed."

What is the meaning of that? It is a suggestion that these commissioners, who were connected with the artillery which is supposed to enshrine the honour of Englishmen, had been biased by party views and had leaned to the advantage of the Government. The same thing might have been asserted if we had been ready to take the same course. If we had sent out commissioners, I have no doubt that their report would have been criticised in the same way by the hon. member for Bothwell in that violent language which he has used this evening. This is what the Hon. Mr. Croker says:

"The commissioners who went to these several places, certainly not with a spirit adverse to that of the framers of the Bill, said, and truly said, that the rights were so very uncertain, that houses were generally rated so much below their value that they would not be guided by the rated value of houses in any borough, but would consider the real value of the houses."

Again, I find this:

"The commissioners recommend that Tweedmouth should be joined to Berwick, not because it will give satisfaction to Berwick, but to Tweedmouth. The commissioners confess that the connection will not be equally palatable to Berwick, but they nevertheless recommend the junction."

Here you have the same sort of criticism. Mr. Croker was a great man in his day, and he shows that some twelve constituencies returned one member each while twelve others returned two members, and he says that the population of those which returned one member each amounted to 70,339, or 4,009 £10 voters, while those who returned two members each had a population of 47,310, or 2,938 £10 houses. That shows that, in the wisdom of the English Government and the methods they adopted, we have an example as to how matters can be squared practically. Mr. Croker says:

"Thus by this impartial and rational Bill, rendered necessary by the anomalies and inequalities of the present system, and moulded for 18 months in the plastic hands of the Ministers, we have this fair, just and satisfactory result; that ten places, having 70,359 inhabitants, and 4,009 electors, are to return 10 members; while 10 other places, with 47,310 inhabitants, and 2,938 electors, are to return 20 members."

Lord Russell, who engineered that great Bill through the House of Commons, who is the father of modern English Liberalism, of whom I heard Mr. Gladstone say that, if the services of politicians were recognized as those of warriors are, the services of Lord Russell would cover his breast with stars, said in regard to this:

"The right hon. gentleman objected in the first place to our making an addition to a place like Exeter, while we made no addition to the borough of Abingdon. I think the best way in which I can answer that objection will be not so much by referring to the particular details of those cases, as by mentioning the principle on which I think the commissioners have founded their report, and on which, in my opinion, those gentlemen who were directed to examine them, ought to have examined them, and which the Government have finally adopted. I think that in the great cities and towns of this country, wherever the town has grown beyond the borough, or wherever there was what some people might call a village, but which is in fact a collection of villas and houses occupied by persons closely connected with the city or large town, and having entirely their business, their occupations, and their interests in that town—I think, in such cases, it was right to add to that city or town, however large it might be—whether it contained 20,000, 30,000 or 40,000 inhabitants—that additional population, which its increase of business or population had so connected with it. I think that where there was to be found in a town a sufficient population and a sufficient constituency, and where such a town has in its neighbourhood neither street, houses, nor suburbs, that were at all connected with it, but, on the contrary, was surrounded entirely by agricultural districts, and which has already a sufficient population within the town, I think, in such a case, it was proper for the commissioners not to make any further addition to the town. Now, Sir, the last of these cases is the case of Abingdon. Abingdon, certainly, is not a large town, but there is nothing like a town round it, and there is no population whatever that is immediately connected with it."

That was one of the cases complained of. In that Bill one of the things strongly objected to in the redistribution here was actually done, and I suppose it was because necessity was laid upon Lord Russell and his colleagues to make it part of the Bill. The 26th section of the Bill of 1832 is as follows:—

"And be it enacted, that the isolated parts of counties in England and Wales, which are described in the schedule to this Act annexed, marked (M), shall, as to the election of members to serve in Parliament as knights of the shire, be considered as forming parts of the respective counties and divisions which are respectively mentioned in the fourth column of the said schedule (M), in conjunction with the names of such isolated parts respectively; and that every part of any county in England or Wales which is detached from the main body of such county, but for which no special provision is hereby made, shall be considered for the purposes of the election of members to serve in Parliament as knights of the shire, as forming part of that county."

Now, Mr. Chairman, you will see that in that Bill, no doubt because of the geographical exigencies, they were forced to put a part of one county into a county to which it did not belong, for purposes of representation in the Imperial Parliament. Now, my hon. friend who spoke last practically condemns the Government because they did not take one seat from Vaudreuil and Soulanges and give it to Montreal; because they have not done that, because they have not taken one seat from Vaudreuil and Soulanges—they condemn the Government. Now, Lord Russell, in this very speech to which I have referred, points out that they have allowed some constituencies to exist that the hon. gentleman might think anomalous, because, he says, it will be easier for men who might not wish to contest a large county, to contest a small borough, and so get a very desirable class into the House. It may be easier for him to get in for Vaudreuil and Soulanges than for a constituency in Montreal. I am told that the Montreal constituencies have always been very expensive to contest. I am making no special reference to Montreal now, but I will say that, looking at the history of things in the old country, if there is to be any preference, if there is to be any weighing of the advantages that would accrue to this House from having a county constituency or a city constituency—I say that looking at the history of this House, and looking at the history of parliamentary representation in the old country, you cannot fail to come to the conclusion that the tendency of a county constituency is to send better men to Parliament than a city constituency. If you look at the history of the House of Commons in England, or take the history of this House of Commons, nearly every distinguished man in each House has represented a county constituency. Now, after all, what are we contending for here? Hon. gentlemen contend eloquently for the representation of population; but they do not point out that this scientific representation of population will give you a better House of Commons. What is the virtue that is in it? Will it give you a better House? If you have the unit of population that they adopt, if you take it as a divisor, and if you get, as a result, a scientific representation of heads in this Dominion of Canada, I venture to say that you will not get a better House of Commons, and you might get a worse. Now, I see no chance whatever of bettering things here so as to get a more varied representation of the forces of this Dominion in this House. I will venture to call the attention of the committee to what Mr. Gladstone said in defence of what my hon. friends to the left of the Speaker would call an unequal representation in the House of Commons. In 1859, when the Reform Bill was under discussion in the English House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone said:

"You must not consider in this matter the question only of the elector."

We have been considering the question of the electors, as if every elector, the moment you gave him the franchise, should have just the same weight as every other elector, no more and no less.

"You must consider quite as much who are likely to be the elected. And permit me to say that the time has come when, in the examination of any scheme of reform, it is of vital and capital importance that this matter should be brought fully under the view of the House. Let me point out that the Reform Bill of 1832 has not in this respect been fairly and fully tried. For twenty-seven years, it is true, it has been in operation, and it has communicated great vigour to the working of the legislative machine. For the first ten or fifteen years of that period the working of the Reformed Parliament has exhibited a union of power, circumspection, and sagacity such as it would be difficult to find an equal to in the history of legislative assemblies. But look at the advantages which attended the first working of this change in our representation. It is true we had a new electoral system, but we had the old statesman to work it. Read the admirable argument of Lord Macaulay in his history of William III. upon the state of the House of Commons at that time, before you had organized the system under which ministries are constituted and maintained in this country. The House of Commons was then an assembly of units incapable of forming into one body and working together. Why is it that from that time to the present they have become, instead of a mere aggregate of units, an organized whole, capable of conducting the affairs of this great Empire? It has been because of the race of statesmen who have adorned this House who have been reared from generation to generation under the operation of your improved parliamentary system, and of that race, I rejoice to say, notwithstanding the twenty-seven years that have elapsed since the Reform Bill, a very considerable number still remain to us. Now, how were these men introduced into the House of Commons?"

I will ask the attention of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is a great Liberal, to this argument of Mr. Gladstone's:

"I am sure I may entreat the patience of the House. I need not trouble them with wearisome citations; but it is really worth our while to consider how this great provision for the exigencies of the country has been made. We have heard, in the course of this debate, some apology for small constituencies. Well, I am no great lover of small constituencies, and it never was my lot to sit for one."

I may say that Mr. Gladstone does not mean that he did not sit for a nomination borough, for he was brought in for Newark by the Duke of Newcastle, when 23 years of age.—

"At the same time small constituencies undoubtedly tend to answer the great purpose of a representative system, in securing its diversity and completeness."

Here is a man who is at present leading the Liberal forces in England. Does he lay any store whatever on this nice representation of heads? Does he lay any store whatever on such arguments as are used by Liberals in this committee? Not at all.—

"If you have nothing but large and populous bodies to return your members of Parliament there, as recent experience seems, I am sorry to say, in a great degree, to prove, local interests and local influences will, upon the whole, prevail, and you will not find it possible to introduce adequately into this House the race of men by whom the government of the country is to be carried on."

Hon. gentlemen who have argued this question in this House do not seem to care one straw as to

what the character of the representation is to be, but the whole question is brought down to a mathematical one as to how votes are to tell in an election. I do not now refer to the subject from a party point of view.--

"By means of small boroughs, generally considered—I have no doubt there are objections to them, but I believe those objections are gradually disappearing under the action of improved laws and an improved state of public feeling—by means of small boroughs you introduce into this House the representatives of separate interests, who stand apart from the great and the paramount interests of the country.

"You introduced here the masters of civil wisdom, such as Mr. Burke above all, Sir James Mackintosh, and many others who might be named, a class of men with respect to whom nothing is less probable than that they should command to any great extent the suffrages of large and populous constituencies. You introduce those calm, sagacious, retired observers who are averse from the rough contact necessary in canvassing large bodies of electors but who form no small part of the best *substrata* of this House, and contribute greatly to the efficiency of your representative system. Many, however, have spoken on behalf of small boroughs. I want to speak on behalf of a certain description of small boroughs—of those where, from kindly interest, from ancient and affectionate recollections, from local and traditional respect, from the memory of services received, from the admiration of great men and great qualities, the constituencies are willing to take upon trust the recommendation of candidates for Parliament from noblemen down or gentlemen who may stand in immediate connection with them."

That is the language of the great Liberal leader, and some one cried "oh," and Mr. Gladstone said:

"I do not complain at all of that interruption. I admit that there is something of paradox in such an argument upon such a question, if it is to be considered as an argument upon paper only; but practice has proved that the real paradox lies with those who will allow of no ingress into this House but one. If that one ingress is to be the suffrages of a large mass of voters, the consequence is a dead level of mediocrity which destroys not only the ornament but the force of this House, and which, as I think the history of other countries will show, is fatal to the liberties of the people ultimately."

Mr. Gladstone goes on to show that Canning, Palmerston, Pitt, both the old and the younger, and Peel, and in fact all the great men who have done so much for liberty and for England had come into the House by means of small boroughs, and some never sat for anything but a nomination borough. The Earl of Chatham never sat for a popular borough; he was brought in for Old Sarum. Mr. Gladstone makes this argument in another place, that from 1835 to 1850 there was, in some respects, a sensible lowering of the character of the British House of Commons, and in 1859 he made that appeal for small boroughs by which means young men of talent, such as he had been, could be brought into the House, and he pointed out how Pitt was brought in when a mere boy, and how Palmerston had been brought in as a mere boy, and that that was the way in which British statesmen had been trained. I am very glad to know that popular constituencies have sent to this House this session some young men of great talent and promise; but I say this, that if we could devise any means of having constituencies, not arranged as these Liberal hon. gentlemen are arranging them by adopting a nice view of the exact material weight of the vote of an elector, but so arranged as to give us the means of bringing all the various forces that are in this young country into this House, we would do more than anything else to advance the country materially, morally and intellectually, by tending to give the Dominion a House that which would approach the ideal of what we should aim at in Canada, a House that would challenge, that would deserve, that would command the respect of the people throughout the entire country. We may say, as Burke said: The House or the Ministry which cannot stand with credit cannot stand long. It is true that a House that does not stand with credit in the eyes of the people may stand and may govern the country, but it cannot stand long in that state of efficiency which a House of representatives should hold. I had intended on this section to move an amendment that would have pointed in that direction of giving us at least two constituencies that, in my opinion, would have tended to introduce into this House a new element, an element free from some of the influences that discountand depress the representatives in this House. I had intended to suggest to the committee that we should give a representative to a group of universities in the east and a representative to a group of universities in the west, but, having made some enquiries, I will not make that motion; and I have made these remarks for the purpose of pointing out what seems to be the fallacious position of the Opposition before this committee. It may not be altogether unfruitful that I should have made these remarks, because it will at all events call the attention of this House and call the attention of people outside, to the fact that so great a man as Mr. Gladstone, so great a Liberal as Mr. Gladstone, and so great a Liberal as Lord John Russell, set no store whatever on this scientific carving out of constituencies that is supposed to be aimed at by hon. gentlemen here. I must say also they are not logical, and clearly they are not consistent, because if their views as stated in one part of their speeches were carried out, it would land them in a state of things the very reverse of what they desire if we are to consider another part of their speeches. Mr. Chairman, before I sit down, probably the committee will permit me to say one word in regard to my view of the measure now before the House. When I spoke originally on this matter, I stated what I thought a measure of this kind ought to be, and I stated that I thought this measure a moderate one. I subsequently had to speak again, and part of what I said on the subsequent occasion has appeared in one of the most prominent papers of the country, but the most important part of what I said has not appeared, and the consequence is—no doubt not by any design of that able and widely read paper—that the public who read that journal may very well think that the whole of the argument and the whole of my opinion on this subject, consists of my opinion of Mr. Mowat's gerrymander in Ontario. I may point out, with the leave of the committee, that my argument about Mr. Mowat's gerrymander was in response to an hon. gentleman who challenged a statement of mine that he had dealt with certain constituencies in a given way. I thereupon pointed out that he had done so, but the public have only seen what I have said in regard to that, and they have not seen my general statement and argument in the first speech I made, nor the reasons why I considered this a moderate and fair measure, and such a one as a member of the party supporting the Government who desires to see fair-play done in this House, might support and go into committee on, with the view of what has been done already and of what is being done, of amending it where it needed amendment and wherever good cause can be shown for amending it. We have

done that already, and I say further, that I think when the Government and when the Conservative party have treated the Opposition in the way we have up to the present minute in this House, it is an unreasonable and unwise thing for the Opposition to speak as they do in regard to the Government and the Conservative party. Why, Sir, it is not the action of the Opposition that has led the Government to concede what it has conceded, but it is the opinion of the Government itself and the opinion of this House generally, Reformers as well as Conservatives, after having looked into certain arguments that were used in regard to certain clauses of the Bill. This is the force that has led to these changes already made, and I say when we go into committee, and when changes are made in a fair and square manner as has been done, I think it is very unwise to say the least of it that these concessions should be met in the way they have been met by the Opposition. In regard to the amendment of the leader of the Opposition I will say, that seeing the way the Ontario section of the Bill has been dealt with, there is not any reason whatever for supporting that amendment. I must therefore vote against it. I have seen that the Government and the party with which I act, have done exactly what I anticipated they would do, especially after the statement of the Minister of Public Works, and I have no doubt that when we come to discuss the clauses of the Bill dealing with Quebec, one sub-section after another sub-section will be dealt with in the same spirit of fairness, and so as to commend itself to the good sense and conscience of this House, and to the good sense and conscience of the country.

Amendment (Mr. Laurier) negatived: Yeas, 27; Nays, 57.

3. In the Province of Quebec—

(*a.*) The electoral district of South Ottawa shall consist of the townships of Masham, Eardley, Wakefield, Hull (including the city of Hull and the town of Aylmer), Templeton, Portland, Derry, Buckingham, Mulgrave, Lochaber and Ripon, and the seigniory of La Petite Nation, and shall return one member.

(*b.*) The electoral district of North Ottawa shall consist of the remaining part of the County of Ottawa as it was constituted (including unorganized territories) on the thirty-first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, by section one of chapter seventy-five of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, and shall return one member.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The subject of this division of Ottawa County has been very carefully considered and it has been agreed that the division east and west will be preferable. The division line will therefore be north and south, and we propose that the following sub-sections shall be substituted for clauses (*a*) and (*b*) in the Bill:—

(*a.*) The electoral district of Wright shall consist of the city of Hull, the town of Aylmer, the township of Templeton, including the village of Point Gatineau, the townships of Hull, Eardley, Masham, Wakefield, Lowe, Denholm, Aylwin, Hincks, Bowman, Bigelow, Blake, Northfield, Wright, Bouchette, Cameron, Wabassee, Bouthillier, Kensington, Maniwaki, Egan, Lytton, Sicotte, Aumond, Robertson, and all the unorganized territories west of the Rivière du Lièvre to the southern limits of the County of Montcalm.

(*b.*) The electoral district of Labelle shall consist of the parish of Notre Dame de Bonsecours, including the village of Montebello, the parishes of Ste. Angélique and of St. André Avelin, the township of Lochaber, including the village of Thurso, the township of Buckingham, including the village of Buckingham, the townships of Portland, Derry, Mulgrave, Ripon, Villeneuve, Lathbury, Hartwell, Suffolk, Ponsonby, Wells, Bidwell, Preston, Addington, Amherst, Clyde, Labelle, Killaly, McGill, Dudley, La Minerve, Joly, Marchand, Loranger, Kiamika, Campbell, also all the unorganized territories west to the du Lièvre River and south of the southern boundary of the County of Montcalm.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the population in each division?

Mr. OUIMET. The figures are 32,000 and a few hundreds on each side. They are practically the same.

Mr. DEVLIN. This is the first intimation which I have had of this proposed change in the division already made of the County of Ottawa, apart from conversations which I have heard here and there. I am glad to see, at all events, that the suggestions which I made in this House some time ago, as well as suggestions made by many others from the County of Ottawa, have met with due consideration. This afternoon the hon. Minister of Public Works, in the course of his remarks, said that we had made no suggestions, but the House will bear with me when I say that, when this Bill was first under discussion, I did make suggestions, and that in the main they have been carried out. I pointed out that the line as proposed to be drawn by the Government was an unnatural line, and did not meet the requirements of the situation. According to the division which has just been proposed the population in each division will be about 32,000. This afternoon, without having had any idea whatever of the division which the Government intended to propose, I myself figured up the population of a division formed of the townships of Eardley, Masham, Lowe, Aylwin, Wright, Bouchette, Maniwaki, Egan, Lytton, Sicotte, Bascatong, Hull, Wakefield, Denholm, Hincks, Northfield, Cameron, Kensington, Aumond, Aylmer and Hull City, and I found that the population would be 32,418. So that the population of the rest of the county would be 31,638. Of course, by the amendment now before the committee the division of Wright is increased by the addition of the townships of Bigelow, Bowman, Blake, Wabassee and Bouthillier, not a large or very material increase, inasmuch as those townships are not yet thickly populated. With regard to the change in the main, all I can say is that no doubt a feeling of sorrow will be experienced because the name of this important division will be changed. However, there is this degree of satisfaction, that the name of one of the new divisions will recall the labours and the apostleship of a life that is well known in the County of Ottawa—a name dear to the heart of every French-Canadian at any rate in the Province of Quebec. Consequently, with the name of Labelle I have no fault to find. Nor do I find fault with the name of Wright. This is a compliment, a just and well-merited compliment, paid to the gentleman who preceded me in the representation of the County of Ottawa in this House. Still it cannot be concealed that there will be a feeling of sorrow at the name of Ottawa being left aside. Now, notwithstanding what may be said by the hon. Minister of Public Works as to our not having made suggestions, we contended that the county was entitled according to its population, to three members, and I think that contention has been represented to the hon. Minister of Public Works himself both by a delegation and from various other sources; and if I mistake not I called the hon. Minister's attention to it myself when this question first came up for

discussion in this House. To show that we did, I may be permitted to quote a few words which I uttered in this House when the measure was first under discussion :

"What we ask for was that instead of having two representatives, we should, in view of the vast and important interests of the county be given three representatives."

Again I said :

"I hold that the line should be drawn not from the east to the west but from the north to the south, and that for many reasons."

Again :

"What we held out for was three members. We have not been granted three members but have only been given two. In view of this, we have asked and we now ask that the line of division should be fairly and justly drawn. We have pointed out that the interests of the various sections are different and that by drawing the line from north to south these sections could be much better represented."

So that when the hon. Minister says that we offered no suggestions, he simply overlooks the suggestions which we did make. Did he not himself call attention to the delegation which went to his office and which asked him in the presence of the hon. Minister of Customs to change the line from east to west and make it from north to south? There were Liberals there, and I made the same suggestion myself. Previous to that I made the suggestion, and always held out that the line should be drawn north and south, so that if there is any credit to be given any one for having this line drawn north and south, I claim as much of it as any hon. gentleman who has brought the matter before the House. I forgot to mention when referring to the new name of the eastern section of Ottawa County, that it was not only a compliment to the most sincerely regretted Mgr. Labelle, but that no doubt it was intended as a compliment to Mr. Mercier, who was the first to recognize the merits of this great apostle, who so faithfully served his country. I still hold that our county is entitled to three members. Its population is 64,056, which divided by three would give 21,352 to each division. This is larger than the population of the County of Vaudreuil, which has now one representative; it is larger than Soulanges, which has also a representative; it is greater than the population of Laprairie and Quebec West; and I think it would even exceed the combined population of Vaudreuil and Soulanges. It is certainly much larger than the population of Montmorency and many other counties, not only in the Province of Quebec, but in the Province of Ontario, which, under this Bill, have representatives in this House. It is larger than the population of four counties combined in the Province of Quebec, which send four representatives, and than three combined in the Province of Ontario, which send three representatives. But we are told that we must be satisfied with two representatives, and I suppose we will have to accept the condition imposed upon us. That, however, will not prevent our still insisting on our right to have three representatives. I must say, without having had the opportunity of looking into the details connected with this second, and I presume, final division of the County of Ottawa, that there is some satisfaction in knowing that the representations we have so strenuously made have awakened the mind of the Minister of Public Works to the necessity of listening to justice outside the ranks of his party.

Mr. DEVLIN.

(c.) The electoral district of Laval shall consist of the village of Ste. Rose and the parishes of Ste. Dorothée, St. François de Sales, St. Martin, Ste. Rose, St. Vincent de Paul, Sault au Recollet, St. Joseph de la Rivière des Prairies, St. Léonard de Port Maurice, Longue Pointe and Pointe aux Trembles.

Mr. LAURIER. It has been decided that the city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga shall have three additional members, and I shall therefore not say anything more on that subject, save to notice a reference to myself, made by the Minister of Public Works this afternoon, when he tried to lash himself into frenzied eloquence, and asked if a man in the city of Montreal, that great metropolis of commerce and culture, whether he be a capitalist or simply a mechanic, is not as much of a man as one in any other part of the country? No one denies that he is; but if the hon. gentleman was not giving utterance to anything more than idle sound and fury, he ought to be logical and give to the 262,000 men in the city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga, who are just as much men as 262,000 others in other parts of the country, the same representation that he gives to that number in other parts of the country. In other parts, the Government give 22,000 men a representative; and if the hon. gentleman attaches any weight to what he says, he would give, on that basis, to the city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga, not 5 members, as he is doing by this Bill, but 11 members, because that is the number these 262,000 men, according to the contention of the hon. gentleman, are entitled to. I do not blame him for not doing so, but I simply mention this to show that the challenge which he threw out to me to meet him in Montreal on this question is not a serious one, and that his argument, if it can be called such, would not go very far there or reflect any credit on himself. It is admitted, according to this Bill, that the capitalists and mechanics of Montreal are not entitled to the same measure of representation as people in the rural counties, and the reasons for that have been sufficiently given not to require repetition. But what I complain of is that there is no method or rule followed. According to the unit of representation, Montreal would be entitled to eleven members, but it is only given five. On what rule is this based? We have not been given any, and that is why I asked before proceeding further we should establish some rule on which to act. It is admitted that city populations are not entitled to the same representation as the rural parts of the country, but there should be some rule by which that difference would be adjusted. However, going beyond that, it is now settled that the city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga shall have three more members and the County of Ottawa one additional member, and we have, therefore, to make room for this increased representation. How are we to do it? We must wipe out four existing constituencies. Now, I suggested very humbly, and am sorry that my suggestion was not received with favour, that one of the constituencies which might be well dispensed with is the County of Laval. It is the smallest county in the Province of Quebec, its population not even amounting to 10,000 souls. I suggested that the County of Laval might very well be united to the neighbouring County of Two Mountains, and my hon. friend replied that there was no connection whatever between Laval and Two Mountains, and that they are separated by a broad river. Still, my hon.

friend has united Iberville and St. John, which are separated by a far wider river, and there is more connection between the population of Laval and Two Mountains than between the population of St. John's and Iberville. There is scarcely any connection whatever between St. John's and Iberville, but the people of Two Mountains cannot reach their market without going through the County of Laval. There may be an argument in favour of the union of St. John's and Iberville, but that applies to a greater extent to the Counties of Laval and Two Mountains. You have created four new constituencies. You unite St. John's and Iberville, and you unite Three Rivers and St. Maurice. I say that you could far better unite Two Mountains and Laval, Laprairie and Napierville, or Soulanges and Vaudreuil. The hon. gentleman says we cannot unite Soulanges and Vaudreuil because they are suburbs of Montreal. I want to know in the name of common sense why he should say that Soulanges and Vaudreuil are suburbs of Montreal. They are to all intents and purposes rural constituencies, and they are at least 25 miles from Montreal. They are no more suburbs of Montreal than Verchères is, and Iberville or St. John's might be counted as suburbs of Montreal on the same ground, because I believe St. John's is nearer to Montreal than Vaudreuil is. Therefore, this argument has no weight whatever. I appeal to hon. gentlemen on the other side. We have been told again and again that, if we showed any good reason for a change, our suggestions would be accepted. I ask that the good old County of Verchères should not be done away with and made to disappear, and that the old County of Napierville should be retained. You have an easy method of creating four new constituencies by uniting Iberville and St. John's, Vaudreuil and Soulanges, Two Mountains and Laval and Three Rivers and St. Maurice. By doing this, you will equalize the population as far as it can be done. I have not heard any reason advanced for making any large disturbance in the representation of the Province of Quebec, and I think the principle laid down should be followed as nearly as possible.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman sees no principle involved in the representation of groups of constituencies as I explained it in the House this afternoon. I will only remind him that his theory simply amounts to wiping out certain Conservative constituencies and leaving the Liberal constituencies as they are. They would have 13 members on the south side when they are only entitled to 9. What the hon. gentleman wants is a majority of representatives for a minority of voters. I have to-day added up the number of groups represented in this House from the Province of Quebec which show that such is the present state of things. I find that we have 33 counties against 30 belonging to the Liberals, two counties being vacant. The number of voters represented by the 33 members is 168,000. The number represented by the 30 Liberal members is only 128,000, leaving 40,000 of a difference. The average number of voters represented by a Conservative member is 4,900, while the average number represented by a Liberal member is 4,200.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the city of Montreal included?

Mr. OUIMET. Certainly, I think the city of Montreal is entitled to be included. The hon. gentleman has more than 7,000 votes in his constituency, which is a city constituency, and that is counted. I have shown that, if the electors had been represented according to their number, the Conservatives would have had 38 members from the Province of Quebec against 25 for the Liberals. As it stands now, if each member of this House represented an equal number of voters, we should have 38 Conservative members from that province. That shows that the Conservatives have been gerrymandered out by the course of time, and, if this redistribution brings back what ought to be fair, that the two parties should have a proportionate number of representatives, it would only be right. It is very well for the hon. gentleman to say that we ought to take everything from the Conservative side. The country will not endorse that, and I protest against the hon. gentleman arguing that, because a man has voted Liberal at one election, he must of necessity vote in the same way at the next election. I do not believe that we hold a lease of the electors. History will tell the hon. gentleman how this has worked in the past. In 1874 hon. gentlemen opposite came into office with a majority of over 100, and they retained their majority up to 1878, but they had a very decided minority afterwards. At the last election we had a majority of 26, and after the bye-elections we had a majority of 65 or over. Is not that the best evidence that the electors are not guided by——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Their own interests.

Mr. OUIMET. That is true. The hon. gentleman never said anything more true than that. They have professed opinions that are according to their interests. It is in the interest of the country at large that this party should be in power and that that party should remain in opposition, and it will remain in opposition as long as the policy of the Government is in the interest of the people of Canada and as long as the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is in the interest of the Americans.

Mr. LAURIER. Nothing can be more fallacious than the argument the hon. gentleman has just presented to the committee. He has just repeated that the object of this measure is to rectify an anomaly whereby a minority of the voters has elected to this House a majority of the representatives, that is the way he put it. Now, the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that, taking out of account, for the moment, the city of Montreal, the majority of the voters was in favour of the Liberal party at the last election; but if you take into account the city of Montreal the balance is reversed, as the Conservative majority in Montreal was very large and in the aggregate of the whole province the majority of the voters was in favour of the Conservative party. Very well. Now, the hon. gentleman says he wants to rectify this by giving additional representation to the city of Montreal.

Mr. OUIMET. I did not say that was my object, but I said if that result happened it would be fair.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well, the correction is an easy one to accept. I presume the object the hon. gentleman has in his mind would be that of correcting the anomaly by giving additional representation to the city of Montreal. That has been

done, of course I must accept the verdict of the committee. But here comes the objection. What I object to is that you are manipulating country constituencies where we have a majority of voters and a majority of the representatives, so as to reverse the effect and to give the minority of the voters the majority of representatives. This is the object of the hon. gentleman, if it is not his object, this result is achieved. You have to create now four constituencies, and instead of adopting your method, and gerrymandering and modifying 20 constituencies throughout the province, I propose that you unite eight counties into four. The hon. gentleman says he will not do it on the north side, I do not care on which side of the river he does it. The principle I propose to him to follow is that wherever you have contiguous constituencies such as Laval and Two Mountains, Soulanges and Vaudreuil, Laprairie and Napierville, Chambly and Verchères, these should be united together, and by so doing you would obviate the difficulties we complain of in the Bill. The principle I have been contending for is that instead of making so many changes in so many different counties, the same result could be obtained with more justice and less confusion by adopting the suggestion I propose.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Minister of Public Works, this afternoon, made some statement that I unfortunately did not hear, but it was referred to by the member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), in which he said that some rebuke was administered to him by some member on this side of the House. Would the Minister kindly repeat that, I would be very much obliged to him?

Mr. OUIMET. The request of the hon. gentleman is not fair to the House. If the member who is absent when another member is speaking, has a right to ask the latter to repeat what he said evidently the practice would not work at all. For the sake of those who were here and who took the trouble to listen to me, I am not going to repeat my speech.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is only a sentence, as I understand. I hope the Minister made no statement he is ashamed to repeat.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are discussing another question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will find that in the *Hansard*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think the Minister of Public Works has answered my hon. friend. The Minister has referred to the fact that the north side of the St. Lawrence is not sufficiently represented now. But the hon. gentleman will understand that that is the fault of his measure, because it ought to have given an additional constituency to the County of Ottawa and then we would have no complaint to make. The hon. gentleman, according to his own showing, ought to have united Vaudreuil and Soulanges and given the member thus set free to the County of Ottawa; he has not done so. But my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) has complained of the measure in this particular, that instead of uniting two counties together, even in the district which he has invaded, he has cut them into pieces and divided the fragments amongst surrounding constituencies. Now, what necessity is there for that? If it is necessary to abolish the constituency of Verchères, what necessity is there for quartering Verchères? Why not unite the whole of the County of Verchères to the county in the immediate vicinity? Now, there is no justification for that. If the hon. gentleman was undertaking to equalize the population of the various constituencies, if he were carving up the Province of Quebec mathematically, there might be some defence for dividing it into electoral districts of exactly equal numbers. But the hon. gentleman has not proposed that, he does not defend a measure of that character; but nevertheless he goes into a particular district—I do not care whether the population is large or small, whether it is up to the average or below—the hon. gentleman proposes to take a district in which there is a majority of votes recorded for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and so divide that district as to give a majority of the representatives, through the agency of that minority, to that side of the House. That is clear to every one who will examine the measure as it refers to the Province of Quebec. I say that is indefensible, and I ask the hon. gentleman what justification there is for his proposition? It is no justification to say that the Conservative party are not adequately represented in Quebec. Let the hon. gentleman point out the constituencies in which this representation is not sufficient, and let him give additional representation to those constituencies; but do not let him undertake to manipulate a district in which he is in a minority in such a way as to give to himself a majority. The hon. gentleman says that it is beside the question to ask where a majority of Conservatives are from, or where a majority of Liberals are to be found, because, he says, that in 1878 the people voted one way, and in 1874 they voted differently. Grant that: what becomes of the hon. gentleman's argument that the Conservatives are not adequately represented? The hon. gentleman also said that Montreal and Hochelaga with 260,000 inhabitants are to receive seven representatives, not the full number; but when the hon. gentleman begins counting the party vote, he counts the voters in Montreal man for man against the voters in the rural districts. Every one will see that is not a fair way of ascertaining the strength of a political party. It is only by comparing constituencies of a similar character with each other that this result can be arrived at, and that the hon. gentleman does not do. I again revert to the fact that the hon. gentleman has not shown any reason why instead of uniting as my hon. friend has proposed, two old historic counties whose population is not adequate to return a representative to this House respectively, he breaks the constituency into fragments. Why does he not unite Verchères and Chambly: why does he not unite Iberville and St. John's? Why does he break up and scatter portions of these constituencies into adjoining constituencies? The hon. gentleman has but one object in view, and it is to serve the party of which he is a member. If that is not the explanation, there is no explanation. The hon. gentleman says the public mind is variable, that it may be Liberal to-day and Conservative to-morrow. But that is not the opinion upon which the hon. gentleman is acting. He is acting on the assumption that there is permanency in the political sentiment of the country, and that electors who hitherto have been Conservative are as likely to remain Conservative as is the hon. gentleman himself. That is the rule on which the hon. gentle-

man is acting, and he picks out a parish here because it is Conservative, and puts it in one electoral district, and he picks out a parish elsewhere because it is Rouge and he puts it in another electoral district. My hon. friend from Chambly (Mr. Préfontaine) was returned by 70 majority. Under this Bill, taking the vote of the last general election, his majority will probably be 1,000 instead of 100. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to "hive" the Rouges in that district, to divide it in such a way that whereas they have four seats out of five, they will, according to the vote given at the last election, have one seat out of four. The hon. gentleman's measure is an indefensible one, and he has given no answer to the argument of the leader of the Opposition which would justify the breaking up of county boundaries and the scattering of fragments of old historic counties into adjoining counties and obliterating them as far as is possible by a measure carried through this House. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether they approve of equal electoral districts or not, whether they approve of preserving county boundaries or not, whether there has been shown any justification whatever for breaking the County of Verchères into fragments and scattering those fragments into surrounding districts? Why is not a whole county, if it is to be obliterated, not united with some whole county adjoining? Is it because the united counties would form too large a constituency? Not at all, according to the hon. gentleman's own calculation. If there is to be a union of constituencies, and the abolition of some constituency, why not secure their abolition with as few changes in the boundaries as possible? The Minister of Public Works has made no defence of the measure sufficient to satisfy any fair-minded man on his own side of the House, and as the Minister of Justice stated that members on that side of the House were left free to exercise their judgment in regard to amending the provisions of the Bill, I say they will be greatly wanting in their duty if they do not exercise that right and undertake to make this a fair measure for the Province of Quebec. It is not fair as proposed and it should be made a fair measure.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the position taken by the Opposition is quite a fair one. I understand that in the Province of Quebec it has been decided by the Government to give to Montreal and to Hochelaga and Ottawa counties four additional members. The difficulty could be settled very easily by uniting four counties in the province, and these, with the exception of one, would not have the unit of population required. I take Soulanges and Vaudreuil. These united would have a population of only 20,411. I next take Laprairie and Napierville, which would have a population of only 21,001. Next I take Three Rivers and St. Maurice, which would have a population of 21,098; and next we could unite Laval with Jacques Cartier, or Laval with Two Mountains. By uniting Laval with Jacques Cartier we would obtain 23,268, and by uniting Laval with Two Mountains 24,460. I do not understand why the Government should be opposed to accepting this proposition, because the same principle has been carried out in the Province of Nova Scotia. It was necessary there to decrease the number of representatives in that province, but instead of changing the boundaries of those counties two of the smallest counties in the province are united. I understand the same course has been adopted in regard to New Brunswick. Why should not the same course be adopted in Quebec on the lines I have indicated? I understand, however, that by such a distribution the Government might lose some members, and that is an insuperable objection to the Minister of Public Works. I understand that the Minister of Justice has declared that the redistribution should be made without having regard to the strength of parties. Why does not the Government put in practice this principle enunciated by the Minister of Justice? In the Province of Quebec it could be done very easily, as I have pointed out. But I also understand that the Government are not ready to lose a single member in that province. I mentioned this afternoon that there were four Conservative counties and four Liberal counties that would give precisely the number required without disturbing the county limits. Now let us say Soulanges and Vaudreuil which are represented by two Conservatives, and Three Rivers and St. Maurice represented by two Conservatives. That would be two losses for the Conservative party, but that could be offset by uniting Verchères and Chambly, which are represented by two Liberals, and St. John and Iberville which are represented by two Liberals. We might unite also Laprairie and Napierville which are represented one by a Conservative and the other by a Liberal; the Liberal by a majority of 18, and the Conservative by a majority of 54, which would be a gain for the Conservatives. Why not, then, unite the counties I have suggested, and in these four constituencies there would be only one above the unit of population required. I think that would be a very just principle to pursue, and it has been the principle adopted in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. I do not see why the Minister of Justice should not ask his colleagues of the Province of Quebec to do the same thing in our province as he has done in his own province.

Clause (c) agreed to.

(*d.*) The electoral district of L'Assomption shall consist of the towns of L'Assomption and Laurentides, and the parishes of Lachenaie, L'Assomption, L'Epiphanie, Repentigny, St. Henri de Mascouche, St. Lin, St. Paul l'Hermite, St. Roch de l'Achigan, St. Sulpice and Lavaltrie.

Mr. LAURIER. I move that Lavaltrie should be stricken out of this section, and I trust the Minister of Justice will give the weight of his authority in favour of the motion which I now make. By the Bill, the parish of Lavaltrie is taken out of the County of Berthier to be added to the County of L'Assomption. These counties were organized in 1852 and have never been disturbed since. The population of L'Assomption to-day according to the census is 13,674, and by adding the parish of Lavaltrie, the population is increased to 14,661. The population of Berthier is 19,726, and by taking away Lavaltrie the population will be 18,849, and, therefore, you remove it from the unit. I do not see what reason there can be for this change except it is to give an advantage to the Conservative member. The County of L'Assomption is a doubtful county. Recently, it has been carried by acclamation by a Conservative, but I do not take that as the strength of the parties. The adding of Lavaltrie would be a small advantage to the Con-

servative candidate, and that is the only reason I can see in favour of the change.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, certain remarks made by an hon. member on the other side of the House would lead some to believe that the County of L'Assomption is venal, is a county which can be bought. Should the hon. member repeat his remarks in the county itself he would not speak long, he would soon be hissed. The County of L'Assomption is one of the soundest and purest in the Province of Quebec, and I protest with all my might against the insulting insinuations made. Should there be ten electors in my county such as the gentleman who spoke thus, I believe that I would decline the honour of representing it, but fortunately they could not be found within the limits of the County of L'Assomption. The hon. leader of the Opposition, who knows L'Assomption well, knows perfectly well what I say here is true. The leader of the Opposition sees no reason for annexing Lavaltrie to the County of L'Assomption. If I am well informed I believe the change is being made at the request of the Lavaltrie people themselves. I have not yet ascertained why they requested this change.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) What reason have they?

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) They have not yet made me aware of them. A word, and I conclude. An hon. member of the Opposition spoke of my election. This is what I have to say to him in answer: If I was elected by the County of L'Assomption I owe it not only to Conservatives, but also to Liberals, and, I will add, to Mr. Gauthier himself. If I say so it is in order to protest against the malevolent, false and unjust insinuations made by a man who does not know the County of L'Assomption at all. As to the Bill, I think it should be adopted as it stands as regards the County of L'Assomption.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte) has just said something which is very strange. It is proposed by the Government to add this parish to his constituency and to take it from Berthier. That parish gave a Conservative majority at the last election, and that is the reason why it is added to the County of L'Assomption. The hon. member who represents that county says that he does not know why the change was made, that he does not see the necessity of Lavaltrie being added to L'Assomption, but, at all events, it must be carried, because the Government propose to carry it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is not right.

Mr. CURRAN. He said nothing of the kind.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. I said nothing of the kind, and I will repeat in English what I said in French. I said that the parish was annexed to L'Assomption County because the people of Lavaltrie asked for it. That is all I said.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the people of Lavaltrie have asked to be added to the County of L'Assomption, is there any petition in the hands of the Government to that effect? I want to know if the Government has any petition in that respect. I take it from the silence of the Government that no petition of the sort is in their possession. The hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte) says he does not know why the change has been made, but we know why the change is made. It is because they feared at the time that L'Assomption was not a sure county for the Conservative party, and they wanted to try and make it sure by adding that parish. Now that the Government has had an election by acclamation in L'Assomption, I suppose they will have no fears in that direction any more, and that they will restore Lavaltrie to the County of Berthier.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. If the hon. member for Berthier were in this House, the hon. gentleman who has just spoken would not say that. The hon. member told me himself that he agreed perfectly well that Lavaltrie should be annexed to L'Assomption, because it was too far for the people to go to Berthier. He said he would favour this, and if there was a vote on it, he would vote for it.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not doubt that if my hon. friend for Berthier were here, he would favour the motion. He would say: If there is to be a general scramble here, I might as well pick up a morsel for myself. The hon. gentleman says that this change was made because the people of Lavaltrie asked for it, but when asked why they asked for it, he says he does not know. Now, I deny altogether that this change is demanded by the people of the parish of Lavaltrie. There is no evidence of that before the House, and if the Government have the slightest evidence to show that the change is demanded by them, they would be only too ready to show it. Perhaps one or two parishioners of Lavaltrie may have demanded such a change, and the hon. gentleman refers to them as the people of the parish, like the three tailors of Tooley Street who called themselves the people of England. But if two or three or ten people from the parish came here and demanded such a change, would that be any reason why such a change should take place? There must be some reason for it. The reason I have heard is that Lavaltrie is nearer L'Assomption than it is to Berthier. In point of fact there may be a very few miles difference. If there is, and if the people of Lavaltrie were influenced by such a sentiment, they would apply to the Local Legislature and not to this Parliament, and ask to be annexed to L'Assomption for municipal and judicial purposes; but they have done nothing of the kind, and it is a mere pretense to say that this change is demanded by the people of Lavaltrie. The only reason for it is that it is a gerrymander to increase the majority of my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman has been elected by acclamation, but he knows that he will not get elected by acclamation another time, and he thinks that in a contest these few votes will be of some help.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I thought my hon. friend at least was convinced of what he was saying; but if he has no other reason to give for objecting to this change than what he has given, I am sorry to say that there is reason to suspect his good faith. My hon. friend knows as well as any one in this House what is the geographical position of the parish of Lavaltrie. It is a strip of land on the north side of the St. Lawrence extending from Berthier to L'Assomption and passing in front of the County of Joliette. It belongs to the County of Berthier, but it should either be in the County of L'Assomption or in the County of Joliette. To go to Berthier the

people have to drive 21 miles, but to go to L'Assomption they have only to drive nine miles. That little piece of land is exactly in the form of a boot, the foot of which would be too long, and the other end has been added to the county to which it really appertains. In the language of the resolution of the hon. member for North Simcoe, which my hon. friend has accepted, there is more community of interest between that parish and L'Assomption, than my hon. friend knows it. He knows that it was a geographical error to have put Lavaltrie where it is in the County of Berthier. Nobody knows this perhaps better than the member for the county himself, Mr. Beausoleil, who, if he were here, would say, not that the change would relieve him of a parish which is opposed to him, but that it would put Lavaltrie in a county to which it naturally belongs.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not accept the correction of the hon. gentleman. I am a native of the County of L'Assomption, and I know Lavaltrie much better than he does. The reasons he has given apply to one-half of the parish, but not to the other half. The people of the back portion of the parish go to L'Assomption for their business, while the people on the St. Lawrence go to Berthier; so that the parish would be divided in sentiment as to the change. It stands to reason that if the parish of Lavaltrie is more connected with L'Assomption, and if such a consideration influenced the people, they would not come to this Parliament, but they would go to the Local Legislature.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They have gone there.

Mr. LAURIER. They have not done it so far, and I do not believe there has been any official information on the subject, because the parish would be divided against itself. If there were a movement in the parish to annex Lavaltrie to L'Assomption, I am sure there would be a contrary movement to leave it in Berthier, There is nothing whatever in the words of the hon. gentleman and no reasons whatever have been given for the change.

(*f.*) The electoral district of Montcalm shall consist of the parishes of St. Alexis, St. Calixte, St. Donat, St. Emile, St. Esprit, St. Jacques, Ste. Julienne, St. Liguori, Ste. Marie Salomée, St. Patrick de Rawdon, St. Théodore de Chertsey and St. Paul, and the townships of Chilton and Wexford.

Mr. LAURIER. Why should St. Paul be detached from Joliette to be included in Montcalm?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. To reach the Gentiles.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a very crooked way of doing it.

Mr. OUIMET. I suppose the hon. gentleman desires that this should be dropped?

Mr. LAURIER. St. Paul, yes.

Mr. OUIMET. We will drop it.

Mr. LAURIER. That is one good point from the hon. gentleman.

Clauses (*f*) and (*g*) dropped.

(*i.*) The electoral district of West Hochelaga shall consist of the towns of Ste. Cunégonde and St. Henri, and of St. Gabriel and Côte St. Antoine wards, in the city of Montreal, and shall return one member.

(*j.*) The electoral district of East Hochelaga shall consist of the towns of Maisonneuve and Côte St. Louis, of the villages of Côte de la Visitation and Mile End, and of Hochelaga and St. Jean Baptiste wards, in the city of Montreal, and shall return one member.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to strike out the word "East." We propose to give that electoral district the name of Hochelaga and to call the other part Maisonneuve.

(*i.*) The electoral district of St. James shall consist of St. James ward, in the city of Montreal, and shall return one member.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to alter this so as to make it read: "the electoral district of St. James shall consist of St. James ward and East ward. I propose to add after the words "St. James ward" the words "and the East ward."

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think it is fair to take from St. Ann's the East ward. The actual population of St. Ann's ward is 28,000, and it is proposed to take from that constituency one part of it. I understand from the Government that the representation in the cities should be about 32,000 to each constituency. Now, here is one which has not the unit of population required in cities, and I do not see why we should decrease the population by taking from St. Ann's ward the East ward.

Mr. CURRAN. As the hon. gentleman, who has taken so much interest in the city of Montreal to-day, has undertaken to interject a few remarks with regard to this paragraph——

Mr. BRODEUR. I live there.

Mr. CURRAN. Yes, you earn your living there, but are very ungrateful to the city which does so much for you. The hon. gentleman cannot have taken into consideration the actual divisions as they exist for the Local Legislature. It is a matter of some importance that the same divisions should exist, as far as possible, for both the Local Legislature and this House. We have in Montreal for the Local Legislature, six divisions. Unfortunately, under the present arrangement, it has been found impossible to give six members to the city of Montreal, and we are restricted to five; but, under the proposition of this Bill, as I understand it, the same divisions shall exist for the Dominion and Local Legislatures, except in the case of two wards. For the Local Legislature, the division of St. Ann's is exactly what it is intended to be here, the St. Ann's, the West, and the Centre wards. The hon. gentleman says that there are in old Montreal Centre, comprising four wards, only about 28,000 people. That is very true, but the number of persons resident in a division does not represent the number of votes there. For instance, we have certain wards in which there are 600 residents and 1,300 votes, because they vote at their places of business, and in one building alone you will find 60 or 70 votes. However, I think it will be very advantageous that the St. Ann's and St. Antoine division, the St. Mary's and the St. James divisions should be the same both in the Dominion Parliament and the Local Legislature. This question of representation has occupied the minds of a certain number of the citizens of Montreal, and it has been contended that in the city the English-speaking population should be entitled to three of the constituencies. The statement made by the Minister of Public Works this afternoon has convinced me that the English-speaking population in the Province of Quebec will have very little reason to complain. It must not be lost sight of that there are only 65 constituencies to work upon in the province; and it will be found that the English-speaking electors

of Montreal of the St. Antoine and the St. Ann's divisions will lose nothing, but will be represented in the future, as they have been in the past, by two representatives. There is no doubt that the English Protestant element in Montreal hold the great wealth of the community. There is no doubt that they represent the banking and the manufacturing and great commercial and shipping interests, and it is quite natural they should claim larger representation. It must not be forgotten, as was pointed out so ably this afternoon by the Minister of Public Works, that in many parts of the province the English-speaking element is not so strong as formerly, and yet no change has been made in the representation of those districts. The British North America Act arranges that in regard to the Local Legislature there shall be no change, but there is no such arrangement for the Federal House, and it is characteristic of the good-will which has always been extended to the English-speaking minority in the Province of Quebec by both parties without distinction, by our French-Canadian friends on both sides of politics, that the greatest liberality and justice in matters of this kind has been shown, and as far as possible, the English-speaking minority are to be represented as they have been in the past, and, even where there has been a large increase in the French population, there is no obliteration of the lines or any attempt made to deprive the English-speaking element of the representation which they have had in the past throughout the province. That should satisfy the people in the city of Montreal that nothing fairer can be done than that which is proposed. I understand it is the intention of the Government to make one constituency of St. Louis and St. Lawrence wards. That, no doubt, will be a constituency in which there will be a majority of French votes, but it will be one in which a gentleman representing the commercial interests in the city will be invariably selected, and I am satisfied that both parties will put forward a man there who will be high up in the interests of our commerce, and that it will be more of a neutral ground than anything else, where race and religion will not be allowed to have so much influence as they may in other parts of the city. There are other considerations which I might offer on this occasion, but, as the city of Montreal can easily sustain the assaults made on her, such as the attacks of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) and his leader, and others who think we are not entitled to have any increase of representation, I think it will not be necessary to say anything further in the interests of that city which I have the honour to represent. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, in his reference to members who live in Montreal and represent outside constituencies, has been refuted by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) who showed that, though he is a resident of Toronto, he does not consider himself a representative of that city, but a representative of West Ontario. He repudiates emphatically the doctrine preached by the leader of the Opposition, as that hon. gentleman may find if he will read his remarks in the *Hansard*. I am quite satisfied to let these gentlemen settle their quarrel among themselves.

Mr. LAURIER. We have none.

Mr. CURRAN. The hon. gentleman has been

referring to the independent press of the country, but, if he will look at the independent press, he will find that the position assumed by him and his followers is such that the independent press contend that it is utterly impossible for any sane man in this community to know what the policy of the Opposition is on this Bill. First, they started with the idea of a conference between the parties. The next thing, as the *Star* says, was to suggest that we have no power to deal with this matter at all. Afterwards, there was to be a redistribution on county lines, and after that there was to be no redistribution at all. The very press which they invoked shows that the course of the Opposition in this House cannot commend itself to the common sense of the country. I am satisfied that this measure is one which, if there had been a desire on the part of the Government to make party advantage out of it, could have been arranged in that way, but the Bill as presented here, and more especially as amended in committee, will convince the country that the Government is anxious to do what is just and right to all sections.

The electoral district of Chateauguay shall consist of the village of St. Rémi and Napierville, and of the parishes of Ste. Martine, St. Urbain Premier, St. Malachie d'Ormstown, Très Saint Sacrement, St. Rémi, St. Patrice de Sherrington, St. Edouard, St. Cyprien, St. Antoine Abbé, Ste. Clothilde, and St. Jean Chrysostôme.

Mr. BROWN. The county from which I come has two-thirds of its population French-Canadians, (of which I am proud), and that constituency has returned an English-speaking member to this House since Confederation, which shows the good feeling that exists there. This Bill takes the parishes of St. Philomène and Chateauguay from that county. We have always considered those parishes neutral as to majorities. I think it is a great injustice to these two parishes. They have no communication and no interest with Laprairie; it is not their judicial district. They are, by this Bill, severed from their own county and annexed to a county where they have no community of interest whatever. A few days ago I asked the hon. Minister of the Interior if he would do something towards repairing a road which would lead these people to the steamboat landing at the Indian village of Sault St. Louis, in the County of Laprairie, and the reply I received was that he had no funds. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) said he was no party man. I will admit that probably he was correct according to his views, but when he said that he wished to show fair-play, that the Government were disposed to show fair-play, to the minority, I thought it very strange that they would not apply this rule to the County of Chateauguay before going so far away as the division of Quebec West. Considering that the Government have such a large majority, I do think it strange that they have not left Chateauguay undisturbed, and left these two parishes of St. Philomène and Chateauguay in the constituency of Chateauguay. That constituency has always been known as a Liberal county; it has a noble history for loyalty in years gone by; in 1812 its inhabitants distinguished themselves in defending the old flag, and for that reason, if for no other, the Government should leave it alone. It is humiliating for the people of these two parishes to be taken out of their old county and brought into another. I should think the hon.

member for Laprairie ought to be satisfied with what he has already got in the shape of a post office, without asking the Government to give him two parishes from Chateauguay. I was a little surprised this afternoon to hear the Minister of Public Works allude to certain counties in the Province of Quebec whose boundaries the Government desired to preserve in the interest, as he said, of the English and Protestant element in those constituencies ; but we find him almost in the same breath making this division of the County of Chateauguay for no other purpose than to wipe out an English-speaking member from the Province of Quebec.

Mr. OUIMET. I never said that.

An hon. MEMBER. But you did it.

Mr. BROWN. Now, I wish to make a suggestion to the Government. Here are eight constituencies which have a far less population than Chateauguay, namely :

Vaudreuil	10,803	
Soulanges	9,608	
		20,411
Laprairie	10,900	
Napierville	10,101	
		21,001
Chambly	11,704	
Verchères	12,257	
		23,961
Iberville	11,893	
St. John's	12,282	
		24,175

These eight constituencies could be very easily added together without interfering with any constituency adjoining them. A few days ago the leader of the House made the following statement :—

"But since the Bill was read the first time in the House, after making a careful study of the comments which have been made upon it by the press from which the hon. gentleman read extracts, I have been much encouraged to go forward with this Bill by finding that, strongly as it has been discussed from many quarters, I have yet to find a statement in any one of those journals of what it is that is wrong, or what it is that is defective in this Bill. You can find in a number of those journals general expression of disapproval, general expression of a suspicion that the Government was seeking a political advantage, but I only find, even in the partisan press opposed to us—with the exception of such comments as have been made upon details like the case of Clarence, which, as I said before, we will discuss by and by—I only find these general expressions of disapproval which I have mentioned."

Now, I will read a few words which appeared on the 24th of May in the Montreal *Star:*

"A list of constituencies ridiculously below the unit (23,000) would be longer than a journal would care to publish, but some of them are these:

Vaudreuil	10,803
Soulanges	9,608
Montmorency	12,309
L'Islet	13,822
Restigouche, N.B	8,309
Albert, N.B	10,971
Victoria, N.S	12,387
Frontenac	13,445
South Grenville	12,931
Leeds and Grenville	13,523

Not one of these is touched by the new Bill. The town of Port Elgin is taken out of North Bruce, which has a population of 22,531—already below the mark—and put in West Bruce with a population of 20,718."

The paper then goes on to show that this Bill is very faulty, and the *Star*, be it remembered, is a paper which favours the Government. Now, it has been admitted by members on both sides of the House, that the cutting and carving of constituencies in Ontario has not proved satisfactory ; if so, why should the Government wish to do the same thing in the Province of Quebec? We have heard some members on the Government side declaring that the local Governments of Ontario and Prince Edward Island had acted unfairly, unjustly and unwisely in the redistribution of seats in those Provinces. Admitting for argument's sake that they have so acted, why should the Province of Quebec be made to suffer for their sins? The Minister of Public Works, speaking about forming constituencies along the St. Lawrence in groups, said he could not form the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil into a group because it would be too small. I should think he would be acting more consistently if he annexed the Counties of Laprairie and Iberville, rather than cut up the County of Chateauguay, taking two parishes from it, and adding to it four other parishes, in that way cutting up the County of Napierville.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I want to challenge the statement that has been made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and to repudiate *in toto* that the Minister of Public Works, as the exponent of the Government, intended to do an act which was never in his mind nor in the minds of the Government, and which I cannot understand could have been achieved by this Bill as it is drawn, not even including the amendment which I believe the Minister of Public Works will propose. I cannot understand by what reasoning the hon. gentleman arrived at the conclusion that the Government wish to deprive the English electors of electing an English member in the constituency. I have had the good or bad fortune during 30 years to visit every constituency of the province, but especially the constituencies in the district of Montreal. Surely it does not make Chateauguay a French-speaking county by taking away from it two large French-speaking parishes, and it is not correct to say that in this manner the Government will deprive the people of the possibility of electing an English - speaking member. During 25 years the representative to the Federal Parliament has been an English member, although the majority of the county is French. But by this St. Patrice de Sherrington and St. Edouard are added, a settlement of two thousand people, which is to a certain extent English-speaking. They are not Protestants, but they are English-speaking. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that if these additions are made to that county it will be made so largely French-speaking as to swamp the hon. gentleman. If that is what the hon. gentleman means, he should know that by adding St. Cyprien and Napierville he would be quite as strong as at the present time, for the people there are of the same political colour as the hon. gentleman. I understand that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will propose that the parishes taken away be restored to Chateauguay, and this amendment will surely satisfy the hon. member for Chateauguay. I listened with pleasure to the Minister of Public Works when he announced that, acting upon representations made to him and to the Government, it was proposed to restore to Chateauguay the parishes which are taken away by this Bill.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire, in the first place, to correct the statement of the hon. Minister of Customs with respect to the parish of St. Patrice de Sherrington. When I state that I have lived all my life in the

township adjoining that parish, and have had business relations for 40 years with most of the people in that parish, and that I have seen them almost every day of my life when at home, I may be supposed to know the facts with respect to them. The early settlement of that parish, 30 or 40 years ago, was made mainly by people from Ireland, Irish Roman Catholics; but the changes which have been so common throughout all that part of the country in the character of the population have taken place there, and at present the element of English-speaking population is almost nil, and I can say without hesitation that there are not 50 English-speaking families living in that parish. The hon. gentleman has repudiated a statement made by the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Brown) with respect to the design of the hon. Minister of Public Works in making the change he had proposed. My hon. friend said, and I think with reason, that the Minister of Public Works, or whoever is responsible for the proposed arrangement of this county, had an intention of making it a French-speaking county. I will give him credit for supposing it was not his colleague's intention. The French have been in a majority in that county, but they would be more largely in a majority if the arrangements proposed in the Bill were carried out. The Minister of Customs was hardly candid when he said that Ste. Philomène and St. Joachim de Chateauguay were going to be detached, and they were French parishes, and that would reduce the French population in the county, but he did not say that four parishes, mainly French parishes, were to be added and thereby the strength of the French-speaking population of the county would be greatly increased. I think any such arrangement as that proposed would be unfortunate, as being likely to disturb the understanding which has existed in that county for many years, an understanding which was arrived at when the late Hon. Mr. Holton commenced to represent the county, and which was largely maintained through his influence, by which arrangement the county was represented in the Federal Legislature by an English-speaking member and in the Quebec Legislature by a French-speaking member. That understanding has been loyally adhered to for many years, until quite recently, when the Conservative party put an end to it. The county is now represented both in the Quebec Legislature and in this Parliament by English-speaking members, and I need hardly say to the Minister of Customs that the representative in the Quebec Legislature is a Conservative and a Scotchman. However, that arrangement has existed for many years. It could hardly be supposed, generously as the French-speaking electors of that county have acted in the past, that, in the face of what the English-speaking Conservatives of the county have done lately, and in the face of the fact that the French-Canadians of the county will be so largely in the majority, this county will continue to be represented by an English-speaking member in this House and by a French-speaking member in the Quebec Legislature.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They will perhaps carry out the arrangement that one would be French-speaking and one English-speaking.

Mr. SCRIVER. That has been the arrangement, but I have good reasons for supposing that the proposals in this Bill if carried out would be likely to put an end to the arrangement, and would not be consistent with the sentiments expressed by the Minister of Public Works this afternoon; sentiments which I was glad to hear him express, and which were certainly liberal towards the English-speaking minority in the Province of Quebec. I fail to see on what ground the proposed rearrangement of the county can be justified. It cannot be justified on the ground of equalizing the population, because the adjacent County of Huntingdon, which I have the honour to represent, and the adjacent County of Beauharnois represented by the Deputy Speaker of the House, are not interfered with at all, and their population is very nearly the same as that of the County of Chateauguay. Neither can the change be justified on the ground of geographical convenience. Any one who will look at the map of the County of Chateauguay under the proposed arrangement will see that the inconvenience, so far as the geographical position is concerned and to which the electors are subjected by its present somewhat unfortunate geographical situation, will be intensified. It cannot be justified on any possible ground that I can think of. It will be unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, if to any considerable extent the limits of counties in the Province of Quebec, or in any province, made for federal purposes, are different from those which exist for local purposes. It will cause inconvenience, and misunderstandings, and it will give rise to difficulties which it will be exceedingly hard to overcome. I know from my own personal experience, to what inconvenience, to what misunderstandings, and to what loss of votes, even the rearrangement of polling divisions has caused, and how often a man through some misunderstanding or neglect has gone to the wrong poll and not finding his name on the list comes to the conclusion that he is left off, or disgusted at not being able to vote at the accustomed place has returned to his home. These difficulties will be greatly intensified if the limits of counties for representation in the Federal Parliament are different from those in the Local Parliament. Unless the very strongest reasons can be shown why a different conclusion should be reached, certainly the boundaries of counties should be the same in every instance. In the case of the County of Chateauguay, the changes proposed by the Minister of Public Works, who I suppose is substantially responsible for this part of the Bill, would create entirely different boundaries for federal purposes from those which exist for local purposes, and in that respect it would be exceedingly objectionable. The amendment to which the hon. Minister of Customs has referred as intended to be proposed would remove some of the objections to the proposed arrangement. For my part I am exceedingly glad to learn that it is not proposed to remove Ste. Philomène and Chateauguay and attach them to Laprairie. I know that the people of these parishes would be exceedingly opposed to such an arrangement, and I know as my hon. friend the member for Chateauguay (Mr. Brown) has stated, that any arrangement which would compel them for any reason to go to the town of Laprairie and pass over that miserable road through the Caughnawaga reserve would be one that would be exceedingly unacceptable to them. With regard to the amendment, however, it cer-

tainly would not be unacceptable to the Liberals of the county, because the parishes of Ste. Philomène and Chateauguay are about equal politically, whereas St. Cyprien and Napierville are strongly Liberal, and that change would not result to the disadvantage of the Liberal party in the County of Chateauguay. I regret very much that it was decided for any reason to make these changes, and I wish very much that the Government had left the district of Beauharnois undisturbed. There are the three counties of the district of Beauharnois which have existed for a great many years; the people have become accustomed to all their municipal and local arrangements, each county has nearly the same population, and on no ground that I can conceive, except the necessity of providing for the placing of the parishes of the wiped-out County of Napierville, can there be a reason adduced for changing the limits of the County of Chateauguay.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the intention of the Minister with regard to the placing of Napierville and St. Cyprien?

Mr. OUIMET. They will have to be placed, then, in the County of St. John's and Iberville. If the suggestion is not made for the change the parishes will remain as they are. If the hon. gentleman wishes to join Chateauguay and Napierville, let him do so.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood from the hon. gentleman this afternoon that the idea which he had in contemplation is to reduce these three Counties of Napierville, Chateauguay and Laprairie into two. This afternoon, when I suggested to the hon. gentleman the propriety of uniting Two Mountains and Laval, he stated that he could not do that without invading the County of Argenteuil, and as Argenteuil was one of the English-speaking counties he would not deprive it of its present representation. I did not see the logic of his reasoning this afternoon, but I accepted it as he gave it to the House, and I now point out that the County of Argenteuil is no more an English-speaking county than the County of Chateauguay.

Mr. OUIMET. The majority is English in Argenteuil, but in Chateauguay two-thirds are French.

Mr. LAURIER. The majority is French in Chateauguay, but the proportion is not so large.

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, it is.

Mr. LAURIER. I will not dispute that, but it has always been considered an English county and has sent an English gentleman here to represent it. Is it, then, the intention of the hon. gentleman to deprive the English minority of Chateauguay of the advantage which they had hitherto?

Mr. OUIMET. No. They have enjoyed that privilege by the good-will of their fellow-citizens, and they are in the same position now. They have no constitutional right to be represented in this House by a member of their language; but almost everywhere in the province where there are a certain number of English-speaking people the representation is divided between the Local Legislature and this House. Now, it seems that the people themselves have reversed that arrangement, since they have elected an English-speaking representative for the Local Legislature. Perhaps the next time they will be of opinion that they ought to be represented here by a French-speaking gentleman. With that we have nothing to do. Chateauguay is not one of the reserved counties.

Mr. LAURIER. I know no county which is reserved so far as this House is concerned, or which has any constitutional right to a particular kind of representative. A certain number of counties have this right with respect to the Local Legislature; but with respect to this House they all stand on the same ground. The County of Chateauguay has always been represented in this House by an English-speaking gentleman. If the hon. gentleman does not wish the English-speaking minority in that county to be deprived of this possible advantage, let him leave the county as it is. I accept his intention, but his action is as far removed from his intention as the night from day. The population of Chateauguay is about 13,000. The hon. gentleman removes from the county two French parishes, Ste. Philomène and Chateauguay, with a total population of 2,665, but he adds six parishes with a total population of 8,482 to the French population of the county.

Mr. OUIMET. What would be the total increase?

Mr. LAURIER. The total increase in the French population would be about 6,000.

Mr. OUIMET. What would be the total representation?

Mr. LAURIER. I think about 19,000; but that matters very little. Whatever the hon. gentleman's intentions may be, he is interfering with an English-speaking county, drowning its English-speaking population in a large French majority. If the hon. gentleman has not changed the ground he took this afternoon, he cannot persevere in this attempt, but he must leave the County of Chateauguay as it is. He sees the force of the objection, and in order to avoid it he proposes to restore to Chateauguay the two parishes of Ste. Philomène and Chateauguay. So far so good; but at the same time he takes away the town of Napierville and the parish of St. Cyprien, and adds them to the new district of St. John's and Iberville, which has already 24,000, increasing it to 27,000. Is that equalizing the population? What is the object of this Bill? There is no principle whatever about it. It is pure jumble, made for party purposes and for nothing else. There has been no reason given either for the Bill or the amendment. I protest against the whole thing.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) It seems to me that the Minister of Customs stated that he was to propose an amendment to the Bill with respect to the County of Chateauguay. I would like to know if that amendment has been proposed?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) No. If the concession which we offered is not accepted, we maintain our Bill as it is.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) Surely, for my part, I do not accept to put the parish of St. Cyprien and the village of Napierville in the County of St. John's, which has already, according to the Bill, more than the required population.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) But Lacolle is taken away.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) I would rather see Napierville in Laprairie. Since you propose to remove from the County of Laprairie the parishes of Chateauguay and Ste. Philomène, which are included in it under the new Bill, you decrease thereby the figure of population which you gave to Laprairie ; then make up for that by annexing to Laprairie the parishes of St. Cyprien and the village of Napierville. The amendment offered by the Minister of Customs is not to be accepted for the following reasons : I totally agree with the remarks made by the hon. leader of the Opposition and my hon. friends of the left, to the effect that the County of Naperville should as a whole be united to that of Laprairie, which would give the standard of population. Most of the other counties of the south shore have not, under your Bill, the standard population, and in ten years from now, you will have to gerrymander new counties to secure the proper figure of population. Now, by joining Napierville and Laprairie, you immediately have the standard population, and you will not have to disturb this constituency any more. The second reason would be that the new constituency would have the natural boundaries of the counties. The four parishes which you now put in the County of Chateauguay have no connection with each other, no common interests, and the end of the County of Napierville is very far from the end of the County of Chateauguay. The first reason is that the Provincial Government of Quebec will likely follow the example of the Federal Government, and will adopt for the Local Legislature the federal election divisions. Now, if the Quebec Government pass a similar Bill, we shall have to transfer the registration office from the county seat of Napierville to the centre of the County of Chateauguay, that is to say to Ste. Martine, which is very far from the village of Napierville. The same will obtain in judicial and municipal matters, and also in the matter of the county exhibitions. In all this, annoyance and trouble will result to the people of the present end of the County of Napierville, who for all the above purposes will have to travel to the centre of the County of Chateauguay, while it would be easier to go to Laprairie which is only a few miles distant.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) There is no need of a gerrymandering in Quebec. There has just been one.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) The Minister of Customs must not confuse a gerrymandering with the increasing of the representation of a province, such as Mr. Mercier made. He respected the boundaries of the counties, and he legislated out of existence neither member nor county.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The Quebec Government have no need of that. They are strong enough.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) The same may be said of you. You are surely strong enough ; and yet you gerrymander the country.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) If we unite Napierville and Laprairie as you wish, what will then be the population of Chateauguay ?

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) Suppose it remains at the figure of 13,000, since it is an English county, and you so desire being agreeable to the English, you will give them thereby the opportunity of sending here one of their own as in the past.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My young friend has based his whole argument on something that cannot be foreseen or predicted now, and on the possibility of something being done in the Quebec Legislature at some future time to change the position as it now stands. But there is no reason to foresee any such change, because the Local Legislature has just added eight counties to the popular representation of Quebec and its representation now is 73 instead of 65, which it was before the regime of Mr. Mercier. There is, therefore, no reason for them at all to change any county, and the whole of the hon. gentleman's argument has been based upon a prediction not possible to be fulfilled. The hon. gentleman has said correctly that by the proposed arrangement of returning St. Joachim de Chateauguay and Ste. Philomène to the County of Chateauguay, the population of Laprairie will not be largely increased. Perhaps if my hon. friends opposite wanted to make a suggestion, they might add Sherrington to Laprairie, which adjoins St. Michel Archange.

Mr. MONET. In order to arrive at Sherrington from Laprairie, you ought to jump over the parish of St. Edouard.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is what I was coming to. The parish of Sherrington, the parish of St. Edouard and the parish of St. Michel might be added to Laprairie.

Mr. MONET. St. Michel is adjacent to Sherrington and St. Phillippe, and Napierville is adjacent to St. Jacques le Mineur, which is in the County of Laprairie.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. St. Michel is adjacent to St. Phillippe in Laprairie.

Mr. SCRIVER. Not St. Phillippe.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is a description from the registry office, which I cannot understand, though it is certified by the registrar showing this.

Mr. SCRIVER. It is erroneous.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I must say it surprised me, but it is a regular official declaration.

Mr. SCRIVER. There is some error about it surely.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am not sure about St. Michel being near St. Phillippe, but I know I am correct with regard to Sherrington.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Public Works stated the object he had was to make two counties where there had formerly been three, Napierville, Chateauguay, and Laprairie. Instead of distributing the County of Napierville into Chateauguay and destroying, practically, the character of Chateauguay, which has been understood as an English county, and in which the two populations have always acted together most cordially—I know of no other county where the mixed population has acted more cordially—I suggest that you would meet that object by uniting the Counties of Napierville and Laprairie. That would give the united counties a population of about 22,000. But the Minister of Public Works says he cannot accept that, because Chateauguay will remain with a population of 13,000 only. Very well, what does he

propose? He proposes now to leave the former county by itself and the County of Laprairie, and to remove the two parishes of Chateauguay and Ste. Philomène, which he intends to restore to Chateauguay, and to put the parish of St. Cyprien and the town of Napierville in the County of St. John's. What will be the population of Laprairie then? About 13,000 or 14,000. Is there any reason whatever why Laprairie should have a population of 13,000, or Chateauguay 13,000 only? Why not leave the County of Chateauguay with its present population and character? The suggestion I make is certainly the most advisable and the most conservative in its character, because it has the least tendency to do away with the present state of things. Therefore, I move:

That paragraph (*b*) be struck out of the Bill and replaced by the following:—The Counties of Laprairie and Napierville will be united and form one electoral division and elect one member.

Mr. SCRIVER. I certainly trust this amendment will commend itself to the approval of the Minister of Public Works. I feel satisfied, from having watched his countenance for a little while, that he has not been at ease in his mind with regard to what it is proposed to do in Chateauguay. I am sure that if this arrangement or anything like it be carried out, it will give rise to some suspicion on the part of the English-speaking population of the County of Chateauguay as to the sincerity of the declarations which he made this afternoon. It would relieve him from all embarrassment on that score or with regard to the objections suggested by my colleague, the member for that county, and myself. As he claims it to be necessary that the one county in this district should disappear, my leader has suggested an easy and a safe method, so far as the interests of my hon. friend's party are concerned, of disposing of that question. At the last election, the County of Laprairie gave the present sitting member a majority of something over 50, and my hon. friend from Napierville was elected by a majority of 17, so that we have reason to suppose that this arrangement would not be to the disadvantage of the Conservative party in the county. I urge strongly upon the Minister of Public Works that he should accept this amendment. I believe it will be an exceedingly popular one in the County of Chateauguay. I believe, as an alternative, it will commend itself to the great majority of the people of the County of Napierville, and I am sure that the people of the County of Laprairie cannot object to being united to such a county, as I know the County of Napierville to be.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman is right, perhaps, when he said my countenance indicated I was rather anxious. I was, indeed, rather anxious to satisfy these gentlemen. But what they have said has convinced me that, after all, what has been done is the best, and ought not to be changed. I believe the present division will do more justice to every one than even the suggestion made by the leader of the Opposition. It is true that this county has been represented by an English-speaking gentleman. The precedent was established by its electing Mr. Holton, and has been followed since, but that does not follow that it is an English county. It is not an English county; two-thirds of it are French. It is because the people want to be fair, or to be more than fair, to the English-speaking population, that they gave them the representation, and, more than that, the English population have now two representatives there. My hon. friend must not forget that in Montreal we gave an additional representative and also in the County of Ottawa. It is not the same thing at all as to the County of Argenteuil, which has a majority of English-speaking people, and if anything was added to that county to bring it nearer to the unit, it would have to be taken from French parishes on each side. Here you have a French county which chooses to elect an English representative. That is their own business, but I do not see any reason why these three counties which, according to their geographical position, ought to form only two, should be changed as has been suggested. All these objections which hon. gentlemen are now raising go to convince me that the first arrangement was the correct one, and I think we ought to have adhered to it, though I have no objection to accept every suggestion that is made. The hon. gentleman says my countenance suggests that I am anxious in regard to this matter, and I may state that I am anxious to satisfy the people in these counties.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I hope the amendment of the leader of the Opposition will be accepted by the Government. It seems to me to be a fair arrangement. The union of Laprairie and Napierville will make a constituency of 21,001, and as far as politics are concerned, it would create a doubtful constituency. The Minister of Customs said that the Minister of Public Works intended perhaps to annex the village of Napierville and St. Cyprien to St. John's. I would strongly object to that, because the uniting of those two municipalities to St. John's with the County of Iberville would make a population of 26,487, which is considerably more than the unit of representation. I read an article this afternoon in the St. John's *News*, a Conservative paper, strongly objecting to the union of Iberville and St. John's, and stating, at the same time, that if the County of St. John's must be strengthened it ought to be by the annexation of the County of Napierville. I am sure that the same party would be opposed to the projected amendment suggested by the Minister of Customs, that the village of Napierville and the municipality of St. Cyprien should be added to St. John's. They would object to that, because Iberville and St. John's are united now except in regard to the parish of Lacolle. I would prefer the first arrangement, because, if the municipality of Lacolle is annexed to Missisquoi it would make a division of 21,396, while, by the proposed addition of Napierville to Chateauguay, the division of Chateauguay would have only 19,000. I think the best arrangement would be to unite Napierville and Laprairie, by which arrangement the municipalities of Napierville would not be scattered, the county boundaries would be preserved and a district would be created with only 21,000 of a population, and, so far as party politics are concerned, it would make a doubtful constituency, so that each party would have as much advantage as the other.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. SCRIVER. I would ask the Minister of Public Works if there is not an omission in this

clause, as there is a village municipality of Ormstown which is not mentioned.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

EDMONTON LAND OFFICE.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the Government to the statement that there has been some trouble caused by the removal of the land office from Edmonton to the south shore of the Saskatchewan, and I would ask if they have any information on the subject, and if they intend to persevere in the change or to leave the office where it has been?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no information as to any grave trouble. Instructions were sent some time ago to send some records and documents to the other side of the river so that incoming immigrants might make their entries without having to cross the river, a distance of about three miles. There is no intention of removing the land office, although some persons who were desirous to make a disturbance did attempt to prevent the removal of the records. Our information is that no serious trouble has arisen.

Mr. LAURIER. Then we may understand that there is no intention to remove the office?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; but an officer has simply been sent with certain of the records to the other side of the river.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 22nd June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. SCRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the hon. Minister of Public Works has come to his duty this morning after due reflection upon the question which was before us last evening in an amiable and reasonable frame of mind. I venture to say that as his countenance looks somewhat more relieved and more pleasant this morning that we may expect concessions from him. I am prepared to hope that he is disposed to yield to what I believe to be the reasonable views of the Opposition and to assent to the amendment which was proposed by the leader of the Opposition last evening as affecting the County of Chateauguay, and that he has made up his mind to allow the limits of that ancient and historic county to remain undisturbed, and to dispose of Napierville County in the way that the amendment suggests.

Mr. SCRIVER.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We might allow subsections (*p*) and (*q*) to stand for the present.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well.

(*r*.) The electoral district of St. John's and Iberville shall consist of the towns of St. John's and Iberville, and the parishes of St. Jean l'Evangéliste, St. Luc, Ste. Marguerite de Blairfindie (L'Acadie), St. Alexandre, Ste. Anne de Sabrevois, St. Athanase, Ste. Brigide, St. George de Henriville, St. Grégoire le Grand, St. Sébastien and St. Valentin, and shall return one member.

Mr. LAURIER. What are you doing with Lacolle?

Mr. OUIMET. Lacolle is to be added to Missisquoi.

Mr. BÉCHARD. Would the hon. gentleman give a reason why Lacolle is annexed to Missisquoi?

Mr. OUIMET. The reason is that the population of the electoral district as arranged would be sufficient, and Lacolle is mostly English, and I understand that it would suit them better to go with Missisquoi.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest that this section would be allowed to stand also, until we had disposed of the other sections.

Mr. OUIMET. It is entirely distinct, and I do not see why it should stand. If the changes made alter the constituencies, there could be one name added to the other sections.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it proposed to alter this constituency any more?

Mr. OUIMET. No; I do not think so.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well, then, if it is not proposed to alter any more.

(*s*.) The electoral district of Rouville shall consist of the villages of St. Césaire and Canrobert, and the parishes of St. Dominique, St. Pie, St. Paul, L'Ange Gardien, St. Césaire, Notre Dame de Bonsecours, St. Michel de Rougemont, St. Jean Baptiste, St. Hilaire, Belœil and Ste. Marie Magdeleine.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to strike Notre Dame de Bonsecours out of this and put in St. Damase.

Mr. LAURIER. May I ask what is the reason of this change?

Mr. OUIMET. The reason is that St. Damase is connected with Ste. Marie Magdeleine. It will make a better division altogether. I may remark that my hon. friend from Rouville has complained that we give him too many Liberal parishes. This is a Conservative parish, and it may temper his criticisms.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sure that the Government is willing to make Rouville too Liberal a county. At the last election I had 69 majority, and the Bill is going to increase it to 800 or 1,000; and now the Government think that this is not enough, and they want to add about 100 more to the Liberal majority by taking away the parish of Notre Dame de Bonsecours, which at the last election gave a majority against me of about 40, and adding St. Damase, which gives a Liberal majority of 50 or 60. The Government want to make of Rouville a Liberal hive, and they want to increase the Liberal majority still further. I do not need that at all, and I think it would be preferable to leave Rouville as it was before.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Before this is carried, I would like to point out that in dealing with my constituency Belœil is taken from Verchères and

joined to the other side of the Richelieu River and annexed to the County of Rouville, which is situated in another judicial district. St. Marc and St. Antoine are also joined to the other side of the Richelieu River and annexed to St. Hyacinthe, also in another judicial district; and Verchères, Ste. Théodosie and Contrecœur are joined to the other side of the river and annexed to the County of Richelieu, also in another judicial district. If the object is to wipe out Verchères, it should be done by dividing the old senatorial division of Montarville into two sections. But it is proposed to unite a portion of Verchères to the other side of the Richelieu River and associate it with a part of the country with which the people have nothing to do. We have no business connection with Sorel or that section of the country; we do our business with Montreal. To throw Belœil into Rouville on the other side of the river, another part into St. Hyacinthe, another part into Richelieu and the rest into Chambly, is, I think, a very unfair division of Verchères. If that county has to be wiped out, I think the Government might find another way of dividing it. If a better division is not made by the Administration, I shall have to move, at a further stage, in order to put myself right with my constituents.

Mr. OUIMET. Belœil and St. Hilaire are, I understand, two parishes which are practically one.

Mr. GEOFFRION. No, no.

Mr. OUIMET. I understand that the people of these two parishes have most intimate relations. On one side up the river is Chambly East and the other side Chambly West. I think it is a very good division, geographically and otherwise.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Chambly as a constituency has always been in the Montarville division. It is to the north of the Richelieu River; and if the division is to be made, it should be done by uniting the lower part of Chambly with Verchères and making one electoral district, and making another by joining the upper part of Chambly with Laprairie. But to say that any part of Verchères naturally belongs to Rouville is very extraordinary. The people of those two sections have nothing to do with each other, either in law, in business or in any other way.

Mr. OUIMET. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what is the division of Montarville that he speaks of?

Mr. GEOFFRION. It comprises Laprairie, Chambly and Verchères. It was an electoral district for the Legislative Council.

Mr. OUIMET. What would be the division suggested by the hon. gentleman?

Mr. GEOFFRION. Dividing Chambly into two, and giving the upper part to Laprairie and the lower part to Verchères.

Mr. OUIMET. How is the hon. gentleman to adhere to the principle that boundaries of counties should not be disturbed?

Mr. GEOFFRION. That has already been decided by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentlemen have so many principles that we do not know which we have to take.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I only say this, that when the majority of the House have decided otherwise, we have to make the best of it. Divide the division into two and that will make it all right, but the idea of taking Verchères and dividing it into four pieces, three of which are thrown across the river, where there is no bridging and no communication except at certain seasons, is most absurd. Of course, in the summer season, we can go there and have communication, but we have no business relations with them. Take my place, Verchères, which is the *chef-lieu* of Verchères. It is fifty per cent further from Sorel than from the city of Montreal. Take the upper part of Verchères at the line between Verchères and Varennes, that is taken down to Sorel which is at least sixty per cent further than Montreal south, and you send us to Sorel with which we have no business relations or associations of any kind. I say if it is decided that that section should be divided, take the Montarville division and make two of that. Of course I would not like it, as far as I am personally concerned, but I could understand it; the proposed division of Verchères is certainly illogical, unfair and will not serve the Administration. I know that many political friends of the Government, those who have fought their battles for years, are not satisfied with it, and I can quite understand their dissatisfaction. I protest in the name of my constituents against this provision as altogether unfair.

Mr. OUIMET. As to the charge of unfairness, the only answer I can give is that it would be utter folly for the Government and their supporters to do what is unfair, because they know very well that would injure them in the estimation of the electors. I entirely repudiate the charge of any unfair intention. On the contrary, we have done all we could in order to commend our redistribution to the electors, so that at the next elections we will not have to meet the charge that we have unduly meddled with the liberties of the electors. As to the division suggested by my hon. friend, I really do not see that it would be an improvement on the present one. If I could see that it was an improvement, I would certainly accept it, and certainly the hon. gentleman ought not to believe for a moment that it was either in the mind of myself or my colleagues to gerrymander him out of political life.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You have done it though.

Mr. OUIMET. Sacrifices have to be made. We have done it for some of our friends, who should certainly be as dear to us as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Who?

Mr. OUIMET. We have joined the Counties of Three Rivers and St. Maurice.

Mr. LAURIER. Do the same here.

Mr. OUIMET. No; because these two counties were contiguous, and were taken from the group to which an additional member was given, and it was only fair the additional member given the group should be supplied from there, and we have done what was right. Opinions may differ, and my hon. friend says that the other division would be better.

Mr. BÉCHARD. When I spoke of unfairness I did not intend to represent the mind or the

intention of members of the Administration, but I say that the proposition is unfair in its bearing. I say there is nothing fair in that division of the County of Verchères. It is possible, as the hon. gentleman says, that the Government had no intention of unfairness, but the unfairness exists. The effect of their proposal is certainly unfair and unjust to the people. I only ask them to reconsider it, and if they do not change their mind, of course I will vote against it. There is not one Conservative out of a hundred, in Verchères, who will approve this proposition, and I am willing to leave it to the Conservatives of that county.

Mr. OUIMET. I admit that in a great many divisions our friends are just as sorry as our opponents, but I cannot help that.

Mr. BÉCHARD. What is the object of dividing Verchères in that way?

Mr. OUIMET. If our own friends are not satisfied, evidently the redistribution was not intended to favour them or ourselves.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman would convince the House much more effectively of his fairness if he would extend the same measure of treatment to his opponents as he has extended to his friends. He told us he has sacrificed one of his friends by uniting the Counties of St. Maurice and Three Rivers. I admit that these two counties are represented by two Conservatives. He says that on the south side of the St. Lawrence, a county has to disappear. Very well, we do not object to that. Here are two contiguous counties, Verchères and Chambly, just as close to one another as the Counties of Three Rivers and St. Maurice. They are represented by two Liberals. We suggest, since the hon. gentleman is averse to interfering with county lines, that he should unite Verchères and Chambly. He will then be extending the same measure to his opponents as to his friends. He has united two Conservative counties, and he will now be uniting two Liberal counties. What objection can he have to this? He told us, apparently with *sang-froid*, a moment ago, that the parishes of Belœil and St. Hilaire are united together; but yesterday, when I proposed to unite Two Mountains and Laval, he told me they were separated by a wide river. Well, there is far more connection between Laval and Two Mountains than between Belœil and St. Hilaire. The river between Laval and Two Mountains is a small stream which, in dry seasons, you can cross on foot from stepping-stone to stepping-stone, whereas the Richelieu is a large navigable river, with a church on one side at St. Hilaire and another church on the other side at Belœil. The people cannot unite their church service because the river is too wide, and it has not even a bridge except the railway bridge across its mouth at Sorel. Yet the hon. gentleman will take the parish of Belœil and transfer it to Rouville, with which it has absolutely no connection. He has not given one reason for this proceeding; it is a gerrymander pure and simple in the interests of the Conservative party. If he wants to be fair, he should accept the suggestion of my hon. friend to divide the division of Montarville into two, and that will cut Chambly into two. He says, and I hail his statement with pleasure, that he will not interfere with county lines, but if he will not, he has an easy method of disposing of this county by uniting Chambly and Verchères, and I move in amendment:

That sections (*s*) and (*t*) be struck out and replaced by the following:—Chambly and Verchères shall be united into one electoral district, and return one member.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the statements which have fallen from the hon. member for Verchères and the leader of the Opposition demand the consideration of the Government. I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to these statements. He has manifested, to some extent at all events, a desire to listen to representations from this side. I ask the Minister of Justice now in the presence of this House and of the country, whether he does not consider that these statements which have just been made by the hon. leader of the Opposition and by the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) require investigation. The hon. member for Verchères does not often intrude upon the attention of the House. He is familiar with the facts, representing as he has done for many years the constituency to be affected, and we have it represented by him that whatever the Minister of Public Works may have intended by the proposition, that the practical effect of it is to operate unfairly. That is a serious and grave charge, and it is a grave thing for the majority of this House, even by mistake, to commit an unfair act. We have the Minister of Public Works applying the euphemistic expression and repudiating gerrymander, but he says he has made a sacrifice. I ask the Minister of Justice whether he does not deem it his duty, in view of the statements made from this side of the House, to reserve consideration of this clause until he considers those statements? The hon. leader of the Opposition has shown that one proposed division is a most unnatural one; that a river cuts off all communication between the two, with the exception of a railway bridge which is not open to the public. It is, in my opinion, the plain duty of the Government to make enquiry into the truth or falsity of those statements, and to let the section stand in the meantime.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has referred to me and called my attention to the statement made by the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion). I am sure that any statement made by that hon. gentleman would have been received with the greatest respect on both sides. I do not, however, agree with the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) that a statement of facts has been made which calls for the clause to stand. The statements made by the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) and the hon. leader of the Opposition, and to which my attention was drawn, have been statements that this was a great injustice, that it was a gerrymander, and that it was doing a wrong to the County of Verchères, but I think we have heard no statement of fact which requires investigation. These are statements of opinion, and they are statements which have been made as regards every clause of the Bill from first to last. They are statements that we very much regret to hear because it shows how diametrically opposed the views of the Opposition are to those which we entertain. We are, however, open to conviction if by any facts it can be shown that this is wrong. Hon. gentlemen opposite have complained that this is an unjust change as it requires that the candidate should cross a river, not a very enor-

mous river, I understand. In election contests we often have to do that, as the counties and federal and provincial districts are not bounded by river lines. I know that they are disregarded in my own province, where we adhere to county lines. To do the leader of the Opposition justice, I do not think he put that forward as an argument that an injustice was done, but only to meet a statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works on another matter. If a wrong is being done I hope that further explanation may be made, so that we may understand what the grievance is. I assure my hon. friend from York (Mr. Mulock) that I supposed the discussion was being carried forward by gentlemen who were acquainted with the local circumstances, and that they were appealing to each other's knowledge of local circumstances, and no facts were stated which would call for an investigation.

Mr. LAURIER. At present, Verchères is dismembered. The county is a peninsula included between the River St. Lawrence to the north and the River Richelieu to the south, which join at the end of the County of Verchères, and to the west is the County of Chambly. I do not suppose that the people from Verchères have any actual knowledge of the County of Richelieu as they have no connection whatever with it. The Richelieu River is a large navigable river, and at Belœil, where it is proposed to join it to the County of Rouville, the river must be at least over 1,000 feet in width. There is not a single bridge from the mouth of the Chambly River up to St. John's, a distance of 45 miles. That is the best evidence that the stream is a wide one. It is the discharge of Lake Champlain, and it is navigated as such. If the hon. gentleman will look at the map, he will see that Verchères and Chambly are close together, and can be easily united, but if you dismember Verchères and annex it to the adjoining county, you are violating all principle. The people of Verchères have no connection with the people of Richelieu, or with the people of St. Hyacinthe, or with the people of Rouville, and you are throwing the whole of Verchères into these three counties. You want to have one county disappear. Very well; I say that the most natural way of attaining that object is to unite these two counties, instead of throwing people into new constituencies with which they have no connection whatever. The hon. Minister of Justice has appealed with much reason that the question had better be discussed by people who have a local knowledge of the geography. I pretend to be familiar with it, but I appeal to any hon. gentleman on the floor of this House to say, if he can see the slightest connection whatever between the parish of Verchères and the town of Sorel, which is the *chef-lieu* of Richelieu?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I have also some local knowledge of the constituency, as I was born ir Belœil; and my family and my brothers live there now. They all say, and I say myself, that it is most absurd to join Belœil to Rouville. We know that a candidate has very often to cross a river, but suppose on nomination day the people have to go to Marieville, which is the *chef-lieu* of Rouville, and supposing it is a windy day the people could not cross because they have only small boats.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They hold no meetings on nomination day.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Oh, yes, we have large meetings on nomination day, and it is on that very day we convert the most Tories. We have no money on our side, and we want to convert them by speaking. We call meetings on nomination day and by telling them about what ought to be good government we bring the Tories to our side. The people of Belœil are very intelligent and they do not require much speaking, but they like to hear what the other side has to say. If these people from Belœil want to go to Marieville, they cannot cross the river. There is a Grand Trunk bridge at Belœil station, but there is a notice put up that no one is allowed to cross on foot, so it is impossible for them to go to the other side of the river unless they wait till winter, after the ice has taken. The leader of the House said he wanted to hear somebody speak about facts; I know the facts, and I now draw his attention to them. I was at Belœil two weeks ago and heard the people talk about it. The Liberals do not care much about the proposed change, politically speaking, because they are sure to win in Verchères, as they are sure to win in Rouville. But the Tories are altogether dissatisfied. They say it is absurd to put them into Rouville when the Government could put them into Chambly, uniting Verchères and Chambly. There is no reason, except a prospective political advantage, that can induce the Government to put Belœil in Rouville.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The river has been spoken of as making it inconvenient to have parishes within the same electoral district on either side of the river.

Mr. OUIMET. We never heard any complaint from the people of St. Roch and St. Joseph that it was a great inconvenience for them to belong to the County of Richelieu.

Mr. LAURIER. They do not complain, but they feel it nevertheless.

Mr. OUIMET. This is not the only instance where counties are divided by a river. Take the County of Champlain and St. Maurice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman himself yesterday made it an objection.

Mr. OUIMET. No, I never complained of that. I only said that if there was a reason for leaving Laval alone, it was the fact that it stood a county by itself, being an island surrounded by two rivers. The reason I gave why Laval should not be united to Two Mountains was that the two counties have no community of interest. But the main reason was this: I explained that Pontiac, Ottawa, Argenteuil and Two Mountains have a population entitling them to five members, and we gave an additional member to Ottawa. I said if we were to equalize the population so as to have every county represent an average of 23,000, we would have to cut up Argenteuil; that was the main reason why I said that Two Mountains ought not to be added to any other county, because it would break up that group. I say that the representation by groups is much more important than representation by united counties. In no one instance of these divisions are the municipal boundaries broken. I still maintain, after listening to all objections raised, that the present division is by far the best. I do not think we could gain anything by yielding to the suggestions of the hon. gentleman, although I may say that they will be

duly considered; we have plenty of time before the third reading.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman told us that the reason for not uniting Laval and Two Mountains was the fact that a river intervened; but there is a river between Laval and Hochelaga, and the hon. gentleman annexed Laval to a portion of Hochelaga.

Mr. OUIMET. That is not fair. I said that the rural part of the County of Hochelaga was better with Laval, because they have a community of interest, and it was better to divide Hochelaga as we have done, adding to Montreal those parts of Hochelaga which are mere suburbs of the city, giving to Jacques Cartier those rural parishes of Hochelaga West adjoining that county, and giving Laval those parishes which ought not to belong to that suburban division. These people complained that their voice was drowned by the city population of Hochelaga, that, practically, they had no voice in this Parliament, and they wanted to be united to a rural constituency. That is the reason it was done—not to serve my interests, because I have been elected for 19 years for that county, four times by acclamation, and three times with very large majorities, and I do not fear any one there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. member were to deal with Laval as he proposes to deal with Verchères, he might put one-half of it into Two Mountains and the other half into Hochelaga. Then the hon. gentleman would be acting towards his own constituency somewhat in the same way that he is acting towards my hon. friend from Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion). Now, my hon. friend from Verchères has pointed out that the eastern or northern portion of his constituency has no community of interest with Richelieu. The people do not associate, the river intervenes, their trade is with Montreal; they have much more communication with Chambly than they have with Richelieu. The hon. gentleman overlooks the geographical obstacle of the river; he overlooks the absence of community of interest, he overlooks the natural associations that exist between Chambly and Verchères, and he undertakes to deal ungenerously with an hon. member who has sat in Parliament for upwards of 30 years. If the hon. gentleman were to allow a feeling of magnanimity to influence him in the smallest degree, he would have taken the geographical obstacles into consideration on behalf of Verchères. I appeal to the Minister of Customs whether he is dealing fairly with an old member of the House, who has been a member for upwards of 30 years, who knows his constituency and whose constituency knows him. I appeal to the Minister of Justice, and I say to him: If you unite Verchères and Chambly you are not removing the hon. gentleman from Verchères from contact with the people with whom he has associated all his life. What do you propose to do when you take off the northern part of his county and put it into Richelieu? You propose to put him in contact with a population to whom he is, except by reputation, a stranger—a population with whom he has had no association. You break up the historical associations that have existed. There is not a principle that hon. gentlemen have conceded in this discussion that is not violated by the proposition of the Minister of Public Works. Let the Minister propose to deal with Laval in the same way as he proposes to deal with Verchères, let him annex one-half of it to Two Mountains and the other half to Hochelaga, and then we will believe the hon. gentleman is undertaking to deal with his own case in the same way he is undertaking to deal with Verchères.

Mr. GEOFFRION. The hon. Minister says that no petition or complaint has been presented. I do not know what he calls a complaint, but I have presented a resolution from one of the municipal councils, against the scheme. I am willing to leave the decision of it to a vote of the people, and I am satisfied a majority of the Conservatives would oppose it. If this blow is intended to strike at me, I am prepared to resign and let the people get another member in my place. There are few of the people in the county who would approve of such a division and association. I understand the people of the upper part of the county, such as at Varennes and Ste. Julie, have a good deal to do with Chambly. With the exception of the lower part of the parish of Contrecœur, the others have to cross to go to Montreal, and have nothing to do either for church, law court or for commercial business with Sorel. I may explain that Verchères is entirely Roman Catholic, and as our Bishop resides in Montreal, our church business is entirely in that city. I may state on my honour that I only know two or three men in the village of Verchères who have anything to do with Sorel, and they are fishermen who go there to buy fish to smoke for the Montreal market. I really believe the Administration will gain nothing by the proposed change, because some of their friends on that account will vote against them at the next elections. I will not speak for myself personally; I am old enough to go out of politics if need be, and I am willing to do it. This proposition, however, treats the constituency with great unfairness. I would even ask one of the Ministers who ran against me if, in his opinion, the division proposed is a fair one? I admit the county is a close one politically, and I will allow hon. gentlemen opposite to change it, but it should not be divided in a manner that is unfair to the people. I protest against the action proposed, and I believe most of the people of the county will also protest against the division. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they are willing to adopt any suggestion which can be shown to be more just than that proposed in the Bill. But there is no one so blind as he who will not see; and if the hon. Minister of Public Works cannot see any injustice, it is useless to continue to point it out, nevertheless any candid man who will look into the matter and consult the people will consider that the amendment proposed is one in the public interest. The only possible object of the present proposal of the Government is to get rid of a political opponent in this House, and it is not creditable to the Administration, if they wish to get rid of a political opponent to endeavour to secure that object in this way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Is there not railway communication with Sorel, and is not the portion of Verchères which it is proposed to add to Richelieu nearer to Sorel than it is to Verchères?

Mr. GEOFFRION. It is not. The shire-town of Verchères is further from Sorel than from Montreal; it is 9 or 10 miles further from Sorel than

from Longueuil, opposite Montreal, and has nothing to do with it. As to railway communication : the railway, unfortunately, is in very bad order and is not running. But even if there is a railway, the argument that a railway is a proper bond of union between the County of Verchères and Richelieu, especially when we shall have to depend upon a railway bridge, which is not and is not likely to be built, to cross the river at certain seasons, to reach Sorel, is a very poor argument, and the Administration must be cornered to be compelled to use it.

Mr. LAURIER. Is there a bridge at Sorel ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. There is not; but there will be if the Government will give the money. We cross the river on a scow. I call the attention of the Administration to this fact. It is well known that Verchères was represented for several years by Sir George E. Cartier. He was born and brought up there, and his family resided there. But it was never proposed to take Verchères into Sorel. When Montreal district was divided for the purpose of creating divisions for the Upper House, Verchères was joined with Chambly and Laprairie, not with Sorel. I would be willing to submit this matter to a vote of the Conservatives in Verchères, for I am satisfied that a majority would vote against the proposal contained in this Bill. It may be favoured by some people who would say : "We will get rid of Geoffrion." I have heard this remark, and even some gentlemen here have told me of it. If this change is proposed to get rid of me, I am quite willing to save my constituents from that injustice by retiring from public life and allow the people of Verchères to elect a successor. I cannot understand what excuse can be offered for the proposed change, and on what principle it is done, for it is truly without reason.

Mr. BRODEUR. Rouville is now surrounded by five counties : Chambly, St. Hyacinthe, Bagot, Verchères and Iberville. Those five constituencies with Rouville are represented on the floor of this House by five Liberals and one Conservative. It is proposed, without any reason, to wipe out two Liberal constituencies, and with the four others to make three Conservative and one Liberal. I ask if that is a fair redistribution scheme ? I understand that the object of the Government is to find one constituency which is to be given to Montreal. By the proposition made by the leader of the Opposition, we might arrive at that, because by uniting Verchères and Chambly we would have the extra constituency required for Montreal. Why does not the Government accept that proposition ? It is true that the Liberals will lose one member by the union of these two constituencies, but we are ready to lose him because the Government will not give us fair and equitable justice. I will go further than that, and I will prove that the object of the Government by that gerrymander of Rouville is to make three or four more seats for themselves. I say further to the Minister of Public Works, that the object of gerrymandering Chambly is to give to his partner a constituency which he cannot get otherwise. In order to have his partner a member of this House, that is the only reason why Chambly will have to go to Rouville to get some Conservative parishes. I think, however, that these Conservative parishes which they will take from Rouville will not allow themselves to be treated in that way, and I have many complaints from them against that proposition.

Mr. OUIMET. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to tell him that what he is saying now is certainly a mistake ? Not that I say that he willingly states what is untrue. I say that if my partner had been willing to enter into public life, he would be to-day a member in the Local Legislature, but my hon. friend knows that my partner has more sense than that. It is enough for one partner in the firm to be in public life, and if we want to get anything in the world, we must preserve our office as it is. I tell the hon. gentleman that it is not correct to state that the division was for my partner or for anybody else.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then for what reason is Chambly gerrymandered, and why do you propose to make it a Conservative constituency, if it is not for that reason ? We propose to give you the extra seat for Montreal by uniting Verchères and Chambly, and I do not see why you should go across the river to take Conservative parishes from Rouville unless you want to make Chambly a safe Conservative constituency. I believe that there is another reason for this gerrymander. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) is not satisfied with his county as it is now. He knows that the sentiment of his county for the last two years is against the political opinions which he has expressed on the floor of this House, and one of the objects of the gerrymander is to increase the majority of the hon. member for Bagot. Is it fair or just to make three Conservative constituencies and one Liberal constituency out of five Liberal constituencies as they are at present ? The Government must know that there is no communication at all between Chambly and the other part of Rouville. Until some years ago there was a bridge over the rapid—because the river at that place is a rapid—but that bridge has been burned and now there is no connection at all between the two counties. If the Government were ready to give some money for building a bridge there I suppose there would be a reason in favour of the proposition, but as the Government does not propose such a thing I understand that the change is made only in order to give the Conservative party three or four more members than they could otherwise get.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The Liberals, who were sent here by a minority of the popular vote in the Province of Quebec, Mr. Chairman, would like the privilege of dictating what shall be done in this House. It is a thing that has already happened to them to govern with a minority in the country and a majority in the House. The Chambly River is spoken of as an insuperable obstacle. I cannot understand the horror of my hon. friends of the left for water and rivers in general. It has just been shown to the House that the present County of Richelieu is crossed by a river, and nobody that I know complained of that ; nobody found fault with the fact that Richelieu is crossed by a river. It is said that at Belœil there is only the railroad bridge which affords any communication with the opposite shore. Then, how is it that every day the Belœil people go to St. Hilaire ? If you go there, Mr. Chairman, you will any day see the citizens of St. Hilaire and Belœil together talking over their interests, in fact having constant and regular

intercourse. They are in constant communication, and it is a mistake to state the contrary. Community of interests is spoken of. I do not understand what my hon. friends understand by that. According to them, it is necessary to go to the same market, sell produce to the same merchant, buy at the same shop, to have community of interests. I do not conceive matters in that light. By community of interests I understand similarity of object in view, common interests to defend and protect. And in this light, is there not perfect community of interests between those parishes? The principal interest of those localities, their primordial interest is agriculture, for they are two rural parishes. In that respect, Mr. Chairman, there is a community of interest between Belœil and St. Hilaire. Both those parishes have the same interests to have protected by this Parliament. That is what I understand by community of interests. But my hon. friends of the Opposition do not look at the matter in the same light. Public interest is not what concerns them ; it is the interest of the party which they have at heart. They have but one object, Mr. Chairman, that of securing for themselves a majority of representatives in this House, without minding whether they will or not have but a minority of the voters of the country. I showed, the other day, that for the last twenty years the Liberals have always been in minority in Quebec, and nevertheless in 1878 they governed the province. Everybody knows that at that time they had only a minority of the popular vote, although they were in majority in the House. In 1882, the Liberals had twelve members representing them in this House, while if they had been returned in proportion to their share of the popular vote, they would have only been six. In 1887, the Liberals only triumphed with the help of a fraction of the Conservative party, and when that fraction of our party abandoned my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, the Liberal party fell back into the position they occupied before. The section of the country now under discussion is represented here by four Liberal members and a Conservative, while the same area is represented in Quebec by a Conservative majority. The Counties of St. Hyacinthe, Bagot, Chambly, among others, are represented in Quebec by Conservatives. These three counties, as well as Richelieu, returned Conservatives by large majorities in March last ; and my hon. friends of the Opposition know very well that if we had now general elections for this House, not having, as they had in 1887 and 1891, the assistance of the fraction of the Conservative party which helped them then, the four Liberal members who sit here now would be defeated.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Why, then, do you change the boundaries of those counties ?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) How is it that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) who was elected only by some 60 votes of majority does not recognize the truth of my statement ? How is it that he does not realize that the provincial representative of the county was only elected by some 20 votes ?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I have no fear of keeping my county as it is, while you are afraid of keeping your unchanged.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) How is it that the hon. member will come here and claim that his party would carry these counties, when at the last elections we took St. Hyacinthe, Chambly and Bagot?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) This should induce you to leave the counties as they are.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Let the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) put an end to his childishness. If he wants to be taken for a serious man, let him put an end to his useless recriminations. He has long enough wearied the House with his demonstrations which were at least frivolous and uncalled for. There must be an end. The object of the Government in presenting this measure was to equalize as much as possible the position of the different counties mentioned in the Bill, so that each of these electoral districts should have an about equal population. In trying to attain this object the Government have respected the parish municipal lines. They transferred parishes bodily without thinking of parcelling them out. If this was not to be allowed, it would be even impossible to redistribute the seats. I believe that as a whole the Government rendered justice to that part of the country. Personally I had no desire of having my county disturbed and I have never requested that it should be. If the Government did what they now ask the House to approve, they did it, not in the interest of the county, as has been contended, but in the interest of the public. Besides, I am satisfied that, had the Government submitted to the House a Bill in every particular conformable to the suggestions now made by the Opposition, the gentlemen of the left would be asking for what the Government are now proposing. The policy of these gentlemen can be resumed in a single word, obstruction, always and anyhow. They want to show that the measures originated by the Conservatives are intended to injure the Liberal party. But our concern is not party interest, but public interest.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question ? If I understood him well, he just stated that the aim of the Government was to equalize the population ?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) As much as possible.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Can he say by how much the population of Bagot was equalized ?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) No ; but it was necessary to disturb Bagot in order to give to Rouville and other counties the standard of population, or a population about equal or nearly so to that of Bagot. As to my county the difference in the result is only about 40 votes. I was desirous of having a county as important as that I had before.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) And specially of a deeper *bleue* complexion.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) As to the hon' members who have a horror of rivers, the Government, in putting that parish in Bagot, do them a good turn in saving them from the necessity of crossing the stream.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) There is no river to cross in the hon. member's county, and I do not know whether he is afraid of water, but there is one thing he is afraid of—the electors of his county. If my information is correct, I believe the hon. gentleman has in his desk some resolutions passed by

the electors of St. Dominique and St. Pie, protesting against the changes proposed by the Minister of Justice, and requesting to remain in the County of Bagot. If I am mistaken, I have been misled by my informants. My hon. friend says he objects to see a part of his county thrown into Rouville, or at least, that he never asked for this change. But that is not the question. I understand that after his two experiences of 1887 and 1891, he might well try to make his county more easy. He attempted to ridicule the movement which in 1887 allowed him to be returned by acclamation. I believe that without the help of a certain number of electors which his Quebec friends have endeavoured to disfranchise during the present session, he would not have to-day the honour of sitting here. But, what I am certain of, is that the electors of St. Dominique and St. Pie appreciate their member at his proper value; and if these electors had had an opportunity to make themselves heard they would have protested against the project of throwing their parishes in the County of Rouville. My hon. friend for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) thinks he is the only one aimed at in the changes which are proposed. I think that I share in his fate. After the last provincial elections the general cry among the Conservatives of St. Hyacinthe was that the county should be gerrymandered "to beat Bernier," as they said. They could certainly not succeed in punishing me personally, for in defeating me, they would serve my private interests and those of my family. If my head is wanted, let at least the County of St. Hyacinthe remain with the present boundaries. The annexation of Ste. Marie Magdeleine to the County of Rouville is strange; but the union of St. Damase to the same county seems to me extraordinary. The member for Bagot must know that the parish of St. Damase has always given a Conservative majority. It is true that in 1891, this parish made the mistake, according to certain Conservatives, of giving me 56 majority and that is perhaps the reasons of the punishment it meets to-day. But if the member for Bagot is good enough to refer to the returns of the last provincial elections, he will see that this parish gave 26 votes of majority to the Conservatives; and if he took part in the confection of the new political map, he should have paid a tribute of gratitude to this parish for the support it gave to his friends and let it remain in the County of St. Hyacinthe.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) The County of St. Hyacinthe gave a majority to the Conservatives at the last provincial elections.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) I am ready to admit that, and the Minister of Customs should admit in return that when a Conservative and a Liberal are elected in a county, the chances ought to be left equal. If the electors of St. Damase had been warned that they were to be annexed to the County of Rouville I know that there would have been a general protest. It is not we, the inhabitants of the county, who settle matters for the county, but outsiders who come and inspire their friends of St. Hyacinthe. For some time since, a prominent Conservative of St. Hyacinthe owned to me that it was proposed to put St. Damase in Rouville. I immediately informed some Conservatives of the parish, who answered me that the thing was absurd and impossible, and that if the Government should become guilty of such an outrage the indignation would be general in the parish. As to Ste. Marie Magdeleine, I wish to put before the House and the country the protest of the electors of that parish, Conservatives as well as Liberals, against the project of placing this parish in the County of Rouville. I hold in my hand a resolution, almost unanimously adopted by these electors, and protesting against this annexation. If the committee will allow, and if I am in order, I will read it, and will take the liberty of giving the names of those who signed it, so that they be recorded. Here is the resolution:

"At a general meeting of the electors of the parish of Ste. Marie Magdeleine, in the County of St. Hyacinthe, held at the church door of said parish on Sunday, 15th May, 1892, Mr. Gédéon Blanchette, mayor, being in the chair, and Mr. J. D. Rainville acting as secretary.

"The chairman explained to the meeting that there was before the House of Commons of Canada a Bill by which the parish of Ste. Magdeleine was proposed to be detached from the County of St. Hyacinthe and annexed to the County of Rouville for electoral purposes, and asked for the opinion of the electors on the project. After deliberation:

"It was unanimously resolved that the electors of Ste. Magdeleine disapprove of the annexation of the parish of Ste. Magdeleine to the County of Rouville for electoral purposes, and that a copy of the present resolution be sent to the representative of the county in the House of Commons to serve all due perposes.

"Napoléon Chabot, Eusèbe Leduc, Eugène Desautels, Elzéar Jacques, Léandre Marois, Charles M. Guilmette, Alexis Blanchette, père, Benoit Cordeau, Adolphe Fredet, Gédéon Blanchette, mayor, T. D. Rainville, F.-X. Hébert, Edouard Vallée, Joseph Lavallée, C. L'Etourneau, Eusèbe Mercier, Joseph Lacombe, Flavie Tétreault, Wilfrid Fréchette, Louis Tétreault, Arthur Guilmette, Joseph Cordeau, Isaac Fréchette, Adolphe Cordeau, Origène Boucher, Joseph Jodoin, Eusèbe Boucher, Edouard Rousseau, Octave Beauregard, Pierre Bernard, J. B. Boulay, Hercule Leduc, Moïse Gauthier, Ildège Petit, Horace Gaudet, A. Choquette, Wilfrid Arpin, A. Boisy, Maxime Frédette, J. N. Fontaine, Adélard Lucier, Albert Blanchette, Philéas Lussier, Antoine Leduc, Alsidas Petit, Ludger Fontaine, Magloire Fontaine, Léon Beauregard, Pierre Marcaurèle, père, Pierre Marcaurèle, fils, Elphège Marcaurèle, Pierre Lavallée, Louis Tétreault, père, Elie Lussier, Damase Jodoin, fils, Misaël Palardy, Elphège Brouillet, Pierre Brouillet, Louis Brouillet, Amable Messier, J.-B. Goyait, Eusèbe Mercier, fils, André Mercier, Antoine Cordeau, Adolphe Cordeau, Joseph Berger, Joseph Beauregard, Henri Desmarais, Onésime Chauvais, J.-Bte Ledoux, Michel Dyameau, Joseph Dyameau, Narcisse Choinière, Eusèbe Bernard, Antoine Tétreault, fils, Antoine Arpin, Louis Duchêne, Alexandre Guilmette, Charles Messier, Joseph Desaulniers, fils, Uldéric Dansereau, Régis Delâge, père, Amédée Langlois, Louis Fredet, Pierre Bernard, fils, Félix Brodeur, Joseph Leduc, Louis Vasseur, Edouard Lussier, Joseph Gendreau, Paul Duchêne, Louis Duchêne, fils, Almérique Messier, Louis Goderre, Victor Fontaine, Joseph Fontaine, Léandre Bachand, Rodolphe Bachand, Barthélémi Lavimodière, Paul Lavimodière, Hyppolite Bachand, Léopold Gendreau, Ephraim Leduc, Joseph Leduc, fils de Charles, Louis Langlois, Victor Gaudet, Antoine Tétreault, Louis Dansereau, Michel Palardy, J.-B. Bernard, François Tétreault, Francis Fafard, F.-X. Dansereau, Victor Phaneuf, Candide Codère.

In all 116 electors, residing in the parish of Ste. Magdeleine. If I am not mistaken the list of the electors at the last election contained 130 names. All those who could vote registered their votes. My opponent got seven, and I had a majority of 110 in the parish. As will be seen these signatures were taken immediately after high mass, in the month of May last. There was no canvassing; no one went from house to house soliciting for signatures; and I am confident that if to-day we should circulate a petition of the electors of Ste. Magdeleine to protest against the change, it would be signed by the totality of the electors, Conservatives as well as Liberals, with the exception of one or two per-

haps. I said a moment ago that the electors of St. Damase were taken by surprise. I met one of the most active leaders of the Conservative party in that parish no later than Saturday last in my office, and on my telling him that there was a project of annexing the parish of St. Damase to the County of Rouville, he answered that if a meeting was called, there would be a unanimous protestation against the project. I will draw the attention of the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Public Works to the fact that by detaching from the county the parishes of St. Damase and Ste. Magdeleine, they remove the two parishes nearest to the township of St. Hyacinthe. St. Damase is barely four miles from the limits of the town, and Ste. Magdeleine is also a short distance from St. Hyacinthe. It seems to me that the Government could have left the map of that electoral district as it was before. We had an ardent enough fight when we were defeated at the last provincial elections. If the majority of the electors of the county are in the future to pronounce in favour of our hon. friends of the right, why, I ask, should the present boundaries of St. Hyacinthe be changed, and why should two parishes be annexed from the other side of the Richelieu River, which are part of the judiciary district of Montreal? We have no communications with the annexed parishes, and unless the Government, in their munificence and liberality, give us subsidies for the building of a bridge, we will have to pass by Belœil, and travel a distance of thirty or forty miles to reach these parishes. According to the last census the population of the County of St. Hyacinthe was 21,423. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you refer to the census figures, to find out the increase of the population of the town of St. Hyacinthe itself, you will see that it is a town of progress and industry. I will note here that the Minister of Public Works gave, as a reason for not joining the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil, that the population of these two counties could increase in the near future. I have no hesitation in saying that St. Hyacinthe is one of the most progressive towns in the Province of Quebec, one whose industries are the most prosperous, not on account of the policy of the present Government, but thanks to the liberality of the citizens of that town, who on all occasions were ready to use their money to bring about that result. Here, Mr. Chairman, are figures which will not fail to interest the House, and to which I particularly draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works and of the member for Bagot. The increase of the population of St. Hyacinthe has been considerable, as I will show. At the taking of the census of 1861 it was 3,746. In 1881 it had reached 5,321, and in 1891, the last census found it 7,016. I am informed, and I have reason to believe it to be true, that, according to the census recently made by the municipal authorities, the figure of the population of St. Hyacinthe is now a few hundreds above that of 7,016. This increase is due to the enlightened, wise and intelligent policy of the town council, which I know is not approved by all—a policy which consists in attracting as much as possible from the neighbouring manufacturing centres, industries which make the wealth of St. Hyacinthe. Just now there is a large building in course of construction in St. Hyacinthe. It will soon be occupied by a business which cannot fail to grow into importance. I refer to the manufacturing of corsets. This industry was formerly established at Sherbrooke, and we have succeeded in bringing it to us. The town of St. Hyacinthe has not hesitated at sacrifices, and voted a large sum to induce those at the head of this industry to settle there. And that it did without minding whether those thus favoured were Liberals or Conservatives. The manager of this industry is well known to the member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) as he is one of his cousins, Mr. Gendron. This gentleman, as the member for Bagot knows well, is one of the most faithful, if not the most ardent of Conservatives. Again, another industry which is now established in the County of Missisquoi, will be located with us before another year, I hope. All these industries will tend to increase the population. But let us take the population of the county as it now is. We already reach the standard. Taking this into consideration, should we not be justified in thinking that the Government should not make any change in the boundaries of the county? If by the side of this consideration you put the argument used by the Minister of Public Works setting forth that the Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil should not be united because their population was apt shortly to increase, should we not be doubly justified in expecting no changes to be made? In ten years from now the population of that town may be 30,000. I do not say that it may not be necessary in the future to make some changes, but at present I see no good reason for any. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to the fact that St. Hyacinthe is the twentieth county, by order of population, in the Province of Quebec, and that there are forty odd whose population is smaller. Why, then, mangle this electoral district as is done? After having detached two parishes from St. Hyacinthe, they add to it two others from another county. As I have said before, the population of St. Hyacinthe is 21,423. Two parishes are added to the county: that of St. Marc, with 897 souls, and that of St. Antoine, with 1,473. By this operation the population of the county is increased by 2,370. But, after this addition, a subtraction is immediately made of two parishes formerly belonging to St. Hyacinthe, with a population of 936. Deducting this figure from the population of the annexed parishes, we remain with an increase of 1,434, which will bring the total population of the county to 22,867. In a party light the parish of St. Damase has not always been faithful, and under the pretext of drawing a straight line, the Government propose to the House to take away this parish. It is a singular fact that it is only in St. Hyacinthe that the Government shows so much affection for the straight line; elsewhere they prefer the crooked. If you want to draw a straight line why not likewise take away the parish of St. Charles? It must be well understood, Mr. Chairman, that I do not ask for such a change; but I simply say, that if a straight line is wanted, and a symmetrical shape for the County of St. Hyacinthe—a consideration which did not move the Government in the matter of the other counties—they must likewise take away this parish. I would be the last man to vote for the annexation of St. Charles to another county, as I would be the last one to vote for the taking away of other parishes which the Government want to detach from St. Hyacinthe. I understand that for

certain political purposes it be necessary to mangle certain counties. Thus, in order to put an end to the existence of the Counties of Verchères and Napierville, which are so unaccommodating for the Conservative party as to return Liberals, certain operations had to be performed. But, I ask to the most partisan of Conservatives, whether they would ever have dreamed of such a piece of shifting as is proposed, whether such a shuffle would have ever suggested itself as the transfer of St. Marc and Verchères to the County of St. Hyacinthe? The hon. Minister of Customs will not forget that this change is not agreeable to everybody in the Conservative ranks. He must know it since the famous epistle-elegy in which the Minister of Customs was threatened to lose for ever the support of an old Conservative leader. For the satisfaction of this poet, now living in Montreal but formerly in Varennes, he ought to have left undisturbed the old state of things. It was cruel to so thoroughly blast all the hopes of the illustrious bard. I have wandered off somewhat from my subject, and I hope that the House and you, Mr. Chairman, will forgive this digression, for if I have not kept closely to the rules of parliamentary proceedings I only followed the example of many others. My hon. friend for Rouville—although there seems to be no love lost between the Minister of Public Works and him—appears to have been given by the Government the mission of harbouring in his constituency the politically orphaned and exiled voters from the neighbouring counties. I hope that he will accept his mission light-heartedly, and thay he will see that they remain good and worthy electors, for I wist they must be good Liberals since they are so ill-treated. In conclusion I will say that I regret that those who had the task of remaking the political map of the Province of Quebec did not think proper to make the intentions of the Government known. I regret that the electors of St. Damase have not been warned of the intentions of annexing them to Rouville. I protest in their name, and say that on the first occasion that comes, these electors, Conservatives as well as Liberals, will not fail to manifest their discontent with such treatment. In my opinion the Government ought to have brought down this measure at the beginning of the session. They ought not to have waited four months, and finally, at the end of the session, when the House is in committee over the Bill, come with projects of the parcelling out and dismemberment of constituencies. Had this measure come sooner the electors of these constituencies could have been made aware of the intentions of the Government towards them. I do not believe there is a single petition from the electors of St. Damase asking for the proposed change. Once more, the Government ought to have made known much sooner their intentions with regard to the County of St. Hyacinthe and the other counties of the Province of Quebec.

[At one o'clock, the Committee adjourned, and at three o'clock resumed.]

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I heard with much pleasure the remarks made this morning by my friend from St. Hyacinthe, on the subject of the dismemberment of the County of Verchères, and of the changes which are to affect his own county, and those of Rouville and Bagot. Like his own colleagues of the left, my hon. friend expressed the regret he felt at a separation from a certain number of his electors. This is perhaps somewhat intensified by the regret which he feels at the coming in of a certain number of electors who do not share his political views. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe asked the House how it was that the Government took upon themselves to disturb the county that he has had the honour to represent, when that county has about the standard population. Like his colleagues of the left, the hon. member seems to be unwilling to take a synthetic view of the redistribution which the Government are making of the seats in the district of Montreal. Every one of these hon. gentlemen looks at the measure from the stand-point of his own political interest, his immediate interest. As far as I can judge, I can say that the County of St. Hyacinthe was disturbed in order to give the neighbouring constituencies the standard population. My hon. friend spoke of a petition which was signed in the parish of Ste. Marie Magdeleine, and by which the electors of that parish protested against their annexation to the County of Rouville. My hon. friend also spoke of certain petitions from the parishes of St. Pie and St. Dominique which, he says, are in my desk. The hon. gentleman does not seem to be a stranger to the petitions signed in these parishes to protest against their annexation to Rouville. I will say that I have truly received those two petitions, but I will point out to the hon. gentleman that the St. Pie petition bears only 107 signatures—or rather 107 names, for they are not signatures, they are names that were written at the foot of a protest, the protest and the names being all of the same hand-writing. It is singular how alike all the people in that locality write.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) They all vote alike, too.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) My hon. friend for St. Hyacinthe will note that 107 electors are far from being the majority of St. Pie, for there are at least 800 electors in that parish. These signatures are, therefore, but a minority of the Liberal vote in the parish of St. Pie, since that parish gives more than 550 votes.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Is there any petition in favour of the change?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) My hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe will again note that while the parish of St. Dominique has a voters' list of over 400 names, the petition from that parish has only 80. Supposing that the petitions are genuine, which I deny, because they bear on their face the evidence of having been written and signed by the same hand, they would only show that the smallest minority in those parishes gave their approval to such a protest. But I have information as to how these petitions were signed. I know that some of the political friends of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe are no strangers to these petitions, which were probably made at the request of some political partisan from St. Hyacinthe. However, the Liberal electors of those two parishes, understanding better than those who represent them here the importance of rearranging the county on a more equitable basis, have refused to sign these protests, which, according to my hon. friend, represent the views of the majority of the electors of those two parishes. I know that in one of those parishes the

ex-candidate at the provincial election, Mr. Archambault, ascended the hustings at the church door and invited the electors to protest against the separation of the parish of St. Dominique from the County of Bagot and its annexation to the County of Rouville; for, did he say, if you consent to become electors in the County of Rouville, presently the Provincial Legislature will pass a law which will divide the County of Bagot, not only for electoral purposes but also for the municipal, registration and agricultural purposes, while for judicial purposes you will remain in the district of St. Hyacinthe as before. Well, notwithstanding all this canvassing, only 80 electors signed the protest. I will also point out to my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe that at least two pages of the petition which he read to the House were written by the same hand. Consequently, it is altogether probable, seeing that they have no certificate as to the genuineness of the signatures, that those names were put down by some jealous political partisan, with the object of showing the House that the discontent is general. My hon. friend, the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier), took occasion of the remarks which were made about his county, to speak of the town of St. Hyacinthe. He thought proper to tell us that it did not owe its present prosperity to the protective policy of the Government. He holds that St. Hyacinthe owes its prosperity to the policy of bonuses and money grants adopted by its corporation, with the object of drawing industries and manufactories within its limits. First, I will point out to my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe, that under the regime of the Mackenzie Government, St. Hyacinthe could as well have voted municipal subsidies to manufactories. Why did it not do so then? Why did it not draw those manufactories which have within the last few years, given it its prosperity according to the member for St. Hyacinthe himself? The answer is easy, Mr. Chairman. Even though the municipal council of St. Hyacinthe had voted bonus upon bonus to attract industries to the town, their industries would have perished in spite of all. As soon as the subsidies would have been spent the town would have been invited to vote some more to maintain industries which the ruinous policy of the Liberal party would have kept in a state of poverty. Mr. Chairman, the citizens of St. Hyacinthe in 1875 had all the intelligence, the the activity which my hon. friend has spoken of, and yet the town did not prosper then, as it has since the inauguration of the National Policy. In 1875 as well as in 1882, and as to-day, it was the political friends of the hon. member who had the control of the town council, and I suppose they had, in 1875, the same desire as to-day for the prosperity of the town. How is it that they did nothing then? It is because they did not want, under the Liberal regime, to risk subsidies calculated to attract manufacturers, for they knew it would have been a total loss. On the contrary, under the regime of the National Policy, the friends of the hon. member understood that the situation was no longer the same. In 1875 the large industrial establishments of that time, instead of prospering, were obliged either to curtail their operations, or to close their doors entirely. It was only after the inauguration of the National Policy that the town of St. Hyacinthe began to prosper, and it was then only that the council adopted, for the benefit of the citizens, the same policy that the Conservative Government had adcpted for the people of Canada in general. The protective policy adopted for the Dominion was found so excellent that the Liberals, who controlled the town council, hastened to adopt it, in the interest of their town. Besides, my hon. friend must know better than any one else, that many of his political friends have turned their backs upon him, because of the economic platform of his party. Thus we have seen Messrs. Coté and Payant renounce the political connections they had kept until then. My hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) must know that if these citizens have abandoned him, it is because their material interests, their industrial and manufacturing interests were endangered by the policy of the party which he supports in the House. It is because they do not want to support the policy of the leader of the Opposition in this House, that they have abandoned my hon. friend, and he need not search for any other reason to explain the desertion of these citizens from his ranks. That policy has been condemned by the municipal council themselves, although they be a Liberal majority, since they adopted towards the local industries the same policy which the Government adopted towards the industries of the country in general. And, Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friend the member for St. Hyacinthe has seen, in the last few years, his popularity decline, it cannot be explained otherwise than by his inconceivable tenacity in supporting a policy which not only does not promote the interests of the manufacturers and of the county which he represents, but would on the contrary mean incalculable loss to them should it even triumph. This is the reason why my hon. friend finds himself abandoned by influential citizens, who cannot understand the tenacity of his attachment to his political friends and to the programme of his party.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Would the hon. member he good enough to tell us what was the majority of the member for St. Hyacinthe at the last elections?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I will tell the hon. member who has just interrupted me, that his colleague from St. Hyacinthe was obliged to say to the manufacturers of the town: "Do not fear for the manufacturing interests. If an attempt is made to hurt them, I will defend them in Parliament, and will prevent my party from putting into action a policy detrimental to them." It is thanks to such assurances given, not in public—the hon. member is too intelligent not to know that such things take place in secret committees—it is thanks to such assurances that he succeeded in calming the fears of his political friends. It is also to the same cause that must be attributed the fact of his meeting with an opposition only at the last hour. It is owing to the tardiness of this opposition that he was elected by such a large majority. At the last provincial elections, what did the hon. member do? When he went into the public meetings to support the Liberal candidate, he did not ask the people to vote for this candidate because his political programme was good, but he would say: "If you do not want to vote for the Mercier Government, vote at least for me, for it is my own destruction which

is aimed in this campaign." Well, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding these appeals, the electors of St. Hyacinthe voted against him and against his candidate. My hon. friend is too attached to his party and to the little coterie which from what has been called "the flaming corner *(coin flambant)*" pulls the wire which works the party in St. Hyacinthe, and the despotism practised by the coterie has brought upon the hon. member the loss of many a devoted partisan who refused to blindly follow the lead of the men who compose this secret committee. The political programme of the hon. member and his party is alone answerable for the decline in his popularity.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Yes, a great decline, when at the last election he was returned by 500 majority.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) He did not get 500 majority, and he would be defeated if he ran again.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) It was 490 majority which he got; not very far from 500.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The hon. member for Lotbinière in very touchy to-day. He cannot allow me to give my views. We have listened with much calmness to the remarks of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe and his friends of the left, and yet we cannot express our views upon this Bill without being interrupted whenever we touch one of their tender spots. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe has brought no new argument into the debate. He simply asked why his county was disturbed? I said from the beginning, and we do not cease repeating it, the counties having the standard population are only disturbed in order that other counties may also be given the required population. A great crime was made of the Government disturbing the habits of the electors. It is said: "But the electors are used to voting with this or that group, and it would be cruel to count their votes with the neighbouring county." Well, I ask, where is the cruelty? And where is the disturbance of the electors transferred from one county to another? Even though a county be divided by a river, are the electors obliged to cross that river to deposit their ballots in the box? Assuredly not. The electors of St. Antoine and St. Marc will vote in their usual respective polling districts, and after the voting the boxes will be taken to the city of St. Hyacinthe for the counting of the votes. That is all. One must be very short of arguments to bring such paltry ones against the Bill. As to the county meetings, they do not take place in the town of St. Hyacinthe, but at La Présentation. In the future these county meetings will simply have to be held in what will be a more central locality. I notice, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend from Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), who is not the least able man of this House, has sought to excite the sympathies over the fate brought upon him by this Bill. I believe that everybody in this House sympathizes with him. The hon. members of the left say: "You wipe out the county of an old Liberal chief, of a man who has rendered services to his party and his country, and that is bad, that is an act of tyranny." I do not deny, Mr. Chairman, the usefulness to his party of the hon. member for Verchères. I am one of those who would like to see him come back here, and I say so with the greatest sincerity. Among all our political opponents there is no man more courteous. But, on the other hand, if my hon. friends of the left have as much esteem as we have for this veteran of politics, they will necessarily return him from the county now called Richelieu, and to which are to be annexed the parishes of Verchères—Ste. Julie, Ste. Theodosie and Contrecœur; the two last parishes will in the future be for the Liberal party the keystone of the County of Richelieu. My hon. friend from Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) is a young man. I am confident that he has no great interest in entering politics for the present. I know that he is only in through necessity, and to serve what from his point of view seems to be the interests of his party. Well, the hon. member for Verchères is not deprived of his county. He can in the future represent the constituency of Richelieu, which the Government might call Verchères, if it pleases my hon. friends of the left better. But why urge such considerations against a measure of public interests? Why, on mere questions of details—because such a member is inconvenienced by the measure, because such other does not care to give up the voters of such a parish—why, I say, for considerations like these, interfere with the *ensemble* of a measure, which in my opinion, is conceived in the public interest, since it secures for the majority of the electors the majority of the representatives in this House?

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) I have no intention to make a second speech on the subject which I treated this morning. I only take the floor with the object of rectifying certain errors made by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont). The hon. member has taken to task the petitions signed by the electors of St. Pie and St. Dominique, asking that these parishes be left in the County of Bagot, and he insinuated that if I was not the one who had originated those petitions, it must have been my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur). It seems to me that the hon. member made a poor compliment to the electors of these two parishes, Liberals as well as Conservatives, who signed those petitions. It was natural that these citizens, threatened with being thrown into Rouville, should think of taking measures to prevent the annexation of these parishes, to the neighbouring county. There was no need of their going to St. Hyacinthe, or anywhere, for information before understanding what were their interests. As to the remark made by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) that these petitions were signed by the same hand, it is possible, Mr. Chairman, that they might have been signed by the same person; the hon. member knows perfectly well that under such circumstances a great regard for regularity does not always obtain. But I would like to know whether the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) means to say that those that have written down those names have done it without the desire and will of the parties. The persons who prepared these petitions and caused them to be signed are honourable people, and I know there is not a single man among them so unscrupulous as to dare do what the hon. member insinuated. Should he have had counter-petitions he could have given his insinuations much more weight. These remarks apply likewise to the petition from the electors of Ste. Magdeleine, it is possible that on it also names may appear to have been written by the same hand, but this does not

mean that at a meeting held and presided over by the mayor of the parish, an honourable man if ever there was one, this municipal officer would have allowed the putting down of names of persons who were not present at the meeting or who did not give their consent. The hon. member, after treating this point, has passed to another order of ideas which he might have discussed with more advantage before his electors. He spoke of my office, which he was pleased to designate, as "the flaming corner." This is not of vast importance to the House and I believe that the country will care little to learn whether it is from "the flaming corner" or any other corner that the political movement is more particularly quickened in St. Hyacinthe. Such appellations or other epithets are easily put up with when coming from the hon. member. He also said that if I had to go back to the electors I would be defeated. I am going to make him a proposition, altogether to the advantage of his party. If the Government want to leave the County of St. Hyacinthe as it is to-day, I propose to resign my seat and offer myself again as a candidate. If I do not succeed, if I do not come back, at least I will be able to say that I have not been put out by a law of Parliament, but by the electors, who alone have the right to chose who shall be their representative. I do not share the opinion of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) as to the supposed decline of my popularity in St. Hyacinthe. And even though I should have against me certain Tory manufacturers of the place, I could still, I believe, fight a pretty creditable campaign, and perhaps even return victorious. The hon. member says, with a bad grace, that I would be defeated in case of a new election. There are not as many changes of public opinion in the county as he affects to believe, and I think I know the county as well as he does. There is not another man in this House, who knows better than the hon. member, why I met with opposition at the election of 1891. I believe no man gave himself as much trouble as he did to find me an opponent. So much so that his friends used to say, when they would see him come every day to St. Hyacinthe, with the object of creating opposition to my election, that he would do better to attend to his own election. The hon. member has given the House to understand that I only had opposition as a matter of form. He made in that, I think, a good compliment to my opponent; for according to him the Conservative candidate was but a man of little account.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I did not say that.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) My opponent and I put in the same time in organizing. How, then, does the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) explain that at that election, at which he took such an active part, I was elected in spite of his efforts and with a majority of 500 votes? As to the manufacturers of St. Hyacinthe I admit that some of my political friends abandoned me at the last elections and thought better to withdraw from me the support they had given me before. They thought that the policy of the Opposition could give them some annoyance. But it seems to me that in spite of that, the majority which I obtained should show that my star has not paled so very much. But is not that of the hon. member from Bagot somewhat dimmer? In truth, Mr. Chairman, we both entered this House the same year. He had been returned by a majority of 300, and I by 134. In 1887, the hon. member succeeded in getting himself returned by acclamation. How, I will not now say. The events are still too fresh to make that necessary. I met opposition, but of hardly any consequence, as my election proved, for my majority was nearly 1,200. At the last election he in his turn met with opposition. But he is very courageous and hard to beat, and after a vigorous struggle he was returned, not by 300 majority, as in 1882, but by 44 or 54 only, which proves that his star has grown somewhat dimmer, as I said a moment ago. I will ask the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), who has had something to do with the making of the map of the counties, how it is that things are managed in this way? I do not accuse the hon. member of being the author of these changes, but when he is accused, he does not defend himself enough to prove us that he was a stranger to the ministerial measure before it was brought before the House. If he wants to judge of my popularity in the County of St. Hyacinthe. I will ask him to join me in inducing the Government to leave the county as it was before. I never complained of it, and I am ready to stand my chances as it is. What interest can these gentlemen have in striking at a man whom they represent as already half beaten? Why annex to St. Hyacinthe, St. Antoine and St. Marc where there is a majority of from 160 to 170? And why take away the parish of Ste. Marie Magdeleine which gave me 110 majority? And the parish of St. Damase, unfortunately for it from what I see, gave me a majority of 56, although it is a Conservative parish, and notwithstanding the fact that it had the advantage of being treated to the brilliant eloquence of the member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont). I would like to recount in a few words the history, somewhat mutilated by the hon. member, of the establishment of manufactories in St. Hyacinthe. Perhaps I am not in order, Mr. Chairman, but since you have allowed the member for Bagot to go over that ground, I may be permitted to do the same. The town council of St. Hyacinthe is, in a large majority, composed of Liberals, although this has not much to do with the question. The policy which the hon. member supports is that of protection, and here it is municipal interests which are at stake. The subsidies which the town voted—and I was in favour of such subsidies, I make no secret of it—were voted, not in favour of industries not already in the country, but in order to attract to St. Hyacinthe industries already established outside. These subsidies were given in order to induce manufacturers to transfer their establishments to St. Hyacinthe. I will mention the works of Messrs. Seguin, Lalime & Co., who are among my opponents. These gentlemen, who were formerly established at St. John's, transferred their works to St. Hyacinthe, and are prosperous to-day. There is also Mr. Moseley, a tanner, from Montreal. After the disastrous fire which destroyed his establishment, the town of St. Hyacinthe was made aware that if it wanted to grant a subsidy to this gentleman he would bring his industry to that town. I favoured the granting of this bonus, although Mr. Moseley is a Tory. I was the first one to say this bonus should be granted. The town voted $15,000, and Mr. Moseley came to St. Hyacinthe. There is also another industry which we established in

1882. It was at the time when, according to the friends of the Government, the Americans were coming with bags of gold to establish manufactories in the Province of Quebec. The man at the head of this enterprise came to us, and we urged him to come and settle among us. The citizens of St. Hyacinthe generously clubbed together to make up the necessary amount, and I have to say that not one of the friends of the hon. member was found ready to put his hand in his pocket on this occasion. The member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) who reads only the *Courrier de St. Hyacinthe*, turned the enterprise into ridicule. The Conservatives were saying: "They only want to deceive the people, with a political object in view." When the hon. member goes to St. Hyacinthe, I invite him to push on to the boulevard, and thence he will see this establishment, which is now prosperous, and which, I hope, before six months will have not only doubled, but tripled its importance. The hon. member would evidently like to create difficulties between the Liberals of St. Hyacinthe. If he wants to be sincere, he will admit that since I am a candidate, Mr. Louis Coté never voted for me nor for my opponent. If he wants to seek information he will learn that Mr. Payant, if I am to credit the rumour, never gave a vote in my favour. It is true that the hon. member for Bagot, thanks to his trip last year, succeeded in having certain manufacturers from St. Hyacinthe publish a manifesto, which produced in Bagot, but not in St. Hyacinthe, the effect which he expected. I do not wish to say anything against these gentlemen, for they have a right to differ from me on industrial questions, and on the effect of the National Policy. It is their right, and I do not complain. But to conclude, I will say that the hon. member for Bagot is not logical, for if he is sincerely convinced that my popularity in St. Hyacinthe is so completely a thing of the past, why does he not ask his friends to leave the boundaries of the county as they are. According to the hon. member, I would be unquestionably beaten at the next elections. Would there not be more glory for him in being able to tell his electors that I was beaten in the fight, rather than to have participated in putting me out of the House by means of a Bill which he supports with all his prestige and all his eloquence?

Mr. DUPONT (Translation). I have only one remark to make. I want to point out to my hon. friend that industries in St. Hyacinthe have only prospered under the Conservative regime, and under the protective policy; and that he and his political friends, whose patriotism he lauds so highly, never thought proper to attract industries there, or to create any new ones when they were in power. I will, moreover, say in regard to his challenge, that although the Liberals were beaten at the last local elections, we still find them with challenges on their lips. I already told the hon. gentleman why his electoral district was disturbed, why my own and those of our colleagues were disturbed; why the Government had been obliged to shift certain parishes from St. Hyacinthe and others from Bagot. I repeat it: It was in order to give the neighbouring counties the required population. I reproached my hon. friend and his colleagues with not wishing to take a synthetic view of the Government's measure. I persist in that reproach, for my hon. friend persists in attacking details and abstaining from criticising the measure of the Government as a whole.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest that we let this section stand for the present, and we will go on with another part of the measure—for instance, that part relating to the representation of Toronto, which stood over.

Mr. DENISON. If I may be allowed, I would like to suggest that the amendment be changed by making it read: "Bathurst street produced to the lake," so as to obviate any question as to whether that street extends to the lake or not. At present it runs down to Front street and over a bridge, and then disappears in a railway yard.

Mr. COCKBURN. Before the amendment regarding West Toronto is put to the committee, I desire to say a few words in reference to it, and to present some facts with reference to the city of Toronto which I trust may induce this House to consider the propriety of further increasing the representation of that city in the House of Commons. I know no city, Sir, which within so short a time has made more rapid or more substantial progress than has the city of Toronto. If we take into account the numerical factor (23,000) which has been taken here by several hon. gentlemen as the guide for parliamentary representation, Toronto would have the right undoubtedly to claim eight members as its proper representation in the House of Commons. The population of the city by the recent census was 181,220, and by the census taken by the city shortly afterwards it was somewhat over 190,000. The increase of the population has been indeed phenomenal. There are other cities in the Dominion, such as Montreal, which have shown a material increase, but the increase of that great commercial capital in the ten years from 1881 to 1891 has been only 39½ per cent, while the increase of Toronto in the same period has been 88½ per cent. Now, within the last year the city has been divided by the corporation into six divisions or wards, which are denominated respectively No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, No. 5 and No. 6, showing a population for No. 1 of 23,000; No. 2, 38,000; No. 3, 31,000; No. 4, 32,000; No. 5, 34,000; and No. 6, 24,000, making a total of 182,000. Looking not only at the increase of the population of Toronto, but at the enormous increase of its manufacturing interests, it does occur to me that some concession should be made so that those interests and the capital invested therein should be represented in this House. The capital invested in manufactures in Toronto in 1871 was only $4,000,000; to-day it is $32,000,000. The number of employés in 1871 was only 9,400; to-day the number is 26,333. The amount of yearly wages paid in 1871 was $2,690,000; to-day it is over $9,360,000. The raw material, exclusive of power and heat, was $7,169,000, while to-day it is over $22,400,000. The value of the products in 1871 was $13,686,000, while to-day it has reached the colossal sum of $45,000,000. The average yearly wages paid to each employé are $355, in contrast with the average yearly wages paid in the city of Montreal of $332. The whole output of our manufactures in 1881 was $310,000,000, while to-day it has reached $500,000,000, an amount about equal to the total products of our Ontario farms. The city of Toronto has made remarkable progress ever since the introduction of

the National Policy, and it is an illustration of the wisdom of that policy. We have heard a good deal in this House of the inestimable benefit which would be afforded to us by the sale of our agricultural products to the 65,000,000 people to the south of us; but I beg to draw the attention of this House to the fact that the city of Toronto alone, with the surrounding district, consumes more of the produce of our Canadian farms than is consumed by the whole United States. In the twelve months of the year 1889-90, the year immediately preceding the introduction of the McKinley Bill, the city of Toronto consumed 86,347 horned cattle of a value of $4,218,000, 55,766 sheep of a value of $1,672,980, and 40,169 hogs of a value of $500,000. In addition to that the city of Toronto consumes daily during the season some 20,000 pounds of lamb, besides a fair quantity of calves, poultry, eggs, &c. The whole export of our farm produce to the United States in 1889-90 was $13,660,858, and we have reimported from the United States $5,389,492 worth, leaving a net balance of only some $8,000,000 of our agricultural products consumed in the United States. The city of Toronto alone, in those twelve months, consumed nearly $12,000,000 worth of the same products. I mention these points so as to show that the city of Toronto occupies no mean position, and therefore is entitled to full consideration in the matter of representation. Then I would like to refer to the amount of bank capital which has been accumulated. I do not speak of the Province of Ontario, but directly of the city of Toronto, and I find centred in that city $14,545,017 paid-up bank capital with an accumulated rest of $6,015,292.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am coming to the question. I think it is perfectly in order for me to show this House the important interests of Toronto, and to demand that those interests should receive adequate representation. I repeat that the banking capital invested in the city of Toronto alone is over $20,000,000. I do not wish to make invidious comparisons, but in all the rest of the Dominion, leaving out the Province of Quebec, there are but $13,639,447 of such capital, so that the city of Toronto alone has over fifty per cent more money invested in banks than the rest of the Dominion, excluding the Province of Quebec. If you look at the trade question——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My hon. friend is out of order. If he will enter into this subject, there will be no end to the discussion.

Mr. COCKBURN. I wish to show the House the interests Toronto has to be represented.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can do that by making a motion for further representation, but he cannot discuss the trade of Toronto because that will involve a discussion which is entirely out of order.

Mr. COCKBURN. I suppose it will be competent for me to discuss the general question as to whether Toronto should not have a larger representation. The objection to the increased representation of cities has been taken, that in each city there is a number of residents who have seats there for other constituencies, and who indirectly represent the interests of the city in which they reside. I can only say that while we have in Toronto perhaps four or five gentlemen who represent constituencies in other parts of the Dominion, I have never gone to one of them to ask him for any help with regard to the representation of Toronto or its special interests; and so far from their being of any assistance in furthering those interests and representation, they have felt, situated as they were, that it was impossible for them, without perhaps giving offence to their own constituencies, to stand up here in behalf of the special interests of Toronto. I think we are taking a wrong basis in denying full weight to the cities in this matter of representation. The motion before the House has reference to the division of Toronto into two, and I might move that the city should be divided into six with the object of giving it increased representation; and it is for that reason I am anxious to show that the cities are not being fairly treated in this Bill. No doubt the cities represent more particularly commercial and manufacturing capital. They are the seats of science, literature, and arts; they are the seats of our universities and the centres of intelligence, and therefore they return as a rule Conservative members. But we must bear in mind that while the counties are constantly diminishing in population the cities are increasing, and there is no use in our trying to stem the torrent in that direction for we cannot do it. In the United States during the last 10 years, 450 counties show a decrease in population, while in the North Atlantic states over fifty-one per cent of the population exists in the cities, and in the whole of the United States fully one-fourth of the population reside in the cities of over 8,000 inhabitants. Therefore it is, I contend, that our cities should have a larger representation. My eloquent friend from Assiniboia has contended that, as a rule, cities all over the world are represented by men of inferior calibre, but if that be the case, they ought all the more to have a larger representation. It may be that the opportunities given in the North-West for a wild, free range over the vast prairies tends to expand the intellect, and that the little pocket boroughs have been the nurseries of genius. We have not, however, in this country the advantage of pocket boroughs; and we in the cities are offered a direct representation of four members for a population of about 50,000 to each member, whereas in other electoral districts a member is given to every 23,000. We are willing that the city of Toronto should be represented by only six members instead of eight. We wish that our corporation should remain a body corporate, and therefore I look for the assistance of my hon. friend from Bothwell, whose ideas with reference to the sacredness of the organic life of counties and of cities we all know. We do not wish that Toronto should in any way be depleted by sending 17,000 or 18,000 of its voters into East York or 14,000 into West York; but we desire that Toronto shall be, so to speak, a unit in representation, and while we have an undoubted right to claim eight representatives, yet, with that modesty which has always characterized Toronto in its demands on the Government and the country, we are prepared to accept six members, one for each of its six wards. I should like, if it were in order, to enlarge more fully on the claims of Toronto, but it seems that I would be out of order in doing so. I might show you, Sir, that of the total assets in the Dominion,

or at least in Ontario, of the loan companies of $118,000,000, no less a sum than $108,000,000 comes from Toronto, but I know that would not be in order. I might also deal with the question of the capital of the banks and loan companies, and show you that in Ontario alone there are $94,695,993 with a reserve of $16,686,632, and that by far the larger part of that capital is held in Toronto. I hold, therefore, that as we are representing not merely heads, we should apply to the city of Toronto the unit of 23,000; and I hold it is but fair we should consider the vast commercial and manufacturing interests and the vast banking interests of that great centre in the representation accorded to it. My hon. friend near me from Hamilton (Mr. McKay) asks: Where are the manufacturing interests? Sir, they are everywhere. There is not a branch of manufacturing which you will not find established in the great city of Toronto. We have even established branches in outlying towns such as Hamilton and elsewhere, and are prepared to spread ourselves still further; and I hope the time will come when Toronto will be able to take in the small manufacturing towns that have been growing around as parasites. I regret, therefore, that I am unable to support the clause which limits Toronto to four members, and which attacks and destroys its organic life in a manner by dividing it up between the Counties of East and West York; and I, therefore, desire to move in amendment to the amendment:

That the electoral district of Toronto shall consist of the six wards as now constituted for municipal purposes, numbering one to six respectively, and shall return one member for each ward.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think we can possibly accept this. We defer to a great deal, if not all, the hon. gentleman has said with regard to the greatness of Toronto. We admire its growth and expansion, and of course its representatives; but I think, in order to give the additional representation called for by this amendment, we would have to reorganize the whole distribution for the Province of Ontario in order to get the additional seats the hon. member calls for by this amendment. In addition to that, we should have to consider all the clauses with reference to the Province of Quebec, because the city of Montreal would have an additional claim in consequence of the treatment of Toronto. As far as the amendment is concerned, I think we shall have to rest satisfied with the explanations the hon. gentleman has made, without putting that provision in the Bill.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I suppose, as a member for Toronto, I have to express my views on this subject. I can agree with a great deal that has been said by my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), and I should be delighted, personally, if I saw the way clear for Toronto to have more representatives. If we were to take simply the number of persons as a guide to determine the number of representatives, we should be entitled to at least six, but I think that even we, as representatives of Toronto, have to look outside of the city, have to look over the province and over the Dominion, and, while I agree with my hon. friend that, if we take population as the basis, strictly, we would be entitled to six representatives, I am not inclined to feel that the Government have dealt unfairly with us in giving us one additional representative instead of three, which my hon. friend thinks we ought to have. We could not get any more representatives without sacrificing other constituencies, and I am sure that the Government have very carefully and wisely considered not only our province, but all the other provinces, and I do not see that we have any more reason to complain than the city of Montreal. I do not know that we have any right to complain at all, because, if we had any more representatives, it could only be by the sacrifice of other constituencies, and I do not know of any constituency in the province that ought to be closed up in order to give Toronto another representative. I make these remarks with some diffidence, because I know that my statements will be criticised in the city of Toronto, but I do not think we should claim for Toronto what is not fair to the rest of Ontario or to the rest of the Dominion. The representatives of Toronto are quite as jealous of their interests as the representatives of any constituency could be. If we had found that Montreal was getting her full measure of representation, and Toronto was being left as she is, we would have been loud in our protests, but I think the Government have done the best they can not only for Montreal, but for Toronto and the other ridings, and I think we should support the Government in what they are doing in this Bill, and I am sure that, when the time for redistribution comes again, the Government will as far as possible give us such representation as we ought to have. As to the amendment of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Denison), it does not affect my riding, but I sympathize with him in his desire to have his riding divided into two, and I shall support it.

Mr. DENISON. Although I agree a good deal with the speech of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) in advocating that we should have six members for the city of Toronto, still I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that the Government have to look about and find where they will get those seats in the Province of Ontario. Every one who has heard this debate must have seen the difficulty in which the Government were placed, or in which the Opposition, if they were here, would find themselves in doing away with constituencies in order to find additional representation for Toronto. The Government have dealt with Toronto as they have with Montreal. They have not given us the full representation we ought to have, but they have done the best they could, and, feeling that to be the case, I will heartily support the Government in giving us four members in Toronto. I might add that, if Ontario had been entitled to seven or eight additional members, as we hoped at one time, there would not have been so great a difficulty, and then I have no doubt that the Government would have given us in Toronto a member for each ward. However, when we have to face the redistribution again, I hope the Government of the day at that time will see that every ward in Toronto shall have its own member.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). I may inform the House of one thing which it does not appear to understand, and that is that, as member for East York, I am as much a member for the city of Toronto as the member for Centre Toronto, and two other members from that city, and my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) also represents the city in the same

way. Probably there is no way to establish that fact better than for us to demand our share of the patronage. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and other speakers have said there is no community of interest in East York as now constituted, part belonging to the county and part to the city. The constitution of the riding as it now is is owing to the fact that there is community of interest and has been from the first. It is quite easy to divide up the city, and I could mark out a constituency which would give a majority of 500 or 600, but I would rather have the constituency remain part city and part county, and I believe the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) entertains the same view. I take it that the Government desire to make as little disturbance as possible in the outlines of constituencies, and that is the statesman's view. Other gentlemen have laid down wide principles, but I say the true principle for statesmen, or even for politicians to adopt is to move along the line of the least resistance, and upon that ground the boundaries of East York are not disturbed. I would like to see Toronto have more representation, but that will come when the increase of population is so much that we can get that representation without wiping out too many of the rural constituencies. You can only do this by leaving it to an increase of population to get an increase of membership.

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When the subject was discussed of giving an additional representative to Toronto, the matter was pretty fully considered, and it was deemed best that as regards the west riding we should not attempt to divide it at the present time. I understand that a portion of that riding—and I speak with great diffidence because I have no personal knowledge of that locality—is a portion which is filling up pretty rapidly, and it was deemed best not to attempt, in this Bill, to make a division; of course the division can be made at any time. Taking the whole matter into consideration, and the suddenness with which the proposed division has been offered to the committee, we prefer that the division should not be attempted at the present time. Before the Bill comes actually into operation there may be another opportunity to consider what division line should be adopted, and by that time the population will probably be more settled and definite than it is now, as between the two proposed ridings. Another circumstance, however, perhaps not a very important one, is that the names of Centre, East Centre, and West Centre, &c., are rather confusing. Altogether the matter requires a little more consideration than we can give it at this stage.

Amendment negatived and sub-section agreed to.

In Nova Scotia,—

(a.) The County of Queen's and the County of Shelburne shall together form one electoral district, which shall be known as the electoral district of Shelburne and Queen's, and shall return one member.

Mr. FORBES. Before you put that question affecting Queen's and Shelburne, I would like to express myself as opposed to that section of this Bill, and I desire to protest against the change which is proposed by the Government. I regret that in the history of Canada it has become necessary to forfeit, in one of the provinces of the Dominion, a member. In 1867 we started with 19 members for the Province of Nova Scotia, and in 1872, in the readjustment of representation, Nova Scotia was given two more members. The population of that province was then 50,000 or 60,000 less than it is now. At that time the increase was given to the Counties of Pictou and Cape Breton. The argument used on that occasion in favour of giving increased representation to these two counties, was thus stated by the then Hon. Mr. Tupper, now High Commissioner to England:

"They would give an additional member to the County of Pictou, the second largest county in that province, and the other to the County of Cape Breton, the third largest county, in which the increase of population had been greater during the last decade than any other counties of the province."

Taking that as a principle upon which Nova Scotia was entitled to increased representation, probably the Government were quite right in according increased representation to Pictou and Cape Breton, as at that time they stood second and third in point of population, coming after the County of Halifax. Since then, I am sorry to say, the County of Pictou has receded; during the last ten years it was one of the counties in that province which lost very largely in population; in fact her loss was about 1,000, while the other counties, notably those of Queen's and Shelburne, were among those which increased their population. Cape Breton has also increased during the last decade, but not nearly so much as some of the other counties. For instance, the increase in the County of Halifax was 3,000, in the County of Cumberland it was 7,161. Therefore, the reason as then laid down by Dr. Tupper why those counties should have increased representation, if used to-day as an argument, would not justify the Government in uniting Queen's and Shelburne and thus depriving the province of a member, as they intend to do by this Bill. I urge that it would justify them in taking away one of the members from either the County of Pictou or the County of Cape Breton, instead of uniting the two Counties of Queen's and Shelburne. I do not want to charge the Government with an attempt to prevent what is one of the great commercial interests of the Maritime Provinces, from having its just representation in this House. It has been stated that equalization of population, together with community of interests, are the principles which guided the Government in framing this Bill. Now, upon the basis of equalization of population, I intend shortly to show, and I trust satisfactorily, that the change proposed by this section is not justified; on the contrary, more anomalies will exist after this Bill is adopted than have existed at any time previous. I may say that community of commercial interests is not observed by the change proposed in this Bill. The south shore of Nova Scotia is notably a community which is chiefly engaged in the fishing industry, and the people do a large foreign trade with the West Indies. Therefore, fishing and commerce should be considered as the two great industries of the shore counties. Now, let us group the counties of Nova Scotia with that object in view. For instance, take the six counties of Richmond, Cape Breton, Victoria, Inverness, Antigonish and Pictou; these have eight members, and they might properly be considered as constituting the coal district of the Province of Nova Scotia. Their united interests are in the coal industry, and all other industries of those counties are second, I may say, to

the great coal industry. It has been rightly said by the Minister of Justice in the discussion on this Bill, as well as by other members on both sides of the House, that where a great body of the people have a common interest, they do not need so much representation in this House as the scattered rural districts with diversified and varied interests. I think the principle laid down by the British North America Act, which prescribes the way in which the county representation shall be fixed for each province, was adopted for the purpose of allowing each province to fix the total number of members which it shall send to this House, but it does not bind the Government to say that every 22,000 of the people in that province—as that is the unit for Nova Scotia—wherever they may be situated, shall have a member. It is upon the same principle the Government has refused to give further increased representation to the cities of Montreal and Toronto. I claim that the counties which I have just enumerated, which may be called the coal district of Nova Scotia, are not entitled to as much representation as would bring them up to the rate of one member for every 22,000. The aggregate population of these six counties is 137,442, which gives to each one of the eight members a unit of 17,180; in other words, these six counties have one member for every 17,000 of their population. Let us look at the Atlantic group, where we have a gross population of 167,474, with seven members only. Those seven members include the two members for Queen's and Shelburne, and under the present Bill the number will be reduced to six members. Under the present representation a member represents over 27,000 people, and therefore the population is not as fairly represented in this House as is the population of the counties which are called the coal counties. If we look at the Bay of Fundy group, which are more particularly called the agriculture or fruit group, we have six counties with six members, and an aggregate population of 145,579, which divided among six members gives an average unit of 24,262 to each member. Therefore, if you take the representation of Nova Scotia in that way of community of interest, it will be found that the counties called the coal counties are over-represented in comparison with the other counties. I do not say they are more represented than they should be, for they are ably represented in some respects by worthy men, but in dealing with the rest of the province the Government have not dealt with it in that fair and just way which should mark all their actions. For that reason alone, the Minister of Justice and his colleagues having charge of the redistribution of the seats in Nova Scotia should, upon their own sound arguments as regards community of interest, have taken away a representative from some other section and not have gone to the shore counties of Queen's and Shelburne. View this matter in another light, and take the counties of Cape Breton and contrast them with the representation of the other counties of the province. Cape Breton has four counties. At one time it formed an independent province, and the people have within recent years claimed that they still stand alone, and their claims have been acknowledged by the Government in this House. Taking those counties, with a population of 86,769, and dividing the number by four members, each member represents 17,357 people. Take the rest of the counties of Nova Scotia, with an aggregate population of 363,703, divided among 15 members, who alone are left to Nova Scotia proper after this clause shall become law, we find that each of those 15 members will represent 24,250 persons. So I claim the support of all members from Nova Scotia proper on this point, that the action of the Bill is injurious to the Province of Nova Scotia, that the province is not fairly treated, that community of interests as a basis on which redistribution should take place in that province is not carried out in any degree whatever by the proposal of the Minister of Justice. If we look at the subject again from the point of equalization of the population, we find that the Bill as proposed presents tremendous anomalies. For instance, there is the County of Halifax, with an aggregate population of 71,421, represented by only two members, giving each member 36,000 people. Upon the same basis as which Cape Breton County receives five members, the County of Halifax would be entitled to four. The County of Cumberland has a population of 34,529, which is largely in excess of the County of Cape Breton which has two members, yet it has only one member. The County of Pictou has a population of 34,500, and it has two members. The County of Richmond has a population of only 14,400; Victoria has only 12,600. If you go into New Brunswick you find one county with only 8,300 and it is left undisturbed, and you have an adjoining county with 41,000 represented by only one member. So equalization of population could not have been the ground on which the Government proposed this legislation as regards Nova Scotia. There are in the Province of Quebec 12 counties below the unit of representation, and there are in Nova Scotia eight counties below that unit. I fail to see why the old historic Counties of Queen's and Shelburne should be disturbed. I admit the counties are not gerrymandered or their boundaries disturbed, but this Bill will deprive the shore counties of one representative in Parliament. I claim that both these counties are, properly speaking, Liberal counties, and the policy of the present Government will tend in the future, unless this Bill is greatly amended for the benefit of those shore counties, to further increase the Liberal feeling in those counties. An attempt is made by the Government in this Bill to deprive Nova Scotia of the possibility, I might almost say the certainty, of returning two Liberal members from those constituencies to this House. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) is not present. I wish he were, as I should like to ask him to state whether he is in accord with this change, whether Shelburne or Queen's are wiped out with his consent and approval, or whether he entered his protest unavailingly with the Government, and whether he merely proved himself to be a "fly on the wheel." I would urge the Government—I do not propose to press an amendment, because the Government are bound to take away a member from Nova Scotia—to reconsider this section, and if it could possibly be done, I would ask them to take from some other part of Nova Scotia a seat, which, I regret to say, we are obliged to lose in that province. The County of Queen's has been established since 1761. At that time we sent the first two members to the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia in the persons of Benjamin Gerrish and Nathan Tupper, and the county had the honour of being represented in that Legislature by

Richard J. Uniacke, the Attorney General. At one time Queen's embraced the present Counties of Yarmouth and Shelburne. Some years after the organization of the county, Yarmouth applied to be set off, and the request was acceded to. Then Shelburne became quite populous, having 16,000 people, mostly United Empire Loyalists from the New England States. Shelburne applied to be severed from Yarmouth, and it became a unit and county of itself. From that day down to this, over 100 years, these historic Counties of Queen's and Shelburne have had existence as part and parcel of Nova Scotia, with municipal boundaries undisturbed. And now in this, the nineteenth century, after 25 years of Confederation and 14 years of the National Policy, we are told that, as these counties have so far retrograded and fallen short of the march of progress made by the rest of the province, they must be shorn of their member and one or other must lose a representative. I take this as a direct reflection on the people of those counties, and I am sure all parties will regret that the people have to lose a member. For the arguments I have advanced and for the arguments advanced by the Minister of Justice himself as to equalization of population and as to community of interests, upon these grounds alone I ask the hon. gentleman to stop the course of this Bill and to see whether it would not be advisable in the best interests of that province, not to disturb the Counties of Queen's and Shelburne, but to restore the County of Cape Breton or Pictou—I do not care which he takes—to its original position of having only one member. The hon. member for Cumberland at that time represented as a reason why Pictou should have two members, that it had progressed in population, and on the same argument I ask that the Counties of Queen's and Shelburne should now be left with one member each. I do not intend to make any amendment, but I enter my protest against taking away from these old Counties of Queen's and Shelburne one or other of their members. I myself would be willing to die a political death providing these counties were restored to their original boundaries, because I do not want to see any interest in Nova Scotia deprived of representation at this critical period when our foreign trade is entitled to all the representation it can have on the floor of this House. I again protest against taking away a member from one or other of these counties, and depriving their industries of representation here, and I ask that the matter be reconsidered by the Government.

Mr. GILLIES. I think that if I were in the place of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes) I would feel inclined to thank the Government very heartily indeed for the redistribution they have made in the Province of Nova Scotia; for if his chances were narrow before, I believe they are very materially increased now or at all events not lessened by the plan of redistribution proposed. I listened very carefully to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Forbes) and I feel at a loss to know what point he has made to which I should reply; inasmuch as that he began nowhere and ended about the same place. It will be very easy indeed to show how unreasonable his request would be—if I can call it a request—if it were allowed by the Government. Let us look a little into this matter and see by comparison how fair and equitable the redistribution is which has been made in our province. In 1871, when the first decennial census was taken after Confederation the population of Cape Breton as a whole was 75,482. The Island of Cape Breton is comprised of four counties as we all know, the largest of which is the County of Cape Breton, and which at that time had a population of 26,452, Victoria had a population of 11,264, Inverness a population of 23,415, and Richmond a population of 14,458, or a total of 75,482. At that time it was found under the terms af the British North America Act that the Province of Nova Scotia was entitled to two additional representatives, and the Counties of Pictou and Cape Breton were the two most populous counties in the province outside of the County of Halifax, which when we entered into Confederation was represented by two members here. Strenuous efforts were made in 1871, by the representatives of the County of Halifax, Mr. Power and Mr. Jones, to have the County of Halifax get one of the two additional representatives. So much did they contend for that that the late Mr. Power moved an amendment to the scheme of the Government asking that a third member be given to the County of Halifax, and that amendment was defeated upon a division. However, the instincts that possessed the Grit party at that time seem to be perpetuated in the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes), as he seems to possess their desire to deprive Cape Breton of any influence this Government confers upon it by giving it just representation in this House. At the time the additional member was given to Cape Breton, its unit was 15,096. The late census shows that Cape Breton has a population of 86,789, or a unit for five members of 17,358, showing an increase of unit of 2,262 over that of 1871, when the additional member was given to Cape Breton. I am prepared to show that no matter what grouping of counties may be made, the present division is the fairest that could be arrived at by the Government, and I am prepared to show a series of groupings or combinations of counties which if made in Nova Scotia proper would show a vastly inferior unit to that now possessed by Cape Breton with its five members. That being the case I think that every reasonable member in this House will concede the justice of allowing Cape Breton to retain her present representation. If we take the population of Cape Breton in 1871, and make a combination of the Counties of Digby, Shelburne, Queen's and Pictou, the following is the result:—Digby, population, 17,037; Shelburne, 12,417; Queen's, 10,054; Pictou, 32,144; or an aggregate population for these four counties of 72,152. They have five members, and the unit for these counties is 14,430, or smaller than the unit for Cape Breton with her five members in 1871. Now, what do we find in 1891? We find that the combined population of the four counties I have just mentioned, Digby, Shelburne, Queen's and Pictou was 80,000, or a unit of 16,000, showing a unit in favour of the four counties of Cape Breton of 1,358 with her five members. That is one combination of four counties on the mainland or Nova Scotia proper, which shows an inferior unit as compared with the four counties of Cape Breton, and that is, I believe, a strong point in favour of the present distribution being left as it was in 1871. Take another combination of counties on the mainland, and instead of Digby let us substitute Guysborough, and take the Counties

of Guysborough, Shelburne, Pictou and Queen's. We find in 1871, these four counties had a population of 71,670 or a unit of 14,332, which showed a unit in favour of Cape Breton four counties of 1,764.

Mr. FORBES. Why does the hon. gentleman take these four counties; why not take some other four?

Mr. GILLIES. I am taking a combination of four counties on the mainland and showing that their unit is less than the unit of Cape Breton's four counties, and my argument is therefore legitimate and proper. I am confining myself to no one four counties, but I am making a grouping of counties on the mainland and comparing their unit with the Cape Breton unit, and if the Cape Breton unit exceeds that of the mainland combination, then my argument is conclusive and the Government's method of dealing with the measure is eminently fair. Now, let us take another group, the County of Annapolis, the garden of Nova Scotia as it is called. We find that, in 1871, the four Counties of Annapolis, Shelburne, King's and Pictou had a combined population of 73,236, giving a unit of 14,647, or a unit in favour of Cape Breton over those four counties of 449. In 1891 the combined population of those four counties was 79,455, giving a unit of 15,891, a unit in favour of Cape Breton as against those four counties of 1,467. This, I think, eminently shows the justice of the action of the Government in leaving the distribution as it was established in 1871, and knocks the bottom, if bottom there was, out of the argument of the hon. member for Queen's. But suppose the advice of the hon. member for Queen's had been taken, and the member had been taken from Cape Breton, Nova Scotia being left as it was, what would we find? That the unit in the four counties in the three combinations I have made, would be in favour of Cape Breton, by 5,697 in the first combination, 5,580 in the second, and 6,237 in the third. What would the hon. gentleman have done? He would have the unit in Cape Breton put at nearly 22,000—21,000 and some hundreds; while the unit on the mainland in the combinations of counties named would be 14,430, 16,000, 15,460, and 15,891. As I said before, this shows how far adrift my hon. friend was in his study of the question, if he did give any study to it. It also shows an unfairness upon his part towards Cape Breton that seems to permeate the political party to which he clings. But I have another combination—King's, Shelburne, Queen's, and Digby, which is equally disadvantageous to the position taken by the hon. member for Queen's. It would show a unit of 16,518, as against the unit in Cape Breton of 17,358, or a difference in favour of Cape Breton of 840. Apart from these figures, there are other and equally potent reasons why the representation of Cape Breton should be left undisturbed. The Island of Cape Breton is practically a separate territory from Nova Scotia proper. Nova Scotia has had an immense influence in the councils of the country, for incidental reasons, beyond those that Cape Breton ever did or could enjoy. For instance, Halifax is represented in this House by two members, and the Local House sits there; the Legislative Council is there, the Supreme Court is there. Nova Scotia is also represented by two Cabinet Ministers in this House and these two Ministers come from the mainland, and, in that way, it has a preponderating influence in the Federal Parliament such as Cape Breton does not and cannot, for a long time, if ever, possess. It must also be borne in mind that the principle of adhering to county boundaries has been faithfully observed by this Bill. Queen's and Shelburne are contiguous counties: their interests are identical, and their combined population is only 25,000 less than the County of Cape Breton or Inverness. Nothing fairer could be than to unite the two smallest counties on the mainland. Now, I may say that I did not intend to speak on this question and would not have done so had my learned friend from Queen's not spoken in the manner he has done. I think that he should feel infinitely obliged to the power that advised the present redistribution so far as the County of Queen's is concerned, because, in the two counties which are united, namely, Shelburne and Queen's, the chances are largely in the hon. gentleman's favour. Taking the last election returns as a test, we find that the hon. gentleman was returned in Queen's by a majority of 101, while the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) was returned by a majority of only 20. Putting these two together it is very evident that the chances are largely in favour of the nominee of the Reform party. That goes to show that the Government were not animated by any desire to unduly favour the party supporting them in this House. Therefore, I think they are entitled to credit, and, if there is any disposition to be fair on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, they will give them that credit and support this Bill.

Mr. BORDEN. I am not very much inclined to differ from the conclusions of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, although I differ from him in the method which he took for arriving at those conclusions. When he says that the Island of Cape Breton is a community by itself, and is entitled, for special local reasons, to larger representation than the rest of the Province of Nova Scotia, I am inclined to agree with him. But the Island of Cape Breton, as everybody knows, though the hon. gentleman did not state it, was at one time a province by itself; and that very fact is a reason why in this Legislature that collection of counties might be granted larger representation than the unit of the Province of Nova Scotia would entitle them to. But when my hon. friend undertakes to sustain his position by making fanciful aggregations of counties, such as Digby, Shelburne, Queen's and Pictou—Pictou and Shelburne being at the extreme opposite ends of Nova Scotia proper, and having no community of interest—in order to prove his position, I think he can scarcely be serious. The hon. gentleman selects the counties having the smallest populations in the Province of Nova Scotia, joins them together, and then he says: See how these counties in the province are over-represented. Then he says: If that does not suit you, I will take the next smallest county, Guysborough, and put that in the combination, and the advantage is still with Nova Scotia proper. Why did not the hon. gentleman take, for instance, the Counties of Halifax and Cumberland and Lunenburg and add them together, divide them by the representation, and see where he would come out? He would find that he would have a unit of 36,000 for each representative. I have only to mention those figures to show the absurdity of my hon. friend's argument, and he has weakened his case,

because he had a good one, by resorting to methods of that kind. I say again I am with the hon. gentleman when he undertakes to say there are special reasons. Cape Breton was at one time a province, and there are special interests to be considered with respect to it. When he makes that statement, I am with him, and am prepared to state that the Island of Cape Breton is entitled to a rather higher rate of representation than the old Province of Nova Scotia. But this point strikes me with reference to this Bill, as it affects the Province of Nova Scotia. The Government, so far as the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are concerned, seem to have had one idea, and that was to maintain the county lines in those two provinces. Why, I could point out that some of the most extraordinary discrepancies exist in those provinces with reference to the numerical strength of the population in the different constituencies. As I understand it, in this Bill there has been the intention to follow various principles. The Minister of Public Works resented the statement of the leader of the Opposition that there was no principle in the Bill. Why, he said, there is every principle in the Bill. We have, he said, the principle of observing county boundaries, we have the principle of equalizing the population, and we have observed geographical proximity. Yes, we have, but unfortunately the Government have applied each of those principles where it suited their own interests best, and the objection I make to this whole Bill is that they have not followed out any one particular principle and applied that equally to all the provinces and all the counties of this Dominion, as they should have done. So far as the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are concerned, it seems we have a close adherence to the principle of maintaining county boundaries. But I say if they had desired also to apply the other principle, which they say they have followed and which we know they have followed in certain other provinces, the principle of equalizing population, they could have found instances in the Province of Nova Scotia of enormous disparity in the populations of the constituencies. And if they had seen fit to consider that principle in connection with the principle of maintaining county boundaries, I believe they might have found another means of withdrawing one representative from the Province of Nova Scotia than the one they have seen fit to adopt. However, I do not propose to quarrel very much with what they have done in Nova Scotia. Had they pursued the same course with reference to all the provinces, I do not believe we could have very much to complain of; but what I wish to impress upon the House is this, that if it is a good principle to apply to the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that county lines should not be disturbed, why is not that as good a principle to apply to the Province of Prince Edward Island, which is adjacent to Nova Scotia? We have in New Brunswick a county of 8,000 people and another county of 40,000—one county five times greater than the other, yet there is no change in the county lines. We have in the Province of Nova Scotia the County of Halifax with 72,000 people, having two representatives only. We have the Counties of Cape Breton and Pictou with some 34,000 people each, having two representatives, and alongside the County of Pictou we have the County of Cumberland—which by the way has increased in population far more rapidly than any other county in the Maritime Provinces during the past ten years—with exactly the same population as Pictou, and thus having just one-half the representation of Pictou. Then it is remarkable that while this principle was strongly maintained in Nova Scotia, it should be lost sight of in Prince Edward Island. I believe that every argument which can be used for the maintenance of county lines in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick applies equally well to Prince Edward Island; and I do hope that when that province is reached, hon. gentlemen will see their way to changing the Bill and adopting the principle followed in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I would point out to my hon. friends supporting the Government in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, that while I appreciate their efforts to maintain this principle with reference to those provinces, they have not done their duty, when they have said: We have got this principle respected in our own provinces, and we will let the other provinces go their own road. It is their duty to see, not only that no injustice is done the provinces they themselves represent, but that none is done in any province, particularly a small province like Prince Edward Island, situated so close to their own. These hon. gentlemen do not know how soon the argument may be used with reference to their provinces, that as the county lines have not been respected in the others, now is the time to infringe upon the county lines in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. In their own interest, it is their duty, if they are not impelled by any higher principle, to see that the Government respect the county divisions of Prince Edward Island. So far as the particular clause with reference to Nova Scotia is concerned, while I sympathize with the hon. member for Queen's, while I think that the fishing interest to which he has referred is entitled to larger representation than any other interest in the province, still I am very glad indeed that the Government have seen fit to observe the principle of preserving the county lines, and upon the whole, I do not think that the alterations made in this Bill are very prejudicial to the interests of Nova Scotia, particularly in view of what has taken place in other provinces.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think I am right in stating that the conclusion which my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) has arrived at is that the readjustment in Nova Scotia is unobjectionable, and, indeed, is so fair as to induce him to suggest a comparison to the disadvantage of other parts of the Bill. I can only say with regard to that, that it is, in drawing a Bill of this kind, impossible to adopt any one principle and to carry it to its end without producing some injustice or some ill effect and running counter to some other principle, which is quite as valuable and quite as necessary to be observed. The scheme by which we adhere to county lines in one province with a number of representatives approaching very closely to the number of counties may not be at all applicable to another province where the representation far exceeds in numbers the number of counties. As regards what has been said by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Forbes), I can hardly expect that, when his county is affected as it is by this section of the Bill, we should

receive his cordial approval of what has been done. My hon. friend made a reference, however, to the absence of the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White). I have to tell him that the hon. member for Shelburne is as reluctant as he to have his county interfered with, and that he has made as strong representations to the Government on that subject. My hon. friend is mistaken in thinking that in proposing this contrary to the wishes of the member for Shelburne, we indicate a contempt of his views and his influence with the Government, or that he could properly be described as a "fly on the wheel," which I think was the phrase used by the hon. member for Queen's. The hon. member for Shelburne is the last man in the House who could be so described. He is not only a faithful and industrious representative of his county, but he is a gentleman of the highest talents and of great experience in public affairs in his own province, to which I ought to be able specially to testify, because I have not only observed his career in this House, but I had the pleasure and honour of serving in the executive of the Province of Nova Scotia with him for four years, and I had abundant opportunities of knowing his capacity for the discharge of public business. We have found it necessary to disregard his wishes in this particular for reasons which I will state to the committee. The duty was cast upon us of making the representation one less in number from our province, and we discharged that duty by making as little disturbance as possible. We had the most inviting opportunity offered to us by the fact that the two smallest counties, Queen's and Shelburne, lay close together.

Mr. FORBES. They are not the two smallest counties.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes.

Mr. FORBES. Richmond is smaller.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Richmond is in the other end of the province and has a population of 14,400, while Shelburne has 14,900, and alongside of Shelburne lies the County of Queen's with a population of only 10,600.

Mr. FORBES. Victoria has only 12,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is 2,000 more than Queen's. I was wrong in saying that those were the two smallest constituencies in the province. Queen's is the smallest, and it lies alongside of Shelburne, which is one of the smallest, and the two together will make a constituency of about 25,000, which is less, as my hon. friend has shown, than the County of Colchester, the County of Cumberland or the County of Lunenburg, and is probably less than the County of Inverness. Then again, as regards these two counties they have as much affinity in their pursuits and occupations and communications with each other as can be found in any two counties in the province. We have paid attention to the population of the counties, though I do not claim by any means that we have tried to equalize the population, but we endeavoured to get a constituency as near the unit as possible, and the united constituency will have a population very little more than the adjoining County of Yarmouth, which has 22,218. It is true that there are anomalies in the province which we have not sought to redress. There is no particular grievance arising out of those anomalies, but, if we had left Queen's unamalgamated with Shelburne, we would have left uncured an anomaly greater than any which now exists. If we had obtained a decrease in the number of members by any other means, we would have had the unit of about 22,000, and yet we would have left the County of Queen's with less than half of that, and so would have left an anomaly which cannot be found in any other province.

Mr. FORBES. There is Restigouche, in New Brunswick, with only 8,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will see about that when we come to it. It would be absurd to say that the leaving of Queen's with less than half the unit could be justified by any parallel in any other province. As to the County of Pictou which returns two members, her population divided by two gives a unit of upwards of 17,250, and Cape Breton divided by two for the same reason would give upwards of 17,000 likewise, while Queen's would show a population of only 10,600. I think the fairness of the scheme as regards Nova Scotia is so obvious that it does not require to be enlarged upon.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Pictou has less than half the population of Halifax, and it has the same representation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Halifax is a city, and has the advantages which cities have, not only the interest which members representing other constituencies have there, but also the advantages which city constituencies have as to the discussion of popular questions and the means by which they can make their influence felt on others. I think we should not be justified in taking away one of the representatives from Pictou or Cape Breton. I was glad to hear the observations of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) as to the Island of Cape Breton. I think there is some force to be attached to the consideration that the Island of Cape Breton was for many years an independent province, and something is due to its insular position which prevents its being in immediate contact or affinity with counties on the mainland, and its interests, its mineral and fishing interests, are localized to a large extent, even its fishing interests are different from those of the mainland.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a consideration that cannot be resisted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the Island of Cape Breton were a province by itself, my hon. friend will admit that she would have received a larger representation than that which this Bill gives, she would undoubtedly never have come into Confederation without it. She has always felt that her representation in the Provincial Legislature, and her representation here, even as given by this Bill, is not adequate to her interests, considering her former position as an independent province. But that view has not been concurred in to the full extent by the representatives from the mainland, nor concurred in by the Legislature itself. While that is a reason for leaving Cape Breton Island as it is, it is a stronger reason still against the reduction of her representation, which would place her unit at about 21,700.

Mr. FORBES. Not as at present.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I say if we take away one member it would leave her unit at about 21,700, while the unit on the mainland would be 24,248; but that would be counting the city of Halifax with

its population of nearly 40,000. In all the calculations which our friends opposite have presented to the House as regards the redistribution of rural districts, they claim the cities should be left out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Only the large cities.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If my hon. friend assumes that Halifax is not a large city, I shall have to invite him to come down and see it, and I am sure he will meet with such a friendly reception that he will come to the conclusion it is a very large city.

Mr. FORBES. With regard to the statement of the Minister of Justice that if Cape Breton were a province by herself, she would still be, as I understood him, entitled to have her full representation of five members. I fail to catch his argument if that is not what he intended, because if Cape Breton was to lose one member she would still have over 21,000 for each member for those four counties, or from that group of counties; whereas the main part of the Province of Nova Scotia would have a unit of over 24,000 for each member Therefore, I still think that the counties of Cape Breton, taken as a whole, ought to lose one member on the very ground that the Minister himself has advanced. The rest of the province would only have about 21,000 to each member if they were allowed to retain their full complements. There would then be nearly the same unit for Cape Breton and the rest of the province, about 21,000 for each member.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman make any suggestion for arranging the redistribution in any other way?

Mr. FORBES. The suggestion I would make, if the hon. Minister will accept it, is to deprive Pictou of the additional member which was given it in 1872, for the sole reason, which was then stated by Dr. Tupper, that she had increased in population in a ratio far above that of the other counties of the province. Since the last decennial census we find that Pictou has receded in population in a ratio greater than the other counties, whereas Queen's and Shelburne have actually increased. I say that if you apply the same rule which was applied by Dr. Tupper when Pictou was given an additional member, you would to-day deprive that county of one member, and leave Queen's and Shelburne as they are.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My hon. friend will admit that Pictou has a larger population than she had when the two members were given to her.

Mr. FORBES. But after this Bill passes she will have a representative for every 17,000, while Queen's and Shelburne will have one member for 25,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If you take a member from Pictou and leave Queen's, the member for Pictou would represent 34,000 and the member for Queen's 10,600.

Mr. FORBES. In the Province of New Brunswick we have one member representing 41,000, and another member representing only 8,000, side by side. In Quebec, the County of Drummond and Arthabaska sends one member and has a population of 43,000, while Quebec West has one member and only a population of 9,241. Cumberland has a population of 34,529 and only one member, and Victoria only 12,000 and one member.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Does the hon. gentleman recommend that principle to be applied to Nova Scotia?

Mr. FORBES. I say the argument of the Minister does not apply. If he proposes to leave that anomaly in existence in one province, why not leave it in another?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are not on the hunt for anomalies. There may be local reasons which may prevent Westmoreland from having the representation which she ought to have if New Brunswick could have another member. No other member is available for that province just now, and no arrangement could be made, probably, for giving her an additional member without creating disturbance in all the constituencies of the province. There may be reasons of that kind which would prevent the removal of an anomaly; but we do not leave it because we are fond of anomalies, nor do we desire to duplicate it.

In New Brunswick,—

(*a.*) The electoral district of the city of St. John shall consist of the city of St. John, as now existing under provincial legislation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of that is to provide that the city of Portland, which has been amalgamated with St. John, shall be taken into the city limits to form part of the constituency. The city of Portland was formerly in the county. Allow me to suggest that section (*b*) should stand for to-day; I do not expect to offer any change in it, but as the members representing the city have been detained by a railway accident, I prefer to take that section up when they are here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the population of the City and County of St. John?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. St. John City has 24,183, and the county 25,390.

(*c.*) The County of Sunbury and the County of Queen's shall together form one electoral district, which shall be known as the electoral district of Queen's and Sunbury, and shall return one member only.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I shall ask the committee to make it the electoral district of Sunbury and Queen's; that has been agreed upon by the members particularly interested. Sunbury was the old name; when the Province of New Brunswick was formerly united with Nova Scotia, it was called the County of Sunbury, and inasmuch as it is the oldest name, we preferred to keep it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Sunbury has not got half the population of Queen's.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Still it is the oldest name; that does not make any difference. Sunbury has a population of 5,759, and Queen's, 12,158.

In the Province of Manitoba,—

(*b.*) The electoral district of Lisgar, which shall comprise the rural municipalities of Rhineland, Stanley, Pembina, Louise, Turtle Mountain, Argyle, Lorne, Dufferin, and the town of Nelson.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the population of each of the districts in Manitoba?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The population of Winnipeg is 25,639; Lisgar, under this Bill, will have 29,287; Brandon, 22,403; Marquette, 12,509; Macdonald, 22,104; Selkirk, 23,560; Provencher, 25,104. As regards Marquette I ask the com-

mittee to bear in mind the explanation I gave in introducing the Bill. Marquette is a district into which population is flowing rapidly, and it is probable the inequality which appears there now will be redressed before the Act comes into operation.

In Manitoba,—

(*c.*) The electoral district of Brandon, which shall comprise the rural municipalities of Morton, Winchester, Pipestone, Wallace, Woodworth, Sifton, Daly, Whitewood, Glenwood, Elton, Cornwallis, and Oakland, the city of Brandon, and the village of Birden."

(*d.*) The electoral district of Marquette, which shall comprise the rural municipalities of Odanah, Glen William, Harrison, Saskatchewan, Blanchard, Strathclair, Shoal Lake, Oak River, Miniota, Archie, Birtle, Ellice, Russell, Silver Creek, Rossburn, Shell River, Boulton, the town of Minnedosa, the town of Birtle and the town of Rapid City, and also all the unorganized territory lying between the western boundary of the Province of Manitoba and the easterly limit of range seventeen, west of the principal meridian, north of township eighteen in ranges seventeen and twenty-two, inclusive, west of the principal meridian, and also lying north of township twenty-eight in ranges twenty-three to twenty-nine, inclusive, west of the principal meridian, to the northern boundary of the Province of Manitoba."

(*e.*) The electoral district of Macdonald, which shall comprise the rural municipalities of South Cypress, South Norfolk, North Norfolk, North Cypress, Langford, Rosedale, Lansdowne, Westbourne and Portage la Prairie, and the towns of Portage la Prairie, Gladstone, and Neepawa, and the village of Carberry, together with all the unorganized territory lying within and bounded by the following limits, that is to say: on the west by the eastern limit of range seventeen, west of the principal meridian, on the east by a line running through the middle of Lake Manitoba, on the south by the north boundary of township twenty, and the same produced east to said line running through the middle of Lake Manitoba, and on the north by the northern boundary of the Province of Manitoba."

(*f.*) The electoral district of Selkirk, which shall comprise the rural municipalities of St. François Xavier, Macdonald, Woodlands, St. Laurent, Gimli, St. Andrews, St. Paul's, Kildonan, Assiniboia, Springfield, St. Clement's, Rockland, West and East Selkirk, together with all the unorganized territory lying north of the municipalities of St. Laurent and Gimli, the same being bounded on the west by the eastern boundary of the electoral district of Macdonald, as described in the next preceding paragraph, and on the east by Lake Winnipeg to the northern boundary of the Province of Manitoba, and also all the unorganized territory lying east of the municipalities of Springfield and St. Clement's and of Lake Winnipeg, and north of the line between townships nine and ten, extending to the northern boundary of the Province of Manitoba, including all the islands in Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In sub-section (*f*) relating to the electoral district of Selkirk, I see that the Government are inviting the House to proceed on the assumption that the eastern boundary of Lake Winnipeg extends due north from the western boundary of the Province of Ontario. The decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was that after you went north of Albany River, the eastern boundary of the Province of Manitoba extended eastward until it met a line drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. Counsel for the Province of Manitoba before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and counsel for the Dominion both maintained that the Province of Manitoba extended eastward to the meridian of the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi. Ontario contested that so far as she was concerned, and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council upheld the claim of Ontario to everything south of the Albany River westward as far as the north-west angle. But Ontario did not contest the claim made by Manitoba and admitted by the counsel for the Dominion as to the territories lying north of what she claimed was in the Province of Ontario. The decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was that when north of the Albany River, the Province of Manitoba extended eastward to a line drawn due north from the Ohio and Mississippi. I do not know whether Manitoba desires it or not, but it is under the decision, within the Province of Manitoba, and if it is not the desire of Manitoba to retain that territory it ought to seek, along with the Dominion Government under the British North America Act of 1871, to establish the eastern boundary. There is no doubt the intention was, by the Act extending the boundaries of Manitoba, not to go further east than the western limit of Ontario. You have, however, the decision of the highest court determining the boundary of Manitoba on the east when you go north of the Albany River. I do not know how far these words in section (*f*), "and also all the unorganized territories lying east of the municipalities," would include the whole of that territory in the province.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council expressed that opinion in a case not referred to them, and they made such a gross geographical mistake on that subject that I suppose they would be glad to take it back if the opportunity were afforded them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the Minister of Justice will see that they had occasion for it. The question was, where are the boundaries as between Manitoba and Ontario, and not simply, where are the boundaries on the west of Ontario, and they followed the line on the north of Ontario and on the south of Manitoba, as well as on the west of Ontario, and that was before them. It seems to me that it would require mutual legislation under the Act of 1871 to make it otherwise.

Mr. McGREGOR. There are only a few fishermen along that line.

In the Province of British Columbia,—

(*a.*) The electoral district of New Westminster shall return two members.

Mr. CORBOULD. I wish to propose an amendment to that section. The electoral district of New Westminster according to the proposed Bill will return two members. I think it is not advisable to carry that out, and I would ask to be allowed to amend that section so as to divide the district and let each district return one member. I propose the following division of the district:—

The electoral district of Burrard shall consist of New Westminster district and the Coast district, as defined in a public notice issued from the Lands and Works Office, on the fifteenth day of December, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine, by the desire of the Governor, and purporting to be in accordance with the provisions of the thirty-ninth clause of the 'Mineral Ordinance,' 1869, saving and excepting thereout all that portion of New Westminster district lying to the east of the meridian of 122° 45' west longitude, and to the south of the parallel of 49° 15' of north latitude produced east from the Gulf of Georgia to its intersection with the aforesaid meridian of longitude; and such electoral district shall return one member.

The electoral district of New Westminster shall consist of that portion of New Westminster district as defined by the aforesaid public notice lying to the east of the Meridian of 122° 45' of west longitude, and to the south of the line of 49° 15' of north latitude produced east from the Gulf of Georgia to its intersection with the aforesaid meridian; and such electoral district shall return one member.

By making this division the population of the district of Burrard will be about 24,500 and the population of the New Westminster district will

be about 17,500, but I may say that the voting population of Burrard district and New Westminster district would be about the same, as there are on the Coast district about 7,000 Indians. Therefore, it would bring the voting population of each of the two districts to about 17,500, as nearly as possible.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Indians are not voters with you.

Mr. CORBOULD. The Indians are not voters. The chief town of the district of New Westminster would be the city of Westminster, and the chief town of the district of Burrard would be the city of Vancouver. There is some little difficulty in making a division so far as territory is concerned. The district of Burrard will be a very large district, but still a large proportion of that district is unsettled at present. This division makes the district of New Westminster look apparently small on the map, although it is some 45 miles one way and 80 miles another. The population of the whole district lies to the south. Heretofore the district of New Westminster has extended from the 49th parallel to Alaska, some 1,500 miles long and 300 miles wide; and the only way to divide it is as I have proposed so as to divide the population.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the dividing line were extended to the sea, would there be any population north of that line entitled to representation?

Mr. CORBOULD. About 4,000 population.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the amendment proposed by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Corbould) is a reasonable one. The application to divide the district is supported by the argument that the district is very extensive territorially, and contains two rival cities, both growing and important, and the opportunity is presented of making a division which will give each of these two cities the rank of chief town of an important and extensive district. I think, therefore, that we should ask the committee to accept the amendment.

Mr. MARA. It is to be regretted that Cariboo, one of the oldest districts in the Province of British Columbia, and one that has probably contributed more revenue to the province than any other, is to be merged into another district; but as Cariboo has decreased in population and New Westminster has increased enormously, and as we have to deal with the population as we find it to-day, I am afraid there is no help for Cariboo, but that it must lose its representative. The district of New Westminster, as the hon. Minister of Justice has stated, is a very extensive one. It contains two friendly but rival cities, and I think it is only right that the district should be divided, so that each city will have a representative here, In the near future, as soon as Cariboo has railway connection with the outside world, I have no doubt that it will be entitled again to have its own representative.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask whether these territorial divisions embrace the whole Province of British Columbia, or whether there is any portion of the province not included in any electoral district?

Mr. MARA. They embrace the entire province. All portions of the province are included.

On sub-section (*p*) Quebec,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Paragraph (*p*) and several others have been redrafted, and I will read paragraph (*p*) as so redrafted, prefacing it with the explanation that it proposes to leave the electoral district of Chateauguay as it is now, except that the Indian village of Caughnawaga will be included in that electoral district:

The electoral district of Chateauguay shall consist of the village of Ormstown, Sault St. Louis (the Indian village of Caughnawaga), and of the parishes of Ste. Martine, St. Urban le Premier, St. Malachie d'Ormstown, Très Saint Sacrement, St. Antoine Abbé, Ste. Clothilde, St. Jean Chrysostome, St. Joachim de Chateauguay and Ste. Philomène."

Mr. LAURIER. Is that the proper designation of Caughnawaga?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the way it is called in the present Act.

Mr. BROWN. There is one point I would like to bring before the committee, and that is the state of the road which leads from Ste. Philomène to the Indian reserve. About six weeks ago, in company with the hon. member for Laprairie, I waited upon the Minister of the Interior and brought before his notice the state of the road in that locality. The Government ought at least to appropriate $1,000 towards its improvement, as it is a work which is absolutely necessary, and is in the interest of the people who have to traverse the county, for there is no other means of communication with the Indian reserve.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Minister of the Interior is not here, but I am sure that the representation made, not only by the inhabitants of the reserve, but by other people surrounding, will be taken into consideration favourably.

Mr. SCRIVER. I merely wish to say, with reference to this road, that the Government have a precedent for taking the action the hon. member for Chateauguay asks them to take. Some years ago, when the late Hon. Mr. Holton represented the county, an appropriation of $800 or $1,000 was made for repairs on this road, and no other grant has been made since. I can say from personal experience that the road is in a condition demanding repair, especially for the convenience of settlers in the parishes, who have to go that way to reach the Caughnawaga village. The Indians who own the reserve are, unfortunately, not disposed to make any more repairs on the road than they are compelled to do, and unless the Government come to the relief of the tribe and the people interested, the inconvenience to the people will be very grave. I sincerely trust this measure of relief will be accorded by the Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know what the repairing of the road has to do with the electoral division, and I presume the candidates will fix the road by arrangement among themselves.

Mr. LAURIER. You are annexing Caughnawaga to Chateauguay, and the member representing that county, who will have to go from Chateauguay to Caughnawaga, will have to travel six or seven miles across the reserve.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is a promise made in advance to the electors by the future member.

Mr. LAURIER. The County of Laprairie not only had promises but was given a post office.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is a hard road to travel to get here, and I presume each candidate would have to take his chances.

In the Province of Quebec,—

The electoral district of Laprairie and Napierville shall consist of the village of Laprairie and the parishes of Laprairie, St. Constant, St. Isidore, St. Jacques le Mineur, St. Philippe, St. Michel Archange, St. Patrice de Sherrington, St. Edouard, St. Cyprien, St. Rémi.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) I want it well understood that I only accept the union of Napierville and Laprairie under the reservation which I still hold to, that there ought not to be any change to the detriment of the rural districts in favour of the towns. And I only rise to say that my electors will certainly prefer the present limits to those of the County of Chateauguay, which they were given before, for they are natural limits.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The County of St. John's and Iberville being united will have a population of about 24,000, but it will be proposed to take away from that constituency the municipality of Lacolle.

Mr. LAURIER. That is already done.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not yet done, but it is proposed to put Lacolle into the County of Missisquoi, which will add 2,500 population to that county and diminish by as much the united population of St. John's and Iberville. It is now proposed that two small parishes, Notre Dame de Stanbridge and Notre Dame des Anges de Stanbridge shall be added to the new County of St. John's and Iberville. These two parishes have, I am informed, a population of about 900, so this will leave the population of St. John's and Iberville about 22,400, which is as close as possible to the unit.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I am sorry to have to differ with the Minister of Customs on this point. I do not see any legitimate reason for adding these municipalities to the County of Iberville. The County of Iberville, united with the County of St. John's, less the parish of Lacolle, will have a population of 21,396, while the County of Missisquoi, by keeping those two parishes which have always been in that county, and with the parish of Lacolle added to it, according to the Government Bill, would have only a population of 21,077, which is still beneath the unit of representation. But, if you detach those two parishes from Missisquoi and attach them to Iberville and St. John's, the latter will have a population of 23,017, which exceeds the unit. By leaving these two municipalities in Missisquoi and annexing Lacolle to that county, you have a population of 21,077, which is still over 200 less than the County of Iberville according to the first proposed arrangement. I, therefore, can see no legitimate reason for making this change. I do not know, but I presume that my hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Baker) has claimed the annexation of Lacolle to Missisquoi, and has asked that it should be detached from St. John's, because about one-half of the population of that parish belongs to the English race, while in the two parishes which it is now proposed to detach from Missisquoi and attach to Iberville the population is almost exclusively French-Canadian. I object to this, because the fact that those people are French-Canadians is no legitimate reason for throwing them into the County of Iberville. This would be simply a repetition of what was attempted to be done with the township of Clarence in Russell, and which was abandoned. The two cases are quite similar, and there is no greater reason for putting these two parishes into the County of Iberville than there was for putting Clarence into the County of Prescott. This proposition of the hon. gentleman would have the effect of diminishing the influence of the French-Canadians in the County of Missisquoi, where that influence is developing every year. I do not think that population will be thankful to the Government for this change. I cannot understand for what reason my hon. friend from Missisquoi should desire to get rid of the French-Canadian population. There is no less exclusive population than the French-Canadians, and that is proved by the fact that there are constituencies in the Province of Quebec where the majority is largely French, and yet they are represented in this House by members of the Anglo-Saxon race. I contend that these two municipalities should remain in Missisquoi, because their annexation to Iberville would raise the population above the unit, while leaving them where they are and annexing Lacolle to Missisquoi would place the population of that constituency at about 200 souls below the population of Iberville and St. John's.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend will not deny my statement that by taking away Lacolle from the united Counties of St. John's and Iberville you add as much, in point of number, of French-speaking electors to Missisquoi than you take away from Missisquoi by adding these two small parishes to Iberville. The population of those two municipalities is only about 900.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I beg your pardon. The population of the two municipalities is 1,621.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Granted, but after that addition St. John's has only 22,000 or 23,000?

Mr. BÉCHARD. Leaving out Lacolle, it would make a population of 21,306.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. And adding the two small parishes?

Mr. BÉCHARD. 23,017.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is about the standard of representation. In Lacolle, which has a population of 2,500, between one-third and one-half of the population is French-speaking, so that the exchange of these parishes from one county to the other is about an equal exchange of French-speaking electors. I hope my hon. friend will not object to that. There is more community of interest, it rectifies the frontier, and it leaves the County of St. John's and Iberville about equal to the unit of representation.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I do not think that the French population of Lacolle is equal in number to the French population of the two municipalities which it is proposed to annex to Iberville. I am surprised that the Government should have come to this de-

cision after the statement which was made this forenoon by the Minister of Public Works, that with regard to the County of Iberville and St. John's it was a settled question, and that no change should be made. I thought I could rely, and I hope I can still rely, upon the word of the Minister of Public Works. I see no legitimate reason to make this change, because, as I have already stated, by keeping these two municipalities in Missisquoi and adding Lacolle, the County of Missisquoi will still be less in population than the County of Iberville by over 200 souls. Now, what is the reason for this change? I see no other than that it will have the effect of decreasing the influence of the French population of the County of Missisquoi.

Mr. BAKER. I had not the advantage of being present at the beginning of this discussion; but I am able to say that my hon. friend is entirely mistaken in supposing that the two parishes of Notre Dame des Anges and Notre Dame de Stanbridge are exclusively French-speaking, although a large majority is French-speaking. But the reason which exists for taking Lacolle into the County of Missisquoi is manifest. That is largely an English-speaking county, they have community of interest, they have sympathy with the people of the County of Missisquoi. There is every reason why the parish of Lacolle should be joined to Missisquoi. There are several strong reasons why the other two parishes referred to should be joined to Iberville. One of the earliest aspirations of my hon. friend from Iberville (Mr. Béchard), when he first entered Parliament, was to detach one of these parishes from the County of Missisquoi and join it to Iberville, which he then represented, and which he has continued so ably to represent up to the present time. The argument which he used then was a most forcible one. Those parishes are an indentation upon the County of Iberville, their business relations lead them in the direction of St. John's. Detaching these parishes from the County of Missisquoi and attaching them to Iberville will accomplish all these objects that seem to be so dear to the heart of the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. SCRIVER. Will it not accomplish some other object too?

Mr. BAKER. Community of interest will be promoted; symmetry of outline will be accomplished; those sharp angles which, according to the hon. gentlemen opposite, are such a disfigurement, will be obliterated. Every reason exists for detaching those parishes from the County of Missisquoi and giving them to the County of Iberville. The population of the parish of Lacolle, by the last census, is 2,528, the population of the two parishes proposed to be detached now is 1,621; so that the population of Missisquoi is increased by 907. The hon. Minister of Public Works stated the other day that the 12 English-speaking counties in the Province of Quebec are over-represented; this will, to a certain extent, rectify that anomaly. Every reason that can impel this committee to change existing boundaries, exists in this case.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think you have given the true reason.

Mr. BAKER. My hon. friend suggested that there may be another reason.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Sympathy.

Mr. BÉCHARD.

Mr. BAKER. I thank my hon. friend for suggesting the word. There is a peculiar kind of sympathy existing between the inhabitants of these parishes and the inhabitants of the County of Iberville.

Mr. SCRIVER. What was the vote of these parishes at the last election?

Mr. BAKER. The parish of Notre Dame des Anges is about equally divided; sometimes there is a majority of five on one side, and sometimes there is a majority of five on the other. The vote largely depends on the questions of administration that are agitating the public mind. The population is an exceedingly intelligent one, and if they find extravagance exists in the administration of public affairs, they withhold their confidence from the Government. This much must be said, that the population, although Liberal in its instincts, Liberal in its habits, and Liberal in its history, voted against the Mercier Government; that is one commendable feature in the history of the parish. The political complexion of the parish of Lacolle is not as pronounced as it is in some other parishes. On the whole, I think that the position of parties will remain much the same, though I confess that there has been usually a certain and a pretty large majority in these two parishes for the Liberal candidate.

Mr. BÉCHARD. The hon. member for Missisquoi has stated that during the early part of my political career I introduced a Bill in this House to include in the County of Iberville the parish of Notre Dame des Anges. That is true, but it is true only in part. It is true that at the solicitation of a few citizens in that part of his county, I introduced a Bill, not to annex the whole parish, but to annex to Iberville a strip which is continued from the parish of St. Alexandre, in the County of Missisquoi. But that is a very small portion of territory, and does not cover more than 10 or 12 farms. My hon. friend opposed the Bill; he wanted to keep those very few people, and he appeared to have more sympathy with them then than he has manifested to-day. But as regards any attempt made to annex the whole people of Notre Dame des Anges and Notre Dame de Stanbridge to the County of Iberville, that never took place. The hon. gentleman now says there are good reasons why the parish of Lacolle should be detached from St. John's and attached to Missisquoi because there is in that parish a large English-speaking element. But according to the hon. gentleman's reasoning, the same reason would be good to leave in Missisquoi Notre Dame des Anges and Notre Dame de Stanbridge, in which there is also a very large English-speaking element according to the statement of the hon. gentleman. Why, then, does the hon. gentleman want to part with those people and exclude them from his constituency and annex them to the County of Iberville, which has already a sufficient population? The hon. gentleman says that change would remove some angles which exist in the county. The hon. gentleman might properly give advice to the Government with respect to other counties, where, from the manner in which they are now constituted, there are a great many angles, and even worse angles than exist in the county of my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman so far has not presented a single legitimate reason in favour of the change proposed. I do not know

the political proclivities of the people of those two municipalities in question, but the hon. gentleman says they are about equally favourable to both political parties, that sometimes there is a majority of five on one side and sometimes a like majority on the other side. If that is the case, it affords no reason why my hon. friend should part with those two municipalities. If accidentally those municipalities gave a majority of five against him, my hon. friend is strong enough not to fear the result of the election owing to that vote. I see no reason, because no plausible reason has been given, for the change proposed. I consider that this is an attempt made to destroy as far as possible the influence of the French-Canadian population which is developing every year in that constituency, and of which the hon. gentleman seems to be afraid. But his fear is groundless, for he knows that there is not under the sun a less exclusive population in their sentiments than the French-Canadian race. This is demonstrated by the fact that there are in the Eastern Townships constituencies where they are largely in the majority, and notwithstanding that fact, those constituencies are represented in this House by English-speaking members. I hope the Government will reconsider their decision and will not repeat here what has been attempted to be done with respect to the township of Clarence, an attempt which has been abandoned, thanks to the sentiment of fairness of the Minister of Justice. I appeal to the Minister of Customs that this county be allowed to remain as it is, inasmuch as with the addition of Lacolle it will be in population below the unit required for returning a member to this House, as it will be only 21,077, while the population of Iberville and St. John's, less Lacolle, will be 21,391, still a population larger than that of the county of my hon. friend. I hope, at all events, that if hon. gentlemen opposite persist in pressing this change, some legitimate reason will be given in support of it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I was very sorry to hear the remarks made by the hon. gentleman. I know it is not the intention of the mover of this proposition to do what is attributed to him, and the hon. gentleman knows as well as any hon. member in this House that the appeal made to prejudice is a wrong appeal on his part. I am not accustomed to hear such appeals from that hon. gentleman; he might have left this appeal to some junior and less experienced member of the party to which he belongs and not have undertaken the job himself. The exchange of electors which is proposed—and I challenge the hon. gentleman to show to the contrary—will not involve a difference of 100 electors speaking the French language. From St. John's and Iberville is taken Lacolle where there are as many French-Canadian electors as there are in the parishes of Notre Dame des Anges and Notre Dame de Stanbridge. I am surprised to hear such remarks from the hon. gentleman. If they were delivered for the purpose of publication in *Hansard* and to be quoted on the hustings afterwards, perhaps they might be useful in one way, a wrong way, I must say, but they are not desirable remarks in this Parliament. I do not practise that kind of appeal to the prejudices. As regards my hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Baker), the French-Canadian electors will no doubt in the future show themselves to be as liberal as they have proved themselves to be in the past. During my hon. friend's long public career he has won the sympathy of the French-Canadian electors and the French-Canadian people in this Dominion. No one among the hon. gentlemen who represent mixed constituencies is more devoid of prejudice than is my hon. friend, who has sat with me for nearly twenty years in the Province of Quebec, both in the Legislature and in the Executive Council. I am here to bear witness that no one can be found who is more devoid of that ill-feeling and of those prejudices than is the hon. member for Missisquoi.

Mr. BÉCHARD. It is not my habit to make any appeal to prejudices, and my conduct in this House up to this time proves my assertion. I am not appealing to prejudices on this occasion any more than on former occasions; but I am opposed to a change which seems to be based upon prejudices. I do not charge the hon. gentleman with the intention of removing that portion of the county from Missisquoi for the exclusive reason that the population there is French Canadian; but I say the effect of the change will be to diminish the influence of the French-Canadians in that constituency. The Minister of Customs seems to indicate that this change is a compensation for the detachment of the parish of Lacolle from the County of St. John's, and its annexation to Missisquoi. Who has asked for the detachment of Lacolle from St. John's? Did the request come through me? I never made any request of that kind. If the parish of Lacolle had been left in St. John's, where it has been since the county has been in existence, I would not have objected; on the contrary, I would have been glad of it; for, although the electors are largely English-speaking people, if I were a candidate, I would have good hope of being welcomed by those people. But I repeat that I see no legitimate reason for the removal of those two municipalities from Missisquoi to Iberville; on the contrary, all reasons militate against it. My hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Baker) says that they would have great sympathy with me. I presume that they would have sympathy with me as much as with any other Liberal candidate, because, if I am rightly informed, the majority is Liberal. I say, however, that that is no reason why they should be detached from the County of Missisquoi to which they belong.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope my hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Baker), who, I understand, has a good deal to do with this amendment, will not persevere in the intention to add the two parishes of Notre Dame des Anges and Notre Dame de Stanbridge to St. John's and Iberville. My hon. friend is pretty lucky in annexing Lacolle to his constituency, because, politically, he will gain a good deal by this. I do not object to that, because I understand that the majority of the people of Lacolle, although separated by a river from his constituency, still have a good deal of business relations with the County of Missisquoi, that they do more business with that county than with the County of St. John's and Iberville. Although I am adverse, under all circumstances, to interfering with county lines, yet these instances prevail with me and I do not offer any objection. I can see no adequate reason whatever for annexing the two parishes which I have named to the County of Iberville and St. John's.

The hon. gentleman has said that it will make the county symmetrical, but it is rather late in the day for gentlemen on the other side to announce that as the principle to guide us in this Bill. The hon. gentleman ought to be satisfied with the annexation of Lacolle, which will give him, politically, an advantage of 50 votes, according to the last election returns, and I hope he will not press the annexation of these two parishes to Iberville and St. John's.

Mr. BAKER. I beg to assure my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, that there is no personal consideration whatever entering into this question. The hon. gentleman is also labouring under a mistake in supposing that the business relations of the people of Lacolle lie in the direction of Missisquoi, because, on the contrary, almost all their business relations are with St. John's. But it is an English-speaking constituency largely. It is not a Conservative constituency, Lacolle is not a Conservative parish. The Hon. Mr. Marchand, the member for St. John's in the Local Legislature, has always commanded a majority in that parish, and it is only on one occasion that the majority has been on the Conservative side. It is a question altogether of attaching the community of Lacolle to the community with which it has most sympathy.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a good reason.

Mr. BAKER. I was glad to hear my hon. friend from Iberville (Mr. Béchard) disclaiming any intention of raising national prejudices. In the County of Missisquoi, where I have been known for years, it would be a question of love's labour lost with him if he attempted to do any such thing. The very best and staunchest support I have had during the time I have had the honour to represent that county has come from the French-Canadian population, and the good feeling that has been exhibited on their part has been entirely reciprocated by me. It is true that on one lamentable occasion a portion of that constituency yielded to the prejudices that were raised by certain interested parties and into the history of which I need not enter now. It is true that for a time they withheld their support, but, as my hon. friend the Minister of Customs has intimated, the strongest and most steadfast supporters I have ever had have been the French-Canadians of the County of Missisquoi. There is no personal consideration in this matter whatever; but having taken on the extra parish of Lacolle, it seems to me only an act of justice that the lines of the county should be rectified, and that the two small parishes mentioned, one of which naturally belongs to the County of Iberville, should be restored to it. I must insist, so far as I can insist, upon having the resolution adopted in its present form. I am very grateful for the benefit that results from the addition of Lacolle, which was done at no suggestion of mine. I am happy to have that community added to Missisquoi, and I think that the whole matter will be more satisfactorily adjusted by adding these two parishes to Iberville. I submit, therefore, that, notwithstanding the appeal to race prejudices that was made in the first instance by my hon. friend (Mr. Béchard), but which I am happy to say he disclaimed the second time he addressed the Chair, notwithstanding these appeals, I must insist, so far as I can, that the resolution be adopted.

Mr. LAURIER.

Mr. SCRIVER. It is not strictly in order, I suppose, to refer to a matter which has already been determined, that is, the addition of the parish of Lacolle to the County of Missisquoi. Had an opportunity been offered to me at the time this was under consideration, I would have said something in opposition to that proposed change, but the thing was done in a moment, almost before my attention was called to it, and I did not make any remarks in reference to it. I may say that I live in the township adjoining the parish of Lacolle, and I know all about its geographical situation, and I am personally acquainted with the great majority of the people. My hon. leader was mistaken in saying that their business relations were more with the County of Missisquoi than with the County of St. John's. They have to my knowledge very little to do with the County of Missisquoi, and until the erection of a bridge across the River Richelieu a few years ago, they had scarcely anything to do in a business way with that county. The difficulties of crossing that broad and rapid river were so great that they never went to Missisquoi except under the strongest necessity. Their business relations are almost altogether with the town of St. John's, as the railway facilities which they have make it more convenient to go there. They cannot reach Bedford, which will be their county town in future, without crossing a drawbridge and travelling a considerable distance over a road which at some seasons of the year, is, to my knowledge, almost impassible. I believe that this change will be exceedingly unpopular with the people of the parish of Lacolle, and especially with the English-speaking people who live generally a considerable distance from the River Richelieu. The people living near the Richelieu are mainly French-Canadians, while the English-speaking people live a considerable distance away from the river, and they will be put to greater inconvenience in going to the county town for federal purposes hereafter. I do not know that it matters very much to the political future of my hon. friend (Mr. Baker), what the result of this change in the parish of Lacolle may be. If rumour speaks true, and I trust it does, he has a fair prospect of being elevated to a higher position before very long, a position which will render him independent of the suffrages not only of his own county, but of the parish of Lacolle. But I am afraid that if that should not be true, and he should again be a candidate for the suffrages of the newly-constructed County of Missisquoi, he will find that his connection with the addition of Lacolle to his county will prejudice him personally very strongly, especially with the English-speaking portion of the people of that parish. My hon. friend from Iberville has shown beyond dispute that no good reason exists for the addition of the two parishes which have been added to the County of Iberville. The only reason my hon. friend has mentioned, and he is fertile in stating good reasons when they exist, and with great force and plausibility, is that very doubtful one about geographical symmetry. I am not as well acquainted with the geography of that county as he is, and he may be right with regard to that. But my hon. friend has shown, so far as nationality and population are concerned, that there exists no good reason whatever for this change; and I understood this morning that it was fully intended that the Counties of Iberville and

St. John's were to be united to form one county, except that the parish of Lacolle was to be detached and added to the County of Missisquoi. Why this new feature should be introduced into the Bill at this eleventh hour I cannot understand. I regret very much that my hon. friend, for whom, as he knows, I have the strongest feelings of personal friendship, should have been led by any consideration whatever to make what I consider a mistake, a political mistake at least, and a mistake which I think is not in the true interest either of his own county or the County of St. John's.

Mr. BÉCHARD. Perhaps my hon. friend forgets one thing with regard to the equalization of population. I have already stated that by the Government's Bill the population of Missisquoi would be 21,077, while that of Iberville would be 21,396. But by the proposed change the population of Iberville will be made 23,017, while the population of Missisquoi will be only 19,456, a difference of nearly 4,000. I think that this is a strange way of equalizing the population.

(s.) The electoral district of St. Hyacinthe shall consist of the city of St. Hyacinthe, and the parishes of Notre Dame de St. Hyacinthe, St. Hyacinthe le Confesseur, St. Barnabé, St. Jude, St. Louis de Bonsecours, La Présentation, St. Damase, St. Charles, St. Denis, St. Antoine and St. Marc.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is moved that this paragraph be dropped.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation). I see St. Louis de Bonsecours, in the enumeration of the parishes, comprised within the limits of the County of St. Hyacinthe, although this parish is mentioned as a part of the County of Richelieu.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The provisions for changing the County of St. Hyacinthe have been struck off from the Bill. Since the county remains what it was, there is no need of speaking of it again.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) I desire to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that a part of the parish of St. Jude was annexed to the parish of St. Louis de Bonsecours, which was formed out of a part of the parish of St. Jude, in the County of St. Hyacinthe, and parts of the parishes of St. Aimé and St. Victoire, in the County of Richelieu. If you count with Richelieu the parish of St. Louis de Bonsecours the part detached from St. Jude and which was part of the County of St. Hyacinthe, will definitely belong to the County of Richelieu?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Yes.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) That is what I wanted to have stated.

(t.) The electoral district of Chambly and Verchères shall consist of the town of Longueuil and the villages of Boucherville, Chambly Basin, Chambly Canton and Varennes, and the parishes of Boucherville, Chambly, Longueuil, St. Basile le Grand, St. Bruno, St. Hubert, St. Lambert, the municipalities of Verchères, Contrecœur, St. Théodosie, St. Antoine, St. Marc and Belœil, and Varennes and St. Julie.

(u.) The electoral district of Bagot shall consist of the town of Acton, the village of Upton, the parishes of St. André d'Acton, St. Ephrem d'Upton, Ste. Hélène, St. Hugues, St. Liboire, Ste. Rosalie, St. Simon, St. Théodore d'Acton, St. Marcel, St. Dominique, and all those parts of the parishes of St. Nazaire and Ste. Christine which are included in the township of Acton.

(w.) The electoral district of Richelieu shall consist of the towns of St. Ours and Sorel, and the parishes of St. Joseph de Sorel, St. Ours, St. Louis de Bonsecours, St. Pierre de Sorel, St. Robert, Ste. Victoire and Ste. Anne de Sorel.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) If I understand aright, the County of Richelieu remains what it was, less the parish of St. Marcel, which is transferred to the County of Bagot. As to the parish of St. Louis de Bonsecours, as my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe pointed out a moment ago, a part of it now votes in the County of St. Hyacinthe, and another with the County of Richelieu. Is it to be understood that in the future the whole of the parish will vote in the County of Richelieu?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) As the Bill reads now the whole parish of St. Louis de Bonsecours goes to Richelieu. If any changes are needed they can be made when the third reading of the Bill comes up.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is moved that paragraph (x) do not form part of the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I understood that the parishes of St. Guillaume and St. Bonaventure, which at first were placed in the electoral district of Bagot, have been removed from that district and are to be placed in the electoral district of Yamaska. I believe this change to be a fair one. The constituency of Drummond and Arthabaska has a population of 44,000. The two parishes of St. Guillaume and St. Bonaventure were formerly part of that constituency, but twenty years ago they were annexed to Yamaska for municipal purposes. They form part of the County of Yamaska for judicial purposes and for registration purposes, they form part of the electoral district of Yamaska for provincial elections, and in fact all their interests and connections are with the County of Yamaska. I believe that the constituency of Drummond and Arthabaska was large enough, and it is only fair that these two parishes should be detached from that constituency and added to Yamaska. This would make the population of Yamaska, which is now 16,000, 20,000, and there would then still be in Drummond and Arthabaska a population of 40,000. I believe that this change would have been very proper. I have remarked that the few last subsections which have been read have been modified for the good of the people, and I certainly would not raise a discordant voice to disturb the harmony which seems to exist, as far as that section of the country is concerned, but I believe it to be my duty to make the suggestion which I have already referred to when I spoke on the second reading of this Bill. We were invited by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works to make these suggestions, and we were told that, if they were fair and reasonable, they would be accepted. I suppose he has forgotten my suggestion, and I take this occasion to recall it to his mind. The constituency of Drummond and Arthabaska is composed of two different municipal counties, with a population of 44,000, and if the parishes of St. Guillaume and St. Bonaventure were separated from that constituency it would still have a population of 40,000, or 20,000 for each county. The two counties are two distinct electoral districts for provincial purposes, they are two distinct registration divisions, they are two distinct judicial counties, and they are two distinct municipal counties. I believe, if we were to take some of the smaller counties and unite them, it would be more fair to

divide Drummond from Arthabaska and allow each to return one member than to see such constituencies as Vaudreuil and Soulanges, with a total population of 20,000, sending two members here. A county of 10,000 sends one member here and two counties of 20,000 each only one member for the two. There is no reason why these two large counties should decrease in population. They are large in area, they have large tracts of yet unsettled land, and they have a population of 44,000, which has been increased by over 6,000 in the last decade, whereas the population of Soulanges and Vaudreuil has decreased by 1,200. The probabilities are not that these old settled counties will increase more than Drummond and Arthabaska, and I suggest that two of these small counties should be united. If the Minister of Public Works is not disposed to put together Vaudreuil and Soulanges, he might take two other counties. He might take his own County of Laval and add it to Two Mountains or to Jacques Cartier. There are many ways of settling this matter and giving a fair representation to the constituency which I now represent. Where is the equality of population when you see two small adjoining counties with a total population of 20,000 returning two members, and another district with a population of 44,000 returning only one member? I think this suggestion should be adopted by the Government, and I believe it would be an act of justice at least to detach the parishes of St. Guillaume and St. Bonaventure from Drummond and add them to Yamaska, which would make the latter county one of a population of 20,000, and would leave Drummond and Arthabaska with 40,000. It would also put in Yamaska what belongs to it municipally and as a registration district and a judicial county. That would only be a fair measure, and I hope the Government will yield to my demand. I do not speak from any selfish motive, because those parishes gave me a majority of about 100, but it is a very small measure of equalizing the population to take the 4,000 from a constituency of 44,000 and add it to a constituency which has only 16,000.

Mr. OUIMET. I do not deny that there is some reason in what the hon. gentleman says, but he knows that the arrangements which are nearly completed now were the result of a compromise. I am not aware what political effect this would have, but I will give the hon. gentleman a reason which I think he will accept. I have already stated that it was deemed expedient not to alter the complexion of the group called the Eastern Townships counties. They are nine in number, and their population is very uneven. If it is necessary to remove the inequality of the representation of this particular constituency, it would become necessary to disturb and redistribute the whole of the Eastern Townships counties, and I do not believe the hon. gentlemen have expressed any desire in that direction. These nine counties have a population of 203,131. They have nine members. That is, every member in the Eastern Townships represents an average of 22,500, which is as near the unit as possible. Sherbrooke, for instance, has only 16,000, and Brome 14,000. If we alter the complexion of the County of Drummond and Arthabaska, it would be only fair to alter the complexion of all the other Eastern Townships counties, and, as the leader of the Opposition has expressed the opinion that we should make as few changes as possible, it was decided to leave all these counties undisturbed. I have no political reason for or against the request of the hon. gentleman. It will be better to adhere to what has been agreed upon, it will be better to adhere to the general principle laid down, and which, I think, received the general approbation of the House, namely, that in those districts where there is no very patent inequality, it is better to make no change which will necessitate the disturbance of several other constituencies. I presume that my hon friends are not more anxious than the Government to go further than is necessary in disturbing the different counties.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I agree with my hon. friend in the principle he lays down, but this is one of the patent inequalities of which he spoke. There is no other county in the Province of Quebec left with such a population. What I ask does not disturb any boundaries; I ask merely that the parishes be placed in the constituency to where they belong. They properly belong to Yamaska, they belonged to that county for over twenty years. My hon. friend has modified his notions on that point since this afternoon, because I see that in the Bill they are placed in Bagot, having been removed from Drummond.

Mr. OUIMET. A great many alterations have been made this afternoon.

Mr. LAVERGNE. That shows that the principle first announced by the Government has not been strictly adhered to.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman ought not to blame us because we have yielded to some of their suggestions.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I am not pressing the proposition, I am only suggesting it as a thing which I think would be fair. Of course, under the circumstances, there having been an arrangement, I do not wish to interfere with it in any way.

(*y.*) The present electoral districts of the city of Three Rivers and of the County of St. Maurice shall form one electoral district, which shall be called the electoral district of Three Rivers and St. Maurice, and shall return one member.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, before this paragraph is voted I wish to make a few remarks. I find that both sides of the House agree to secure one or the other of the Counties of St. Maurice and Three Rivers to disappear. The hon. leader of the Opposition congratulates the Government for having wiped out St. Maurice. On the Government side, it is believed that one of the counties of the district of Three Rivers must be given up, and it is to be done by joining Three Rivers and St. Maurice. As I am the younger of the two members for these counties, it will be my county which will be sacrificed. I desire that it be known in St. Maurice, that I protested against the sacrifice of that county. We prepared a petition setting forth our protest. It was presented to the Government. I will ask permission to read it, so that it be known that I opposed this union of the two Counties of Three Rivers and St. Maurice:

"OTTAWA, 27th April, 1892.

"The Honourable J. J. C. ABBOTT,

"First Minister, Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—We hear that there is some intention of gerrymandering the District of Three Rivers and depri-

ving it of one of the five members that represent it in the House of Commons by joining together the city of Three Rivers and the County of St. Maurice.

"We think it due to you and your colleagues to say at once that we cannot approve such a change. The representation of the district is small enough and the members of the district for many years past have been loyal supporters of Sir John A. Macdonald's Government, and they, therefore, would expect that in any change to be made this should not be lost sight of. Why not leave well alone? If the city of Montreal, the County of Hochelaga and the County of Ottawa require an additional representation, why not obtain the three additional members from the District of Montreal? Why deprive the District of Three Rivers of one of its members to give him to Ottawa, Hochelaga and Montreal City? We would understand that one of the five counties or constituencies of the District of Three Rivers had increased its population three or four times, the remainder of the district might have to contribute thereto.

"Moreover, the District of Quebec and of Three Rivers have 26 members, including Mégantic. The Montreal District and Eastern Townships have 39. Thus, this Montreal District and Townships have 50 per cent more representation than Quebec and Three Rivers Districts.

"We hope, therefore, that the Government will not deprive us of one of our five members.

"We remain, Dear Sir,

"Yours very truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.
"J. T. ROSS.
"H. MONTPLAISIR.
"F. L. DESAULNIERS.
"O. CARIGNAN."

Now I must also express the regret which I feel at seeing that the Government did not take into consideration the request privately made by the representatives of this district, to the effect that additional members are required for Montreal and Hochelaga, not to make the district of Three Rivers suffer for it. The Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil have not been touched, and yet they are within the district of Montreal and their aggregate population is less than that of St. Maurice and Three Rivers. The population of Soulanges and Vaudreuil does not reach 20,000, while that of the Counties of St. Maurice and Three Rivers is 21,000. A representative from the district of Three Rivers is taken away to be given to Montreal and while that is done, two counties of less importance, from the stand-point of population, and situated in the very district of Montreal, are left untouched. The future will tell whether the Government did well to wipe out a constituency from the district of Three Rivers. I will say no more, Mr. Chairman. I am a party man, and yet I give my first vote against the Government on this question. I thought the hon. leader of the Opposition and his friends, would show me some sympathy on this occasion, but they appeared to turn the thing into a laugh, and not appreciate the position I had taken. Since it is so, I return to my party. In concluding, I will ask the Minister of Public Works to be good enough to see that when changes are made amongst the government employees on the St. Maurice River, they be made upon the advice of people really interested, and not at the request of people who have no right to speak on the matter. These people should not be listened to or allowed to control Government matters in the County of St. Maurice.

6. In the Province of Prince Edward Island there shall be five electoral districts, designated and constituted as follows:—

(a.) The electoral district of King's, which shall consist of lots numbers 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59 and 66, in King's County, as designated and bounded on the official survey and map of the said island made by direction of the Government of Great Britain by Captain Holland in or about the year 1766, including the town of Georgetown.

Mr. WELSH. I did not intend to say anything on this Bill, but owing to some remarks made by the senior member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) the other evening, I have made up my mind to speak upon it. I am very sensitive when anything derogatory to Prince Edward Island is said in this House. The hon. gentleman, in reply to my colleague (Mr. Davies), said:

"I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's explanation, when he says he had nothing to do with the local gerrymandering of Prince Edward Island. Report connected him with it, and I gave it as a report when I mentioned it yesterday. Now, with respect to this local gerrymander, it is like any other dirty pool, the more you stir it the dirtier it gets. Since the hon. gentleman has brought this matter up again, it is necessary I should give some further explanation to the House as to the mode in which the gerrymander was brought about. It seems that this Local Government to which I referred yesterday in not very flattering, but justifiable, terms, was frightened into introducing this gerrymander into their Local Legislature. They had not the manliness, they had not the pluck, to bring it up and fight it out on the floor of the House of Assembly. They passed this gerrymander in the Local House and sent it to their friends in the Upper House where they had a strong majority, and the local Premier who was ruling in the Lower House by a majority of one, came round by the back door and said to his friends: Gentlemen, I am only ruling by a majority of one, bring in a gerrymander that will offset this and enable me to come into the House at the next election with a good majority. That would be the right thing to do. The Legislative Council, at the bidding of this autocrat, passed this local gerrymander."

Now, I am very sorry my hon. friend made those remarks. I have known Prince Edward Island pretty well for the last 40 years, ever since that Island obtained self-government, and I challenge contradiction when I say that there is no province flying the British flag in the world that has been better governed than Prince Edward Island, by either party that has been in power. Will my hon. friend deny it? No. I now publicly state that the present Premier of Prince Edward Island will not disgrace the record. I am very sorry to hear that statement of my hon. friend—because he is my friend. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, he is a political godson of mine. I am his political godfather; I think he will acknowledge that. It is a strange thing, when he was christened at that time, he was a Liberal, but he has changed his name, therefore I am not answerable for his sins. But we have always been great friends, in fact I voted for the hon. gentleman when he was a Liberal, and voted for his family on every occasion they set up. We are very great friends, although we happen to differ on some political points. Now, I am sorry the hon. gentleman made those remarks, because they are in bad taste. If there is any fault to find with the Government of Prince Edward Island, this is not the proper place for it. If we have got any dirty clothes to wash, let us wash them at home. The hon. member made an attack on the local Premier, declaring that he introduced a Bill by the back door, through the Legislative Council. But, whether the Bill was right or wrong, it was passed by both branches of the legislature. A Gerrymander Bill could not otherwise be passed, and even if it were introduced in the Legislative Council, it would afterwards come down to the Lower House for its approval. The hon. gentleman said the Local Government was an autocratic government. It is an autocratic government if the

hon. gentleman says so, for we must accept his word. But it is a Liberal Government which has succeeded. It had a majority, and when the last Dominion elections occurred two of its prominent members resigned their seats and contested Dominion constituencies. At those elections they were defeated and their places were filled by Liberals, and a Liberal Government came into power. The ability of the present Premier, who is a rising and able gentleman, is shown by the fact that with a small majority in the House he was able to solve a problem that had puzzled every Island Government during the last 20 years. During that time there has been an agitation in favour of reducing the cost of legislation. We have in the Island two legislative bodies, the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly and there has been a very general feeling of reducing expenses, but every government in power failed to solve the problem. This autocratic Government has, however, solved it, and their action has met with the general approval of the people of the Island. An hon. friend from the Island has shown me a map—we tell each other all we know, for I have nothing to hide, and I believe the other members from the Island entertain the same feeling towards each other—showing the way the gerrymander has been carried out. But it must be admitted that it was high time to abolish Georgetown, a borough with only 200 resident voters, and a population of only 1,060, 158 less than 10 years ago, while every other constituency in the Island averaged 7,300. Was it probable that the Legislative Council was going to abolish their own body and leave a pocket borough like that, with voters qualifying on property qualification and franchise qualification? The hon. gentleman will admit that it was necessary that the borough of Georgetown should be altered in some way or other. The hon. gentleman may find fault with respect to the manner in which it was done, but the local Government was only following the principle laid down in this House in 1882, and which is being followed in the present Bill. The Minister of Militia need not shake his head, for the Island has not had a day's luck since it was confederated. We lost one million dollars of the fishery award by joining Confederation. Then there were three millions of money due to the Island for non-fulfilment of terms, which the Dominion is too big to admit it should pay, and the money has not yet been paid. The Government have taken away the militia force from the Island and are going to annex it to New Brunswick—or at all events it is proposed to do so. Then it is proposed to take a member from King's.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. WELSH. Oh, yes. The Government are cutting the Island into pieces. We have already lost our trade owing to the National Policy.

Mr. BOWELL. We will leave the Island.

Mr. WELSH. You would not leave the Island if you could take it away. The Government must admit that they are taking away a member from King's County.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. WELSH. Only one member is given to King's by the Bill. How has this change been carried out? The Government had to come to the Island before they could discover a principle to work on; but when they did come there, one would think they had been living there almost all their lives. They ascertained that the fixed principle must be a unit, 22,000 exactly. But within 40 miles of the Island we see great departures from this principle. The Minister of Justice sympathized with Shelburne, and I have no doubt he sympathises with King's, or at least with one of them. If the hon. members for King's were on this side of the House in political feeling as they are in their seats, there would be very little trouble in gerrymandering the Island. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) laid down a certain principle, and said the boundaries should not be changed when the population came within 20 per cent. of the unit. Prince County has 36,000, and Queen's 48,000, or a total of 84,000. How is that as regards the unit when they return 4 members? The Minister of Justice looks like an honest, truthful man, and I hope he will act in that regard with respect to the Island. I never doubted him. I have had the fullest confidence in his honesty and integrity in all matters brought before him, and in his desire not to allow political feelings to influence him; but this session I am beginning to doubt him. King's County is only 20 per cent. above the unit, yet hon. gentlemen opposite are taking all this trouble with regard to a few thousands, and they are carving up the Island on that ground, although a few moments ago they did not take much trouble with respect to a few thousands in Quebec. The candidate who runs in East Queen's will carry his life in his hands, for he will have to travel 100 miles from one end of the constituency to the other. I am willing to take three honest men from the opposite side of the House, wherever we can find them, and I would not be afraid to take the Minister of Justice among the number, and to leave this matter to them. Take them and ask them to say if it is necessary to cut up that Island. For 120 years in Prince Edward Island the boundaries of the counties have never been touched. With all our political agitation down there we have never interfered with them, but now we are told that the Island is to be carved up. Will my hon. friend the Minister of Justice say that the division as proposed is fair to the Island? You begin at the north shore nearly opposite Gaspé, and you go right across the Island until you come opposite Pictou in Nova Scotia, and then you go around until you come to Port Hood. Talk about the gerrymander, my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Macdonald) has got on his chart there, but even if his map is correct, I do not know which of the two is the worst. I say there is not a shadow of reason why these counties should be carved up in this manner, and I do hope that the good sense of the Government will see that this proposal is not insisted on. I sympathize with King's County, because I know it very well, and I have had as much to do with it as any man in Prince Edward Island, but that county has to lose one member and its representatives know that. I hope the good sense of the House will be brought to bear on this question and that county lines in Prince Edward Island will be untouched. I know that my hon. friends from King's have to express an opinion in some way or other to justify themselves to their constituents for losing one member; but under the terms of Confederation that has to be done, and it is out of our

power to remedy it. I feel for King's County losing one member just as much as my hon. friend does, because we want all the members we can get from Prince Edward Island to obtain even-handed justice in this House. I do hope that the Government will reconsider this matter, and that they will do as they have done in Quebec, listen to reasonable counsel.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I want to make a verbal change in this section, by adding after the words "sixty-six" in the fifth line, the words "also the town of Georgetown, Common Royalty and Reserve Lands and Boughton and Panmure Island," and to strike out the words "including the town of Georgetown," in the last line of the section.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Justice will not press this motion to a division in the House, because if he does he will be inflicting a very severe injustice upon the people of the province I represent. I had the honour of presenting my views on this matter to the House the other night, and I would not repeat my argument were it not that I have noticed during the last few days a reasonable disposition on the part of the Government side to listen to the suggestions, and to compromise, at least, if they would not accept all that the Opposition asked of them. The position I take with respect to Prince Edward Island is this, and I ask the attention of hon. gentlemen to it for a moment, and let them judge whether it be reasonable or not. The Maritime Provinces had their counties laid off by a royal survey over 120 years ago, and no county in those provinces has had its boundaries changed since then. When you came to apply the rules which you laid down for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick you determined that the controlling rule should be the maintenance of these lines. Why? Not because there was the same proportion of population in each of the counties, for there was nothing of that kind to guide you. On the contrary the population of the counties in these provinces was as dissimilar as possible, and varied all the way from 8,000 to 74,000. You did not determine because of this variance in the population to depart from the principle of adhering to county lines. You thought that was a just principle, that the people were satisfied with it, and you let it remain. I want to ask hon. gentlemen opposite after you have left county lines as they were in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, why do you apply a different principle to Prince Edward Island? If hon. gentlemen will look at the atlas I have placed on the Table, they will find that Prince Edward Island is divided into three counties. Prince County has a population of 36,500; Queen's a population of 46,000; and the small County of King's a population of 26,000. One member has got to go from the Island, and where would common sense dictate he should go from. You cannot take a member from Queen's because Queen's has a population of 46,000 already. The county I represent has had nearly double the population of King's ever since Confederation, but I never heard any Liberal say that King's was unfairly treated because it had two members. It was a solemn compact made at Confederation between the political parties then on the Island, that these counties should remain intact, that they should have a representative in the Senate, and that they should have two members in this House from each county. That has been maintained till now, notwithstanding the fact that the population of Queen's County is double that of King's or very nearly so. But now we have to lose a member, and where should he come from? The population of King's County is only 26,000 and a few hundreds It is only 4,000 above the unit, and why should you not take the member from that county? On what principle or reason are you going to carve up the Island and ignore county lines, and making ridings which in shape rival nothing that I know of in the world? Any hon. gentleman who looks at the map will see that an attempt of the grossest kind has been made to gerrymander the Island. Talk about the gerrymander in Quebec! Why, Sir, there is no gerrymander in Quebec compared to this. It happens that Prince Edward Island has changed its political views time and again. At present it sends four Liberals and two Conservatives here; but it does not follow that it is always going to do that in the future. In Prince County there is a population of 36,500, which gives over 18,000 for each member; in Queen's there is a population of 46,000 which gives 23,000 for each member; and in King's there is a population of 26,000, which gives a population for one member and 4,000 more. Look what you have done in the counties just across the straits from us. Pictou is the nearest county. It has a population of 34,500 that is 1,500 less than the population of Prince County, and yet you leave it with two members. Why do you not leave two members to Prince County? Why do you apply a different rule to Prince County from that which you apply to Pictou? Then Cape Breton County, which is within three hours' sail of Prince County, has a population of 34,000, or 2,000 less than Prince County, and it has two members. You do not cut and carve it up; you do not take townships from the adjacent counties, and add them to Cape Breton. Not at all; you prefer to maintain the old county lines as they have always existed, and you retain the two members. Why do you apply a different rule to Prince County, cutting it up and destroying the county lines, and taking three or four townships from Queen's and adding them to Prince? I want to appeal to the common sense of justice and fair-play of hon. gentlemen opposite. This is a gerrymander prepared by little local politicians whose souls cannot rise above their noses and the political advantages which they think they will get by cutting and carving the electoral districts. It is a gerrymander, and is not based upon any proper principle. I have heard a great deal of talk from hon. gentlemen opposite about the importance of observing the historical continuity of counties. Why are you abolishing the historical continuity of the County of King's, which has existed for 120 years? The people of that county have been accustomed to meet together at the sessions of the courts, and in agricultural associations every year as a grand committee composed of men from all the county. They have been accustomed to act together in judicial matters, agricultural matters and political matters, and why are you going to sever that historical continuity? Why do you refuse to apply to Prince Edward Island the rules which you apply to every county in the adjoining provinces? Surely, because we differ from hon. gentlemen opposite in our views, that is no reason why we

should be dishonestly treated. I appeal to the fair play and the common honour of the House if it is right to treat us in this way. For the first time in the history of Canada you are proposing to interfere with the county lines in the Maritime Provinces, and you are doing it in the hope of gaining a paltry political advantage. Can hon. gentlemen opposite justify it to their consciences? Is there any honesty in it? The community of interest in King's County has always been as I have described it; in no respect have the people of King's County and Queen's County met together to transact business; the political conventions they have held have been county conventions; and yet you are proposing to take a portion of the county I represent and add a part of the County of King's to it, although the people of those counties have never met. You want to observe the principle of representation by population; but I have shown that although you have divided the counties up in the hope of securing the return of a Tory member who would not be returned in the ordinary course, you have not secured and cannot secure equality of population. You have 21,000 in West Prince, 20,000 in East Prince, 21,684 in King's, 22,000 in West Queen's, and 23,406 in East Queen's. You have about 3,000 more in East Queen's than you have in East Prince, by your own showing; and if you left the county lines undisturbed, you would just have 4,000 more in King's County than the unit. Look at the counties across the straits and see what they are. If you take any of the counties in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, you will find large discrepancies in their populations, and I do not see that you make any attempt to overcome those discrepancies. Take the County of Westmoreland, which has 41,000; and then take the County of Restigouche, which lies alongside, and which has only 8,000.

An hon. MEMBER. It is not alongside.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, I will take a county which is contiguous, the County of Albert, with its population of 10,971. I do not see any burning disposition evinced on the part of any hon. gentleman in this House to destroy the old county lines of Westmoreland and Albert and divide them into two constituencies with equal populations. I do not make any complaint about that. I would be sorry to see the historical continuity of those counties broken; I think it is better to leave them as they are, and to leave the people as they have been accustomed to work together. But why should the little silver streak which divides Prince Edward Island from the mainland cause you to alter the principles you have applied in your treatment of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? I say that if the hon. gentleman wants to do justice, he can do it by leaving the counties as they are. My hon. friends complain that they lose a member. That is no fault of this House or of any of us. As we have not the population, we have to lose a member. King's County, if it remains intact, will only have 4,000 above the unit. and the old historic county of my hon. friend will remain as it is. Why does he want to take three townships from it and shove them into Queen's? Your Bill shows that you have done that; you are creating a county here, East Queen's, over 100 miles in length, and we will have to drive to go down to the new townships where we have never been accustomed to go before, 60 or 70 miles because there is no railway there. I cannot see on what principle you are acting. I heard the hon. member for Albert contend strongly for the principle of county lines. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) and a number of others expressed their adherence to that principle. The hon. member for East York has stated to-day that the true rule, the only safe and statesmanlike rule is that taken by the Government of disturbing the existing boundaries and conditions as little as possible. Is that hon. gentleman prepared to live up to his convictions? Is he prepared to vote that the principle which he asks should be applied to Ontario shall also be applied to Prince Edward Island? There is no rule or principle which has been laid down by any hon. member on either side, as a controlling and guiding rule to be applied, which, when applied to Prince Edward Island, will not leave the counties as they are. The Bill then would be satisfactory to Queen's County, and that county will return two members, as it always has done, having a sufficient population. Prince County, the only one whose population has gone on increasing during the past ten years, will return two members, being but a few thousand below the unit, and King's County will return one member with only 4,000 above the unit. I say that will be fair to all parties, and I appeal to the Minister of Justice to deal out to our little province the same fair-play, which, to some extent, he has shown towards Quebec, I understand, to-day. There have been concessions made there. I cannot be made believe that the Government themselves ever made that division; I have no doubt it was done by some of those who have sought to turn a small minority in a large majority. You may do it, but you will do it at the sacrifice of principle, fair-play, and common honesty. Sir, do you imagine this thing is going to remain there? Break in upon the county lines of the Island if you will ignore all those principles which you say have guided you in Ontario and Quebec, and which have controlled you in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, gerrymander Prince Edward Island as you are doing, and I doubt if you will attain the ignoble end which the gentlemen who drew that up had in view. It is true by taking three townships away from King's and putting them in East Queen's, by going to the other end of the county and taking township number twenty-four from West Queen's where it has voted for forty years and putting it into East Queen's, you have given yourself a nominal majority of about 100 on the vote of the last election; but I have sufficient faith in the good sense and integrity and honour of the voters of the Island to be convinced that they will not respond to the invitation held out to them by this gerrymander to return the minority candidate to this House as their representative. It is the most unjust and wicked attempt to gerrymander that has been made in the Dominion; it cannot be defended on any principle whatever. Surely the Government are strong enough, surely they have a sufficiently large majority, larger than they ever expected, to enable them to do justice. And, Sir, I appeal to them on every ground, I appeal to them on the ground of common justice, I was going to say common decency, I appeal to them on the principles which they have applied to Nova Scotia and New

Brunswick, not to break down the county line rule, especially as the counties in Prince Edward Island, as they now stand, represent populations which come as nearly to the unit as you possibly could desire. You can maintain the county associations, the community of interests, and the counties as they are, and give the five members to the Island without breaking down one of these county lines at all. I think that would be fair. I know it would be acceptable, and I never could conceive how my hon. friends ever consented to allow their county to be divided in the way it has been. Why do they want to lose those townships? Why do they take the three townships, 61, 63 and 64 from King's County, where the people of these townships and their forefathers before them have always voted? Are they ashamed of them? Why do they want to thrust them into Queen's.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). You should not be ashamed of them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not. I once had the honour of representing them, when a young man, in the Local Assembly, and perhaps, although the hon. gentleman does not think so, I may have the honour of representing them in this Chamber. I know that you are giving me a very up-hill fight. I know that you are putting 328 Conservative votes into my riding in the hope of swamping it; I know you cannot justify that by any principle of common honesty, but only on the ground that the party in power has the might and are going to do what they like. They are going to overturn every rule which controlled them, not only in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, but in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I would submit to the Government that they should take time to consider this proposition, and leave the counties as they are. I therefore beg to move:

That in the Province of Prince Edward Island there shall be three electoral districts as at present constituted and designated, of which the electoral district of Prince County shall continue to return two members, the electoral district of Queen's County shall continue to return two members, and the electoral district of King's shall return one member.

The hon. gentlemen who represent King's now, and who propose that they should only represent hereafter a part of King's, will then have the honour of representing the whole county. This does not take anything from them. They surely will occupy as powerful and dignified a position in this House when representing the whole county as when representing a part of one. I cannot understand why they sanction this unless in the ignoble hope of swamping East Queen's, and I do not see why they should want to do that.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). How many will be against you now?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When the hon. gentleman puts in the 128 majority from King's and the 200 majority from West Queen's there will be about 100 votes against me, and the hon. gentleman knows that in the last three elections I carried that riding by very handsome majorities. The majority I had last in the county was about 347, and they are taking about that number and putting it into East Queen's to swamp me. I say it is unfair, unjust and unmanly. I say that a party having a majority such as the other side have should not stoop to gerrymander a man out of his seat when they cannot get the people to vote him out. To legislate a man out of his seat is not an act which will ever reflect credit on themselves, and I believe there is many a member among them who will be ashamed to record his vote for it. I do not believe the Government understood what that division meant when they first brought it down. I ask the Government to consider the proposition I have submitted. They have left the counties of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia alone, although Pictou and Cape Breton have not as large a population as Prince County and have 10,000 less than Queen's. They have not attempted to remove the discrepancies in population in Restigouche and Albert and other counties in New Brunswick, and I ask them not to apply that mathematical rule to the Island of Prince Edward which they shrink from applying elsewhere. I say it is unfair. I say the natural division is the division which was laid down 120 years ago, which was sanctioned at Confederation by both parties, which I believe the majority of both parties desire to maintain, and which I think it would be in the interest of both parties to maintain.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If I thought that this provision in regard to Prince Edward Island justified one-twentieth part of the strong adjectives and substantives my hon. friend has applied to it, I would withdraw these clauses at once and take into consideration some other method of redistributing the representation of Prince Edward Island. I would like to meet the views of the hon. gentleman if possible in order that the harmony with which the Bill has proceeded so far through committee might be continued to the end, but I am convinced that the hon. gentleman in making the allusions he has done to the redistribution in Prince Edward Island, while I do not question his sincerity, has been speaking under the influence of some strong excitement not due to the provisions of the Bill itself but due to some extraordinary view which he has taken of this redistribution. I am unable to share in that excitement, though I share the views of the hon. gentleman to a great extent as to the desirability as far as possible of maintaining county lines. As I am unable to share in that excitement, I shall ask the House to treat this as a matter of business and to take up detail after detail and see whether it is open to the terms of being a dishonest measure, of being a gerrymander, of being a violation of every principl of fair-play, and an attempt to legislate the hon. gentleman out of his seat. It is true that we did consult and get advice from local sources as well as from our friends in this House from the County of King's, as to what redistribution should be made, not to secure the greatest party advantage, but a redistribution which would challenge contradiction in this House on the ground of its fairness. I was surprised at the hon. gentleman attacking the redistribution in his province in such strong language as he did the other night, because I had hoped from the information we have, and from consulting the maps and the records, that the redistribution in all the Maritime Provinces would have passed almost without a dissenting voice, so fair did we believe it to be. The hon. gentleman imputes to us the base desire to legislate him out of his seat. It would be vain, after every line and syllable of the Bill has been attacked on similar grounds for four weeks past, to attempt to deny that imputation. We

had over two weeks debate on the second reading of the Bill in that strain. It was alleged that we had no desire but to seek the political scalps of our enemies. We assured them that that was not our intention, but that we would give every consideration to suggestions which might be made in regard to the details of the Bill when we got into committee if they would ever, in time or eternity, allow us to get into committee, and stop the everlasting flow of words which threatened to go on for ever. Since we have been in committee, the complaints of hon. gentlemen have practically ceased, and the only complaint that they now have to make is that their grievances have been removed, and that they have not the complaints to make to the country which they expected they would have. As to any design on our part to remove the hon. gentleman from his seat in this House, I not only repudiate that, but I assure him that I would not pen one line for that purpose. I would be foolish, indeed, to try to legislate a majority into the hon. gentleman's constituency for that purpose, because I know perfectly well the influence he possesses in that constituency by virtue of his ability, and that it would be a very difficult task, even if we equalized the votes as he thinks we have done, to deprive him of his seat there, and I know, moreover, that the influence he possesses in the province on account of his abilities and his long public services, would place at his disposal the strongest Liberal constituency in the Island.

Mr. WELSH. He does not play that game.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman need not play the game of saying that we are trying to oust the hon. gentleman, because I give him credit for possessing that strength in his province, on account of his ability, to enable him to claim and possess any seat there at the disposal of the Liberal electors of the province. I merely add that to my repudiation of any desire or intention to legislate so as to take the hon. gentleman's seat from him. I think that that charge is a piece of rhetoric, and has been made under excitement, and that the hon. gentleman would not be disposed to adhere to it on reflection. Let us take up the features on which that is based. The hon. gentleman has insisted that we are going against the principles we have acted upon in the other Maritime Provinces. He has put that to the committee as if we were invading his province with a special view to equalize the population.

Mr. WELSH. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My hon. friend admits that that is the way in which it is put to the committee. We are not going to that province for that purpose, but because there is a duty cast upon us by the British North America Act to deprive that province of one of its representatives. They have now three counties, each represented by two members. We have to find five seats there instead of six. We have to divide the three counties into five constituencies, and how you can do that without doing an unfairness in regard to population or else departing from county lines, I am utterly unable to see.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The population of the counties settles that for you.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman pressed that very earnestly on the committee, but I am unable to see it. I understand his position to be that the County of Prince should continue to have two members, that the County of Queen's should continue to have two members, and that the County of King's should lose one. If I were disposed to debate this matter in the tone of excitement the hon. gentleman assumed, I would say why should the County of King's lose one of its members. Is it because that county happens to be represented here by two Conservatives. I can imagine no other reason. My hon. friend thinks he has another reason based on the disparity of the population, and I am sure it was sincerely with that view that he pressed it upon the committee, but would it be a fair arrangement that Prince and Queen's should each have two members and that King's should lose the one that is to be lost? Under that state of facts, one member in the County of Queen's would represent about 23,000, each member in Prince would represent 18,000, while the solitary member for King's would represent 26,634. Why should that disparity exist except for the purpose of depriving a Conservative county of one of its representatives?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) For the same reason that, although a disparity four times as great exists in the adjoining province, you do not break the county lines there.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will show that that does not hold good. The hon. gentleman has said that we cannot, in redistributing, get an exact equalization of numbers. I admit that; I admit that we cannot do it exactly without dividing townships, which we have not done—we have adhered to the township lines—without dividing even families, and eventually, I suppose, you would have to divide a man. But we come as nearly as we can to that by adhering to the lines of townships, and the committee will see how much fairer in point of equalization of population the numbers are under the new scheme. Under this scheme, King's will have a population of 21,684; East Queen's will have 23,466; West Queen's will have 22,209; East Prince will have 20,723; and West Prince will have 20,987. Now, I do say that this is as close an approximation to equality of population as you can possibly get in that Island. You get as near an equalization of population in those districts as you can possibly get without dividing townships, which we do not want to do. But if you take out of one division any township and put it in another one of these divisions, then you disturb the equalization that is effected by this scheme. We want to know what reason can be given for taking that township out of that electoral district and putting it into another when it disturbs the equalization which is approximately effected here. Again, I say to the hon. gentleman that we are not invading his Island for the purpose of equalizing population, and that is the answer which I make to the hon. gentleman's allusion to what is done in the neighbouring Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I will first take up his allusion to the Counties of Westmoreland and Albert. Westmoreland, he tells us, has a population of 41,000, and Albert a population of a little over 10,000. If we had by this Bill been creating those constituencies, the hon. gentleman's argument would be unanswerable. But let the hon. gentleman tell me what purpose would have been

served in this Bill by stepping in there and attempting to equalize those populations thereby disturbing county lines. We should not have been able to provide for the diminution in the representation which the law requires for the Province of New Brunswick, and we do not profess in this Bill to go all over the country to remove anomalies and equalize population. We profess to be making the changes which the British North America Act requires to be made, with as little disturbance as possible, and when we come to a province where we cannot without injustice as regards population, adhere to the county lines, we claim that there is no unfairness in redistributing the whole of that province into five constituencies containing as nearly as possible an equal population in each.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman permit me to remark that under the distribution which he has made there is as large a discrepancy between the population of some of the ridings as there would be between Queen's County and King's if he had kept the county lines. East Prince has 20,000; East Queen's, 23,000; or a difference of 3,000. If you leave the counties as they stand, Queen's County with 46,000 returns two members, King's with 26,000 returns one member, the difference would be 3,000—just the same discrepancy as exists in the present Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That does not strike me at the moment, but I will examine the hon. gentleman's figures as soon as I have an opportunity. But the hon. gentleman will need to point out to us how that can be remedied by the removal of one of these townships into another county without creating greater disturbance that we have. Will the hon. gentleman say whether he does not in that larger district include Charlottetown?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certainly. I say the district which the hon. gentleman has carved, called East Queen's, has 23,466, whereas East Prince has only 20,000 odd.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see that the disparity which exists there, and to which he calls my attention, is accounted for by the fact that he includes the city of Charlottetown, and we have not pretended, nor can anybody in drafting a Redistribution Bill, attempt to give the same representation by population to the cities as we do to the rural population. But the hon. gentleman proposes, as a substitute, that we should transfer that disparity to a purely rural constituency in the west end of the Island, namely, the County of King's, where there would not be anything like the same justification for it as there is now with the city of Charlottetown. Now, pursuing the question of existing anomalies, let us examine the Province of Nova Scotia. What purpose would have been served by going to the Counties of Cape Breton and Pictou and taking away one of the members there? You would have accomplished the result of diminishing the representation as the law requires, but you would have provided that one member there should represent 34,000 people, whereas for the last ten years he had represented but 17,000; and what is of more importance still, you would have been leaving the County of Queen's, which is under your hand and eye, with a population of 10,000, lying alongside of another small county of about 14,000 to which it could be annexed without the slightest invasion of county lines. Therefore, you would have been doing a palpable injustice and creating another anomaly. Does the hon. gentleman's argument, that there are other anomalies in Canada, justify in the slightest degree this scheme by which he proposes to give a largely increased population to the County of King's?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I misled the hon. gentleman in saying that Charlottetown was in East Queen's, it is in West Queen's. The constituency that has the largest population is purely a rural one.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will look at that in a moment. The hon. gentleman referred to East Queen's, that has a population of 23,466, and the lowest is 20,723, a difference of about 2,700. But the hon. gentleman will see that by his scheme the discrepancy is much larger between the smallest and the greatest, In Prince the population for each representative would be 18,000 and in Queen's it would be 26,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. Prince is increasing more rapidly than the other.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not aware of it. Now, these are the circumstances under which this redistribution of Queen's is offered to the committee. As I said before, we were obliged to go to the Island for the purpose of changing the number of seats; otherwise what the hon. gentleman has said about disturbing county lines would be correct. If the taking away of dual representation in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia would have accomplished the result with anything like the fairness with which that result has been accomplished, all that the hon. gentleman has said with respect to the comparison between his province and the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would be applicable and would be irrefutable. I am going to refer the committee to the local redistribution, not at all for the purpose of saying—because I must leave that to the hon. gentlemen who represent King's and who will say more than I can, because I know nothing about it except what I see on the plan, whether it is a fair or unfair one—but I refer to it simply because I can draw this argument from it: I am willing to assume for the sake of argument that this local distribution was a fair, correct and straightforward distribution. The hon. members for King's have pressed on the committee the view that it is not so. I leave that to them, but I assume for the purpose of my argument that it is fair and just. If there was so much to be said in defence of the county lines, if the strong expressions used with respect to honesty, fairness, justice and meanness and all that kind of thing could be urged in defence of the county lines in the Island, surely the Local Legislature, which has the domestic interests of the Island in charge, which has the power to change those county lines from time to time and depart from them, should have treasured them more sacredly than they have done in their measure passed during the last few months, when they carved up the country and constituted coloured sections as shown in this map, in which they not only departed from county lines——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They never touched the county lines.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Because the whole gerrymander is within one county; or, I should say, it does not adhere to county lines. The measure does not profess to adhere to county lines, and the changes are carried out within the county lines. But hon. gentlemen will see that they have not only made a most extraordinary redistribution, as it would appear from the map, but they have absolutely departed from the township or lot lines and every here and there they have divided a lot in two. The hon. gentleman may avoid all responsibility by saying that he entirely disapproves of the local readjustment. The hon. gentleman has not done so; and until he does so, I have to repeat that I assume that it was a fair one and one made by the Provincial Legislature paying just as much regard to municipal lines, or rather local territorial divisions, as the Local Legislature thought such divisions deserved in treating the question of redistribution. I press the argument on that point no further than that; but I do say that if the Local Legislature, having immediately the local interests of the province in charge invaded the lines of lots and connected together for representation purposes patches of territory which cannot be approached without invading other constituencies altogether, then the hon. gentleman has pressed too strongly on this committee the sentiments and feelings which he entertains and which he professes the people of the Island entertain as regards the adherence to local boundaries, county or township lines or lines of lots. When the question comes to be examined, apart from the feeling which the hon. gentleman has thrown into the question and which the committee must necessarily divest itself of in order to consider this question fairly and in a business-like way, the redistribution of the Island will be found to be a fair one; and, in claiming that, I am claiming for it even less than we expected, because we did not expect that its fairness or justice would be challenged, especially as the redistribution sections with respect to the other Maritime Provinces have passed with hardly a word of debate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has appealed to me as to whether the local gerrymander in the Island meets with my approval or disapproval. I have never had the pleasure of seeing what that gerrymander is up to this moment. I am no more responsible for it than is the Minister of Justice himself. I have a copy of the Bill introduced into the Legislative Assembly, but I do not know what measure has been passed. I cannot pass my opinion upon it for I have never seen it.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). Have you not seen the local press?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not beyond the fact that there was a gerrymander made. I saw the hon. gentleman's plan the other night. I suppose the hon. gentleman will accept my statement, that I never was consulted about it, that at present I know nothing of it, and that at the present moment I do not know what it is, except that I have seen a party-coloured map, which appears very strange. I hope the Minister of Justice will not be controlled, as I fear the hon. member for King's was controlled the other day, in his decision on this question, and thereby do a wrong to the people of the Island, simply because the wrong may have been done by the Local Legislature.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Certainly not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let us reason this matter out on its merits and deal even-handed justice. Let me press this point on the committee. Heretofore King's with half the population of Queen's has had two members. During the 19 years we have been in Confederation I have never raised one word of complaint in regard to it, I have never suggested there should be any equalization of the counties, or that the counties should be changed or that King's should only have one representative. I hold that the matter will readjust and settle itself. As the counties now stand, Queen's with its 46,000 is entitled to two members and King's with 26,000 is only entitled to one member, and there are 3,000 or 4,000 people over. The fact that it has 3,000 or 4,000 over the unit cannot be advanced as a reason for breaking in county lines, because you have that discrepancy multiplied fourfold in numerous cases in the adjoining provinces. If the fact that one county has 3,000 or 4,000 more than the unit is the only excuse for breaking down county lines, and if you act on that excuse as regards Prince Edward Island, how can you justify yourself for not applying it all round in the Maritime Provinces? Does this circumstance justify the Government in breaking into county lines which have been established for 120 years? It cannot be so. The argument appears to me to be unanswerable, and I desire to point out that in the new division the Government have made, they have continued the same discrepancy that would exist if the county lines were not interfered with, or very nearly the same. The Government have given East Queen's 23,000 odd and East Prince 20,000 odd, or a discrepancy of 3,000. I submit to the committee that it is impossible to avoid some small discrepancies. Leave the county lines alone. Leave the people of King's, who have worked together in all their affairs, alone, and maintain the sacred principle of county lines until forced to break them down, and do not seek to do so by some subterfuge. I accept the statement unreservedly, as made by the Minister of Justice, that he did not attempt to gerrymander me; but I cannot ignore the fact that I am gerrymandered. The person who prepared the Bill has placed in East Queen's 128 Conservative majority from King's, and 200 Conservative majority from West Queen's, making 328 Conservative majority put into East Queen's. It is impossible to get over this fact—you have gerrymandered me out. Talk as much as you like about your intention; I carried the county with some hundreds majority and whether I am able to overcome the effect of this gerrymander or not is a problem which the future alone will solve. I have stated nothing but the bald facts, and I am not going to be taken away from the argument by hon. gentlemen saying that the Local Legislature did this or did that. If they did a wrong let them be held responsible for it, but do not let us do another wrong of that kind: two wrongs do not make a right. If you break down county lines in Prince Edward Island how long will the county lines in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia remain? They will go down some day, and some party will be urged by its supporters to do so, and they will point to the fact that the county lines have been broken down in Prince Edward Island and demand that the

principle should be extended to the other Maritime Provinces. I say that we have a sound principle to go on in the maintenance of county lines, which maintains the historic continuity, which maintains the community of interests, and which maintains the relations of the people of the counties as they have done for 120 years. Hon. gentlemen know that in the Maritime Provinces political party lines do not prevail as rigidly as they do in Ontario. Since Prince Edward Island came into Confederation the county which I represent and which for three elections has sent two Liberals here, sent on one occasion two Conservatives to this House with 700 majority. That has been all changed, I think for the better and you may think for the worse. The people are not in their political convictions educated the same way as they are in the Province of Ontario. You may be the gainer, as you think, of a temporary political advantage, but possibly you may not succeed in your efforts. However that may be, you are introducing a vicious system, a system which, if adopted by your opponents, would gerrymander you out of existence on the Island, and if applied to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick might be productive of the worst results. I appeal to hon. gentlemen whether, for a paltry advantage which may or may not be gained, it is worth while to break down the principle you have sacredly observed in the Maritime Provinces heretofore. I hope the hon. Minister of Justice will study the figures I have given him, and not press this matter to a vote to-night. The hon. Minister said that I have been labouring under excitement, and perhaps I have. I have fought the fight in that county three times, as hard as mortal man ever fought in election contests, and I do not want to see the old county I have represented for ten years broken in upon, and three portions of another constituency brought into it, so that it will take a long time for me to get in touch with the people. You are dragging the people from King's County and bringing them into Queen's, and you make them associate with people with whom they never associated before, politically. I can see no other advantage to be gained from it except a party one, and I appeal to the hon. Minister of Justice to give the figures I have submitted to him fair consideration before he presses this matter to a vote.

Mr. DENISON. If this map which I have here, properly represents the gerrymander of constituencies by the Local House, I believe that it is a most disgraceful thing. That being the case, I see no reason why this House should attempt to follow it even though at a distance, and I think that for the sake of a paltry—if I can use the term—number of 3,000 people, that it is hardly necessary for this committee to go to work and gerrymander the whole Island. I shall vote for the amendment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are not gerrymandering it at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to offer a few words on this matter. Although I am not familiar with the geography of Prince Edward Island, yet from the few facts that stand out in this discussion, and which struck me as being of a character that ought to press themselves upon the mind of the Minister of Justice, it is evident that if the county lines of Prince Edward Island are respected, that the disparity in the unit of representation is not sufficient to warrant a resort to any such measure as is contemplated by this proposal to cut and carve up the Island. The public can see rightly or wrongly, that the placing of an adverse Conservative majority in the riding of my hon. friend from Queen's County (Mr. Davies) is an unwarrantable attempt to gerrymander out of this Parliament one of the most useful public men in the Dominion of Canada. We have had exhibitions in the United States of attempts to relegate public men of prominence to private life in that way, and these attempts have always brought discredit on the party which made them. There is no reason whatever that can be adduced for the operation which it is proposed to apply to the Province of Prince Edward Island. The fact that King's would have 26,000 inhabitants, the fact that the two members for Prince would receive 18,000 each, a county that is increasing rapidly in population and where the disparity will lessen rapidly ; I say that this disparity does not warrant any interference with the county lines which have been established for 120 years. This disparity is much less, if the county lines are respected, than exists in Ontario, or Quebec, or in Nova Scotia, or in New Brunswick. This disparity will not justify the action that is proposed to be taken ; it is no argument whatever in favour of it, and I hope that the Minister of Justice will allow this matter to stand over for further consideration. I am happy to say that in the consideration of the details of this Bill, we have had a disposition evinced by the Government which has somewhat surprised me. I confess, Sir, that if I had been aware of the existence of this disposition before, perhaps my criticism on the general character of this measure would have been a little less warm than it has been. I hope that the Government, having so far shown a disposition in many cases to give us fair-play, will not now stultify their record by persisting in this proposal in regard to Prince Edward Island. I am sure if the Minister of Justice will take time to reflect on this matter coolly, he will feel that the proposal with regard to the rearrangement of these constituencies is not in the interests of the Government, or in the interest of fair-play to carry out. Do not have the stigma cast on the Government that an attempt is made to import three or four hundred Conservative majority into my hon. friend's riding. Let us have this feature of the Bill carried out in the line of the other features that characterized the Bill, where concessions were made, and then the feelings of this House and of the country will be much better, and the reputation of the Government will be better than if they persisted in the small advantage that would accrue to them by the proposal in the Bill. I hope that the Minister of Justice will see the force of these arguments, and will allow the section to stand over.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the disparity which the hon. member refers to, and to which the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) made allusion, instead of it being 3,000, it would be more fair to state the facts, and to say that it is 8,000. The hon. gentleman took for the purpose of his comparison that which suited the argument of the hon. member for Queen's, namely, the county which had the largest population ; but he overlooked the fact that he was proposing to give in Prince County a representative to every 18,000

persons. As regards the characterization of the local redistribution, I say nothing about it. The hon. member for West Toronto does not know whether it is fair or unfair: he knows less about it than any of us who belong to the Maritime Provinces; and no one who merely looks at a plan can tell whether it is fair or unfair. But it shows that those boundaries which are so sacred in the mind of the hon. member for Queen's are not regarded by the Local Legislature.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Justice to-night. I always listen very carefully to anything he says in the House; and since this Redistribution Bill has come before the House, I have been specially careful to hear on what principle he advocates it. He has introduced a new principle to-night; he has evinced a great deal of new-born zeal for the principle of equalization—I use the term new-born zeal advisedly, because he has been urged again and again to look at the inequalities which exist all over the country and to do something to rectify them, and he has steadily refused to take any action in the premises. The only intelligible principle I have heard him lay down was that which he laid down in his speech the other night in reply to the hon. member for Bothwell, when that hon. member pleaded that county lines should not be interfered with, but that old association, should be respected. In order that I may not misrepresent him, I will read the words he made use of:

"Every word that the hon. member said upon that subject as regards their community of interests, as regards their familiarity with each other's views, as regards their consultation with each other as to the best men to represent them in Parliament, as to their habit of thought and their habit of congregating together for purposes connected with their representation in Parliament; every word the hon. member said in favour of continuing the county lines applies with ten-fold force to the continuance, as far as possible, of the existing political divisions of the counties. If the hon. gentleman recognizes that it is impossible to keep people who are accustomed to sit on the jury bench together, who are accustomed to elect municipal councillors together, who are accustomed to select their wardens together; if it be at all important to congregate these persons together and keep them within the lines within which they are accustomed to act, it is surely of equal importance, at least, that these people, having been congregating within certain political lines during the last 10 years, since 1882, and having acted together in political matters so far as this Parliament is concerned for the last 10 years, and shall not now be wantonly severed upon any mere theoretical principle are regards county lines or any other. Is it not important that we shall continue the principle of continuity, that we shall continue with the party convention it may be, the party caucus it may be, the occasional political discussion on the street it may be, of men who are accustomed to assemble to discuss their political requirements? Is it not important, I ask, that we should provide that these persons shall continue to congregate, and to meet, and to consult, and to advise and to vote together, as they have been doing for the last 10 years, unless some good reason can be offered to this committee to the contrary? It is upon that principle, I say, that all the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) urged with regard to the county lines—and all of that we are not disposed to dispute as regards any matters which affects the counties themselves—applies with ten-fold force to the maintenance of the political divisions of the last 10 years, unless some reason is given to show that that political line is unjust, that it ought to be violated, or that it operates unjustly to some other section of the country."

That was the principle the hon. gentleman laid down, and from which he refused to depart. We pointed out that by the Redistribution Act of 1882, if you choose to call it by that soft name, the grossest injustice was done throughout the country, but the hon. gentleman refused to rectify that injustice, because he held that it was more important that the continuity of the present electoral districts should be maintained. And now, Sir, I appeal to his own principle, and I ask him, if it is important that the boundary lines laid down ten years ago should be respected, is it not at least of equal importance that the lines laid down 120 years ago should be respected and continued? The figures have been given over and over again, but let me refer to them again. King's County has a population of 26,633, Prince 36,470, and Queen's 45,977. Now, what the hon. member for Queen's proposes is that the member who is to be taken away from the Island should simply be taken from King's County, and the continuity of 120 years not interfered with, but that the other two counties shall continue to elect two representatives each to this House. Now, the only reason the hon. gentleman can urge to-night for refusing to accede to that resolution is that by his scheme the population is equalized. Well, Sir, on his own reasoning since this Bill came before the House, that has no force whatever. If it were necessary I could point to one constituency in the adjoining province which has not 2,000 or 3,000 more, but which has 17,000 more than the County of King's would have if left as it is; I refer to Drummond and Arthabaska; and yet the hon. gentleman refuses to rectify that inequality. He will also find that the population of East Quebec is 36,384, some 12,000 or 13,000 more than the unit, while West Quebec has only 8,000; and yet the hon. gentleman does not see fit to apply his principle of equalization to remedy that gross inequality.

Mr. AMYOT. Does the hon. gentleman desire Quebec West to be done away with?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I certainly do not, but I want it to have something like the same population that East Quebec has. I want the hon. Minister of Justice to apply the principle all round if he is going to apply it to Prince Edward Island. On the principle which he himself has laid down, there is not the slightest justification for this breaking up of the Island, call it by the term redistribution, gerrymander, or what you will. Now, since no principle the hon. gentleman has laid down can be applied to it, we have a right to charge that it is done for the purpose of keeping our hon. friend out of this House, and the country will so regard it. I do not believe it will have that effect. I believe the people of Prince Edward Island have sufficient honour and honesty to resent such an attempt, and will send the hon. gentleman back by an increased majority; but the attempt is made all the same, and the disposition to do the wrong is unmistakable. Is this House not to be governed by the ordinary rules of fair-play and justice which characterize people outside the House. Why, school boys on the play-ground would be ashamed to take advantage of their opponents in any such manner. I have only to refer to the gerrymander of 1882. Let me just point out one of the things done then. We had a few months ago to regret the loss of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, a man who had broken himself down in the service of the country, a man who had spent his life and money in its service. He had left the constituency he had represented ever since he came to Parliament, and accepted a nom-

ination in East York, and you would fancy that, under the circumstances, broken down in health and unable to engage in a canvass, if any one were entitled to fair-play it would be him. The highland chief, when about to engage in battle with his foe, seeing that his enemy had nothing but his naked blade, threw away his own target and engaged in the fight on equal terms. Did the Government deal with Mr. Mackenzie in that way? No: despite his condition, they gerrymandered his riding so as to secure his defeat, tied his hands and then left him to fight his battle. That is what they are trying to do with the hon. member for East Queen's. I do not believe they will be successful. The amendment he has proposed has carried one gentleman on the other side, and I hope it will carry sufficient others to secure its adoption.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Justice has stated, and so have a good many other gentlemen opposite, that what the Government desire above all is to conduct these distributions in the several provinces with the minimum of disturbance. That is a good principle, but when I tendered a practical application of that principle in the case of the Province of Ontario, when I showed that by simply uniting the four smallest constituencies in that province, you might supply the requisite number of members for Toronto and Algoma, my practical application of the principle did not meet with the concurrence of the hon. gentleman and his followers. But passing that, it does appear to me that there is absolutely no satisfactory reason for refusing to acquiesce in the proposition of my hon. friend. When you remember that these 26,000 people in King's have been, on the principle laid down of equalizing the population, enormously over-represented for a great many years, there is very little hardship in saying that King's, which, as I see by the census returns, is a perfectly stationary county, should now have a representation slightly below the unit of representation. Prince County is the only one in the Island which has had any material increase during the last ten years, and if the state of things which led to that continues, before another ten years come round, in all probability its population will be nearly equal that of King's.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Only 2,000 of an increase.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a considerable increase in an Island where in no other part is there any increase at all. There has been on the contrary a considerable decrease on the Island at large, but King's County has remained stationary. If the desire of the hon. gentleman is to have a minimum of disturbance, no proposition can be made which can compare with that of my hon. friend. You simply remove one member from one county, and everything goes on as before. We are entitled, I submit, with all due deference to the Minister of Justice, to look to the adjoining Province of Nova Scotia. It is very unfair to apply to Prince Edward Island a principle which the hon. gentleman refuses entirely to apply to Nova Scotia. He refuses to allow any dual representation, so called, that is to say giving each county the right or privilege, if it be a privilege, to return two members—he refuses to allow that to continue in Prince Edward Island, but he does not in the slightest degree disturb Cape Breton, Pictou or Halifax City or Halifax County in his own province. The hon. gentleman just now made the argument that 36,471 people in Prince County are too few, and that its proportion of representation was altogether too great.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Only as compared with others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Only as compared, but in all the other provinces enormous disproportions exist which he refuses to remedy.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not going about the Dominion redressing anomalies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You deliberately create them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. All I contend for is when you have to alter constituencies you have to do it with regard to population.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But not to the extent of disturbing the whole province, because it is necessary to take away one member. Prince County has two members for 36,471. I turn to Cape Breton; it has two members for 34,000. Pictou, which is a diminishing county—it has diminished I see by the census—has two members for 34,550. Now, in my own Province of Ontario the hon. gentleman had no scruple whatever, when he might have reduced some anomalies, in disturbing as many counties as he saw fit, and, at the same time, allow the greatest anomalies to exist. Take the counties I pointed to the other afternoon, the County of Frontenac with 13,300 and Lennox with 14,900 people, adjoining the County of Addington with 24,000 people, 11,000 more in the one case and 9,000 more than in the other, and that might have been done with the most perfect propriety, because, although the hon. gentleman does not know it, I know it because I have represented these counties, Lennox and Addington are properly one county. The municipal counties of Lennox and Addington have a population of very little more than the unit, and it would have been infinitely better for him to have restored Frontenac to its old population and Lennox and Addington to their old population and given them two members than to have cut and carved the Niagara Peninsula as he did. That would have met with the universal approval of all fair-minded men, and have redressed some of the other inequalities I have pointed out. But here all the hon. gentleman need to do is simply to leave the two counties of Queen's and Prince alone. No human being can say that any real injustice would be inflicted on the inhabitants of King's by giving them one member for 26,634, for it is notorious that both in Ontario and Quebec there are a score of counties with a larger population than King's would have. There are counties with 44,000 people, there are counties with 36,000 people, there are counties with 38,000, there are several counties with 30,000, 31,000 and 35,000. Sir, there can be no possible injustice, if that is all that is standing in the way of hon. gentlemen acquiescing in my hon. friend's proposal, in doing in Prince Edward Island what they have done or permitted to continue to be done in both the great Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, not to speak of the very glaring cases which exist in New Brunswick, where you do not feel called upon to redress such enormous and improper inequality as Restigouche with

8,000 and the County of Westmoreland with 40,844. There is an inequality, if the hon. gentleman likes. There is a thing which ought to be redressed. There is a thing which, if you choose to meddle with county boundaries, you are bound to redress. It is a gross injustice that 41,000 people in the County of Westmoreland should have one representative and that 8,000 people in the County of Restigouche should have one representative. With these facts staring you in the face, it is simply trifling with the House to say that it is a gross injustice that 26,000 people should only have one representative. The discrepancy between Prince and King's is not to be compared to this. King's has always been over-represented. I find that, in 1881, that county had a population of 26,100, while there was a population of 48,110 in another constituency in that Island. No one complained that one man in King's was nearly equal to two men in Queen's, and it is preposterous to allege that any injustice or any wrong would be done by making the population of that county 3,000 or 4,000 more than the unit of representation. I would add to what has been said by my hon. friend beside me, my desire that this matter may be allowed to lie over and be considered, in the hope that the hon. gentleman will see that he is doing a thing which is not fairly justifiable in itself and which will certainly provoke very high-handed retaliation one day or another, if the party on this side of the House are ever called upon to redistribute the representation of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). The hon. gentleman ended his remarks by saying that this Bill would only lead to retaliation at some future time. If the retaliation, when it takes place, is done on the same fair basis as this redistribution, there will be nothing to complain of. I will leave it to any honest, honourable man who takes the plan of Prince Edward Island in his hand and knows that one representative has to be taken away and that three counties have to be redistributed so as to give five seats, to say that this is not the fairest distribution which, under the circumstances, can take place. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) tries to make a point on the ground that the whole of this redistribution has the sole aim of driving him out of Parliament. I would not like to see him out of Parliament, but he has a city and a county which is a safe constituency for him as long as he behaves himself and the people support him. Next to that there is a constituency in which, taking the past census and the past vote, there will be a majority of 89 or 90 Conservatives. I think there is pluck enough in the hon. gentleman to face a majority of that kind. I have faced a majority of that kind myself, and I turned a majority against me of 60 or 70 into a majority in my favour of 150. Looking at this fairly and squarely without any party bias at all, it is a fair distribution remembering that there is only about 90 conservative majority in East Queen's. The hon. gentleman has a safe constituency in Queen's.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) East Queen's has always been my constituency.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). See how unfair the hon. gentleman is. It is not true that East Queen's has always been his constituency any more than West Queen's. Does he not live in West Queen's, that is, in Charlottetown, and has he not that constituency safe for him? We had to divide the Island into five ridings, and we commenced at the east point and took township after township until we got the unit as close as possible. We might commence from the north, and in the same way reach the same results. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) laid great stress on the county lines, and said they had lasted for 100 years, and it was a shame to disturb them. I may inform the committee that with us there are practically no county lines. We have no county councils, no county taxes, no county rates, and yet this hon. gentleman will come before you and say, do not be guilty of this iniquity, do not allow these county lines to be blotted out. The only thing we have in common is the courts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are there no county courts?

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). Of course there are county courts, but we are the only province in the Dominion, and possibly in the world, with no taxes of a municipal nature, or almost of any nature. The hon. gentleman from Queen's says this measure is unfair and unjust. I deny the charge and, as far as I was consulted by the Government about this redistribution, the only thing the Government wanted to impress upon me was to see that there was a fair and equal distribution. They did not want to cut off their opponents, but they wanted to divide the province fairly into five ridings. It would have been easy for us to have left certain townships in King's County and strengthened our hands very materially, or to have so arranged the townships as to strengthen our friends in eastern Queen's, but we made a fair and generous distribution, and while we left ourselves a fair chance for a fight, we left our opponents also a fair chance for a fight. It seems to me that the great point the senior member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) tries to make out, is that we want to swamp him. Now, Sir, a more ridiculous statement could not be made in this House. He has a constituency that gives him a majority of three or four hundred, and I dare say that no man could take it from him; therefore he has nothing to complain of. As I said before, they have got another constituency in the same county in which they have a good fighting chance, and I think we have treated them fairly right through. Now, he also stated that the three lots that were taken from King's County and placed in Queen's, had no association in common with Queen's. I deny that. At least lots 63 and 64 have as much in common with Queen's County as they have with King's County. In the first place they have more trade in common, their trade is much larger with Charlottetown than it is with the county town of Georgetown. In the next place, they are largely of the same way of thinking, as they are mostly Presbyterians, and their associations are much more with the people of Queen's in the county adjoining them. I shall not trouble the House to-night by referring to the local gerrymander. I could say a good deal to show the iniquitous way in which that gerrymander was forced through the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, but as the hour is late I will forbear. I merely repeat that I defy the hon. member for Queen's, or any other unabiassed gentleman, to make a fairer distribution of the Province of Prince

Edward Island into five ridings, than has been done under the present Bill.

Mr. PERRY. I have been hoping for a few days past that the Government would think proper to reconsider the Bill now before the committee, and that some concessions would be made to Prince Edward Island. I formed the opinion from the fact that concessions were made in the great Province of Ontario and the great Province of Quebec, but I am afraid, after listening to the speech delivered by the Minister of Justice, that Prince Edward Island has very little to expect. Is it because Prince Edward Island is the smallest province in the Dominion that we are to get no consideration? The present Government of Canada shoot very sharply with the people of Prince Edward Island when they carry out the terms of Confederation so far as representation is concerned, but they are not so particular when the people of Prince Edward Island ask the Government to fulfil their part of the terms of Confederation. As soon as they think they have the shadow of a reason to deprive Prince Edward Island of one member, they do it at once. I was under the impression at one time that the Government would be magnanimous enough not to extend their wrath down to Prince Edward Island, but I see that they are going to do so in the shape of this Gerrymander Bill. Providence has lately been more kind to Prince Edward Island than the Government. Last week a great storm swept over a great portion of Canada, but it did not cross the Straits of Northumberland—I suppose because the tunnel is not yet built. But the poor people of that Island are to be visited with a gerrymander storm. Now, my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Macdonald) who has just sat down, got very warm: he takes credit to himself by saying: We have done this, and we have done that, we have framed a Gerrymander Bill for Prince Edward Island on equitable terms. We have commenced at the North Cape of Prince Edward Island, in Prince County, and we have gone on and cut out one riding, we have gone into three townships in Queen's County. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he got his information from my hon. friend from King's County. Is that Bill framed by the hon. member for King's? Who asked the Government to make this alteration? How did the Government find out that it was pleasing to the people of the Island that county lines should be broken up? I find here in sub-section (*d*) it is provided that the electoral district of East Prince shall consist of lots numbered so and so, enumerating lots 29, 30 and 67 in Prince County. Now these townships are not in Prince County, they are in Queen's County. Let me ask the Minister of Justice, when the sheriff of Prince County issues his proclamation calling a meeting of the Supreme Court at the shire-town of Prince County, what are these people going to do? Are these people in townships 29, 30 and 67 going to obey that proclamation, or will they go to a court in Charlottetown, Queen's County, the county in which they actually live? Let me tell the Minister of Justice that this provision of his Bill may create a great deal of trouble there. The plan adopted by the Government in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia has not been followed in Prince Edward Island, and why? Just because it would not do to take one member from Cape Breton, because the five members from Cape Breton are Conservatives. It would not do to take one member from Pictou, because both members from Pictou are Conservatives; it would not do to take one from Halifax because there they are both Conservatives. But in Prince Edward Island it is all right, because that Island sends four Liberals to this House. Under the present arrangement the Conservative votes in Prince Edward Island will be 1,100 or 1,200 in the minority, but they will be able under this Bill, to return three Conservative members, whereas the Liberals can only return two. the Government suppose that their party with a minority of 1,100 or 1,200 in the Island will be able by this gerrymander to return three members out of five. By the present arrangement West Prince is "hived." There will be a majority there of 500 or 600 Liberal votes, whoever may run. I think that constituency is quite safe for a Liberal whether I run there myself or not, and I will go bail for the fact that no Tory need apply, and one will not get in there while I live, at all events. In cutting out West Prince hon. gentlemen opposite commenced at township 1 and went down to township 16 both inclusive. They passed over township 15 and left it in East Prince. Why was that done? It will be necessary to go 25 miles from the eastern border of township 16 in order to cross a bridge to go to West Prince to attend a nomination or election. That goes to show that the hon. member for King's who appears to have advised the Minister of Justice in regard to this Bill knows nothing at all about West Prince. He may know something about Queen's, but I do not think he ever saw Prince. In regard to the reason why the Government passed over township 15 and took 16, I believe the Government were actuated in doing so by the fact that township 15 had a majority of Conservatives and it was necessary to add that township to East Prince, so that no Liberal would have a chance to run successfully in that division. They, however, leave township 16, which has a majority of Liberals, to West Prince which has already a Liberal majority of 500 or 600. That is the kind of justice that Prince County is receiving from hon. gentlemen opposite. There is no doubt that the Bill is prepared for the purpose of gerrymandering the hon. gentleman for Queen's (Mr. Davies) out of his seat. I will hardly go so far as to say that the Minister of Justice knew at the time he framed the Bill that it would gerrymander my hon. friend out of his constituency. But it will have that effect, and it looks as if the Government well knew it. But the people of the Island are not to be disturbed by these small matters from doing their duty, and they are not to be turned aside by any whim of the Government. The people of the Island are independent. One would imagine from the speech of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) that all the people on the Island are beggars. I do not know the people of his constituency, but the constituents of Queen's and Prince are not beggars, but are as independent as any other people of the Dominion, not only in pocket but in mind. Perhaps his constituents have not minds of their own, and in fact I doubt it when they sent the hon. gentleman here. In order to defend the present Bill the Government have referred to the act that the Local Legislature of the Island have passed a Gerrymander Bill. The hon. member for King's has shown a map which is enough almost to frighten a horse off its oats;

but will the hon. gentleman swear that the map is correct and that it shows exactly the gerrymander carried out on the Island? We have only the hon. gentleman's word for it, and it is quite easy for any one, more particularly for a man having his finger in the Government pie, to get up a plan. No doubt it does not cost him much. If it cost a little, he would have enough left out of the election funds. I will not say where the funds came from, but I am afraid they came partly from the Red Parlour. I think they had some little money left, I suppose enough to pay for the plan. There is no reason why the Island should be gerrymandered, why the county lines should be disturbed, and I warn the Minister of Justice that a disturbance of these lines may create great trouble in that province. For instance, a magistrate living in Prince has no jurisdiction in Queen's, and a Magistrate living in Queen's has no jurisdiction in King's, and suppose of magistrate living in townships 29, 30, 67, issues a warrant for a person in Prince County, how could the warrant be carried out? The Minister of Justice will tell me that these three townships are still in Queen's County. But the Bill says that "29, 30 and 67 in Prince County as designated and bounded on the said official survey and map on the said Island." What is that survey? The survey of Captain Holland in 1766. In that survey no such lots appeared in Prince County. If that is the kind of information furnished by the hon. member for King's, professional men must be laughing at it. I had in my mind when the amendment of the hon. member for Queen's was disposed of to move another amendment to leave the Island represented by six members as at present. It would be interesting then to see how the hon. members for King's would vote, and whether they would dare to vote against the representation of the Island by six members. I would like to see that, but I think I would have a little more charity than my hon. friend. I am a loyal subject, and I am not going to be a rebel now but I will submit to the law. I say that when the fathers of Confederation came here in 1873 to sign the terms of union with Canada, they had a right to ensure that Prince Edward Island would never be represented by less than six members. The Government having found out that they made that mistake take advantage of it, but when the people of the Island ask them to fulfil the terms of Confederation as far as winter communication is concerned, they say we are not bound to do it. Yet the hon. members for King's are satisfied with the Government for not carrying out the terms of Confederation, they are satisfied with the Gerrymander Bill, and are satisfied that the Island should be represented by only five members. Let my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Macdonald) go across to Cape Breton and he would find that Cape Breton has a population of only 86,000, but it is represented by five members. The Government took care that although Nova Scotia had to lose a member they would not take him from Cape Breton, because the five members from there happened to be supporters of the Government. My hon. friend from King's has taken the responsibility of the whole of this gerrymander, and he says that we did this and we did that, and that we have prepared a just and equitable measure. I do not know who the "we" along with himself is, but it might be the gentleman known as the wirepuller in Summerside. I ask is it just to tamper and meddle with the county lines of poor little Prince Edward Island because she is the smallest province, and because her voice cannot be heard here as the voice of Ontario and Quebec is? Is it fair for the Government to single her out and say: You are a small little province with a population of only 109,000, and we have a majority at our back, and will punish you because you have not sent six members to support this immaculate Government of ours? I was glad to find a little while ago that there was one independent Conservative on the other side of the House who stood up manfully and said that he would support the amendment of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). He is not a Grit, but he is a man of conscience, and a man who would like to do justice even to the smallest province in the whole Dominion. I am glad to find that small a province as we are we have friends from Ontario and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to come to our rescue, and that being the case I have every reason to hope that justice is going to be done to the people of Prince Edward Island. If the Minister of Justice once visited that Island, if he breathed the pure air in the month of July or August, he would have a good opinion of it. If he does the people justice, and if he comes to visit that Island, even the children going to school would say here is the Minister of Justice, the benefactor of the people, who gave fair-play to the people of Prince Edward Island, and soon. Why, Sir, it would be a great consolation to him. I do not know that they would not even throw flowers under his feet while he was passing through the streets of Charlottetown and Summerside. I would advise the Minister of Justice to adjourn the House now, and go home and take a good sleep, to sleep the sleep of the just, and to wake up to-morrow morning with a full conviction that he is going to do the people of Prince Edward Island justice, and if he does that I doubt very much if I will oppose him any more during the present session.

Mr. McLEAN (P.E.I.) I have listened carefully to the hon. members for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and Prince (Mr. Perry) to see in what respect they find fault with the redistribution as it applies to Prince Edward Island. I find that the only fault they tried to point out to the House is the one fact that the county lines will be broken, and I think that the House will agree with me that if they had, as they had during the last Parliament, in this House, six Liberals representing Prince Edward Island, they would not find fault with the gerrymander, as they call it, as it is at present. Do the hon. gentlemen from Queen's pretend to tell this House that if there were two Liberals representing King's in this House at the present time that they would say that this redistribution was unfair. Let us enquire for a moment what they say they have to complain of. I may point out for the information of the House, in the first place, that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), if he conveyed any impression at all to my mind, conveyed the impression that East Queen's always was his county. I want to assure the House that he never lived in East Queen's, and that if there is any representative for East Queen's it is his colleague (Mr. Welsh), because he actually does live in East Queen's as it is

now. His summer residence is on lot 48, which is in East Queen's, but the hon. member from Charlottetown (Mr. Davies) never represented East Queen's any more than he did the whole of the county, except that the two hon. gentlemen ran as colleagues. According to the redistribution as it is now, and taking the last election in King's County and adding the whole vote Liberal and Conservative, and dividing it in two, the result would stand that King's County gave 171 Conservative majority, and Queen's East gave a Conservative majority of 89. Now, I think that the hon. member for East Queen's (Mr. Davies) as he calls himself, will say that if the Government have done half the wicked things he has said they have done during this and last session, that it would not be hard to overcome that majority of 89 against him. But the hon. gentleman dreads the fact that in the election before the last he had about a 1,000 majority in Queen's while, last election he had only a majority of about 400, and he is perhaps afraid that it will go on in that direction. I do not think that he could otherwise complain that a majority of 89 is going to gerrymander him out of the county. In West Queen's there is a Liberal majority of 305, and that should be a safe constituency for the hon. gentleman if he wants to get one, and is afraid of being gerrymandered. Now, it is said that there is a gerrymander being attempted in East Prince. When I tell the House that in East Prince there is a Conservative majority of only 30, it cannot be fairly asserted that an attempt has been made to gerrymander that district, while in the western part of the county, from lot 1 to lot 16, there is a Liberal majority of 516, and these lots are not interfered with in any way. When the Island is divided into five ridings, instead of three counties as before, each man running an election will have to run on his own merits; he cannot be helped by his colleague who lives at the other end of the county; and on that principle this is as fair a redistribution of the Island as could be made. I would ask any hon. gentleman who thinks it is unfair to take this fact into consideration, that although the population has been equalized as nearly as possible, not one lot has been broken; and any gentleman who takes the map and goes into a room, not knowing the political complexion of one part or another of the Island, and attempts to divide the Island into five constituencies, he will arrive at the very same figures.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman admit that he has divided the Island so as to give Conservative majorities in three districts?

Mr. McLEAN (P.E.I.) I will ask the hon. gentleman if there has been one lot passed over for the purpose of doing that?

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

Mr. McLEAN (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman claim, because there are four Liberal representatives in this House, that they have such a large majority that they are entitled to that for all time to come?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman did not hear my question. I asked him if the Island has not been so divided that, while it sends five Liberal members and one Conservative member today, there will be Conservative majorities in three of the districts out of the five?

Mr. McLEAN (P.E.I.) I have been so fair that I have given the exact figures in each county, and the hon. gentleman has not tried to deny them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do they not show a majority in three districts?

Mr. McLEAN (P.E.I.) I have read them so; but the only trouble with the hon. gentleman is this: He has pointed out that lot 24 has voted in West Queen's for the last 20 years. I do not know that it has voted with the hon. gentleman every time he has run an election; but it has not been transposed; it is in the centre of the county. The hon. gentleman's idea was to put lot 24 in West Queen's. East Queen's will have a population of 23,466, and West Queen's 22,210. Lot 24 has 2,615. Take that out of East Queen's and add it to West Queen's and it would leave the population of East Queen's at 20,851 and make the population of West Queen's 24,825. That is what the hon. gentleman says would be a fair division; but he forgets to add that it would convert his minority of 89 to a majority of 120.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is just the reason it is put in, to convert my majority into a minority.

Mr. McLEAN (P.E.I.) I appeal to this House if that would be a fair division. Then we have the fact that the hon. gentleman lives in West Queen's, and he is not compelled to run in East Queen's unless he sees fit. If he thinks he has more influence in the county than he had in previous elections, and if he thinks that this is a gerrymander in the eyes of the people of Prince Edward Island, with the object of taking his seat from him, surely it is not a great task for him to overcome a majority of 89. We know that in Prince Edward Island the great question before the people has been the question of free trade, and upon that question the hon. gentleman has carried his election by a large majority; but he forgets to tell this House that that majority has been greatly reduced, and it is his fear of further reduction that makes him dread even the small majority of 89 against him. The man who has only 89 against him, and has not faith in his policy overcoming that majority, does not deserve to be a leader in a great party. I do claim that this is a fair distribution, and it has not been attacked. The hon. gentleman says that it will compel him to travel 100 miles to go from one end of East Queen's to the other. Well, if we left Queen's County as it is, the distance the hon. gentleman would have to travel from lot 20 to lot 62 would be much further than the distance in East Queen's from lot 24 to lot 61. That is not the reason why the hon. gentleman wants Queen's County and Prince County left intact. It is so that the hon. members from Prince, one living at one end of the county and the other at the other end, will be able to combine their influence and run together. Yet in the case of King's County, the hon. gentleman evidently thinks it is no trouble for one man to canvass 120 miles of territory. That is his idea of fair-play. Now, we have in Prince Edward Island three counties to be formed into five ridings, as nearly equal in population as may be; and in carrying that plan, no hon. gentleman can point out where any injustice is done. As for community of interest, as my hon. colleague has pointed out, apart from the fact that if a man commits a crime in King's County he has to be tried at Georgetown, or in Queen's County he has to be

tried in Charlottown, or in Prince County he has to be tried at Summerside, there is no other interference with the people of Prince Edward Island so far as county boundaries are concerned.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. (Thursday.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 23rd June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ENQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to enquire whether those census returns, which were promised ten days ago, are yet forthcoming or are likely to be ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are expected every day. The delay, I am informed by the Minister of Agriculture, is in the Printing Bureau.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 95) further to amend the General Inspection Act. He said : I do not propose to discuss this Bill at this stage, nor do I propose to ask the House to go into committee upon it to-day ; but some members of the House, who are obliged to leave Ottawa very shortly, desire to present some views on the measure, and I move the second reading to-day in order to give them an opportunity to do so.

Mr. BORDEN. I am very much obliged to the hon. Minister of Justice for having moved the second reading of this Bill in order to give me, among others, an opportunity of presenting the views of some persons, in the Province of Nova Scotia, who are interested in the subject, and who, I believe, have asked that some action be taken in reference to the inspection of apples and apple barrels. I do not understand that the Bill meets the case as put by the Fruit Growers' Association of Nova Scotia. It provides that apples shall be included within the provisions of the General Inspection Act. I understand the complaint of the Fruit Growers' Association to be with reference to the size of the barrel. The difficulty is not so much with the quality of the fruit as in the fact that barrels of different sizes are used in the shipment of apples to Great Britain, which, of course, is our principal market. The Fruit Growers' Association of Nova Scotia had a meeting recently, and the secretary of that association has forwarded to me a resolution which puts the case from their stand-point much better than I can, and as it is very short, I will read it :

"Whereas the Nova Scotia Fruit Growers' Association, now convened at Middleton, consider it desirable that a change be made in the statute relative to the size of apple barrels; trouble and loss having come to Nova Scotia shippers, owing to the fact that the Upper Provinces use a much larger barrel than the law provides, and whereas the shippers of Nova Scotia comply with the provisions of law and use the sized barrel therein provided : Therefore resolved—That the Government be requested to legislate in the matter, and compel shippers to use a barrel of the exact dimensions, no larger and no smaller, so that the size of barrel shall be uniform throughout the Dominion. Every barrel to be branded by a sworn inspector under penalty. Also the cubic contents be given, as well as length between heads, diameter of head and diameter of bilge instead of measurements as at present."

In sending this resolution to me the secretary of the association wrote me somewhat in detail. I will not trouble the House with reading his letter, but will merely mention that he points out that the shippers of apples in Ontario are in the habit of using the flour barrel, which is a very much larger barrel than that provided for in the statute. They desire to have this grievance remedied rather than an inspection of the fruit. The amendment before the House provides only for the inspection of apples ; it does not provide for any regulation of the size of the barrel ; and I desire to ask the Government whether it is their intention to introduce any provision in this Bill for an inspection of the barrel itself. I do not myself see how this can be done, because that would really be an amendment to the Weights and Measures Act, and not properly to the General Inspection Act. I may say that besides the meeting of the Fruit Growers' Association to which I have referred, there was a meeting very largely attended of fruit growers and dealers in my county, shortly after the date of the meeting of the Fruit Growers' Association ; and as a result of that meeting a committee was appointed to draw up such a Bill as would meet the views of the persons interested, and a copy of that Bill was sent to me. I showed it to the Minister of Inland Revenue, and asked him if it would be possible for him to introduce this Bill, which is really an amendment to the Weights and Measures Act of the Dominion, and he said he thought he could not do it this year, although it might be possible to introduce an amendment to the present Bill as it was going through this House which would meet the point ; and it is with a view to that that I desire to put these views before the House now. The Weights and Measures Act provides for a barrel of a certain size, but it does not provide for the greatest diameter of the barrel. It provides that the staves shall be so many inches in length, I think 27 inches from croe to croe, that the head of the barrel shall be from 16½ to 17 inches in diameter, and that the barrel shall be as nearly cylindrical as possible ; but it does not provide for the greatest diameter of the barrel, namely, at the bilge. The consequence is that dishonest shippers make their barrels very nearly straight, and in that way make the contents less than they ought to be. It is desired that the exact dimensions of the barrel should be fixed, not only the length of the staves but the length of the barrel inside between the heads, because dishonest shippers are in the habit of making the heads of unusual thickness and putting the thick side on the inside, thereby diminishing the capacity of the barrel. They are also in the habit of making the barrel very straight, and in that way diminishing its gross diameter. It is proposed that the exact dimensions shall be given, and that the maker of the barrel shall be required to have his name stamped legibly on the barrel, and that a fine shall be imposed upon the

maker of any barrel which is not up to the standard, and also upon the shipper of any barrel under size. I do not know that it is necessary for me to go any further. I think I have expressed the views of the Fruit Growers' Association of Nova Scotia, very many of whom are my constituents, and in that respect have discharged my duty; and I desire to say that if it is impossible to introduce a provision to meet the case in the Bill now before the House, I hope the Government will take the matter into consideration and introduce the Bill required by these people during next session. In fact, I think that would be the better way, because the men engaged in manufacturing barrels have now tens of thousands manufactured, and it would be evidently a hardship to them that a certain size should be required for the market now after those barrels have been made in good faith. But if the Government would give an intimation of their intention to make this amendment and decide what size they propose to adopt, that would be a notice to these people to be on their guard for next season. I may add that it is desired potato barrels should be included as well as apple barrels in the provisions of the Bill. At present the people of Nova Scotia are shipping all their potatoes to the West Indies, which is the only market they have; and from the fact that barrels of different sizes are shipped, they are, when they reach the market in Havana, divided into two classes, small and large barrels, and the price of the small ones is altogether out of proportion to the size of the barrel. Although only slightly smaller than the average, the price received for them is very much less, and it is desirable, therefore, that the potato barrels should be included as wellas theapple barrels. Before taking my seat, I would like to point out to the Minister of Justice the fact that there seems to be a law in the Province of Nova Scotia, included in the Acts of the provinces of Canada now, not repealed by the Revised Statutes of 1887. And this law is a very much better one than the provisions contained in the Weights and Measures Act with reference to barrels. In fact, I may say that the Bill which has been forwarded to me to have enacted here is almost an exact copy of the Nova Scotia statute, and I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether this law is really in force in the Province of Nova Scotia now. I assume that it is, from its appearance in this volume, but it does not agree with the Act in the Dominion statute. The size of the barrel laid down here does not agree with the size of the barrel provided in the Dominion statutes, and perhaps the Minister of Justice would answer me with reference to this and also with reference to the question I put as to whether it is intended in the Bill now before the House to introduce any further amendment providing for the inspection of the barrel itself.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). This question of the inspection and packing of apples has been for some time a very important one, not only in Nova Scotia but now in the North-West. In my county and in the county of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, it has been agitated for years. We have all seen the desirability of having a proper inspection of apples. The different fruit growers' associations, the different traders in apples, and the honest farmer, have been endeavouring for some time to get a proper way of controlling the packing of the apples, and I think the Government are taking a proper step in this direction by placing apples in the General Inspection Act. This matter has also been lately brought to my attention, as well as to the attention of the hon. member for King's, by the Nova Scotia Fruit Growers' Association. We are both anxious to have it put upon a proper basis and properly regulated. This is, however, an Inspection Act, and has not, I presume, much to do with the size of the barrel. We have a law now, under chapter 104 of the Weights and Measures Act, with reference to the size of the barrel, which has been referred to by the hon. gentleman; and the coopers generally, as I am informed—I have taken pains to become informed on this matter—govern themselves in accordance with section 18 of the Weights and Measures Act. That section reads as follows:—

"All apples packed in Canada for sale by the barrel shall be packed in good and strong barrels of seasoned wood, made as nearly cylindrical as may be. The staves of such barrel shall be 27 inches in length from croe to croe, with heads from 16½ to 17 inches in diameter; and such barrels shall be sufficiently hooped with lining hoops within the chimes, the whole well secured by nails.

"Every person who offers or exposes for sale by the barrel, otherwise than in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, shall be liable to a penalty of 25 cents for each barrel of apples so offered or exposed for sale."

I think that law obtains generally in Nova Scotia, and coopers govern themselves by it. Now, in order to see that not only the apples but the barrels also shall be in accordance with the law, I would suggest, if it can be possibly done in the Bill before the House, to have not only an inspection of apples but also an inspection of barrels, so that the barrels shall be in accordance with this Act. This Act may not at present meet the requirements of the trade. It may not be sufficiently defined. There is a margin with reference to the bilge of the barrel. The law says it shall be as cylindrical as possible. Now, in order to make a substantial barrel, there must be of necessity some dimension fixed. Some apple traders say there must be more bilge than at present given to the barrel, not only to add strength to it even for moderate shipment but also for shipment across the water, because that is the trade which governs all these matters with us at present, our larger shipments being to London more particularly. The bilge of the barrel produces strength and breadth to it, and when apples are shipped by steamers, from 10,000 to 15,000 barrels at a time, the greater bilge there is to the barrel, the greater is the protection to the apples against being crushed in the lower tiers of the vessel. However, I agree perfectly with what has been said by my hon. friend respecting any material change in the construction of the barrel at the present time, for I am informed that the coopers have thousands of dollars' worth of stuff out, and are making the barrel for the coming shipment, and it would be unjust to them to be put to any inconvenience or expense by adopting a new law on the subject at present. There is now a sufficient margin to meet the requirements of the shipper, and, if there is an inspection provided in the present Bill for the barrel, I think for the present year the matter could be easily arranged. I have had frequent consultations with the Minister of Inland Revenue with reference to this, and that is, as I gather, his idea. I understand there is no

apparent reason why this Act cannot be amended in committee, so that the inspection of barrels may be had as well as the inspection of the apple. There are other details in this Bill which would be more properly considered when the Bill gets into committee. There has been a considerable discussion in reference to the fee, and there will no doubt be an argument as to who will pay the fee, and there will be a discussion or some argument, I presume, as to who will inspect, where the inspection will take place, and how many inspectors there will be. Another important matter to be considered will be, whether the date of the inspection should not be placed on the barrel, and there are also some matters to be considered with reference to what No. 1 and No. 2 Canadian apples should be. There should, in my opinion, be something in the Act providing against slack barrels. The price of any barrels which go to the London market and are there called slack is reduced enormously. We often see bills come back in which barrels of apples are marked slack, and their prices are reduced considerably, though the apples may be better than those which are not slack. All these things will, of course, be taken up when the Bill goes into committee and will be thoroughly considered. It is a most important matter, particularly for our section of the country, and it is getting to be important for other sections of the country. I consider that, when apples are sent in barrels to the London market, they should be sent in uniform barrels. If they are sent in boxes, they should be sent in uniform boxes. There is no necessity now to go into the question why that should be. In London they have a system of placing upon the market the small barrels and large barrels separately, and, as has been stated, the price of small barrels is less and very much out of proportion to the price of larger barrels; and, although these smaller barrels are more in accordance with the Act and fulfil the law in every particular, still the one who sends the larger barrel reaps a greater benefit than the one who sends the smaller barrel; so, when this export trade is considered, I think it is proper to have a uniform barrel. I will take occasion to refer to other matters when the Bill goes into committee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am only able to speak with much reserve as to what may be done in regard to the inspection of apple barrels, because the Minister in charge of the Bill must deal with that, and he has knowledge from his department which I do not possess at the moment. I have understood the difficulty as to the packing of apples to be that, while the Inspection Act now provides what the capacity of an apple barrel should be, a larger barrel has been used. I do not think there is any complaint that apples have been packed and sold in barrels of less capacity.

Mr. BORDEN. The Act does not provide for greatest diameter—a most important omission.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Still the capacity is provided for.

Mr. BORDEN. No; the length of the stave and the diameter of the head are provided for, but not the capacity.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I see I am subject to correction even in regard to what I thought I knew about this measure. The representations which have been made will be given to the Minister in charge of the department, and if it be possible to meet the views of hon. gentlemen, I am sure it will be done. If not, we will perhaps next year regulate the capacity of the barrel. I doubt if it will be possible to inspect the barrel as to its capacity and construction. I think that is a matter which the sellers will have to look after for their own preservation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think one of the difficulties is that the barrel now provided for is smaller than that previously provided for. The change was made some years ago at the suggestion of some member from Nova Scotia, and I think one of the difficulties now is that the capacity of the barrel as fixed by our statute is smaller than that fixed in other countries, so the attempt to pass on the markets of the world a barrel of smaller capacity than is used elsewhere has injured the market price of the Canadian article.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I think the barrels should be exactly the same size. They should not be 16½ or 17 inches, but should be definitely one or the other. I had a long conversation with a gentleman who saw a quantity of apples bought in London and in Glasgow last fall. He stated that the barrels in Canada were a little larger than the barrels on the continent of Europe, and the apples were equal if not superior, yet the small barrels of Europe brought the highest price. The size of the barrel should be definitely stated, and it must have a considerable amount of bilge. Unless a barrel has a considerable amount of bilge, it is impossible to pack the apples as tightly as you can in a cylindrical barrel, and consequently there is a good deal of what they call slack within the barrels, especially if the apples are large. Therefore, the size of the barrel and the amount of bilge should certainly be stated, because you can then tell the quantity of apples in the barrel. A difference of one inch in the size would make a difference, upon thirty barrels, of about one barrel between the larger and the smaller class. With respect to inspection, the inspection of any article to be taken away from the farmers should not be made imperative, because we should have a clear understanding what value we are to get for our goods before they go out of our possession. When the goods get to Montreal, the inspection ought to be made permissive and not imperative, else the article should be inspected before it leaves the farmer's place.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Unless there is some good reason for interfering with the trade as it has been conducted in the past, I do not think the Government should interfere very much. Now, I know the practice at present in Ontario is to make the apple barrel or cask the same size as the flour barrel. The staves in the flour barrel made heretofore used to be 30 inches in length, but lately they have found that 28½ inch staves were long enough to hold the required quantity of flour, and were better than 30 inch staves, so they are now making their flour and apple barrels out of the 28½ inch stave, that is about 27 inches on the inside, and the heads are made 16½ inches in diameter. That is the size of the apple barrels as well as the flour barrels now. The only reason the apple barrels have not as much bilge as the flour barrels, is that it saves a large amount in the freight. We know that freight across the ocean is according to space, and the more bilge there is to

the barrel the more freight you have to pay; it is for that reason that the apple barrels are made with only a sufficient bilge on the barrel to tighten the hoops. Now, I do not think that it requires very much bilge to strengthen the barrel. If barrels are made out of seasoned staves, they do not require very much bilge, only sufficient to tighten the hoops. The apples are packed tightly in these barrels, and are carried all right without very much bilge, and it saves a great deal in the freight of the fruit. We know that to-day there is hardly a barrel of flour carried across the ocean, because the bilge of the barrel increases so much the price of freight, that it pays better to carry the flour in sacks. The reason they are making apple barrels without bilge is to save freight in crossing the ocean. Experience has proved that the fruit can be carried just as well in a barrel with very little bilge as it is in a barrel with a large bilge. I do not think the Government would be wise in interfering at all with the trade in that respect. I have heard no complaints at all from the western part of Ontario, and I think it is better to let the trade regulate this matter. In the county I have the honour to represent, there are thousands upon thousands of apple barrels made every year, and I have yet to hear of one single complaint either in reference to the packing or the inspection. I think unless a case can be made out stronger than has been made out the Government should not interfere with this matter at all. Those that manufacture flour barrels are usually men who manufacture apple barrels, and they are not going to make three different kinds of barrels.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the apple question has been disposed of, I wish to make a few remarks with reference to the cheese question. I see by the General Inspection Act that provision is made for the inspection of almost every article that is produced in the country save the article of cheese. It makes provision for the inspection of flour, meal, wheat and other grains, beef and pork, potashes and pearl ashes, pickled fish, fish oil, leather and raw hides. Butter is provided for by the General Inspection Act, and by the Act that is now before the House, provision is being made for the inspection of apples. I have given notice:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that provision be made by the Government for the official inspection of cheese and butter, in order to adjust any differences that may arise between the buyers and the sellers.

That was on the Notice Paper, but the Government having taken private members' day, Monday, we will not be able to reach it. Therefore, I intend, when this Bill goes into committee, to move that a clause be added giving the Government power to make provision for the inspection of cheese. There is a general complaint throughout eastern Ontario, and it is beginning to be heard in Quebec, since that province is increasing her cheese production, regarding the necessity for cheese inspection. In eastern Ontario particularly most all the cheese is sold at the Boards. At Brockville last week 80,000 boxes were placed upon the Board; valuing these at $7 a box, it would amount to $56,000 worth of cheese sold on the Board last week at Brockville, and that is continued every week during the entire summer. Factory men meet there and they mark on the Board the number of boxes, naming the factory where made. The buyers bid for it, and it is shipped to Montreal, and there it is inspected by the buyers. There is a general complaint among the producers of cheese that if the markets go down, when the cheese arrives at Montreal the buyers simply say that there are so many boxes not up to the grade, and the sellers have got to take the price the buyers offer them on the pretense that the article is not up to the grade; but the producers say that the cheese is all of the same quality, and it is merely because the market has fallen that the buyers declare the cheese off grade. In western Ontario it is quite different. It used to be different in the Brockville district. In western Ontario the buyers go around and buy at the factories, and inspect there, weigh there, and pay for the article. Professor Robertson, who has travelled through this district, reports that there is a general feeling among the producers of cheese throught the Province of Ontario that some provision should be made for appointing a person at Montreal to inspect cheese and adjust differences between buyers and sellers if the cheese, when it arrives there, is reported by the buyer not to be up to the standard quality. I think Leeds County this year is the banner county of the Dominion for the production of cheese. By the census of ten years ago Oxford County headed the list, but I am informed now that Leeds County produces the most cheese of any county in the Dominion. Our people, at their meeting at Brockville a few weeks ago to establish a Board, discussed this question and agitated very strongly in favour of the Government making provision for the inspection of cheese at Montreal. In the Agriculture Committee which met yesterday, I moved a resolution asking that the House recommend this course, and that report of the committee was adopted by the House yesterday, and I presume when the House goes into committee on this Bill, the Government will approve of a clause being added that will empower them to make such provision for the appointment of a man at Montreal, which is the principal port of export for eastern Ontario and Quebec, and where the cheese is inspected and shipped, as will settle this vexed question as to whether the producers of cheese are receiving justice at the hands of the buyers when the cheese reaches Montreal. The clause will, no doubt, make provision that it be permissive, as my hon. friend from West Huron wanted the inspection to be in reference to apples. There will be nothing to prevent a merchant buying his cheese at the factory and having it inspected there, the same as any other article. But if cheese is sold and subject to Montreal inspection, if a dispute arises between the producer and the buyer, there should be some authority to whom reference might be made to say whether it is up to grade or not. I do not believe that the fault is so much with buyers as rumour says it is. I think, perhaps, it would be a benefit to the cheese producer to know that there was provision made for inspection, and that it would have a tendency to make all the factories get their cheese up to a better grade. Therefore, I think it would be as much in the interests of the cheese producers as of the buyers that the Government should take action and make provision for the inspection of cheese, as well as every other produce that is sold. Cheese is now one of the leading, if not the leading, article of produce; it is growing in proportion every year, and I believe that pro-

vision should be made whereby it can be dealt with under the Inspection Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COCKBURN. Mr. Chairman, feeling as I do a deep interest in the political and general welfare and fortunes of the Island of Prince Edward, I do not like to allow the present occasion to pass without saying a few words in reference to the Bill now before the House. If the intent of this Bill were to remove, or to legislate as it were, from the Chamber, the genial member from West Queen's (Mr. Davies), I should indeed deeply regret the necessity of such a step. He is a gentleman of whom the little Island has every reason to be proud, and in his private relations he has always shown himself courteous and refined. I am sure I echo the sentiments of every member of this House when I say that we would indeed regret his removal from the arena of politics in this Dominion. But, Sir, the question that has forced itself upon the consideration of the House is not one that the Government have sought themselves. The very Act of Confederation from which we draw our national life, forced the question of redistribution upon the consideration of the Government, and the problem that confronted them was: how they were to divide into five constituencies a territory which had formerly been represented by six members. Well, Sir, if the redistribution were absolutely necessary, I cannot say that the proposed redistribution in the Bill is an unfair one. At the same time I think that a better redistribution, on the same lines even, could have been made, but the question is whether a redistribution at all is necessary. If you take the redistribution as proposed, by the electoral districts I find that the difference between the highest and the lowest is only some 3,000 population, whereas if you take the proposal of my hon. friend from West Queen's (Mr. Davies) there is a difference between the lowest and the highest of some 8,000. Well, Sir, I do not consider a difference of 8,000 to be very material. I know myself that in the city of Toronto an imaginary line divides me from my hon. friend on the east, and that while I have 26,000 of the choice electors of Toronto to represent, my friend has 43,000, or a difference of 17,000. I do not wish to enter here into any question of politics, but if I had been allowed to do so the other day by the hon. Chairman I was prepared to show the superior merits of Centre Toronto. I say that a difference of 8,000 is to me but a small difference when I recollect this great difference between East and Centre Toronto, or, again, West Toronto. If I look to the Maritime Provinces I find there the County of Westmoreland with an electorate of some 42,000 and an imaginary line dividing it from the County of Albert with a population of 10,000 or 11,000, showing a difference of 32,000. The ground may be taken that nothing was done with reference to remedying that apparent incongruity, because the people did not wish it, or for the still stronger reason that a national organic county life had sprung up in these sections and that it was unwise to disturb it. I fully sympathize with that feeling, and the question in my mind to decide is: whether really in the Island of Prince Edward there does exist that same strong county feeling and habit of co-operation inside of counties which exist in the neighbouring Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. I think the question hinges on that. We are assured by the hon. member for West Queen's (Mr. Davies) that for generations the people of Prince Edward Island have voted within these lines, that the county line is regarded by them as something in a manner sacred, and that they have been accustomed to work together in these counties. On the other hand I am assured by other gentlemen that there are no municipal or county councils in the Island, and that they are not even blessed with county taxes. The statements are somewhat conflicting, but with me it is a very important matter to determine whether this national county feeling exists among the various electoral districts of Prince Edward Island, and if I have from my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) the repeated assurance that he is labouring under no mistake, that those Counties of Queen's, King's, and Prince's have been accustomed to regard their divisions in the same sacred light as he believes that the electoral districts of Albert and Westmoreland have, then I am prepared to say that I do not think it necessary to redistribute the Island of Prince Edward. I must have that assurance, however, before I take the ground that one rule should be applied to Prince Edward Island and another to the neighbouring Province of New Brunswick, that Westmoreland should remain with its 42,000 and Albert with its 10,000, and that we should ignore in Prince Edward Island those principles which are so highly respected in dealing with the Provinces of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. Can my hon. friend from West Queen's (Mr. Davies) give me the assurance that the people in Prince Edward Island regard these lines with much the same feeling as the electorate regard their county lines in Albert and Westmoreland? If he can my course is clear, and no other course is open to me as far as I can see but to vote with him. I must confess that I should have preferred to have seen the 109,000 of Prince Edward Island divided somewhat differently. If county lines are to count for nothing in that province, I should have preferred to take the Bill that has been brought in by the Government and have allotted to Prince County West 21,000, and 20,723 in the East; to Queen's West I would have allotted 24,824, but I would have brought into that No. 24 township, and in that I would have included the town of Charlottetown, and in including that I would not consider the increase to the 24,000 more than the 21,000 of the other, for I have been taught only yesterday that cities are of very little account in a redistribution. To East Queen's I would have given 20,851 population, and to King's 21,684. It does appear to me that if there must be a redistribution, and if those are the lines on which we are to go, this would be a somewhat fairer redistribution than that which has been proposed. Permit me to say now, that I think my hon. friend from Queen's West (Mr. Davies) was wrong in imputing to the great Conservative party any desire

to practice a gerrymander in the Island of Prince Edward. It is a small and tidy little Island. I think that in this House it has more than held its own. It may not have arrived at the dignity of having a $20,000,000 tunnel to connect it with the mainland, but it must be said that the people have lived in hopes for many years; and I have no doubt, when engineers are going down there—and particularly about the time of every election—that their hopes have been fostered, and that before gray hairs begin to appear on the heads of the youngest citizens of the Island, they may have this bond of union which they love so dearly. I should like to receive from my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) an assurance in the House that these county lines are considered sacred in Prince Edward Island. I should be glad, indeed, to see this matter amicably settled. So far the Government have yielded to every reasonable representation which has been made to them from the Opposition with reference to the redistribution of electoral divisions, and it has been to me a great pleasure to see yesterday so many leading members of the Opposition get up in their seats and express their gratitude, or their *quasi* gratitude, to the Government for the reasonable consideration which had been extended to their proposals.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is very *quasi*.

Mr. COCKBURN. It was *quasi*, but still I may state there is no doubt about it, that there was a feeling in this House that the Government had yielded a great many points, and that in a matter of this kind where feeling runs high on both sides, they had acted fairly and honourably on the whole. I honestly believe that my hon. friend from Queen's East (Mr. Welsh), in his glowing language yesterday, really expressed the sentiment of his heart, and that he thought his little Island was going to be disembowelled and torn into shreds and patches and blotted from existence. His heart is in his province, his soul is in it, and I do not wonder at that. It is a pretty Island, a small Island, but still it has been an important factor in this great confederacy of the Dominion, and I have no doubt that if the electorate of Prince Edward Island continue to send the same class of representatives which they have sent hitherto, the high fame of the Island will be maintained.

An hon. MEMBER. If they send Tories.

Mr. COCKBURN. My hon. friend suggests that it was the duty of the Island to send Tories instead of Grits. I have no doubt that as the Island grows in knowledge and grows in wisdom, it will see things, perhaps, in a new and better light; but I feel persuaded that if we pass this Bill, and the sentiment exists strongly in the Island that it is a gerrymander—which I do not believe it to be—if this feeling is spread throughout the Island, we shall not see one Conservative member returned from it. The people of the Island of Prince Edward are a high-spirited race. They come from Scotch descent and naturally they possess a great many of the traits and characteristics of that people. They have been a loyal people, and they have not even retained one shred of the land that belongs to themselves. One county is the Queen's, another is the King's, another is the Prince's, and the whole Island belongs to the Prince, so that they are exuding with loyalty; and when they come to us at the end of this long debate and ask us to be merciful, and when we look at the majority that we have of 65 stalwart men, I think that the appeal made by my hon. friend from West Queen's (Mr. Davies) for at least merciful treatment, is worthy all consideration. I think, Sir, that, in concluding this debate, we might extend at least to the Island some consideration for the feelings with which they are now actuated.

An hon. MEMBER. Conclude with prayer.

Mr. COCKBURN. My hon. friend suggests that I should offer up a short prayer in their behalf. Well, Sir, I can only say that if this Bill were to pass, and if all is true that my hon. friends from Queen's East and West have said, then they would be past praying for. I have nothing more to say with reference to the question of representation except to express the hope that we shall deal fairly, honestly and liberally with the Island.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the coloured race?

Mr. COCKBURN. A gentleman here on my left, somewhat dark in colour, is very anxious about the coloured race. I sympathized with his aspirations, not once, not twice, but again and again as he made affectionate enquiries with reference to the coloured race, and I honour him for the fact that he is nowise ashamed of the progenitors from whom he comes. I trust that in the future they may live up nobly to the example that they have shown in sending me to this House. I feel proud to represent them, and I feel sure that if they had to deal with this question, they would mete out to the Island of Prince Edward all that justice to which it is fairly entitled.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Chairman, I would indeed be a very hard feeling man if I did not accept with pleasure the kind sentiments the hon. gentleman has expressed towards Prince Edward Island, and although there was a little facetiousness with which he garnished his speech, yet I know that he was sincerely desirous of bringing the committee to some reasonable terms in this matter. He has appealed to me with regard to certain facts, and I will state them to the committee, and they can draw their own conclusion from them. The Island of Prince Edward was divided off into three counties by a Royal Commission in 1766. For a period of time before we had responsible government these counties were represented separately in the Assembly which then existed. Responsible government was obtained in 1850, and I suppose political passion raged more intensely in that little Island than it did anywhere else in Canada, because they say that the smaller the pit the fiercer the rats fight. Our people struggled manfully to upset the old family compact which had fastened on the Island and political passion was at a white heat. Then in the midst of that political passion they divided the Island into political districts. I ask hon. gentlemen, if there ever was a time in the history of the Island when they would be disposed to ignore county lines, was it not then? Queen's County had at that time nearly three times the population that King's had, but what did the Local Legislature do? They subdivided the county into equal electoral districts, giving King's County as many representatives as Queen's had, although Queen's County had three times the population. There was not a man in Prince Edward Island to say: Let us tear up the

county lines which had been settled by Lane in 1766 at the command of the Queen; and whatever political advantage was gained to one party or the other, those lines were sacredly maintained. Political parties in the Island fought their battles on those lines from 1850 to 1862, when an elective Legislative Council was formed; and what did they do then? Although Queen's County had double the population of King's, each of the three counties was divided into an east and a west riding, each of which elected a member to the Legislative Council. The county lines were not infringed upon. I care not how high political feeling has raged, and it has been pretty high in Prince Edward Island, there was not a man found to ask the Legislative Council to break down those county lines.

Mr. McLEAN (P.E.I.) Did they not give a legislative councillor to the city of Charlottetown?

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Certainly. Queen's County was divided into two electoral districts for the Council, and the city of Charlottetown, with its population of 14,000, was given one councillor itself. I say that no man was found in Prince Edward Island, either when the Island was divided into fifteen electoral districts for the Lower House, or into seven for the Upper House, to propose that county lines should be infringed upon; and although Queen's County had double, and at one time treble the population of King's County, we never asked for a larger representation than King's. I say this is the first time in the political history of Prince Edward Island that any man has ever attempted to infringe on those lines. The hon. gentleman asks me what about the community of interests in those counties. I tell him that there is a shire town in each county; the county assizes meet at that town twice a year; the grand and petit jurors are drawn exclusively from the county; the sheriffs are appointed from the county; county exhibitions are held in each county once a year; and when I led the Government in the Local House and ventured to propose that those county exhibitions should be done away with and one exhibition substituted for the whole Island, I never heard such a storm in my life, and one of those who opposed the proposal was the hon. member for King's. Take away our county exhibitions, they said, where four or five thousand people gather socially together every year and exhibit their wares from different parts of the county? Never; and I could not carry a majority of my own ranks with me. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in saying that the counties are not municipalities: but before we came into Confederation we made them judicial districts. Each county has its county judge and county court and assize court, and I do not know anything that exists *quoad* county institutions that does not exist there. I have no objection to the people whom you are going to include in Queen's County. They are a bright, intelligent people. As I said last night, I had the honour to receive my political baptism there, having represented that district in the Local Assembly. But I say that when you are infringing upon county lines in Prince Edward Island, you are laying down a principle that will be used to your disadvantage all over the Maritime Provinces. Adopt this principle there, and before long you will see it applied also in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. You are legislating two Liberals out of the House, and if your divisions had existed at the last election, instead of having four Liberals here, we would only have two from the same vote. You can do it if you like; you have your majority. Go on and do it. I have ended my protest; I have said my say; and if there is not manliness enough and generosity enough among you to apply to Prince Edward Island the same rules that you apply to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, I will submit. But we have not yielded yet; we will have a fight about it when we go among the people; and if we do not find fair-play here, we will find it there.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am, indeed, glad to hear the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) to-day. I admire very much his sentiments of extreme generosity to Prince Edward Island, and the only thing I regret is that I cannot emulate them. Although he is not able to make a fair redistribution of Prince Edward Island, he is willing to readjust his treatment of the Island in a way that is very satisfactory to the friends of that Island, among whom I class myself; and, though he is not able to give them the tunnel, he is quite willing to accede to the excited feelings of the gentlemen who are animated by the notion that this Bill is devised by some local enemy to inflict an injury upon them. It would be very enjoyable for me to exercise that feeling of generosity which prompts some of our friends on this side of the House to endeavour to meet the wishes of the hon. member for Queen's. Nothing would be so pleasant to me, as one member of the House, but I cannot yield to that temptation to show generosity, simply in order to gerrymander a county which happens to be in the position of supporting the Government, and that is precisely the position here. Another redistribution is proposed which can only have that effect, and which we must assume, therefore, has only that purpose. But when my hon. friend repeats seriously the contention that, because an anomaly exists in a neighbouring province, we should repeat that anomaly in Prince Edward Island, it seems to me that he is going far afield to look for any principle on which to base a redistribution. In New Brunswick we have not disturbed the county lines of Westmoreland and Albert, because there was no necessity for doing so; but, if the constitution provided that, instead of each of those counties having one member, there must be three members elected from the two counties, undoubtedly we would have laid our hands upon those counties and created three districts. We were not going about with a tape measure to measure all the electoral districts in Canada; but where we have had to create new districts we have endeavoured to equalize them as far as possible, and before any hon. gentleman can charge us with inconsistency, he should show that in any electoral districts created by this Bill we have departed from that principle. When the hon. gentleman speaks of disparity between different constituencies, I must remind him that the extent of the disparity is to be considered, as the hon. member for South Oxford considered it last night, in reference to the whole population of a province; and when he speaks of a disparity of 8,000 in Prince Edward Island as being small, it is relatively large when we remember that that is nearly 8 per cent of the entire population of the province. I should like exceedingly, if it were a mere question of generosity or personal considera-

tion, to yield to the strong feelings presented by the other side of the House; but I am sure that nothing that has transpired yet, not even the strong statement of facts presented by the hon. member for Queen's as to the attachment of the people to the county lines—as to which, however, I understand the hon. members for King's to differ from him—not even that has convinced me that this redistribution of Prince Edward Island is other than fair, and for my part I must confess that I entertain the feeling which I had when I laid the plan on the Table, that of all the parts of the measure that would bear examination, scrutiny and contest, this was above all fair and reasonable.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think, Sir, if there is anything that would go to show the propriety of the course pursued by this side of the House in regard to the interpretation of section 51 of the British North America Act, it is the state of things that we have before us in the case of Prince Edward Island. It is pretty clear, all through this discussion from first to last, that the Government have felt themselves not a little embarrassed in regard to what they have to do with their own friends and supporters. The Administration will find it necessary, in conformity with the British North America Act, to make a redistribution. We find it necessary to take away from certain of the Maritime Provinces the portion of the representation which they now possess, and everywhere we find that the Administration have this question before them: how they are to protect all their own supporters now having seats in the House and comply with the provisions of the law. The hon. gentleman yesterday, when he had under consideration the provisions dealing with the Province of Quebec, undertook to obliterate, out of all proportion to the number of representatives in this House, seats held by hon. gentlemen on this side; and now, when the Government come to deal with Prince Edward Island, if they were to act in a perfectly impartial manner, they would find it necessary to take a representative from the county which sends two here to support the Government. Every speech made, and especially that made by the Minister of Justice last evening and again to-day, shows that the Government are unwilling to deprive a supporter of theirs of a seat in this House, and that illustrates what I believe to be the wisdom of the provision of the British North America Act, under which the general principle on which redistribution is to take place shall be determined by this House, and the work of carrying out that redistribution shall be in the hands of a body not affected by any such considerations as those which are at this moment proving paramount with the Administration. The Minister of Justice says in effect that it will be grossly unfair to deprive a supporter of the Government of a seat in this matter of redistribution. But if he is acting upon some principle, I apprehend that the principle he is undertaking to apply where the interests of a supporter are not in question, which is to deprive the constituency which is smallest in population, of the power of sending a representative, ought to apply in this case also. That is the rule he has undertaken to apply in the Province of Nova Scotia and in some degree also in the Province of New Brunswick. If you were to apply that rule to Prince Edward Island, the solution would be perfectly simple. You would be obliged to see which of the three counties of Prince Edward Island has the smallest population and to withdraw the member from that county. I will venture to say that if the County of King's had sent two representatives supporting the Opposition, there would not have been one moment's question on the part of the Administration in making up its mind what course ought to be taken. There can be no doubt about that. Let us look at the state of things in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Prince Edward Island is divided into three constituencies. They are double constituencies, it is true, but there are the three. What did the Government do in Nova Scotia? Did the Government come down here, and because they had to withdraw a member from Nova Scotia, propose to redistribute the whole province? Why, they did not find it necessary to redistribute any constituencies except the two adjoining ones having the smallest population. They united those two constituencies and left every other one untouched. The Minister of Justice spoke last evening as though, because two constituencies are united into one, a different rule should apply. You may withdraw, he argued, one member from a constituency returning only one member and you need not disturb any other constituency except that one and the adjoining constituency. But when the hon. gentleman comes to Prince Edward Island, he says when you undertake to withdraw one member where there were two a different rule must apply. Why should a different rule apply? Suppose that Shelburne and Queen's, Nova Scotia, had been united and returned two members, as Pictou returns two, and the hon. gentleman had carried out his rule, would it not have been just as easy to have withdrawn the one member from Queen's and Shelburne as to withdraw one member from Shelburne and unite Queen's and Shelburne? Is it not exactly the same thing? And when you come to Prince Edward Island and you have three constituencies returning two members each, one constituency having a population of 36,000, the other 46,000, and the other 26,000, where should your act of subtraction take place if not in the constituency having the smallest number of people? You withdraw a member from the one with 26,000 inhabitants and leave it with one member. Why should you interfere with the other two? What rule is there which the hon. member has undertaken to lay down? I admired the ingenuity of his speech last night, but I thought it was so clever that the hon. gentleman himself must have felt it was a specious argument, because there could be, from the fact that two members are returned from each constituency, no difference in the principle from the fact of two adjoining constituencies returning one member each. The rule is exactly the same, the principle of subtraction is exactly the same. You have withdrawn in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick a member from a county with the smallest population where you can most conveniently unite it with another small county, and when you withdraw a member from a small county in the Island, the reason, if there there be any difference, is more potent in favour of withdrawing a member from a double constituency, because you have no disturbance whatever and have neither union or distribution to make. You have simply to reduce the representation in the constitueney having 26,000. When the hon. gentle-

man says that the case of the Island is different on account of the smallness of its population, I am unable to see that it is. Prince Edward Island sends representation to this House in proportion to its population. It is because you are applying the rule of representation by population among the provinces that you are taking a member away from the Island. Now as to the question of equality, the same rule of convenience and of historic continuity and of preservation of the county boundary that you ought to apply in every other province applies with equal force in Prince Edward Island. The Government profess in this Bill to have gone on the principle of disturbing communities as little as possible. Why, then, should you disturb Prince and Queen's? Why should you go beyond the boundary of King's in the case of Prince Edward Island more than in other cases? Queen's County has a population of 46,000, or 23,000 for each member. King's has a population of 26,000: but do you not find that difference in every other province? Take the case of Drummond and Arthabaska, in the Province of Quebec, with a population of 44,000. You have not divided that, although it is entitled to two members, and you have the County of Soulanges with a population of 9,000 which you have not undertaken to unite to the adjoining constituency of Vaudreuil, though the two together would have a population of less than 21,000. If you can leave those anomalies in the Province of Quebec, why do you undertake to deal with anomalies, if you think it worth while to call them so, in the Province of Prince Edward Island, which are less, if you withdraw a member from King's, than the anomalies in any other province in the Dominion? There is greater equality of representation, if you respect county boundaries and give two members to Prince and two members to Queen's, as they now have, and withdraw one from King's, than under any other arrangement you can possibly make. Why, then, should you interfere? It is precisely as I have stated. The Government have certain supporters here who are pressing upon the Administration not to obliterate the seats they now have, and the Government are yielding to these importunities beyond what the public interest requires. That by itself goes a long way to show the wisdom of the course which is marked out in the British North America Act, and which should be followed. I was not a little surprised and I was somewhat amused by the speech addressed to the committee last night by one of the members from King's. The hon. gentleman said that the senior member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was a very popular member, that he was a courageous man, that he was a gentleman of ability, and that he expected he would go into this county notwithstanding the change which is made, and would stake his political fortune upon his chance of carrying it. The hon. gentleman said my hon. friend had jumped pretty high before, and they would put the bar one peg higher, they would put it up to a majority of 89 against him, and ask him to run and see whether he could clear that bar or not. That is the proposition which is made and the proposition which these gentlemen have pressed upon the Administration, and which the Administration are asking us to adopt. The Minister of Justice told us early in the discussion that we ought not to legislate with a view to political advantages or disadvantages, that party interests ought not to be taken into considerations, or, at all events, ought not to be made paramount. Why, the hon. gentleman has told us to-day that party interests are governing in this matter. He said: How can the hon. member for Queen's expect us to wipe out a seat in a constituency which is held by a supporter of the Administration?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I beg your pardon. I did not say anything of the kind. I said there would be no excuse for adopting the hon. gentleman's proposal, except on the ground of depriving one of our supporters of his seat.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but it shows what facts had found a lodgment in his memory. They were that this constituency returns supporters to the Administration, and that the proposition of my hon. friend would take away one of those supporters. The question is, whether it is fair to take away that supporter? Would it be fair to take one member away from Queen's? If my hon. friend had gone to the Government and said, in case Queen's had been represented by supporters of the Administration with a population of 46,000, leave King's and Prince with two representatives each and take one away from Queen's, then the observation of the Minister of Justice would have had great force because my hon. friend would have been asking that a member should be withdrawn from a county having the highest population, and the Minister might have said with very great force: Your proposition is in the interests of a party, because you are proposing to take away a member from that constituency which is entitled by its population to retain its present representation. But that is not my hon. friend's proposition. It is that we shall take away a representative from the constituency having the smallest population, and because it has the smallest population. It is pointed out that there are only 3,000 people in the county above the unit. It ought not to have a second representative unless its population was something more than one-half above the unit. If King's had a population of 35,000 instead of 26,000, then the observation of the Minister of Justice would have had great force. If these constituencies had been nearly equal so that it was impossible to make choice between them, there would have been great force in his observation and there would have been some reason for applying a different rule from that which is followed in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; but, when there is a great disparity in the population, when the condition of the three constituencies enables the Government to find a simple solution for the difficulty, then I say that there is no valid reason for departing from the rule which has been adopted in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Further, my hon. friend has pointed out that in the Province of Prince Edward Island a majority of the population voted at the election of 1891 against the Administration and in favour of the Opposition candidates, and, as a result of that, under the existing organization, a majority of the representatives from the Island were returned to this side of the House. But with that same vote, upon the divisions that you propose to make the Island of Prince Edward would have returned three supporters of the Administration and two members of the Opposition. I would like to know

upon what ground the Minister of Justice, or the hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island who are pressing this matter on the Government unduly and unfairly, can propose to make a division of the Island which, taking the last vote, would give to the minority of the people a majority of the seats in this House? That is your proposition. You come here and ask the House to make such a division of the Island of Prince Edward that a minority of votes shall return a majority of members to this House. What would be the condition of this country if you applied that everywhere? It would create revolution. It would be legislating men into Parliament and legislating men out of Parliament. I say that the two supporters of the Administration from King's are not loyal to the Island, they are not fair to the Parliament of Canada, they are not fair to the Administration which they follow, when they press upon the Administration a division of the Island that will produce such results. Hon. gentlemen opposite ought to support the amendment of my hon. friend; they ought to resent any attempt on the part of supporters from any section of this Dominion to force upon the Administration a policy which is in itself unjust. Sir, the Administration in this matter requires the protection of their supporters against undue influence of this sort. It is undue influence, it is improper influence, and the Government would have been saved from that influence if they had taken the view of my hon. friend and myself as to the meaning of the law. But that was rejected, and the House has thrown upon the Administration the difficult task of making a redistribution under these circumstances; and if you impose upon the Administration the duty of proposing a scheme of redistribution, you ought to have special care that neither the hon. members from King's nor the hon. members from any other constituency in this country can come to the Administration and say: Gentlemen, we have been supporters of yours in this House, and we wish to preserve our seats at all hazards. If members are to be withdrawn from this House, let them be withdrawn from the Opposition; if there is to be a denudation of the representation in any province, let it fall upon the Opposition and let us be protected, no matter whether we have the population behind us or not. That is the position taken by these hon. gentlemen; that is what they are forcing upon the Administration. They are forcing the Minister of Justice to defend a redistribution in Prince Edward Island that he has not permitted to be applied to the Province of Nova Scotia, in which he has a special interest as a representative and a Minister. It is a principle that has not been applied to the same extent in any other province, and I ask hon. gentlemen who wish to preserve, to some extent, the historical continuity of the counties, who think that is more important than the mere application of the rule of three to the redistribution of seats—and I entirely agree with him—I ask them to come to the support of the constitution, to support the amendment of my hon. friend from Queen's, and not to permit the two representatives from King's, the smallest constituency in Prince Edward Island, to bulldoze the Government, and to abuse the power given for the distribution of seats under the constitution.

Mr. DAVIN. I was very much pleased last night to hear the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) say what he did about the Bill. The Bill, with the exception of a seat in Prince Edward Island, is pretty well through this committee. I was very much gratified to hear the member for Norfolk say that the Government had dealt fairly—that the Bill was a pretty satisfactory one. I was very much pleased, also, to hear my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) say, as he did to me, that he considered this a fair Bill. Now, when we have one stalwart Reformer from Quebec, and a stalwart Reformer, a leader among the Reformers, from Ontario, declaring that the Bill is a fair Bill——

Mr. CHOQUETTE. As amended for Quebec.

Mr. DAVIN—no doubt his attention would be mainly directed to the Bill as regards Quebec. We remember that, in the debate on the second reading, the Minister of Public Works and some supporters of the Government said that when the Bill got into committee, if there were some defects in it, the Conservative party would consider them in a fair spirit. But what was the language of hon. gentlemen opposite? Day after day they held language of complete distrust, although in the earlier part of the debate the Minister of Public Works sounded the keynote of the attitude of the Government in Committee of the Whole; he said: Let us go into committee, and any fair proposition will be considered. I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen should have shown their gratitude, because they were like doubting Thomas, and not until they went into committee did they realize the fairness and sense of justice of the Conservative party in this House.

Mr. LAURIER. It remains to be seen now.

Mr. DAVIN. I suppose my hon. friend means with regard to Prince Edward Island. Now, my hon. friend from North Norfolk read to us the other night at great length to bring out the principle laid down for the Boundary Commissioners in England. In a few remarks I addressed to the House on the second reading of the Bill, I brought out, as I venture to think at the time and think now, all those portions of the directions to the Boundary Commission that were necessary to support the propositions which I intended to defend. I said my own inclination would lead me not to look entirely to population, but I would look to other considerations, and amongst others to county lines. But the principle that the Bill has gone on, and the principle that has been endorsed by hon. gentlemen, is to represent population and to give an even representation. That is the main principle of the Bill, and the Government have added this further principle, to effect this object with the minimum of disturbance. Now, we have here the language of an hon. gentleman who has taken a leading position in the debate. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), speaking on the 15th June in this House, said:

"Let us deal fairly in this matter. Let us adopt that course which is best in the public interest; and if we do that I am satisfied that we can make a redistribution measure satisfactory to both sides of this House; but you cannot make it satisfactory proceeding as you are doing. You either go altogether too far, or else you do not go far enough. If you are disposed to disregard county boundaries, make the electoral districts equal."

Now, the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, and I feel that I am expressing the opinion of my brother members of the Conservative party, when I say that he leads it with as much pleasure to his

opponents as to his followers—the hon. the leader of the Opposition in his speech said :

"If there is a principle which ought to be recognized, in a measure of this kind, as far as possible, it is the principle of representation by population."

Mr. WELSH. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. "Hear, hear," says my hon. friend from Queen's. I refer to the more genial member for Queen's (Mr. Welsh) because it is only a question of degree in geniality between the two representatives from that county. Then the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in his speech which he repented of last night——

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. DAVIN. He did not exactly put on a white sheet or wear an absolutely Ash-Wednesday face, but he expressed himself as agreeably surprised at the Bill, and he recanted what he had said. In his speech on the 17th June, in which he indulged in very violent language against the Conservative party and the Conservative Government, when dealing with the Redistribution Bill of 1885 in England—and, of course, he was holding it up as a model for the Conservative party here to follow—he said :

"If the hon. gentleman will take the population of the British Empire and divide it by the number of members of the House of Commons, he will find what the unit of population is. He will find that the population of those boroughs, while they do not conform precisely and exactly to the average basis of population, they conform to it as nearly as the circumstances of the case and the instructions to the commissioners will permit. The Bill, Mr. Chairman, is a Bill which met the approval of the whole House. It was prepared by no party. It was devised by a general conference of the managers of both parties, and so you had a Bill which gave you representation that bore as exactly an equivalent to population as the circumstances of the case would allow."

Very well, Sir. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), who is also a leader of the party, a very important man, and the most plan-making mind, I believe, in the party—I do not use the characterization of that hon. gentleman in a bad sense, but in a good sense, because no man can be a leader in politics unless he can make schemes,—when I refer to the hon. gentleman from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) as the scheme enacting genius of the party. Now, what does the hon. member say, and of course he was very violent against the Government, and very distrustful. He says that he did not see why some broad general principle should not be adopted, and he thought that due weight should be attached to population.

[At one o'clock the Committee adjourned, and at three o'clock resumed.]

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Chairman, an argument from comparison was used by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), an argument comparing Prince Edward Island with other provinces, and applying what was done in one or two cases in other provinces to the whole of Prince Edward Island. Now, Sir, there is a Greek proverb that I learned when I first began to attempt that language, and it is a famous proverb. It is that the half is greater than the whole, and we have also the divine statement that a mite is larger than a million. We have been told that when the widow threw in the mite, she threw in more than all the other subscriptions that were put into the poor-box on the celebrated occasion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That did not amount to a million nor anything like it.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend thinks it did not amount to a million. Perhaps, I am thinking of what they threw in out of their bounteousness, and comparing it with what I would throw in myself ; and my hon. friend is perhaps making the same comparison with regard to what he would put up in the box, and probably then it might not amount to so much as a million. I want to point out to my hon. friend for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) the fallacy he fell into. If you take a large province, and we will suppose that province sends 50 or 60 members to this House, you may secure that the representation shall be practically just in carrying out the principle of your Bill, and yet in one or two details for some reasons or other that may seem cogent to Parliament, you may not actually insist on the principle of "rep. by pop." which is a principle so dear to hon. members. If you take a small province with five or six members, and if you say you want to adhere there to county lines, why, Sir, you might commit so violent a breach of the principle you have been applying to the larger provinces, that the thing would be absurd and would jeopardize and destroy the harmony of your Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let me call my hon. friend's attention to his fallacy.

Mr. DAVIN. You have not heard my side of the argument in full, and what can you know of the fallacy ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, I see it. The case of the difference in Prince Edward Island is the case of the difference between one or two constituencies which if all aggregated together would amount to a very small percentage of the entire population. But in a province like Ontario this difference may extend to 50 different constituencies, and when you aggregate that you will find that there is just as large a percentage as there is in the case of Prince Edward Island. That was also the fallacy of the argument of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) is quite wrong, and he cannot get over the argument that I made. I say here that what is proposed to be done by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is this: He proposes actually that the difference in population between two constituencies in Prince Edward Island returning members to this House, shall be one-twelfth of the whole population of the Island. If you want to see the full absurdity of that proposal, what you have to do is to take the population of Ontario, which is about two and a half millions. Take the one-twelfth of two and a half millions, and add it on to 23,000, and you have a constituency of 23,000 plus the one-twelfth of the two and a half millions returning one member here, while you have another constituency of 23,000 also returning one member. That will explain to you the absurdity which the hon. member from Queen's (Mr. Davies) wants to insist upon. Now, Sir, looking at the map of the proposed division, we see that what was clearly done is this: The Government proceeded to take the extremity of the Island. It proceeded from township to township until it arrived at the unit. It arrived at the unit in lot 59 in King's County. It next commences at lot 61, and it does not arrive at the

unit until it gets to lot 24. When it gets to lot 24, it commences again and goes on until it gets to lot 20. Then again it commences at lot 30 in East Prince and goes to lot 15, and then again it commences at lot 16 and goes on to lot 1, at the other end. Whatever way you take it, whether you commence at lot 1 at one end in Prince, or lot 47 at the other end in King's, you will come precisely to the same result if you are aiming at getting at the unit. Now, Sir, I do not see the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) here just now, but I am told that the hon. member objects greatly to lot 24 being in East Queen's. He seems to try to impress this House with the view that East Queen's is his constituency, but, Sir, there has not been up to the present time, nor will there be until the Bill has passed, any such constituency as East Queen's. There is the County of Queen's, returning two members to this House, and the hon. member (Mr. Davies) is as much a member for what is called West Queen's in this Bill, as he is for East Queen's. As a matter of fact he lives in Charlottetown, and he is actually more the member for West than East Queen's. I do not want to enter into the reasons why, but a little bird has whispered it to me ; one of my colleagues in the representation here who has conversed with the member for Queen's, tells me, that one of the reasons he objects to have lot 24 in East Queen's—and that in fact he would be pretty well satisfied if township 24 had been taken out of East Queen's and put into West Queen's—is the reason that there is a certain complexion, partly religious and partly political in lot 24. Let me ask the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is so logical, what are his friends and himself doing when they found an argument on the opinions of the people of lot 24 ? They are doing the very thing that they say the Minister of Justice and this Government must not do, and which I agree that we should not do. We are told that we should have no regard whatever to the political opinions of the people, but that we should make a redistribution fairly on a broad principle, and not think of taking a party advantage. We are told that we have nothing to do with that ; but what does the hon. gentleman opposite do. He says : I am going to analyse the opinions of these people ; and in doing that, does he go all over their past history and all over the elections in which they have voted ? No, but he goes to some recent election, and because they may have voted in a given way, he says : I am not going to allow you to make a symmetrical division of this Island, in order that we shall have the principle of representation by population carried out. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the very gentlemen who denounce in this House the allowing of political or party considerations to weigh with us ; these are the very gentlemen who allow political and party considerations to weigh with them. If I admitted for one minute, which I do not, that there is any cogency in the argument of the principle of political opinions being considered, I must remember that if lot 24 is made part of East Queen's, yet in lots 61, 63 and 64 of King's, though there is certainly a Catholic vote, there are large numbers of Orangemen, and these lots are placed in East Queen's. Lots 61, 63 and 64 have about 3,000 Protestants to 200 Catholics, and I am informed by one who can speak with authority, that the majority of the Protestants belong to the Orange order. What, then, is the hon. member for Queen's so very angry about ? Now, Sir, I will say one word to my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). There was a certain warmth, not to say tenderness of sentiment, in the way he dealt with the hon. member for Queen's. My hon. friend had only one difficulty in going some distance with the hon. member for Queen's ; he wanted an assurance from that hon. member. I could not help thinking that he was very much in the position of a gentleman in love, who was about to propose to some one around whose name the poisoned tongue of suspicion had breathed some dark whispers, and he said to her : All will be right, only I must have an assurance. I need hardly say that where there was ground for suspicion there would be indignation and objurgation ; this would be in exact ratio to the foundation for suspicion. And what occurred ? The young person from Queen's came out with an indignant assurance, and I think my hon. friend from Centre Toronto has been in this House long enough, for six years, to know that the siren from Queen's has enough assurance for anything. But I could not help contrasting the violent manner of the hon. member for Queen's with the balanced and calm manner of the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for Quebec East. I could not help thinking that while they felt that there were some things in the Bill which they had good ground for criticising, the hon. member for Queen's felt that he had no good ground for any complaint whatever. Because the tone of the hon. member was not the tone of a man who wanted to persuade. It was a defiant objurgation ; it was the tone of a man who was posing as a pseudo martyr before the people of Prince Edward Island, not of one who was anxious to change anything in this Bill. In fact, he told us that he did not mind very much for he felt very confident what the result would be.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ; he misunderstood me. I did not say I felt very confident. I said I indulged the hope that the better nature of the people there would reverse the injustice of the decision which this House apparently intended to come to.

Mr. DAVIN. I suppose that is confidence. Now, Sir, my hon. friend from Queen's spoke of the rearrangement by the Bill as if it would return for certain three Conservatives and two Liberals. He said that would be the result.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On the vote of last election.

Mr. DAVIN. But all you have to do is to look at the history of Prince Edward Island to see that you cannot take the vote of last election as indicating the way in which the people of Prince Edward Island will go in the future. But suppose that should be the result ; are we going to pause and say we will not make a fair and equal division because we are assured by the hon. member for Queen's that if we do the people may return three Conservatives and two Liberals ? That would be allowing considerations of party politics to weigh with us.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It simply gives to the minority three representatives and to the majority two.

Mr. DAVIN. In going over the townships of the Island, have we anything to do with the political complexion of the people?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen know, from the part I have taken upon this Bill, and from my views generally, that if I saw any turning aside to gain a party advantage by that distribution, I would not support it. But I say, looking at the principles upon which we have been acting, of going from township to township and equalizing the populations of the constituencies; looking at the fact that in Committee of the Whole this Bill has been made with regard to Ontario and Quebec what my hon. friend from Montmagny said was a good Bill, and a Bill which the hon. member for North Norfolk last night was led to praise: I say, seeing that this fair principle of going from township to township has been adopted, I have no hesitation in saying that I cannot vote for the amendment, and must vote for the arrangement which the Government have placed on the Table.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not intend to take up much time in reiterating arguments that have already been advanced in favour of the amendment which has been proposed. It is evident from the speech of the hon. gentleman who last spoke that he is convinced that the Bill is all right; and from his well-known independence of character in the House, which makes him ready at all times to vote in the way he thinks right, I can see that there is no hope of his voting for the amendment. Even though the Ministry should be influenced by the arguments to accept it, it will have an independent opponent in the hon. member for Assiniboia. I say I will not go over the arguments which have been adduced to show how the county lines of Prince Edward Island can be maintained and a distribution made that would be fair and just to all. There is one difficulty, judging from what the Minister of Justice says. He, perhaps, did not say it in so many words, but it is the one point to which I wish to give special attention, that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Queen's involves a sacrifice on the part of the Government of one of their supporters from King's; and what the Minister of Justice said gave us to understand that was a thing which was not to be expected from them. I can sympathize with that feeling. As a party man myself, I can understand that it would not be pleasant for him to contemplate doing what, in his view, would be the wiping out of one of his political friends. When we had the Redistribution Bill of 1882, one of the features that aroused the most opposition and the most ill-will was that it was designed to strike, and did strike at, personally, a great many of the then members of the House. It was intended and designed by its provisions to politically put to death man after man who sat upon this side. That, of course, was bound to arouse feeling on the part of the political associates of these gentlemen. It must have been also distasteful to their political opponents who recognize something like legitimate warfare and considered that illegitimate, because, however you may differ in political sentiment in this House, it is impossible for a party, associated together as the members of Parliament are, not to form personal attachments, while there may be political differences. You will find the sentiment of good-will pervading the different members who are called together, and therefore when any Bill is designed to strike any individual member of the House, and to take an unfair advantage of him, it is calculated not only to arouse opposition on the part of those who value him, not only politically but personally, but it is calculated also to arouse opposition from those who, while not agreeing with him politically, esteem him personally; and if the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Queen's meant to strike, personally, at one of the representatives from that division, while the Bill itself was intended to prevent that, and if there was an injustice in the amendment, I could quite understand the Minister resenting it and others members not liking it. But the position is this. The amendment, as I understand it, of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), while it proposes to leave just one member for King's and two to Queen's and two to Prince, not interfering with boundary lines, does, as I understand it, no personal injustice to either of the representatives of King's. If it did, it would have some weight. The Bill introduced by the Government strikes out one of the members for King's. Under its provisions one of these gentlemen must retire; that cannot be helped. Gentlemen on this side can sympathize with those gentlemen just as well as gentlemen on the other side, but the stern facts of the case, much as we regret it on this side as well as on the other, require the loss of one member or the other. Whatever be the cause of the condition which necessitates this loss, it cannot be charged to the hon. gentleman who leads the Liberal contingent in the Province of Prince Edward Island, or the Liberal party. The reduction in the representation of the Island is due to its loss of population, and whatever may be the cause of that loss, these gentlemen are not responsible. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), in pointing to the great increase of that city in prosperity and wealth, an increase in which we all rejoice, claimed that it was the result of the Government policy. If he takes that ground, he must admit that the opposite results in other parts of the Dominion are equally the consequence of that policy, and logically, then, the loss of population in Prince Edward Island is not to be attributed to any action on the part of the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) or the Liberals of Prince Edward Island, but must be due, by parity of reasoning, to the policy pursued by the Government. If that be so, certainly the Liberal party in that province are not the ones that should suffer because of this loss of population. One of the members for King's must go and is going under this Bill, and it cannot be urged that a personal injury is being done to either of the members of that county. But while the Bill takes a member from that county, it is designed to strike personally at the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies).

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In my judgment that is its design, and I emphasize the fact that the amendment of my hon. friend from Queen's does not strike at either of the members for King's. That has been done by the Bill itself, and that is unavoidable under the circumstances, but the Bill also goes further, and in the interests of the party,

strikes at the leader of the Liberals in that province.

Mr. BOWELL. Why?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Because it is in defiance of the rule followed out in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which is not to interfere with county lines.

Mr. BOWELL. There are no counties in Prince Edward Island. How can it interfere with them?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In purpose or in effect, at any rate, it is putting my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) in a minority, and if he is put in a minority I can only understand that to be done in the hope that he may be defeated in the next contest.

Mr. BOWELL. That implies he must go to a constituency in which he cannot live.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman says it implies he must go there. I do not see that that carries weight. The hon. gentleman knows that the leader of the Liberals from that province wants to have the Liberal party get fair-play and their proper representation in this House, and if he considers that he is struck at in the riding in which he ought to run, and struck at personally, he is justified in denouncing this as an unfair Bill. Hon. gentlemen must look at it in the light that the Bill itself strikes at one of the members for King's, not designedly, but by force of circumstances, but it further, without any justification, also strikes at the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), whereas the amendment takes out the vicious sting from the Bill and leaves what everybody admits to be fair. Whether the amendment or the Bill prevails, the County of King's must lose a member, but because it must lose a member is no reason why an unfair blow should be struck at the leader of the Liberal party in that province. The argument of equalizing the population used by the last speaker is not carried out, and is not the guiding principle of the Government. The guiding principle of the measure as enunciated by the Minister of Justice, the only principle laid down in this discussion, has been that you should preserve existing electoral divisions as much as possible, and the amendment proposes the preservation of existing electoral divisions, leaving two members for Queen's, two members for Prince, and one for King's, and by doing this you have about the exact unit in one case, you approach moderately near it in another, while in King's, with one representative, you will have about the same number as many other constituencies in other parts of the Dominion. It seems to me that the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's is one that must commend itself to the House. If it struck personally at one of the members in this House for King's, I could understand that the Minister of Justice, whom they support, would hesitate to adopt such a proposal, and so would hon. gentlemen on this side of the House on personal grounds, but the Bill itself takes away the seat of one of the members for King's, and then it comes down to a mere matter of political success. Which of these gentlemen will secure the nomination for King's I cannot say, but the other hon. gentleman is not likely to ask for a seat in either of the other divisions of the Island. I understand that neither of them lives in the section of King's which is proposed to be put in the County of Queen's, and the probability is that some one else may be put in there, so that the personal feelings which would weigh with any one in a matter of that kind do not come in here except in regard to the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) who is struck at personally in this Bill. That is where that hon. gentleman has cast his political lot. He has fought his battles there, and the design of this Bill is to put him in a minority, and to make him fight an uphill battle.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). He might as well come to King's County.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I believe he lives on the border of that county, so my hon. friend will have the privilege of going to one of the other counties if he chooses, but, as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has pointed out, he views this measure as being purposely levelled against him. He has signified that he intends to contest that particular riding.

Mr. DAVIN. And to carry it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And to carry it if he can, because you cannot always tell how elections will go. As my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said, he has jumped a pretty high bar before, and he may do it even if the bar is placed a little higher. But that does not do away with the unfairness of the proposition, and the Liberal party, who admire him and recognize his talents, do not like to see a Bill which goes out of its way to strike at him. Hon. gentlemen opposite recognize his talents as shedding a lustre on this Parliament, and they will not view this Bill with any greater favour because it is doing such an injustice to this gentleman. That is the only point I wanted to urge, because the Minister of Justice suggested that an injustice would be done to the member for King's if the amendment were carried. That is not so, because it is not likely that either of these gentlemen will seek a seat in the other counties. Will it not be conceded that it would be fair to give an opportunity to the majority of the people of the Island to elect a majority of representatives in this House? Instead of that hon. gentlemen are endeavouring to secure to a minority of the electors a majority of the representatives. That is not in accordance with the spirit of the constitution. It is not fair or legitimate, and therefore, while we all regret that one of the members for King's can no longer have a seat as a representative for that county, it is not the fault of the Opposition or of the amendment, but it is due to the fact that the Island has not maintained its population. There is still time, however, to do what is just and fair, and not to remove from public life a gentleman who is admired on this side of the House and who is also, I believe, held in personal estimation on the other side. It is these personal features in the Bill that cause such a feeling in regard to it. In 1882, that raised the feeling which I am happy to say we have not had to the same extent in regard to this Bill. There we saw the member for North Perth sitting in the House, and before facing the electors again, he had 200 or 300 electors thrown into another constituency. That savoured of cowardice on his part, but we saw some gentlemen plotting in secret to put to political death the other representative from that county, living in the same city with himself, holding social relations with himself,

and yet plotting to put him to political death by throwing a Liberal township into the next riding. In that case we saw men on the other side of the House who were too cowardly, in a political sense, to enter upon the battle until they had strengthened themselves by adding Conservatives to their riding, and throwing Liberals off, at the same time plotting to compass the political death of men with whom they were associated, and who happened to have seats on this side of the House. That is what aroused great enmities against that Bill; these are the feelings that make Liberals to-day, who went through that battle, speak with bitterness with reference to it. It was not legitimate, it was not manly warfare. We think we see in this Bill as it affects Prince Edward Island, a repetition of that kind of warfare; we believe we see one of the members of this House whom we hold in esteem on both sides of the House, being struck at in this Bill, and we ask that that be not done, but that we frame a Bill that, while it does injustice to no one, will do what is just, honourable and fair, and leave that gentleman to fight his battle as he has fought it before, with the disadvantages or advantages that he may have had in the past, but that this Parliament shall not lend the weight of its power to place that gentleman at an unfair advantage. The Parliament of Canada should not be engaged in the work of endeavouring to strengthen by legislative enactments the supporters of the Government, or to weaken opponents of the Government, but it should move on the plan of doing what is just and right. When municipal bounds have not been altered in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, though we had to lose a member from each of them, it is suspicious on the very face of the Bill that while in those two provinces you disturb no county lines in order to accomplish that, when you come into the little Province of Prince Edward Island you tear up all the bounds of that Island. I say it is suspicious on the face of it, I say that there is a something guiding the action of this Government that is not commendable. It cannot be a desire to equalize population, else the same plan would have been followed in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; but with inequalities left in those provinces greater than would exist under the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), members on this side of the House are forced to the conclusion that Prince Edward Island is being dealt with in a different manner from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and that is done with a view to damage the leader of the Liberals from that province, and the Liberal party in the province. The proposition of the member for Queen's appeals to the House not to act from partisan motives, but to act according to the principles of justice and fairness, and that as we dealt with the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia where they had to lose a member each, so we should deal with the Province of Prince Edward Island. Then, I think, will the Government be entitled to some credit for doing what is right in reference to Prince Edward Island, as they have received credit from the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) for amendments that were right in reference to Ontario and Quebec. I may say to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that they ought not to be blamed for recognizing these concessions on the part of the Government, for it is to their credit to acknowledge where the Government made concessions, instead of its being made a matter of reproach to them.

Mr. DAVIN. I never said it was a matter of reproach, I said it was greatly to their credit.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, but there was a sneer in the tone of the hon. gentleman, as I understood him. But I accept his statement as he puts it in that way. But when I heard it I thought, from the tone in which he spoke, as if he meant that the member for North Norfolk had eaten his own words; he used some such expression as that. Why, Sir, the members of the Opposition are willing to admit when the Government do what is right, just as they are ready to censure them when they do wrong. We admit that in the matter of Ontario some amendments were made, and in the Province of Quebec still greater amendments, as we consider, were made in the direction of justice, and we desire to give this advice to the Minister: Persevere in well doing; as you have done well in the other provinces in reference to some matters, continue in that course, and finish this Bill by doing what is just and right; deal with Prince Edward Island as you dealt with Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and then you will secure for yourselves a still greater meed of praise.

Mr. YEO. Last night the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald), in addressing the House, stated that he considered the proposition of the Government for redistributing Prince Edward Island, fair in every respect. Now, Sir, there may be a great difference of opinion in reference to this matter. If I were a supporter of the Government and anxious to serve the interests of the Government only, I might, perhaps, consider the proposition fair and just; but I am of a different opinion. However, I do not wish to speak of it as to its political bearings altogether. As one of the representatives from Prince Edward Island, I ask that that province should be dealt with in the same manner as the Government have dealt with New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. If the same principles which have been adopted in this House with regard to these provinces are extended to us, we cannot complain. I was surprised to hear the senior member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) say last night that the county lines of Prince Edward Island were purely imaginary. I do not think the hon. gentleman would make that statement in Prince Edward Island. I have lived on that Island nearly all my life, and I know that county lines have been strictly adhered to there.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). The hon. member will excuse me—I said, except in so far as the courts were concerned.

Mr. YEO. I accept the hon. member's explanation—in so far as courts are concerned. But I say that in every other way county lines have been strictly adhered to. Every man living in each county who has any interest in that county, is proud of being a native of it, whether it is Prince, King's or Queen's County. We have county institutions, we have agricultural exhibitions in which the people meet together yearly; and in our common courts, our Supreme Courts, and in many other ways county lines are observed. I see it is intended that we shall have registry offices in the different counties, and judges of pro-

bate offices, and all these things which tend to unite the people of a county more closely together. In my opinion, no greater injustice could be inflicted on the people of Prince Edward Island than to sever these county lines. These lines—as has already been stated—were established more than 120 years ago, and they have been closely adhered to ever since. Now, why is this proposition made by the Government? Just because King's County happens to have a population of 4,000 over the unit for one member. As we stand just now, King's County will have about 4,000 above the unit for one member, Queen's County will have about 2,000 above the unit for two members, and Prince County will have between 5,000 and 6,000 below the unit for two members. The difference in population between these counties has been greater in the past than it is at present. King's County has always been largely below the unit, it has scarcely one-half the population of Queen's County, still there was no desire to reduce the representation of that county. It has always been held that while we had six representatives, King's County should have an equal number with the other two. This division of the counties was strictly adhered to when we entered Confederation. The members were then allotted by the Local Legislature, composed of both sides of politics, and although at that time King's County had 23,000 and Queen's County 46,000 people, still it was thought that it would be better to leave each county to be represented equally rather than interfere in any way with county boundaries. It has remained so from that time until the present. If the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is carried, I do not consider any injustice will be done to King's County. I am sure either of the hon. gentlemen who represent King's County at this time, if he should happen to be chosen as representative at the next general election, would better represent the county as a whole than it would be represented if a portion of the people were placed in another county and the people united with those with whom they have no acquaintance. I think I am correct in saying that the senior member for King's has been a candidate at every election in that county since we entered Confederation, and if he should be the lucky one to be chosen as a candidate and should be elected at the next election, I am sure no one in the Island would know the county better than he does. I am sure the people of the county would feel better pleased at being represented by that hon. gentleman than to be represented by a gentleman living in another county. It is strange that Prince Edward Island should be the only province singled out for the purpose of applying the principle of equalization of population. It is somewhat singular that the Government should have gone to the smallest province in the Dominion to apply this principle. If we look across the straits at New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, we find the same principle has not been acted on there. Hon. gentlemen who have preceded me have referred to the disparity in the populations of the different constituencies in Nova Scotia as well as in New Brunswick. Pictou County with a population of 34,000 has two members; Antigonish with 16,000 has one member; Richmond with 14,000 has one member, whilst Cumberland with a population of 34,000 has only one member. I do not understand how hon. members from Nova Scotia can reconcile themselves to this fact, that while they are anxious to retain county lines in that province and consider it proper to do so, they appear to be willing to break down county lines in Prince Edward Island. If that principle of retaining county boundaries was proper in Nova Scotia, why should it not be carried out in the Island of Prince Edward? Further, I find that Cape Breton County with 34,000 has two members, Victoria with 12,000 one member, and Halifax City and County with 71,000, two members. So we see in Nova Scotia the population of counties ranging from 71,000 to 12,000, a far greater disparity than exists in Prince Edward Island counties. In New Brunswick almost a similar disproportion of population exists. Westmoreland with 41,000 has one member, while the adjoining County of Albert with only 10,000 has one member. If it is right and proper to equalize the population in Prince Edward Island, why should it not also be done in New Brunswick? No attempt has been made to equalize the population there. And if I am correctly informed, when it was found there was an increase of population in Nova Scotia and the province was entitled to two additional members, no attempt was made to equalize the unit of population, but the additional members were given to the two constituencies having the largest population. Under the present Bill, when it was necessary to take away a representative from Nova Scotia, it was done by merging two counties together, and the combined population of the two counties will be above the unit, and largely above the population of many of the other counties. Still this was the best course to adopt under the circumstances. A similar course was also taken with respect to New Brunswick, and one member was taken from the City and County of St. John. I suppose if the principle of equalization of population, which is put forward as one of the principles of this Bill now, were applied, St. John might fairly claim to have three representatives, because in one New Brunswick constituency there are only 8,000 people. I may point out to the committee that during the last 20 years King's County has increased in population 3,000, and Prince County during the same time has increased 8,000; so the population in Prince is increasing far more rapidly than the population in King's. Within the last ten years King's County has increased in population only 200 while Prince has increased over 2,000. I consider if the redistribution is carried out as proposed in this Bill, a very serious injustice will be inflicted on Prince Edward Island, regardless of the political bearing it may have. I do not look upon that consideration as being of first importance; I look upon the convenience of the people of the province as being paramount rather than the political effect such changes may secure. In Prince Edward Island each county has its proportionate share of representation in the Local Legislature, the public grants are distributed equally between Prince and King's, and in every way they are treated equally. If the system provided for in this Bill is introduced it may completely change the order of things in that respect. I think we have a right to claim for Prince Edward Island that the application of the same principles which are carried out in the neighbouring provinces should be extended to us. We ask nothing more; we

have the smallest province of the Dominion and have the smallest representation in this House, and on these grounds we have the right to expect that the Government and the majority of this House will give us at least equal justice with the other provinces. I do not think the Island should suffer because the people thought fit at the last general election to return four Liberals and two Conservatives. I hope that will not enter into the consideration of this House in dealing with this question. I trust, Sir, that there is a feeling on the part of the Government and of this committee to deal fairly towards Prince Edward Island by leaving the county lines remain undisturbed. The hon. Minister of Justice, when speaking last evening, said that he had received information which bore out the statement that this redistribution was fair and just. A great deal depends upon what source he received this information from. I feel confident that I am correct in saying that if the hon. Minister would take his information from any one but an interested politician,—and I do not care what party he may belong to—I am sure that the advice would be to leave the county lines undisturbed. I believe that would be the honest opinion of any Prince Edward Islander who had given the matter any consideration. It is a matter of universal regret to every one in Prince Edward Island that it is found necessary to deprive us of one of our representatives, but as such is unfortunately the case I think it ought to be done in such a way as to deal out the least injustice to us. If the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) should be adopted, the loss of a member from King's County would be in one respect a loss to the Island as a whole. I dare say that hon. gentlemen have seen that when any question affecting the interest of our province arises the representatives from that province generally manage to act and vote together. It matters not what particular county he may represent, where the interests of the province are concerned every representative of the Island does his best to see that she gets fair-play and justice. Really, so far as the division of counties is concerned, and as to the number of representatives from each county, it makes no great difference. I can only say that, if I represented the smallest county in Prince Edward Island, I should have no hesitation in saying that a member should be taken from it. I look upon it that it would be better to do almost anything than to break into county lines; it is, besides, adopting a very vicious principle. If the proposal of the Bill is carried out now, in ten years, in all probability, if a further reduction has to be made, you will have to re-enact the same kind of measure again. There may be a change in the party in power, and then there may be changes made which the opponents of the Government will consider very unjust. If you adhere to the county lines now, and take a member from the smallest county, then when any further reduction is necessary, and I sincerely hope it will not be necessary, you can take that member from the next smallest county, the county which I have the honour to represent now. If, on the other hand, we should be entitled to receive an additional member, then King's County could get that extra member, and we would be placed in the same position as at present. Some hon. members have contended that the dual representation should be done away with. If that rule is adopted universally, well and good, but we find that it is not proposed in the other provinces, and I do not see why it should be extended to Prince Edward Island. I am sorry to see that on one or two occasions the Redistribution Bill passed by the Local Legislature has been brought into this debate. I do not think it is a matter which this House has anything to do with, and I was very sorry to hear my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Macdonald) refer rather disrespectfully to the Local Government of Prince Edward Island. I can only say from my personal knowledge of the Premier of that province he is a gentleman of high ability and good reputation, and a gentleman whom a Prince Edward Islander has reason to be proud of. I know the members of the Local Legislature personally, and from my knowledge of them I do not believe they would pass any measure which was calculated to inflict an injustice on the people of Prince Edward Island. I know they are men who have large interests in that province, and I am sure that they would not do anything calculated to inflict injury on the people, or which would in any way attempt to curtail their privileges and rights. If, unfortunately, they should be mistaken and pass any measure which is calculated to inflict an injury on the people, the people of that province will not be slow to resent it. I would strongly advise my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Macdonald) to reserve his indignation until he gets back to the Island, where the matter can be more properly discussed, and where it will have more effect than in this Legislature. Now, Sir, I only wish that I could use stronger language to convince the Government and the majority of this House of the great injustice they will inflict on Prince Edward Island if they adhere to the Bill as introduced here. I feel sure that the interference with county lines will meet with almost general disapprobation from the people of that province. From my knowledge of the people, and from the deep interest they take in their own particular county, and the attachment which they have for their counties, I believe that they will look upon this as an act of great injustice. As to the political bearings it may have it is very hard to say. The people of Prince Edward Island are a reading and intelligent people, and they are well informed as to the passing events of the day. They take a good deal of interest in political matters, and in this respect I may say that they compare very favourably with their fellow citizens in any part of Canada, so that I feel sure that when they find that the Government are determined to carry out the propositions of this Bill it will meet with their strong condemnation. One reason urged by the hon. member from King's (Mr. Mc Lean) against the continuation of county lines, was the inconvenience the candidates would be put to in travelling a long distance to canvass the whole of the county. I do not know that candidates think very much of this, or that their convenience is much studied by the people, but if it does put them to extra inconvenience it will not be so great as the inconvenience which the people of these three townships will be put to, if the proposal now before the committee is carried out. In those counties the people have always more or less business with the county towns. They are obliged to go there frequently; their whole business lies in that direction; and by this Bill you propose to cut

them off from old associations, and thus inflict serious injustice upon them. I can only hope and trust that the good sense of this House will induce them to adopt the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Queen's. If they do, they will be giving us the same treatment that has been meted out to our neighbours in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and that will meet with the wishes of the majority of the people of the Island. So much has been said on this question, and so well and ably said, on this side of the House and by some hon. gentlemen on the other side, that it is unnecessary for me to say anything further. My principal object in rising was to endeavour to convince the House of the necessity of maintaining county lines, by showing that those lines are not merely imaginary, but are real and strictly adhered to, and that adherence to them in regard to representation in this House, would be to the interest and welfare of the people of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MASSON. I have taken a particular interest in this debate, which was opened so warmly by the hon. member for Queen's, and I expected to find in the course of the debate some reasons given of a practical and not simply of a sentimental nature, to show that this redistribution in the Island of Prince Edward was not only questionable, but absolutely wrong. So far, however, I have not heard any reasons advanced to show that it is absolutely wrong; I have heard very few that would lead me to regard it as even questionable. The two main objections urged so warmly by my hon. friend from Queen's are, first, that this redistribution interferes with county boundaries, and secondly, that it is a personal attack upon himself. As to the first objection, I must say that while listening to the hon. gentleman's references to the antiquity of these county boundaries, I thought he made out a strong case in favour of their maintenance. I was then ignorant of the fact that the counties so-called in Prince Edward Island are entirely different, in almost every material respect, from counties as we know them in other parts of this Dominion. We are told by members from that Island—and as the statement has not been contradicted I accept it as a fact—that there is no such thing there as a county council or a county municipality. The so-called counties are nothing more or less than judicial districts, and their associations are only such as pertain to judicial districts. But as respects intercourse between the people, the county boundaries are admitted to be merely arbitrary lines of great antiquity. That being the case, it seems to me that the Province of Prince Edward Island affords an opportunity of trespassing on county lines such as no other province affords. But the hon. member for Queen's told us this morning that for some reason or other, these boundaries were held in high esteem by the people of the Island, and he spoke in glowing language of a time when, although political passions ran high and political feeling was at fever heat, so great was the respect of the people for those county divisions that, in distributing the representation, the Local Legislature of the province gave to King's County the same number of representatives as to Queen's, notwithstanding the fact that Queen's had double the population of King's. That was certainly a respect, not of the boundaries alone, but of certain rights that those divisions, as divisions, were supposed to possess. I will not attempt to enquire why that is so. It may be on account of the majority in one division being of one religious complexion, and in another of another complexion. I take the fact as stated by the hon. gentleman who has led the debate on this question as being true, no matter on what ground it rests, but these divisions have claimed, and have been allowed, equal rights in representation. Now, when Prince Edward Island was brought into the union, it was easy, as six representatives were given to the Island, to respect those divisions by giving them two representatives to each county. But now an entirely different problem is presented. Instead of being able to give two representatives to each division, respecting the equal rights of those different divisions, the problem is how to give five representatives to the three divisions. Now, the Bill proposes to do that, irrespective of the divisions, by equalizing the population. As was stated in the opening of the debate, there was no possibility of taking one township, or lot as it is called, from one division and giving it to another without making the discrepancy greater. But what does the hon. gentleman propose? Does he propose to respect the equal rights of those divisions? No. Although his province, while political passions were at fever heat, respected the equal rights of the different divisions, his proposition is to throw those rights aside; and while he would retain for the County of Queen's two representatives and for the County of Prince two representatives, he would for some reasons give to the County of King's only one.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would not. The British North America Act does it.

Mr. MASSON. That is only the way in which the hon. gentleman proposes to solve the problem of giving five representatives to the three divisions. Now, I will not pretend to say why the hon. gentleman wants to do away with the equal rights of these divisions. I will not undertake to say whether it is on political grounds or on account of the religious complexion of one end of the Island as compared with the religious complexion of the other end; but it is clear that for some reason or other he thinks that King's County is not entitled to equal representation with the other divisions. He would trample under foot this sentiment so dear to the Island in the days he spoke of, and he would retain the double representation for Prince and Queen's. The other objection that the hon. gentleman has urged against the Bill is that it strikes personally at the leader of the Liberal party from the Island. Now, that is a man of straw put up for the purpose of being knocked down. Why does the Bill strike personally at the leader of the Liberal party from Prince Edward Island? That leader, recognized and honoured as such, represents the County of Queen's, which has two representatives. He is one of the two members elected in that county, each of whom represents the whole county, and he lives in one of the divisions which he admits is a Liberal division. He says that we are striking personally at him, and his friends repeat the charge, because one of the divisions, in which he does not live but which contains a portion of what he now represents, under this Bill, had a Liberal majority of 89. Certainly that is so light a man of straw

that it does not require the rhetoric we have had here to-day to knock it down. It is clear that, as leader of the Liberal party of the Island, the hon. gentleman may see that it is his privilege and duty to accept the more difficult of the two seats. He may say: I will give to my colleague the easy battle, and I will, as leader, enter into the heat of the fray, and I will win though I may have to face fearful odds. But the odds which he says are against him are by no means so tremendous. He says himself he has fought against greater odds before, and is not afraid of being beaten. However, he says he is not confident but hopes to win. Then why all this fury about the Bill?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would the hon. gentleman himself like to be obliged to face a majority of 98 against him?

Mr. MASSON. I faced a larger majority when I entered this House. We have the example of one of our Ministers, one of the leaders in Ontario, who faced a much larger majority than that at the last bye-elections, and came out triumphantly. However, I will not detain the committee by referring at greater length to this question. These are the two main objections taken to the Bill, and after all this debate I can see no weight in either. As regards the county boundaries, I submit that it is impossible, with the problem before us, to respect them without doing violence to the sentiment existing in the Island that the different divisions should be equally represented, and by the Bill they are as equally represented as the population will allow. Commencing at one end of the Island, the County of King's has one member to itself, and it has its say in the election of another. The County of Queen's has the advantage, if any, over the other. The County of Prince, at the other end of the Island, has a member to itself, and a voice in the election of another. In that way it cannot be said by the people in any one of these divisions that they have a less representation in the House than the people of the other divisions. They have a voice in the election of two members in Prince and King's; and if Queen's has the advantage, it is because it is the largest and has the city with it. For these reasons, I believe there is not the iniquity in the Bill we have heard so much about. I believe it is by no means an unjust measure. It is clearly based upon representation by population, and, moreover, it is only urged that in the political complexion it would have three on one side and two on the other. What does the hon. member propose? He wishes to put four on one side and one on the other. That is an admission on his part that it is impossible to keep the lines exactly as they are and distribute the population on an equitable basis. The scheme he has is to put four against one instead of three against two. Which is the fairest measure? If the hon. gentleman were to say that his scheme was intended particularly for the benefit of his political party, I do not think there could be any doubt in the matter. I would be sorry to support any measure which I considered struck at a prominent member of the Opposition. I have had experience of that feeling, as I represent a county which was formerly represented by the present manager of the *Empire*, then a leading member of the Ontario Opposition. Not one, but two personal and decided blows were struck at him before the Liberal party could decapitate him, and they succeeded in that by gerrymandering the county in the most disgraceful manner, making a string of townships north and south and a string of townships east and west across the country, a "T"-shaped riding, grouping the Conservatives outside the riding and leaving a Liberal majority against him of some 300 to 400. Such was the means taken to oust that gentleman from the Legislature. As a personal friend and supporter of his, I felt the injustice done my friend on that occasion, and I would be very sorry to support any measure which would personally strike at any gentleman on the other side. But in dealing with this matter, where a reduction has to be made, some party is bound to suffer, and I would say, with reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), who said that the two members blamed for this dishonest action are the two Conservative representatives in that riding, who advised the Government to do this for political purposes, the answer to that statement is that one of these very two men must fall. It is an evidence of the good faith of these gentlemen that if they did devise this scheme they devised one which obliterated one of themselves; and, if they are responsible, it is to their credit that they have decapitated one of themselves.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to address a few remarks which are called forth by some reference made to myself by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and I wish at the same time to urge again upon the Minister of Justice and his colleagues the eminent justice of the claim put forth by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). The hon. member for West Assiniboia has chosen to inform the House that I said this was a fair Bill. I gave no opinion about the Bill. I had given my opinion before as to the character of the Bill. What I did say was that I was very glad to see that the Government had seen fit to drop some of its most obnoxious features, and that I viewed with great pleasure the evidence given of the spirit of fair-play to the extent it was given. I repeat that observation. When this Bill was introduced into this House, it contained provisions which were very distasteful to members on this side. It contained provisions, I believe, which were eminently unjust, and which justified me in characterizing it as a measure framed on the lines of the obnoxious gerrymander of 1882; and surely I may be permitted, in fact I would deem myself unfair to hon. gentlemen opposite if I failed to do so, to make due admission as to the concessions they have yielded, as to any degree of fairness they might have evinced in their course. I repeat that I was gratified the Government took the steps it did, in some instances, and it would have disarmed to some extent, I repeat again, the vigour of my remonstrance at the outset if the Government had frankly declared that certain objectionable features of the Bill would be eliminated as they have been. I expressed the regret then, and I repeat that expression now, that the Government have not seen fit to crown its course of conciliation, so far as it has pursued such a course, by dealing fairly with my hon. friend from Queen's. If the Minister of Justice had chosen to have made this gracious concession that we had a right to expect from him, and that I have a very great wish he should give, I should have had a great deal more feel-

ing in favour of this Bill than I now have, and I cannot avoid expressing the wish that even now the Minister of Justice will see that, in view of the temper of the House and of what many of his supporters have said, the wish expressed by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) shall be adopted even at this eleventh hour, and that steps may be taken by the Minister of Justice which will be highly creditable to himself and will remove one of the most objectionable features of this Bill, and will go as far as it can to reconcile the public sentiment of the country with this Bill, unless he were to go so far as to withdraw it altogether. The Minister of Justice informed us before lunch that there was an undue feeling of generosity on his side of the House. I suppose, if he intends to persist in this provision in regard to Prince Edward Island, he will be bound to consider that the feelings expressed by the two hon. members from Toronto were unduly generous, but I believe those hon. gentlemen gave expression to the views which are actually entertained by the great majority of hon. gentlemen who sit behind the Minister of Justice. I do not believe there is more than a small minority of members who are not desirous to see fair-play dealt out to an hon. member of this House, and who do not sympathize with the views expressed by the hon. gentlemen from Toronto. The Minister of Justice says he cannot meet the views of his friends in this regard. I am very sorry that is the case, but I can understand that certain manipulators residing on the Island of Prince Edward, having no higher view than to get certain political advantages, not recognizing how gross a crime it is to interfere with free representation and to drive from public life a public man, are desirous to have Prince Edward Island fixed up in their own particular interest, and I can understand why the Minister of Justice cannot act in the manner desired by the more liberal-minded members of his party, because he has the pressure on him of these men who have these selfish and narrow-minded views and persist in their endeavour to prevent justice and fair-play being done with regard to the hon. member for Queen's. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) informed us that a necessity rested upon the Government to carry out this arrangement, that the main principle, the underlying principle of this Bill was to secure as nearly as possible equal representation, and that, acting upon that principle alone, the Government have felt compelled to carry out that arrangement. How near have they come to that in other provinces? They have made a readjustment in Nova Scotia and in New Brunswick of the same nature as we are considering in Prince Edward Island. Were they governed by the principle of equality of representation in those two provinces? Did they leave any less glaring inequalities there? They left Albert with a population of 10,971, they left Restigouche with a population of 8,309, they left Westmoreland with 41,478, and York with 40,979. Here are inequalities which are unadjusted in the Province of New Brunswick both in regard to excess of population and lack of population, greater disparity, a greater departure from the principle of equalizing the population than will exist in the Island of Prince Edward if the proposition of my hon. friend is acceded to. How did they treat Nova Scotia? They dealt with it in the same sense. Did they equalize the representation there? Not at all. They left Antigonish with a population of 16,112, Guysborough with 17,195, Richmond with 14,400, Victoria with 12,337; and then, in excess of the unit, they left Cape Breton with 34,223, Colchester with 24,000, Cumberland with 34,529, Halifax with 32,865, Lunenburg with 31,076. Here are inequalities of representation very much greater and more glaring than the inequalities in the representation in Prince Edward Island would be if the resolution of my hon. friend is accepted. If the resolution of my hon. friend is accepted, the representative of King's would have a population of 26,633. In New Brunswick two ridings are left with a larger population than King's would have, and in Nova Scotia there are six ridings with a larger population than King's would have. If it is necessary to deal with King's, why is it not necessary to deal with Cape Breton, with a population of 34,000, Colchester with 27,000, Cumberland with 34,000, Halifax with 32,000, or Lunenburg with 31,000? If it is not proper to leave King's County with a population of 26,000 for one member on account of this sacred principle of the equalization of population, why should Westmoreland be left with one member for a population of 41,000 and more, and York with nearly the same population? If the principle is so sacred in Prince Edward Island, and it is necessary to cut up the County of Queen's because it has some 4,000 above the unit, why has not that principle been applied in the other provinces down by the sea? That proves that the Government are not binding themselves by any hard and fast lines, but that they permit other considerations to have weight with them. What these other considerations are, it is not necessary to enquire now. How have they dealt with the Province of Ontario? They have redistributed seats in that province, and the same principle with regard to the equalization of representation would apply to the Province of Ontario that they say must apply in Prince Edward Island. What have they done? Why, they have left in the Province of Quebec, a population greater than the County of King's, P.E.I., possesses, in a large number of counties. They have left Cornwall and Stormont, with 27,000; East Elgin, with 26,734; North Essex, with 31,500; Kent, with 31,500; North Perth, within a few of 27,000; Russell, with 31,643; Simcoe East, with 35,800; Simcoe North, with 29,000; East York, with 35,000; West York, with 41,000. If the principle of equalization of population was so necessary to be applied in the case of Prince Edward Island, why was it not necessary to apply that principle in the Province of Ontario? Here is the County of Queen's with a population of 36,670, which, if divided, would give to each representative 18,335. It is necessary to redistribute, and cut and carve this county because it has a population too small in order to secure the application of the principle of equalization; but the hon. gentleman has left in Ontario, Brockville, with 15,800; Cardwell, with 15,300; Durham West, with 15,300; Frontenac, with 13,445; Grenville South, with 12,031; Hastings East, with 18,053; Leeds and Grenville, with 13,523; Lennox, with 14,902; Middlesex West, with 17,288; Northumberland West, with 14,947; Peel, with 15,472; Peterborough, with 15,808; Prince Edward, with 18,892; Victoria North, with 16,849. Now, if it is necessary to break over county lines in Prince Edward Island for the purpose of reduc-

ing the population of King's below 26,633, if it is necessary to break over county lines in order to give the County of Prince more than 36,470 to entitle it to two members, with 18,235 each, why was it not necessary to deal with Cardwell, with 15,000; with Durham West, Frontenac, Grenville South, Huron East, Leeds and Grenville, Lennox, Middlesex West, Northumberland West, Peel, Peterborough, Prince Edward, Victoria, every one of these ridings having a smaller population than Prince would have if divided by two? Why was it not necessary to apply the principle of equalization in the case of Ontario, when it becomes a sacred duty to apply it in the case of Prince County, P. E. I.? And if it was necessary to cut down the population of King's from 26,633 because it was some 4,000 above the unit of representation, why was it not necessary to cut down the population of Cornwall and Stormont, with 27,000; of Elgin, with 27,000; of Essex North, with 31,000; of Kent, with 31,000; of Russell, with 31,000; of Simcoe East, with 35,000; of Simcoe North, with 28,000; of East York, with 35,000; of West York, with 41,000? Why, if the principle requires absolute application in the Island of Prince Edward, the cutting down, and the raising up, and the carving, and the redistribution process, in order to equalize the population of the riding, then this sacred principle should have been applied to Ontario, should have been applied to Quebec, should have been applied to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It has not been applied to any one of these four provinces, and there is no necessity why it should be applied to Prince Edward Island. Sir, the remarks of my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Masson) with regard to county lines in Prince Edward Island, I believe are not correct. He told us that they have not any counties there, that the people do not realize that they live in counties in Prince Edward Island. They have a sort of communistic arrangement, I suppose, down in that province. They do realize they have got a province, I suppose, but they do not realize that they have counties. Sir, that is sheer nonsense. Have they not county courts? Have they not assizes? Have they not sheriffs? Have they not county officers? Have they not county organizations? Have they not county agricultural societies? Have they not been acting as counties for the last 120 years? And simply because their county arrangements does not embrace the same duties and powers that are embraced in Ontario, because there is a difference with regard to municipal arrangements and municipal authority, we are told that, inasmuch as they do not conform to the Ontario precedent and standard in every respect, consequently they have not got counties. Sir, they have got counties, and so great is their pride in their county arrangements that the Local Legislature, I understand, have not dared to disregard county lines; and there is no province in this Dominion where stronger reason exists for paying attention to the county prejudices and county interests that have grown up within county lines, than exists at the present moment in the Province of Prince Edward Island. Now, we are told by the hon. member for North Grey that the claim put forth that this measure was calculated to destroy a prominent Liberal member in this House, is all mere moonshine, that it is a man of straw put up to be knocked down. Well, my hon. friend from Queen's certainly is put up to be knocked down. That is the object of the arrangement, it places a hostile majority of 98 against him. They want to knock him down, undoubtedly. But he is not a man of straw. It is evident there is no reason for disregarding county lines, there is no reason for modifying the inequalities of representation in the Province of Prince Edward Island, that does not exist in all the other provinces. I say there is no reason for refusing to leave those inequalities except the reason that certain local politicians in Prince Edward Island want to arrange the district so as to secure the illegitimate and improper advantage that is derived from the gerrymander, the object of which is to relegate to private life a prominent public man. Members on the opposite side of this House realize that. They realize the unfairness of this measure; the instinctive spirit of justice that actuates every Briton, cannot be repressed, and leads many of these men in their secret hearts to say, and some of them openly, that this movement is one that cannot meet with their approval. The hon. member for North Grey said he would be sorry to deal a stroke to any member in this House. Well, let him give evidence of his faith by his works. If he would be sorry to deal a stroke, let him refrain from assisting in dealing a stroke. If he thinks that it is not fair-play to manipulate and carve up ridings in such a way as to place a hostile majority in that riding against the hon. member for Queen's, let him refuse to be a party to the transaction. I hope that the Minister of Justice and his colleagues will realize that this is a little game that is rather beneath their handling, and their character would be just as good, their prospects of success just as good, their position in the country just as good, if they listened to the voice of reason and refused to become a party to an arrangement that is calculated to drive to private life a prominent public man. Sir, that is a scheme similar to that perpetrated in Ohio when Governor McKinley was gerrymandered out of his district and was driven from public life in Congress, it is just such a scheme as has been practised in the United States scores of times, a scheme for the purpose of so manipulating districts as to stab public men to death, as to drive them from public life, and give them no hope of being able to serve their country in a useful capacity. It is a cowardly way of dealing with public men, it is an indefensible scheme, it is one that the Government ought not to adopt, it is something this House ought not to sanction; and the excuse that is offered for the perpetration of this wrong, namely, that we must equalize the population in the different ridings in Prince Edward Island, I repeat is a mere excuse, and is entirely without foundation. Because I have proved by figures that there is not a province in which the Government has not attempted to deal with ridings with more than the unit and with less than the unit. I believe if we take the course we should adopt in this matter, we will be able to put this Bill through and separate with a feeling that after all there is a spirit of justice and fair-play actuating public men in this country that will not permit the perpetration of glaring wrongs. I felt last night, not exactly a spirit of pride, but a spirit of gratification at the concessions which the Government have

made. I really felt as though they were beginning to be actuated by a desire to secure justice as far as they could. I did not know but that there might be a political millennium approaching some years hence when truth, righteousness and justice would be kept in view in the administration of the Government. I beg the Minister of Justice not to have my illusion so rudely dispelled in that matter as it will be by his continuing to insist on a gerrymander, a redistribution that places a hostile majority of 98 against a leading member of the Opposition and against a leading and most useful public man in the Dominion, and to insist on applying to the Island a principle of equalization of population that has not been applied to any other one of the provinces, and not having been so applied, the hon. gentleman is debarred from claiming that he is compelled to apply it to the Province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. WELDON. I desire to address a few remarks to the committee, although I should have preferred to have given my vote without offering any explanations of the reasons which influence me in giving it. The discussion that has taken place on this sub-section 6 of clause 2 has been impassioned and heated to a degree that is not justifiable by the Bill before the House. I was somewhat surprised by the intemperate language of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), the impassioned language of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), and the extreme language of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and the impassioned language last night of the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong). I sympathize very strongly with the position taken in the speech delivered by the hon. member for Prince, who regretted there was not power under the constitution to protect the Island of Prince Edward and enable it to retain its six members with which that Island entered the union. If it had been at all possible to set in motion section 52 of the constitution so as to preserve the six members without increasing unduly the size of the House, I would have been prepared to support a motion in that direction; but when calculations were made, it appeared to be practically impossible. If it were feasible, and I throw out the suggestion, it is perhaps worth considering whether it would not be well to ask for Imperial legislation with a view at least to preserving to the smaller provinces, which do not grow as rapidly as the Province of Quebec, the number of members which they possessed at the time of the union. When Quebec outgrows Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia the *amour propre* of those smaller provinces is wounded, and yet the rights of the great provinces would not be materially interfered with if the number of representatives with which those provinces entered Confederation is maintained. As regards the Bill, I cannot concur in the opinions held by a large number of my colleagues. This does not seem to be an outrageous Bill, but it is a Bill intelligently and reasonably carrying out the redistribution of the Island of Prince Edward in deference to a principle which I thought had commanded the assent of the great majority of the members on both sides of the House, although it certainly did not convince my own mind. When I spoke one week ago, and also two weeks ago, I pointed out that the great difficulty with which any tribunal or commission would have to deal in considering a scheme of redistribution would be this, that while they would agree that three, four or five principles were all good principles, the difficulty would arise in deciding which of two sound principles where they conflict should prevail. The Minister of Justice stated most distinctly not once but many times that the Bill was not prepared in deference to one or two principles but that several principles must be regarded, and that if one principle exclusively were attempted to be carried out we would, in common parlance, run it into the ground. But to go back, I pointed out some days ago that the practical difficulty would be to choose between two principles—on the one hand to make the electoral districts equal in population, and on the other hand to create as little disturbance as possible. I gathered from the speeches made by hon. gentlemen, notably the members from Ontario, not so strongly by the hon. members from Quebec, that they were strongly of the opinion, and they committed themselves to this position by the wording of the motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that it was important to place in the foreground this principle of equalization of population. I desire to refer to the remarks made by the hon. member for King's, P.E.I., to the effect that if you start out by adopting that principle, you cannot do better than adopt the provisions contained in this Bill. That contention has not been answered. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has spoken long and often, but he has not contradicted it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). That stage of the discussion has not been reached, because I have submitted an amendment embodying a principle to which the hon. gentleman gave his assent the other day.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. member for King's has convinced me and many members of the House that if you have to regard the equalization of the districts, and not meddle with the lines of lots and townships you cannot make a more equitable and reasonable arrangement than that proposed in the Bill. In an earlier stage of this discussion I declared my opinion to be that the cardinal rule should be that of making the least possible disturbance of boundaries. I adhere to that position now. Whenever these two principles to which I have referred come in conflict, it is better not to stand for equalization of population but rather for the principle of least disturbance. For this reason alone, dissenting from almost everything that has been said, I am compelled to vote for the motion of the hon. member for Queen's.

Mr. MULOCK. The difficulty the committee finds itself in now arises largely from the point referred to by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), the entire abnegation of principle in settling this question. Whilst it is true efforts have been made at various stages of the discussion to fix upon some principle or principles that should guide us in settling throughout the Dominion the constituencies, we are now confronted with the fact that the majority of this House has refused to be governed by a principle, and as all principle is being set aside, we are now dealing with each question as it arises. That being the case, it is specially the duty of the Government, and of that member of the Government who is charged with

the administration of justice, that no proceeding shall take place whereby substantial injustice will be done. Let me call the attention of the Minister of Justice to a proposition he laid down at an early stage of the discussion. The hon. gentleman will find that in the speech delivered by him on the 15th instant, he also laid it down as a proposition that whatever strength there might be in the argument in favour of maintaining county lines for municipal or other purposes, the argument spoke with tenfold force when applied to political matters; and that if it were unwise to disturb county lines for municipal or local purposes it was ten times more unwise to break up these combinations which existed between various localities which brought men together from time to time to confer as to the best persons to represent them in Parliament. I now call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the attitude which he assumed less than two weeks ago, and I ask him, has there been a case made, warranting the disregard of that principle, and warranting him in calling upon the House now to say that the county lines of Prince Edward Island shall be entirely set aside, and that there shall be some other principle applied that has not been applied elsewhere? The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) offered an extraordinary explanation for this arrangement, when he said that symmetry should be the guiding principle. Do you think that any one with a regard for symmetry would divide Prince Edward Island as it is proposed to be divided on that map? Why, Sir, to look at it you would think that chain lightning had struck the Island.

Mr. DAVIN. You have numerical symmetry, not geographical.

Mr. MULOCK. Oh, he did not refer to geographical symmetry then. Well, we will see how far numercial symmetry has been carried throughout the Dominion. I do not speak now in any spirit of anger or indignation. I speak as a member of this House desirous of seeing the House assuming a dignified position, and I do say that Parliament could not more degrade itself—I am not suggesting now that it is going to do so—than to prostitute the power of a majority to tyrannize over a minority, and thereby defeat the will of the people. Although a member of this House may in a moment of heat, and in the hope of obtaining a party advantage, cast a vote that will in fact degrade Parliament, yet I am sure there is not one member here who when he returns to his constituency, and in his cooler moments but would regret such a vote. I appeal to the better sentiments of the members of this House, and more particularly to those of the Minister of Justice from whom I do expect fair-play and from whom the country expects fair-play. I appeal to the sentiments of hon. gentlemen on all sides of this House to see that no unjust decision is arrived at, which although it may temporarily be a party advantage, will permanently injure the position of Canada in the eyes of the people. I presume that when the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) speaks about numerical symmetry, he means equalization of population. I ask him as a lawyer if he thinks it is fair to pass a law that is not general in its application. When we pass a statute did you ever hear us say that the provisions of that statute should only apply to a particular class? Was there ever legislation passed of such a character as that? Then, Mr. Chairman, if it is not the custom of this Parliament to pass laws local in their application, on what principle are we to justify the contention that representation by population or numerical symmetry shall only apply to the Island of Prince Edward and be ignored thoughout the rest of the Dominion?

Mr. DAVIN. It is not ignored.

Mr. MULOCK. We will see how it is not ignored. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), correctly says that if that were the guiding principle you have, so far as numbers can be arrived at a fair numerical basis, that representation in Prince Edward Island. But take any other of the provinces and what do you find there? Among the rural constituencies in Ontario I find that there is one constituency with a population 12,931 and another with a population of 35,000. We have a variation of 23,000 people in ridings in the Province of Ontario, and will the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) tell me how the principle of numerical symmetry is applied in Ontario?

Mr. DAVIN. It is applied in Ontario in this way: The number of members that were to be dealt with in Ontario would not justify any rational man in going over all the constituencies in that province. But you have six constituencies in Prince Edward Island and one-sixth of the representation is to be taken away from it, and one-sixth of the representation having to be taken away from it, there is a rational ground for dealing with the six constituencies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Did you do that in New Brunswick when you took away one-eighth of the representation?

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has not made his case much better. He simply told us the principle has not been applied to Ontario, but he knew that before.

Mr. DAVIN. How could it be universally applied?

Mr. MULOCK. Well, why did you say it had been? That is what I wanted you to explain. If we go through the whole Dominion the same difficulty confronts us. In the Province of Quebec the riding of Quebec West has a population of 9,241, represented by one member, while Drummond and Arthabaska has a population of 43,926, also represented by only one member. That is an illustration of the application of the principle of numerical symmetry, so far as Quebec goes. What do we find in the Province of New Brunswick in this regard? We find Restigouche, with a population of 8,309, represented by one member, and we find, at the other extreme, the County of Westmoreland represented by one member only, with a population of 41,478. One riding in that province has a population five times greater than another, and has only one member to represent it. I suppose that the hon. member for West Assiniboia will say that that is another beautiful application of the principle of representation by population. Let us come to Nova Scotia and see how the principle is applied there. The County of Victoria has a population of 12,387 and the County of Cumberland has 34,529, or about 300 per cent greater than the population of Victoria, and yet each has but one representative in this House. If the principle

of representation by population has not been applied in any of these four other provinces what cogency is there to compel the Minister of Justice in this case to disregard the argument which he advanced to the House when he said that the obligation to maintain existing lines was tenfold greater in regard to political than municipal lines? How comes it that you insist on the application of the principle in the Island of Prince Edward which has been disregarded in the whole Dominion? It is not often that we find the tail wagging the dog, but in this case we find two powerful members of the House dictating to the Government.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. The boys, too.

Mr. MULOCK. I dare say the boys may do it—persons who do not appreciate the importance of their obligations. But I am appealing to those members of the House who have a sense of justice. This is not a boys' game; it is a game of men, and I would like to know if the time has arrived when the Administration are going to be dictated to, and allow themselves to be dragooned into a certain line of action merely because two of its followers wish them to do it.

Mr. McLEAN (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to say how my colleague and myself are going to be benefited by the Bill which the Government have brought in. If he examines the figures, he will find that whoever runs in King's County will have his majority reduced by something like 120 or 130. The hon. gentleman for Bothwell also spoke as if we were bulldozing the Government; but I do not see that my colleague or myself have anything to gain from this redistribution.

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman is so disinterested, he will deal with this question impartially, and not as he and his colleague did last night, when they appealed to their colleagues to support them. Why did he not rest his argument on a fair statement of the figures? If, however, they have no personal or political interests to serve, let them deal with this matter in a judicial and impartial way, and then there will be no occasion for any of the comments I have made on their conduct. But until they do that, they certainly expose themselves to the charge of being the leaders of this movement. How comes it that they have such an influence on the Cabinet? It is not an influence which has been manifested on the floor of this House, but outside of this House; and it is time for the House to protect itself against influences of this character.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) What influences do you refer to? Name them, if you dare?

Mr. MULOCK. I refer to the political and party pressure which has been brought to bear by these hon. gentlemen in order to secure to themselves advantages which the situation does not warrant in itself. Now, the hon. member for Queen's laid down a principle that ought, I think, to commend itself to the judgment of the House, and I would like to ask those hon. gentlemen who are now so sensitive about their positions, how they get over his proposition. The Minister of Justice, who seemed much influenced by the arguments of the hon. gentlemen from King's, has apparently decided against the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's, namely, that this whole difficulty could be removed by simply giving one member to King's. The Minister of Justice will remember that he himself urged that there should be as little disturbance as possible wherever any rearrangement was necessary; and in view of that he explained why there had not been any greater disturbance elsewhere. We did at one time during this debate urge that the wrong done by the measure of 1882, which has no defender in this House, should be undone; and what did the hon. Minister of Justice say? He said that the effect of doing that would be to disturb a great many ridings, I think 60 or 70; and he asked, is it reasonable to suppose that after this Act has been in force ten years, a number of gentlemen will unite to disturb so many ridings and to legislate a dozen members out of Parliament? He said therefore he would not be a party to a wholesale disturbance of the province merely for the purpose of rectifying a wrong which every man in this House, and every man in Canada with any conscience, admits was a gross outrage. If that was a sound position for the Minister to take, how comes it that his doctrine is entirely ignored in the Island of Prince Edward, and that every riding in the Island is to be torn to pieces in order to remove one seat. There is one simple way out of the difficulty, and I now come to a question which I want to put to the Minister of Justice. If the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's is caried out, what does it involve? It involves only one member for King's representing 26,663 people. This would meet the view of the Minister that there should not be any more disturbance than necessary. Now, I ask the Minister of Justice why he should not assent to that poposition with reference to Prince Edward Island, when he has assented to the same proposition with reference to all the other parts of the Dominion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I spoke fully on that last night, and the hon. gentleman cannot expect me to repeat my remarks.

Mr. MULOCK. You have not done it in other parts of the Dominion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My hon. friend did not hear me last night.

Mr. MULOCK. It was so soporific a speech—

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am glad it had a soothing effect on the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. Now that I have awakened to the merits of the case——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot be expected to speak twice because the hon. gentleman went to sleep during my speech.

Mr. MULOCK. At all events, I can tell the hon. gentleman how he has left the population in other parts of the Maritime Provinces.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have not gone there.

Mr. MULOCK. But you were not called upon to disturb the county boundaries in Prince Edward Island either. The same duty was cast upon you in one province in rearranging the representation as in another. There is exactly the same obligation in all. New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have lost each a member as well as Prince Edward Island, and the same duty was cast upon you, and you should have followed the same course of acting in the one province as in the other two. In Nova

Scotia you have left one member to represent 30,979 of a population in the County of York. If a county in Nova Scotia can represent 30,000, why cannot a county in Prince Edward Island represent 26,000? You leave Westmoreland, N. S., with 40,000, and why cannot one member represent 26,000 in King's, P. E. I.

Mr. DAVIN. The same argument would justify and probably that would satisfy the hon. member having two members for King's, two members for Queen's and one for Prince. That is the hon. gentleman's argument.

Mr. MULOCK. There are three counties in Prince Edward Island. King's has a population of 26,000; Prince, 37,000, and Queen's, 45,000. If there is to be one member taken away, surely common sense would dictate taking him away from the county having the smallest population. If one representative is sufficient for Westmoreland, N.B., which has 41,000, how comes it you cannot be satisfied with one for King's? And so, if we turn to Nova Scotia, you have one representative for Colchester with a population of 27,000, one for Lunenburg with a population of 31,000, and one for Cumberland with a population of 34,000. How comes it that in this rearrangement you can leave these ridings with one representative each, and you cannot make things right by having one representative for King's, P.E.I.? Your action in this matter in one province affects all the others, because you are dealing with representation of the whole of Canada by this Bill. The hon. gentleman, as a lawyer, knows well that is the case. You are now laying down a system of representation in this Parliament for ten years to come. Every portion of the representation in the Dominion is now under consideration, and will have to be guided in future by the precedents you are establishing now. Go to the Province of Ontario, and you find the very same system obtains there. In that province, the following ridings have populations greater than King's County, and are represented by but one member. There is East Elgin with a population of 26,000, North Perth with a population ot 26,000, Cornwall with 27,000, North Simcoe 28,000, North Perth 31,000, Russell 31,000, East Simcoe 35,000, and there is a large number with about 26,000; so that throughout the whole Dominion, with the exception of Prince Edward Island, you find members representing each a far greater population than that of King's, P.E.I., and yet we are told that these precedents amount to nothing, and that it is necessary to ignore them. We are told by the Minister of Justice to disregard county lines and disturb the whole of Prince Edward Island in order to remove one member. I hope before the Bill leaves the committee, the Minister of Justice will endeavour to bring an impartial mind to bear on this question, because if he does not, he will be held primarily responsible for this measure. The country had expectations, and I hope it has not yet lost them. I certainly do not desire myself to lose my confidence in the hon. gentleman's integrity, or in his desire to do what is right. It is desirable that a public man in his position should be recognized as being moved by a desire to do equal justice throughout the whole of Canada; and if on this occasion he turns a deaf ear to the arguments addressed to him in this matter and allows this arrangement to take place, I venture to say that he in the end will be the greater sufferer, as he will lose the good opinion of many who desire to recognize in him the embodiment of what is right. The responsibility will rest with him if in the end he does not assert his power and allows my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island or any others to coerce him into sanctioning a measure not right in itself. Therefore, while there is yet a *locus penitentia*, I ask the Minister of Justice to suspend action with regard to this provision in order that he may be able to do justice, and thus leave no cause of complaint with respect to the representation of Prince Edward Island.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 49; Nays, 71.

(*b.*) The electoral district of East Queen's.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope that paragraph will not be carried as it now stands. I would solicit from the committee a little attention to this paragraph, and I sincerely hope that the Minister of Justice will not rigidly exact from his party a compliance with this section as it is drafted. There are a few minor errors into which I will enter later, and which involve no party disputes, but I desire to call his attention to the division he has made. The hon. gentleman has taken three townships from King's County and put them into Queen's. That has been settled, and I have to accept that, those three townships having a population of about 5,000, and a Conservative majority of 128. Queen's County has been divided into two ridings, but township 24 has always been in the west riding in regard to local affairs and has never voted with the east end of the county either for the Legislative Council or the Legislative Assembly. Township 24 has a Conservative majority of 200, and I submit to the committee as a matter of fair-play that, having transferred the three townships from King's County into Queen's, it is unfair to take this township with a Conservative majority of 200 from the west into the east. I only ask the Government to leave that township where it always has been. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite do not want to legislate a man out entirely. By the proposal of the hon. gentleman, West Prince will have a population of 21,000, East Prince, 20,723; King's, 21,684, West Queen's, 22,209, and East Queen's, 23,466. By this proposal, there will be about 3,000 more in East Queen's than in East Prince, so you cannot get mathematical accuracy in this division, but, if this principle is adopted, let us come as near to it as possible. East Queen's has the largest population of any and is a purely rural district. The Minister of Justice was under the impression that Charlottetown was in East Queen's. It is not, but is in West Queen's. I propose to leave lot 24 where it has always been, and to allow it to vote in West Queen's, which will make the population of West Queen's 24,824, and the population of East Queen's 20,821. I think that is not unfair. My first motion has been voted down, but, as the Government have determined to break up the boundaries, I would ask that township 24 should be left in West Queen's where it always has been and where it has been left by the Local Legislature.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If I understand the effect of the hon. gentleman's proposal, it is not very reasonable. I stated to the committee last night that I thought the distribution had been as fairly made as possible without dividing townships,

and that we could not transfer one lot or township without making a wanton disparity in the representation. My hon. friend now says that East Queen's, which he regards as his constituency has now a population of 23,466, which is something over the unit, but he proposes that we should take out of it lot 24, which has a population of 2,615. That would reduce that constituency to a population of 20,851. Let us see what the effect of this transference would be. West Queen's, which now has a a population of 22,209, with the addition of lot 24, would have a population of 25,824, while under the system we have in the Bill, the largest constituency has about 23,000 and the others about 21,000. I think there ought to be some reason given for ransferring that township other than the fact that the inhabitants have been accustomed to vote in Queen's County. They are still in that county, but the hon. gentleman wants them transferred from the east to the west.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman sees that he is not putting my argument fairly before the House. I said that township 24 properly belongs to the west end of the county. Any one can look at the map and see that for himself, and by the local division it belongs to the west riding of the county. Of course, when the county was one, the people in that township voted with the others, but there is no reason for transferring it to the east except it be that at the last election it polled a Conservative majority of 200, and you are taking it out of the west riding where it has always been and putting it into the east on that account. How can that be justified? West Queen's is largely an urban population. As the hon. gentleman argued very properly last night, it is impossible to bring down an urban population with accuracy. There are 14,000 people in the city of Charlottetown, but when you find that this township 24 is geographically situated at the north-west part of the county and has always been kept in the west end under the local divisions, that the people have never had any interest with the east in voting for either the assembly or the council, but have had all their political associations and connections with the west, what is the object of transferring that township to the east, when without it East Queen's would have a population of 20,851, which is close to the unit. The unit in Prince Edward Island is 21,880, and the population of East Queen's, if my proposal is carried out, would be 20,051. For the House of Assembly lot 24 always votes with 21, 23, and the other adjoining townships. They were in the west riding of Queen's, and when Queen's was divided into two ridings for the purposes of election to the Legislative Council, lot 24 was in the west; it always voted there along with 23, with 21 and 20. But you take it out and put it along with the townships in the other end of the county. I do not think that is fair-play.

Mr. BOWELL. Is not lot 24 in Queen's now, as represented by the hon. member?

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

Mr. BOWELL. Well, they will still vote with Queen's will they not?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have not made myself understood.

Mr. BOWELL. You argue that because it is in the division which now exists for the House of Assembly, therefore we must, for Dominion purposes, put it in the same riding. That is what you argue.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, I do not. In the first place it is geographically situated in the west side of the county. By the old Bill township 24 was placed in the west riding in 1852. When responsible government was granted to the Island, township 24 was in the west, and in 1862, when the Legislative Council was made elective, township 24 remained in the west riding, and has always been part of the west riding for the purposes of election to the Legislative Council. Now, it is there geographically, it is there by legislative enactment, they have always voted there, and why take them out? I believe there are not ten men in the whole of lot 24 who have ever been in lot 61, 62 or 64 in King's County; they never met the people of those lots in their lives. It is the most unjust division that can possibly be conceived. I know by whom it is done. It is done by the local men who instruct the Government in this matter. They have taken the 128 Conservative majority of Queen's County, and they take 200 majority in this, in order to swamp East Queen's. Is this House going to sanction that gerrymander? I appeal to the good sense of the House, to that sense of fair-play which certainly animates some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and to the sense of fair-play which I hope will distinguish the Minister of Justice. There is no reason in the world for dragging them out, unless you do it on the principle that you want to gerrymander the county.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In the speech which the Minister of Justice addressed to the House on this subject last night, he said that the division in which Charlottetown was placed, was the division which contained the largest population, and that the Government were not giving by this Bill to an urban population, representation to the same extent as to rural constituencies. Now, if that be so, there can be no reason for making a rural constituency in this case considerably larger than the one in which the city of Charlottetown is placed. Now, putting lot 24 from East Queen's into West Queen's, as my hon. friend suggests, makes the division in which the town of Charlottetown is found a little larger than the other, and so you arrange the matter in accordance with the rules which the Minister of Justice himself enunciated, and upon which he says the Government were proceeding in this Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not say that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman argue that a rural constituency ought to be larger?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have not discussed that at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said last evening that in this matter they were giving to the division in which Charlottetown was the larger population, and upon the principle which I have mentioned. I think the hon. gentleman will find that in *Hansard*. All through this discussion the Government have maintained that the urban population were not, in consequence of their ability to act with greater intensity than a rural population scattered over a larger territory, entitled to the same representation in proportion to their number. Here the hon. gentleman is re-

versing that principle and undertaking to give to an urban population a larger representation in proportion to their numbers, than to a rural population.

Mr. LAURIER. Notwithstanding the strong position taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice upon this question, I still venture to hope that he will come to another conclusion. I am sure the hon. gentleman will admit that, though it is desirable to equalize population, it is also desirable, as far as possible, not to interfere with the existing state of things, if the two objects can be harmonized, that of equalizing the population, and that of maintaining the old landmarks. I understand that the County of Queen's has been divided for the Local Legislature, and the present Bill proceeds upon the same lines of division except in regard to township 24. As I understand, the local Act divides the Island into two equal parts, but this division has not been accepted for Dominion purposes. I understand this division has existed for the Local Legislature for more than 40 years; it has always been satisfactory to the people, no complaint has been made. It strikes me that this division ought to be accepted, since it is found acceptable for the Local Assembly. It is true, it may make a difference in population, but as the hon. Minister of Justice has said, it is impossible mathematically to equalize the population: one division must have a few more and another a few less than the unit. But as I understand it, whether you place township 24 into the one or the other division, the difference in population will be more than 2,000.

An hon. MEMBER. 4,000.

Mr. LAURIER. No, as I understand the figures given by the hon. gentleman a moment ago, it would leave the population of East Queen's at 20,821. Under such circumstances, if you adopt the line which has been adopted by the Local Legislature from time immemorial, you preserve the old landmarks, which is a desirable thing to do. Under such circumstances it seems to be time that the hon. gentleman should be guided by the weight of justice and his better sentiments in this matter.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to know whether the Minister of Justice will yield to the suggestion I made before recess. I do not know whether I made myself clear about the discrepancy of population; but I pointed out yesterday that there is a discrepancy by the present division of 3,000 between East Queen's and East Prince, and the hon. gentleman accounted for it by suggesting that Charlottetown was included. Charlottetown is not included in the east but in the west. The hon. gentleman's argument I thought was very reasonable. He said:

"Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see that the disparity which exists there, and to which he calls my attention, is accounted for by the fact that he includes the city of Charlottetown, and we have not pretended, nor can anybody in drafting a Redistribution Bill, attempt to give the same representation by population to the cities as we do to the rural population."

As a matter of fact the hon. gentleman will see that Charlottetown is in the west, and that the disparity to which I called his attention was in the riding of East Queen's and not in East Prince. The change which I propose, of leaving township 24 in West Prince, where it geographically belongs, would create a similar disparity to the one that exists now, but that disparity would be accounted for on the reasoning which the hon. gentleman adopted in his speech yesterday, that it contains the city of Charlottetown. That is the only reason why the disparity exists—there are 14,000 people in Charlottetown, and it is in the west riding. Lot 24 is in the west riding of the county, as it was divided by the legislature 30 years ago for Legislative Council purposes. It is in the west riding also for Assembly purposes. The people have never politically associated with the people of the east riding except in the Dominion elections when the county was one. Now that we are making two ridings of the county, it would be fair and equitable that township 24 should be left where it has always belonged—in the west riding. I am not asking very much in requesting the Minister of Justice to yield that one point, to leave two evenly fighting districts where there will not be a large majority in favour of either party. I am sure this arrangement will be more in unison with the feelings and desires of the people, and it will be maintaining the local electoral districts as they have been in existence from time immemorial. It is unreasonable to destroy not only county lines but local electoral districts. I press the hon. gentleman to deal a little generously in this matter and yield this point.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it that objectionable township where it is rumoured you do not like the political complexion of the electorate?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of course I do not like the complexion of the electorate of that township. I have endeavoured to point out that those who inspired the Bill transferred township 24 from the west to the east because it gives 200 Tory majority. That is what I object to, and I have not concealed it from the committee. It amounts to a gerrymander, and you are destroying local electoral districts, and taking single townships from a county and placing it in the east, when it belongs to the west geographically, because it happens to give a Conservative majority. I say this is unfair and unjust, and I can only appeal to the majority to do justice, and I ask that it be done. I suppose you could use a majority to tear up the local electoral divisions everywhere.

Mr. BOWELL. Township 24 has always been in Queen's for Dominion purposes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But, as you are dividing the county into two portions, the question arises as to which riding you shall place it in. You have put it in the east. It belongs to the west for both branches of the Legislature, and it is now put in the east for the first time in history.

Mr. BOWELL. Because there has never been a division of the county for Dominion purposes. We are not dividing it for local purposes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The division is now being made into two ridings. There have been two ridings for local purposes, and township 24 has always been in the west, as it is geographically, and you are taking it from there and putting it in the east. This change cannot be justified on any principle.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a very common occurrence. In Ontario we do not have Dominion and Local Legislature lines the same.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) You may not have Dominion and local lines the same.

Mr. MULOCK. They were nearly the same until 1882.

Mr. BOWELL. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When the county has been divided into the east and west for 30 or 40 years, it will require some argument to justify the taking of a township from one electoral division and placing it in another to which it does not geographically belong. I know why it has been done. It is done because there is 200 Conservative majority there, and that is just what a gerrymander is, and that is what I am protesting against, and what I ask you not to do. I can only appeal to the sense of justice on that side of the House, and I think the House will see what it is justice to do.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Mr. Chairman, permit me to say a few words on this matter. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is very indignant because the lines that constitute the electoral district for the Legislative Council of the Island have been interfered with. There was no sign of his indignation when these lines broached on the County of King's, but as soon as it comes to Queen's County, he rises in great indignation and he thinks it a terrible thing. Now it does not make a pin's worth of difference, it does not alter the polling divisions or anything else. The thing will just go on as it did before, and there is no reason in the wide world why the Legislative Council lines for the Local Legislature district should be called in question in this matter at all. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have heard certain rumours going around this House, and as I am an outspoken man I will state them here now. When I hear a thing I am prepared to face the man with it, and I may as well say it here since I have heard it. I have heard that the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) has been going around among our friends on the other side of the House and he has been saying to them: Look what they are doing, they are dumping lot 24 on us, they are dumping a township on us made up of Catholics, and put them in my constituency.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to give his authority for this statement?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Give your authority.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) It is a common rumour.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Common rumour won't do; name your authority.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I will ask the hon. gentleman if he did do so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, I did not. I tell the hon. gentleman that I did not go round amongst his friends at all. Some of his friends were looking at the map the other day and he and his colleague were present, and I was called across the floor of the House to ask what this meant. I went, and in the presence of five or six gentlemen, among others he and his colleague, we talked the matter over, and I told them it was an outrage that having created 128 majority in the east, they were now creating 200 Tory majority in the west. I said it was an outrage and I repeat it.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Do you deny making that statement, Mr. Davies?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What statement?

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) That the Government was turning over lot 24 in your constituency which had a large Catholic vote?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I deny saying anything about the Catholic vote. I said there was a large Tory majority of 200 against me.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Well, I have made my statement of the rumour; I am not one who will go behind Mr. Davies's back and say a thing which I would not say before his face.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did the hon. gentleman ever hear me say it?

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I did not, but having heard it, I thought it my duty to give you a chance to deny it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Take it back now.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Take what back? I will take back any language of mine when I make a wrong assertion, but I have acted like a man, and I have told the hon. gentleman to his face what I have heard, and if he denies it why that is the end of it. It has been common rumour and I thought I had a right to say it. Now let us look for a moment at the proposition of the hon. member from Queen's (Mr. Davies). He says that we have dumped a large Conservative vote on him. The facts of the case are, that according to the Redistribution Bill, East Queen's shows a majority in favour of the Conservatives of 89 votes. According to the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's, the taking off of lot 24 from East Queen's and adding it to West Queen's, would leave him still a majority in West Queen's of 227. I ask hon. gentlemen which is the fairer proposition: our small majority of 89 for the Conservatives, or his proposition to take off lot 24, and leave a large majority in favour of himself and his friends. I believe that the proposition of the Government as stated in the Bill is as fair as any man could make it taking it from one end of the Island to the other, and as fair as it is possible to do it, having the township lines in view. Now, a great deal has been said to-day about the influence of myself and my colleague being brought to bear on the Government. That statement bears contradiction on the face of it, because if our object was to bring influence on the Government, I suppose that we would bring that influence to bear in favour of ourselves. If we were so inclined to bring to bear influence of that kind, and had only our own selfish ends to serve, we could very easily have taken a portion of southern Queen's and added it to King's, or we could have taken a portion of northern Queen's and added it to King's, and carved out two very nice constituencies for ourselves. But,

Mr. Chairman, I say that we had no such object in view, as making Conservative hives for ourselves or our friends. All we wanted was a fair and square distribution and that is what is contained in the present Bill. It is a fair and honest redistribution, and any removal of lot 24, or any other lot, will leave it in a much more unfair position than it is at present, and will give a party advantage to either one or the other, greater than does the present Bill as now constituted. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has been able to deny the rumour which has been floating around, for I did not think it was possible that the hon. gentleman would be so unfair as to make an assertion of that kind, when there was no reason for it, and when he has got a majority in Queen's County as it is now constituted of about two Protestants to one Catholic. I did not think it was possible that the hon. gentleman would make an assertion of that kind, and I am glad to hear him deny it. I might say, however, that the lots that were taken from King's County and put into Queen's had 4,092 Protestants and 847 Catholics. I have these figures before me in order to show that there was no disposition to create any feeling of that kind, and I was sorry indeed to hear that anything of that nature should be spoken of. I repeat again that I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman could contradict it.

Mr. DICKEY. I think the hon. member from Queen's (Mr. Davies) should satisfy the committee that the interests of equality of population should be suited by the change he proposes, because, if we depart from county lines, I cannot see what measure this committee can take of the electoral districts, unless they resort to mere numbers. Personally, I was opposed to departing from county lines in Prince Edward Island, but the committee have decided otherwise, and I do not see how this committee can take the assertion of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that there is a Tory majority in a particular district, which remark only applies to the last election, and can act upon that. As I understand it, this division was made by going to the north-east end of the Island, and making a constituency as nearly as possible to the unit without dividing a township, and working from that westward, forming constituencies that came as nearly as possible to the unit. The position of the city of Charlottetown render that second constituency of irregular shape, but, as I understand the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), Charlottetown must go into the west riding, and therefore it seems to me that the division which the Government proposes now—the committee having decided to depart from county lines—is the best that can be proposed. I would submit to my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) that it is a fatal objection to his scheme that it makes so disproportionate a division in the east riding of Queen's.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On that point the hon. gentleman is a little mistaken. I will call his attention to the figures. By the division as it at present exists, there is a discrepancy of nearly 3,000 between East Queen's and East Prince. That is caused by putting lot 24 in East Queen's. I want to put lot 24 where it geographically belongs.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.)

Mr. DICKEY. I understand that that discrepancy is unavoidable owing to the different sizes of the townships. Unless we adopt the principle of dividing the townships, we cannot get rid of a certain discrepancy; but the division which the hon. gentleman recommends would involve a greater discrepancy still. Having departed from one principle, I think we should now keep as closely as possible to the other.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The discrepancy caused by putting lot 24 in East Queen's is 3,000. The discrepancy which would be caused by leaving it in its natural and historical place would be 4,000, and that discrepancy is due to Charlottetown being in the western division. Does the hon. gentleman say that a difference of 1,000 in the discrepancy justifies the transfer of one township from the west end to the east end? The idea is preposterous. The hon. Minister of Justice gave the best answer yesterday that could possibly be given when he said that where you have a city like Charlottetown at one end of a county, you cannot pretend to give the same representation to the city district as to the rural district. In such a case there must necessarily be a little discrepancy. But my proposition leaves the township where it belongs geographically, and where the Local Legislature has for forty years determined that it should be. Surely that ought to have some weight. These people have been accustomed for the last forty years to vote in political alliance with the west end of the county, and never in the east end. If the hon. gentleman will do me the favour of looking at the map, he will not look at it five minutes before he sees that the division proposed in the Bill is a wrong division. I do not want unreasonably to press this thing; but hon. gentlemen will see that they are proposing a division that will always be a source of trouble; and every year an amendment to this Redistribution Bill will come up until it is rectified, for the people will not be satisfied. I am convinced that there is not a man in this committee who, if he looks at the map, will not say at once that I am right.

Mr. TISDALE. What about the three townships taken from King's and put into Queen's? You might as well ask that these should be put back.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I argued all day yesterday and to-day that they should be put back, and the committee have decided against me.

Mr. TISDALE. If the committee have decided against you in that case, they have decided against you here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, the committee have not decided against me here. They have simply decided that three townships should be taken out of King's and put into Queen's, so as to equalize the population.

Mr. TISDALE. The same here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No. According to the division in the Bill, the population of East Prince is 20,000 odd, and the population of East Queen's 23,000, a difference of 3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. It appears to me that there is very little force in the argument of the hon. gentleman, or there must be a different condition of things in Prince Edward Island from what exists in Ontario. He advances two reasons why this

township should be left as it is. One is a political reason, because the complexion of the electors is different from that of his side of the House, and the other is geographical, because the township is part of the other county for local purposes. If he came up to Ontario he would find that the outlines of the local electoral divisions and those of the Dominion divisions are scarcely ever the same. In my district, for instance, there are some townships from the local division of North Grey, some from the centre division, and one from the south division. I cannot understand why it can make so much difference in Prince Edward Island that one township should be in one division for federal purposes and in another division for local purposes. The other argument, regarding the political complexion of the electors, is not, I think, an argument that should weigh with this House. If that were the principle on which we were dividing up the country, we would have to go upon different lines from those we have adopted in regard to this or any other redistribution of seats. I understand that this division is one based on the principle of numbers and of maintaining township lines, and the division the hon. gentleman desires would make the districts more unequal than they are under the Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Just a word or two. I cannot submit in silence to have these appeals characterized as appeals to fairness and justice, because while I admit the perfect sincerity of the gentlemen who call them so, they strike me as being appeals to secure a party advantage. While, as I have said so often before, nothing would give me greater pleasure than to yield to the hon. gentleman's personal wishes and expostulations in this matter, I do feel that in doing that I would be departing from the only principle on which we can be guided in dealing with Prince Edward Island, in order to give a party advantage to our opponents. As the hon. member for Cumberland has said, it is a very difficult matter to arrive at a distribution of a whole province like Prince Edward Island, where we have to depart from county lines and where we have no other guide but numbers. The hon. member for Bothwell was unfair, and to some extent the hon. member for Queen's also, in making use of my remarks of last night about Charlottetown. The hon. gentleman called my attention to the fact that one of these constituencies had 2,700 less than another, and I asked him if that were not accounted for by the fact that Charlottetown was in the larger one. He said it was, for the moment being mistaken; and accepting that, I said: You cannot expect in an electoral district containing a city that the numbers shall not be somewhat swollen over those of a rural district. It turns out that the city of Charlottetown is not in that district, and that we have in the two districts, notwithstanding the city of Charlottetown, nearly an equalization of numbers. But these hon. gentlemen seek to turn my argument into this, that although it happens that you have, in the district, that contains the city of Charlottetown, a fairly approximate equalization, you must not adopt it. But having succeeded in approximating the equalization, you must throw in an extra township in order to make it unequal. I never made the argument to the committee and it has never been made to the House yet, that because an electoral district contains a city it must be made unequal. We have admitted that where the inequality exists we do not propose to rectify it, and it would not be reasonable to rectify it to the full extent of numbers; but I have never heard that you must throw a rural district into a district adjoining a city in order to make its number larger. The facts about the numbers are these, and I am sorry to have to repeat them so often. King's keeps its 21,000; the two divisions of Queen's, in consequence of Queen's being so populous, not only containing the city of Charlottetown, but I suppose containing the large population which centres in that county, in consequence of the city being there, are somewhat in excess, 23,466 and 22,209. When we come to make the two Princes, we come to a county which has a small population, not the smallest in the Island, because King's, as a whole county, is the smallest, but when you come to make the two divisions of Prince, you find it makes the smallest divisions in consequence of the disparity of population, and you have in the one 20,723 and in the other 20,987. Is that any reason why we should step into the next county, in which we can make a pretty fair approximation of the numbers, and say we will take a township out of one and put it into the other, and make a disparity of 4,000—and for no other reason than the one the hon. gentleman candidly gives, that this township casts a large Conservative majority? When hon. gentlemen state that as a reason why we should change the lot from one riding to another, it seems to me they ask us to depart from the principle I declared we ought to base the redistribution upon, and notwithstanding all that has been said, we have made our redistribution upon a basis that will be fair, regardless of the mere question of party. I think we have proved that. We have conceded in the other provinces almost everything demanded, down almost, if not quite, to the point of giving the advantage to the other side. And here it is claimed we cannot meet the demands of justice and fairness, unless we deliberately take a lot out of one riding and put it in another, simply because that riding is inconvenient by reason of the fact that it casts a Conservative vote. It seems to me that to recast the Bill on that ground is what we cannot be expected to do. As the hon. member for Cumberland stated to the committee, the reason why we cannot more exactly approximate equality is that we do not want to divide townships. If we did that, we could approximate much better to the principle of equality. But short of that, this is as fair an arrangement as it is possible to make, and I cannot see the force of the argument that geographically the lot belongs to no one division more than another, because we were told last night and all to-day that the geographical divisions of the Island are counties, and this lot always has been in the county in which it is in this Bill. The one point remaining then is the hon. gentleman's point, that it is in the other riding for local legislative purposes, but we cannot undertake to regard local divisions. Its people have always voted with those with whom they will be associated hereafter for Federal purposes, and it seems to me that removes any complaint.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is not fair in saying that I am asking him to put township 24 out of the riding where it is now into

another. I am not asking that. The hon. gentleman sees it is in the west riding now for local purposes, and it has been so for the past 40 years, and he is taking lot 24 out of the west riding and putting it into East Queen's. I am asking to leave the lot where it is. I am asking the hon. gentleman, when reconstructing the riding, not to break in upon the geographical divisions of the county and upon the local subdivisions which have existed for so many years and which work so well; and as to the slight disparity which will be thus caused the hon. gentleman gave a complete answer yesterday when he said that would exist necessarily because the city was in that riding, and you could not pretend to equalize with mathematical certainty where there are cities. These are his words:

"We have not pretended, nor can anybody in drafting a Redistribution Bill, attempt to give the same representation by population to the cities as we do to the rural population."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. For that reason both of these two ridings are much larger than the others.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman would leave lot 24 where it ought to be and where it has always been, there will be a slight disparity of only 4,000, and that is caused by the fact that the city is there, and the objection to that disparity was answered yesterday when he said that where there are cities you cannot avoid the disparity, as the population must be necessarily larger because of the city being there. You cannot cut a township into two. I would move that township 24 be struck out of section (*b*.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is on paragraph (*b*.) Those in favour of that paragraph remaining as it is in the Bill will please rise.

Paragraph agreed to: Yeas 59; Nays 39.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is moved that in paragraph (*b*.) after number 24, the words "Rustico Island" be added.

Amendment agreed to.

(*d*.) The electoral district of East Prince.

Mr. PERRY. I do not understand how the Government, or whoever framed this Gerrymander Bill, came to the conclusion of adding lot 15 to East Prince. Lot 16 is added to West Prince. Hon. gentlemen could not have looked at the map or they would have found that lot 16 is separated from lot 14 by the Grand River, which is about two miles in width at the mouth, and there is no means of crossing except in canoes or scows. Lot 15 naturally belongs to West Prince, and there is no understanding why it is added to East Prince, thereby unnecessarily extending the distance 25 miles from the north of lot 15 to the end of the riding as now gerrymandered. I suppose this is because there happens to be a majority of Conservatives in lot 15, and the Government think that East Prince would not be strong enough without it to elect a Tory. I suppose they were aiming at my colleague. This is trying to gerrymander Prince in the same way as they have gerrymandered Queen's County. The hon. member for King's County says "we" have done this and that. Yes, they have gerrymandered the Island, and a pretty mess they have made of it. Now he is gerrymandering a county which he never saw an acre of. The Minister of Militia, the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Public Works are the people of Prince Edward Island, and they are arranging all these things. They say: We have tried to bribe them by promises of a tunnel and we have not succeeded in that; now we will gerrymander them. They use their power and are determined to show these Grits what they can do. It is something to boast of, and it is amusing to hear members from Ontario who never saw Prince Edward Island, stating what they believe should be done for the good of the people of that Island. I am not going to move in regard to this, because I see it is no use. The Government are determined to carry their Bill in all its unfairness and ugliness. Is it because there are 2,000 French Acadians in lot 15 that they must be sent down to vote away from where they have always voted? I was surprised awhile ago—and I hope that rabid speech will not be reported—to hear the hon. member for King's appeal to this House with an attempt to affect the prejudices of the people. He said that my hon. friend from Queen's County (Mr. Davies) went begging to members on the other side of the House, asking them, for God's sake, to transfer lot 24 out of his county because the people there were Roman Catholics. Yes; they are Roman Catholics. They are countrymen of my own. They are Acadians and a fine people they are. The hon. member for Queen's has fought here on their behalf. He has fought for the maintenance of the Rustico Bank. Can my hon. friend from King's County say the same? My hon. friend is too well known in Rustico and in Prince Edward Island for any members to stand up here and say that Mr. Davies is ashamed or afraid to have the Catholics of Rustico in his county. This is an unmanly attack, which may be well enough for the hon. member for King's to make; but where is the charity and fair-play? I am not so fortunately situated as is that hon. gentleman from that stand-point. I have the honour to represent the majority of my constituents, who are Protestants, and I can truly say that we get along well in Prince. We meet socially and at our pic-nics, and religious divisions are never mentioned. I throw back in the teeth of the hon. gentleman the statement he has made, which I believe is not correct. I want the House to understand that there is no religious feeling on the Island, that Catholics and Protestants there are living together harmoniously, that political contests take place altogether on political grounds, and such a speech as has been delivered by the senior member for King's is simply intended to arouse religious feeling among innocent, quiet, law-abiding people. Although the injustice is great, although I am convinced that lot 15 should be added to West Prince and lot 16 to East Prince, I will not move an amendment in that direction, for it would be useless to do so. The Government have made up their minds that because Prince Edward Island is the smallest province and because the people do not send a majority to support the Government, to perpetrate an injustice on the people. They have made up their minds to gerrymander the constituencies, so that a minority of votes shall return a majority of representatives. Is that fair, is there any justice in it, can such action be defended? If so, we had better get out of the country altogether. I expected something better from the Minister of Justice; I thought he would do what

was right. What is the meaning of the word "we" which has been used so frequently, and which has not meant well to the welfare of the people of the Island? I challenge the member for King's to show that a single petition from any part of the Island has been sent here asking that the province be gerrymandered. Perhaps the hon. member for King's County has been assisted by the two Senators from that county. Although that county is the smallest in the Island and the least populous, it has two senators, while Prince, which has a population of 11,000 or 12,000 more than King's, has not one senator. I may be told that we are represented by Senator Howlan. I deny it. He has not lived in Tignish for the last 10 or 12 years, and certainly does not represent Prince County. The two senators from King's possess a large amount of influence, but they appear not to be satisfied until there is a wholesale gerrymander carried out. This gerrymander must be carried out just as the two members for King's wish it. I have seen them on different occasions cross the floor with a gerrymander map and point out to Government supporters how important it was to support the Gerrymander Bill and pass a law in such a way that for all time to come the Government will have three or four representatives. They do not follow the principle, "do unto others as you wish others to do unto you." If they repeated the Lord's Prayer twice daily they would not support such a measure; and if they came here and heard Mr. Speaker repeat those words in the Lord's Prayer at the opening of the House, they would hardly do it. There are a large number of French Acadians on the Island, and because the Government suppose they are my friends and supporters, they must be victimized and thrown adrift. It is almost as cruel as the action taken in 1755, when 10,000 of my countrymen were expatriated. I shall be very much mistaken if these people do not resent this action, for they are not accustomed to being so treated. They are honourable, law-abiding and loyal subjects, and I am proud to have them among my constituents. If any one of them votes against me, he does so on principle; but when he will find this Gerrymander Bill passed by the Government, he will resent it as an outrage perpetrated upon his people.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was going to ask the Administration whether it was their intention to keep unenfranchised Indians on the voters' lists, because I purpose to call the attention of the House before the end of the session to the effect that that has had upon the administration of Indian Affairs. I would like that the hon. Minister of the Interior would state fully the effect in the cost of the administration of his department, and on the control that the department can exercise over these reserves on which the unenfranchised Indians have been placed on the voters' lists. I never raised the objection, although I knew that they were not legally in the county, but the revising officer has held a court there, and they have always resisted being put upon the voters' lists. I think that last year, after a good deal of effort and about a fortnight being spent amongst them, 20 of them were persuaded to allow their names to go on the list, and they are, I have no doubt, legally outside the limits of the county.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman in using the term "unenfranchised Indians,' puzzled me for a moment, but I remember now that he used the term in the sense of the Indian Act, and that there are Indians who have the electoral franchise on this Island.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are Indians who, if they choose to apply to be put on the voters' list, would be entitled.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that every island ought to be in some constituency, if it has voters. We have not considered the question of the Franchise Act in connection with this subject. I did not know what the population was, but I have received letters saying that these islands appear to be overlooked, and that they ought to be in some constituency, and were nearest to Bothwell.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly they are nearest to Bothwell, and if it is necessary to put them in some constituency I am not objecting. I am only calling the attention of the Government to the fact that there are no persons there except unenfranchised Indians. I have no objection myself now, any more than I had when that section was under discussion, to put enfranchised Indians on the voters' list. I think they are entitled to go on on exactly the same terms as any other class of the population. These islands are included, in the Upper Canada statute, in the County of Lambton for judicial purposes, but they are not included in any county for electoral purposes, for the very reason that it was never proposed until 1885, to enfranchise politically the wards of the Government. These Indians are under the control of the department, and I know myself from communications which I have had, that the influence of the department over the Indians on these various reserves in Ontario, where the political franchise has been extended, has in a large degree been destroyed, and the department, so far as its influence is concerned, has been completely demoralized. The Indian agents in many places having been forced into political practices have lost that control over the Indians as wards of the Government that they ought to possess, and all the enquiries I have made point in every instance in the same direction. I shall mention later matters which I do not intend to mention now, because they are not directly involved, but which must be known to the Minister. They show the very great impropriety and the great mischief that have been done the Indian population by undertaking to extend to them, when they are still wards of the Administration and still held to be incapable of exercising control over their own affairs, the political franchise; the highest franchise known to our law and to our constitution. I am not objecting to these islands being put in the County of Bothwell. They are placed nearly opposite the township of Chatham, and I do not object to their being placed in that county.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

The electoral district of Bothwell shall consist of the township of Sambro (including Walpole Island, Ste. Anne's Island and the other islands at the mouth of the St. Claire), Dawn, Chatham and Zone, the villages of Wallaceburg, Dresden and Thamesville and the town of Bothwell.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suggested the other evening that certain changes in the County

of Bothwell should be made, but I understand from the Minister that the Government object to consent to these changes, and so I do not propose to press them at this time upon the attention of the House.

(*b.*) The city of St. John, as now existing under provincial legislation, shall also form part of the electoral district of the City and County of St. John, and the said electoral district shall return one member only.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As I understand this provision, the people of the city of St. John first vote exclusively for the election of a member for the city, and then they unite with the electors of the county to assist them in electing their man. That seems to be a most improper and indefensible system. Why not divide the two and give the city its own member, and place the county in exactly the same position? To give the city electors two votes while the electors of the county have only one is something which I venture to say has no parallel in any portion of the British dominions. If the hon. gentleman wishes to have a united constituency, and to allow the voters of the whole constituency to vote for two members, that is open to the same objection as any other double constituency; but to give the inhabitants of the city of St. John the privilege of electing a member for themselves, and after that the privilege of assisting in defeating or it may be of electing another member, is a most unusual and improper thing. You might as well give the inhabitants of the city of Ottawa the privilege of going out and voting in the County of Carleton after they have elected a member for the city.

Mr. HAZEN. The system to which the hon. member for Bothwell takes exception is one that has prevailed in the city of St. John for the last hundred years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We do not care for that.

Mr. HAZEN. Surely the hon. member for Bothwell has some respect for historical continuity.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not a principle of historical continuity. It is an ancient abuse according to the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. HAZEN. We will not discuss to-night whether it is an ancient abuse or historical continuity; but I say that old institutions of this sort are entitled to a certain amount of respect. That system has prevailed in St. John over since it was a constituency. It prevailed at the time of the Confederation of the British North American provinces. At that time, when New Brunswick came into the Union with the other provinces, and when the constituencies for federal purposes were formed under the British North America Act, one member was assigned to the city of St. John and another to the city and county of St. John. In 1872, under the redistribution of that year, that constituency was not interfered with at all, but the extra member given to the Province of New Brunswick was assigned to the city and county of St. John. In 1882 that constituency was not interfered with, and I think there should be some very good reason given to this House before it interferes with a system which has worked successfully ever since that constituency was a constituency, and against which not one single word of criticism has been uttered from the people interested, either in the newspapers or elsewhere. Now, I will point out to the hon. gentleman that a year or two ago that constituency presented a greater anomaly than it does at the present time. Until a few years ago the city of St. John included 25,000 or 26,000 people. There were five parishes outside of the city, one of which was the parish of Portland. That parish grew rapidly until it became a town and finally a city, and a few years ago it was united to the city of St. John. In the general election of 1891 the city member was elected by the smaller constituency, containing about 25,000 people. At that time there were 16,000 or 18,000 people in the city of Portland who voted separately from the city of St. John. After this Bill passes the whole city will consist of 39,000 people, being the old city of St. John and the city of Portland united, and the member representing the city of St. John will represent those 39,000 people. Outside of the city of St. John there are four parishes, containing altogether about 10,000 people. The system has prevailed from time immemorial, for local as well as for federal purposes. Up to a year ago for the Local Legislature the city elected two members and the city and the county four members. The charter of the city of St. John was a charter originally taken from New York. The system has worked well, and no expression of opinion against it has been heard from any representative body or from the press of either side of politics in the city of St. John; and when the representative of both the city and the county are of opinion—perhaps it is a matter of sentiment largely—that it is better to adhere to the old system of things, no objection having been raised against it, I do not see any reason for changing it. I may say that from a party stand-point it does not make the slightest difference. I am the representative of the city and county, and it does not make the slightest difference to me personally whether in the next election I run for the city and the county alone, or in association with another candidate. There is no party advantage to be gained, and there is no sinister purpose in view. My sole desire for having the system maintained as it is at present is because I believe that unless there is a good reason given for making a change, it is not wise to disturb an old custom such as this.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not regard this as a matter of custom at all. I suppose that if there had been in the city of St. John a special franchise, the hon. gentleman would not come here and ask that that franchise should not be interfered with. We had provincial franchises, and the hon. gentleman's friends all insisted that they should be done away with, and they proposed a franchise of a wholly different character. Now, the hon. gentleman comes forward and says that the city of St. John ought to elect one member, but that the County of St. John ought not to elect a member, but it may be entrusted, along with the city, with the privilege of exercising the elective franchise. What kind of electors has the hon. gentleman in the County of St. John that he cannot entrust them with the election of a member to this House? He is willing to allow them to vote along with the people of the city, but he dare not put them in a position of equality. They are an inferior race according to the hon. gentleman's contention. You give to every man living in the city of St. John two

votes, but to every man in the county you give the privilege of voting only with the electors of the city. If the hon. gentleman were to come forward and say that the county should be separated from the city, that would be an intelligible proposition. If the hon. gentlemen were to say that the city and county should be united and return two members, as the city and county of Halifax do, that would be an intelligent proposition, but he declares that the people of the County of St. John were 100 years ago placed in a position of inferiority and that this inferiority shall be perpetuated. That is what the hon. gentleman now stands up and supports. Because that was so 100 years ago and the people have not complained, he is willing to perpetuate that condition of things. Well, the hon. gentleman has been ready to undertake to alter counties in this Bill which the people have not asked him to change. Why, he has assisted us in gerrymandering the whole district of Niagara. The people of Niagara did not ask him to do that. The representatives from that district did not ask him to do that; but when it comes to the district in which the hon. gentleman lives, the City and County of St. John, he says that this abuse, this stamp of inferiority has been placed upon these people for 100 years and he declines to remove it. They do not complain, they are ready to submit to it, and they are not to be trusted to vote alone, and so they are tied alongside of the people of the city just as you would an unbroken colt alongside of an old trained horse in order that it may be kept going right. So the hon. gentleman says that these people, although they have been subject to this training for 100 years, have not been sufficiently broken in, and are not to be trusted with the electoral franchise, standing alone. I will be interested in seeing what the electors of the County of St. John will say to the defence the hon. gentleman has made of this stamp of inferiority.

Mr. HAZEN. I have always entertained a very high regard for the wisdom of the hon. member for Bothwell, and I must say I have never seen it more prominently manifested than on this occasion. The city and County of St. John, since Confederation, has been represented in this House, at times, by men of experience and ability, some of whom have belonged to the Reform party, and one of whom was a Cabinet Minister in the Government of which my hon. friend was a member. That hon. gentleman who had a seat in the Liberal Cabinet with the hon. member for Bothwell, never thought fit to raise his voice against that condition of things, and it has remained for the hon. gentleman, with the superior wisdom he possesses, a wisdom so vastly superior to that of the Liberals of the City and County of St. John, who have never found any occasion to express a desire for any change in the system which has existed in those districts since Confederation, to find out that the people of the county are oppressed, and treated as an inferior class to the people of the city. I must say that I admire the hon. gentleman's wisdom to-day more than I ever admired it before, and I wonder what his Liberal friends in the city of St. John, and those who have sat in this House with him, session after session, representing the county, will have to say of his present course. I wonder what the friends of the hon. gentleman who was a Cabinet Minister with him representing that county will say, when they find his colleague saying that he did not properly represent his constituency, and that it remained for that hon. gentleman to come here and stand up in the interest of the County of St. John, and show that the people of that county were not receiving fair-play at the hands of the Government. I repeat again that in 1867, at the time of Confederation, this system existed of one gentleman being elected to this House from St. John city and one from the city and county, just exactly as it will be when this Bill becomes law. And in 1872, as I have pointed out before, when the then City and County of St. John were united as now, we did not hear any one, either Liberal or Conservative, get up in this House and say that the people of that county were being treated as an inferior race, because the citizens of the city of St. John voted for three representatives and the people of the county only voted for two. Does the hon. gentleman think that the people of the County and City of St. John are behind the times and unable to understand their own interests? Does he think that the people living in the county have so little an idea of what is going on that they do not know of the provisions of this Bill? And does he think that the people are so lacking in intelligence that if they felt they were downtrodden they would remain silent and not raise their voices in their own behalf? The system has worked satisfactorily and well, and that being the case, and there being no protest from the community at all, there not being the slightest opposition to it, and there never having been heard any voice raised against it on the part of any of the representatives of that district at any time in this House—and were there any injustice, not only the representatives of that constituency but of the other constituencies in the provinces would not be slow in making their protests heard—people there will be able to appreciate the kindly interest and motives which influence the hon. member for Bothwell in exercising so paternal a care over their interests. The hon. gentleman, in his anxiety to score a point against me and put something in the *Hansard* that could be circulated in the constituency to my detriment, has been unfair enough to charge me with having said that the people of the county were an inferior class. Every man within the sound of my voice knows that I said nothing of the sort. If the hon. gentleman's argument is correct, if I said so, not in words but practically, then the same thing was said by the former members in that constituency, his colleagues in this House. The same thing was said by the Hon. Mr. Burpee and Mr. Weldon and other distinguished Liberals who had a seat here, and to whom the hon. gentleman's view of the question never presented itself at all. The people of the county are not an inferior class. The people of the parishes of St. John are a people who have a high degree of intelligence, are a well educated, enterprising people, a people in every respect on a par with the electors of every other portion of the country, and a people I believe who even possess as much intelligence as the constituents which send the hon. gentleman himself to this House. Now the hon. gentleman says I cannot trust these four country parishes to elect a member.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You do not.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. They are trusted as they have been for 100 years. They feel proud of forming part of the constituency of St. John and do not protest against this system. We have every confidence and every regard for them, and have no desire in any way to treat them with disrespect or with any feeling other than respect and confidence. If the House had adopted the principle of dividing the constituencies into ridings in every instance, there would have been some basis for the argument of the hon. gentleman, but no such principle has been affirmed. In some cases we have two members for the same constituency, in others we have the constituencies divided; and until some fixed principle or rule is laid down, I cannot see why the present system which prevails in the city of St. John and in the county, and which has worked so well in the past, should not be retained. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his remarks, made reference to the Niagara Peninsula. I do not see what that has to do with the City or County of St. John or that it has anything to do with the argument before the House. As I understand, the question is entirely different in the Province of New Brunswick from what it is in the Province of Ontario. In the Province of Ontario it is decided that an additional representative should be given to the great city of Toronto,—and to my hon. friend (Mr. Cockburn) who says "hear, hear," I must say that I fully appreciate the greatness and importance of that city—and it had been decided that a member should be given to the Nipissing district, and to do that it is necessary, in some way or other, to arrange the province so as to reduce the representation elsewhere in Ontario. Nothing of that sort occurs in the Province of New Brunswick. Unfortunately, under the British North America Act, they have to lose two members, but the question is in what manner you are going to make good the loss? This has been done by uniting Sunbury and Queen's, and taking one member from the City and County of St. John which was given to them in 1872, so that the City and County of St. John stands precisely in the same condition as it did at Confederation and up to the year 1872. As far as I am personally concerned, it makes not the slightest difference to me whether the whole constituency returns two members, whether it is divided into two ridings, or whether the present system is continued, but the present system has proved satisfactory, and I do not see why it should be departed from.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). When does the hon. gentleman propose to resume the committee?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not until Monday. The amendments suggested require some consideration, and we have very little time for that until Saturday.

Committee rose and reported progress.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 96) to make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the militia force on active service in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

Bill (No. 97) to amend the Winding-up Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Dewdney: That Bill (No. 89) further to amend "The Dominion Lands Act," be read a third time, and the motion of Mr. Davin in amendment thereto.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That this Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of striking out all the words after the word "Interior" in the 5th line of the 2nd page up to and including the word "acre" on the 19th line of the 2nd page.

He said: The effect of the amendment will be to make cancelled pre-emptions when homesteaded subject to the same conditions as other lands.

Motion agreed to, and Bill reconsidered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is the fit time to obtain from the Minister in charge, whoever he may happen to be, some information as to the recent loan floated in England. I presume the Ministers have received the details, and can give the House the requisite information.

Mr. BOWELL. The Minister of Finance is not in the House to-night, but he will be here to-morrow, when he will be able to give the hon. gentleman the information he desires. I confess I am not in a position at the present moment to do so. If the hon. gentleman desires we will allow item No. 1 to stand in order that he may put the question when the Minister of Finance is here, or he may take the opportunity on any other item.

Department of Printing and Stationery. $22,842 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this item, I may take occasion to remark that it does not appear to me that the alteration that has been made has at all facilitated the business of the House. There appears to have been very great delay this session in furnishing us with papers, which under the old regime we were in the habit of receiving at a much earlier period, more particularly papers in connection with the census returns. Over and over again—and I impute no blame to the Minister of Agriculture—he has informed the House that such and such documents would be brought down within a day or two, and weeks and weeks have elapsed without the production of those documents, and in other respects unusual delay and increased expense have taken place in connection with this department.

Mr. CARLING. I would say to my hon. friend that the bulletins have been in the hands of the printer. I expect that I will be able to distribute them to the members perhaps this week. It is not the fault of the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say it is the fault of the printers, that new department we have created.

Mr. CARLING. They have so much work to do that they cannot get this ready in time.

Kingston Penitentiary..... $162,763 49

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to enquire of the Minister of Justice whether any alterations or extensions are to be made at Kingston, and if so what?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; we propose to erect a lunatic asylum and a prison for female convicts as soon as possible, and I propose to ask the House for a vote for the preparation of material for these purposes. It is under consideration whether we shall ask likewise for a grant of money to purchase a site, as additional land will be required if we carry out both enterprises. I am not able to say yet whether the Government will ask for this grant this session or not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About how many people would be required to be accommodated?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Among the women about 30, and I think about the same number of lunatics.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where are they now?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The lunatics are in a large ward by themselves, in the building where the mill is; but the ward has no accommodation for recreation or exercise. In fact, they are not allowed out at all and do not receive any of the treatment usually extended to lunatics for their health and restoration, such as gardening, and I am very anxious to have a building erected for that purpose. The accommodation for the women is now in the basement of the prison, and although there is room enough for them there, the place is very unsuitable as regards dampness and ventilation.

Publishing Debates..... $40,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid that this is wholly inadequate. Of course we have to take the vote, but what will it cost altogether?

Mr. BOWELL. The only information I have is that this is the ordinary vote; but we have been in the habit in the past of taking a supplementary vote, and from the information I can obtain just now, $25,000 more will be required.

Board of Customs and outside Detective Service—To meet expenditure in connection therewith, including $400 salary of Commissioner of Customs as Chairman of the Board..... $23,600

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand the Minister of Customs has introduced a considerable number of rather important changes having regard to the use of detectives and the distribution of seizures. It might be as well to state what these changes are and what induced him to make them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They are not very important, but I think they are in a good direction. Certain officers receive a certain salary who were formerly entitled to a share in the fines or penalties and forfeitures made in connection with the seizures of smuggled goods. Now, by a modification of the regulations, collectors over a certain salary have no share in those fines and seizures, and all other officers receiving certain salaries are not to have a share either. One provision of the regulation also is that a certain percentage shall be taken on the gross proceeds of all seizures, fines and penalties to assist in meeting the expenditure in connection with the preventive service.

Department of the Interior..... $95,414

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I remember aright, there was a considerable amount of discussion as to the policy to be adopted with respect to certain officers who had been found guilty before the Committee on Public Accounts of grave irregularities, and no definite statement was made as to the final conclusion the Government had arrived at. I presume that their salaries are included in this vote, and I presume also that the Government have by this time settled what course to adopt with respect to the officials, and I shall be glad to know what decision they have arrived at.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The position of those officers is the same as when this question was before the House some few weeks ago. The clerks are all occupying the same position as they had then, and the Government in the meantime have not considered it necessary to make any change.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that the Government ought to have been in a position to have informed the House before prorogation, because no doubt the House itself has an opinion upon the question as to what course the Government have been taking. The hon. gentleman appointed a commission and that commission made a report. He has suspended some of the officers from the position they occupied and permitted them to continue the discharge of their duties. That is an unfair position for those men to be kept in, and the hon. gentleman, before asking the House to concur in this proposition, should be ready to inform us as to the course the Government intend to take. He is asking for public money, and he has also provided for the payment of a chief clerk who is really an unnecessary officer, an officer rendered necessary only by the degradation to which the hon. gentleman has submitted his deputy. Before the Government make up their minds, they ought not to ask the House to make this appropriation. The hon. gentleman ought to be prepared to give the information.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What officers does the hon. gentleman refer to, because I do not think any were under suspension at the time this was discussed?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman informed the House that his deputy had been put in the position of a chief clerk, and he provided for the payment of a chief clerk because there was no such officer previously provided for. That is an unfair position in which to keep the deputy and to keep the House. The House ought to know what the hon. gentleman intends to do. He told us what his own inclination was, but the report of the commissioner was rather against him, and we were not informed what view would be taken by the hon. gentleman's colleagues. We ought to know that before the House is asked to concur in this estimate.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The position is the same as it was when this item was before the House on a previous occasion. Mr. Burgess is occupying the position of a chief clerk, the amount of his salary having been voted in the Supplementary Estimates for this year. It will be necessary, when the Supplementary Estimates come down for next year, to make that provision if the Government propose to continue Mr. Burgess in the same position.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). At present the department is left without a deputy head. Mr. Burgess is a chief clerk acting as a deputy. The law imposes certain duties on a deputy. Either that is a necessary office or it is not, and we ought to know what the hon. gentleman proposes to do, whether he proposes to give Mr. Burgess the position he formerly occupied or to withhold that position from him. The House has nothing to do with the matter of appointment, but it has to do with the appropriation and with the criticism of the Government in reference to these matters. There is a rumour abroad that the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce another officer connected with another department which we understood was to be transferred to the Department of Agriculture, who is to be made deputy head. I think the House has a right to know what the Administration proposes to do while the estimates are under consideration. The hon. gentleman asks for an appropriation for a deputy. How do we know whether he will have a deputy for the next twelve months or not?

Sir RICHARD CARTRIGHT. I think we ought to be put in possession of the intentions of the Government. This is not a new matter. It was brought very pointedly under the attention of the Government three or four months ago. Surely the Government can make up their minds as to what course they will adopt in regard to the late Deputy Minister of the Interior, and surely they ought to take the House into their confidence as to whether they are going to reinstate that officer or do without a deputy or put another deputy in his place. As my hon. friend has remarked, a sum of money has been granted or is to be granted for the salary of a deputy head who is non-existent at present, and also a sum for a chief clerk who I suppose is doing the work of the deputy head. It is very reasonable for us to ask the Government whether they propose to have a deputy head, and who he is to be. There has been none for some months, and yet the deputy head is an officer entrusted by statute with certain important duties. I forget when Mr. Burgess was suspended, but I think it was about November. We are now close to the 1st of July, a period of eight months, time enough in all conscience for the Minister of the Interior to make up his mind and obtain the views of his colleagues on the subject. If he has not done that, he had better let the item stand until he can inform us what he is going to do.

Mr. LAURIER. The suggestion made by my hon. friend is a very reasonable one. It is not fair to the House to ask for the appropriation unless the Government are prepared to give the information asked for. Almost three months ago the hon. Minister gave us the same answer as he does now, that Mr. Burgess had been reduced to the rank of a chief clerk, but he could not give any information as to what would be done in the future. Under the circumstances, and the hon. gentleman not being in a position to inform the House what he will do, I think we should wait until the House is informed what the intention of the Government is.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Although three months have passed, I am not in a position to make any definite declaration with regard to the position of Mr. Burgess. There are only five members of the Government here, but, if they were all here, I could not make any statement until I had formally presented my recommendation to them, and my intention was not to do that until after the session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the item should stand.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the item is under Civil Government salaries for the Department of the Interior. The House has voted a payment for Mr. Burgess as chief clerk up to the 1st July, and has likewise passed in this resolution the salary of a deputy head. I understand the objection to be that it is desirable that a statement shall be made whether a deputy head is to be appointed. That cannot be done because it has not been mentioned to Council, and of course in addition to that it must be submitted to His Excellency. The duties are provided for, as Mr. Burgess is discharging them with the salary of a chief clerk, and, when the Supplementary Estimates come down in a few days, I propose to ask an appropriation which will regulate that matter for the coming financial year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. I must remind the House that we are not in committee The hon. gentleman has spoken twice already.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest that this item should pass, and you will have the other in the Supplementary Estimates to discuss.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, we agreed to let this item go because it was stated that the subject was under consideration and we were to have the opportunity of further discussing it on concurrence. Concurrence has come, and there is yet nothing decided.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is nothing in suspense. My hon. friend intimated that his disposition was to make a recommendation in reference to Mr. Burgess. He has not made that recommendation, and it remains in the same position.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Burgess is practically discharging the duties of deputy head, although he has only the position of a chief clerk. This is an anomalous position which cannot last for ever.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It cannot and will not last for ever. When we take a vote for salary for a deputy head, it implies that we will appoint one.

Mr. LAURIER. The deputy head does not exist?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government cannot make an office exist until the salary is voted.

Mr. BOWELL. We have never yet passed an estimate, either the present Government or the late Government, without some cases occurring in which clerks and officers were estimated for but had not been appointed. The head of a department frequently found it necessary during the coming year to appoint a second or third class clerk, and he took a vote for the salary required. But in some

cases those officers were not appointed. I have not had an estimate during the 14 years I have been in charge of the Customs Department, which has not contained votes for salaries of officers whose positions have not been filled during the year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The question is the right to keep the position of deputy vacant or not. I hold the Government has no right to do so.

Resolution agreed to on division.

Ammunition—Government Cartridge factory at Quebec..... $50,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to enquire from the Minister of Militia whether he has adopted regulations allowing a certain quantity of small arm ammunition to be issued to officers and men of the active service while engaged in practice. What is the rule of the department?

Mr. BOWELL. There has been no change in the practice in vogue during the last few years, and the only free ammunition issued is that allowed to the Rifle League. Of course, small appropriations are given to the rifle associations, varying from $25 to $100.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the difference between the Rifle League and the Rifle Association?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Rifle League is a union of the different Rifle Associations throughout the Dominion. Reports are published in the newspapers of matches when the men are camping out, and the reports are carried over the telegraph wires. This was considered by the department, when I had the honour of presiding over it, to be a most efficient way of encouraging rifle practice, which is so desirable in the force.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object in the least to a reasonable grant for ammunition, either to the associations or to the league. On the contrary, my impression is that it will be of very considerable benefit to the militia service if both the associations and the league receive a moderate quantity of ammunition for the purpose, and I would support the Minister of Militia in any grant for that special purpose. What quantity of ammunition has been granted to the Rifle League?

Mr. BOWELL. The Rifle League has been established about three years. Its headquarters are at Toronto, and its president is Col. Gibson, Provincial Secretary. The amount of $2,000 or $3,000 is granted the league for ammunition. I am glad to hear the opinion expressed by the hon. gentleman in regard to a larger vote for this purpose. Nothing would give me greater pleasure, as it would all those who are interested in the militia, if I had sufficient money at my disposal, to double the grants made to all the rifle associations.

Drill Pay of Militia..... $275,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About what is the number of militia intended to be placed in camp this year.

Mr. BOWELL. This amount will cover the annual drill of about 25,000 men. A number of corps have been ordered to drill in the localities in which the organizations exist, for the purpose of reducing transportation expenses, which are very large. After considering the matter the General determined, and I fully concurred in his opinion, that it would be much better to put a larger number of men under canvas, and perform their annual drill this year by confining them to localities near their headquarters, than to pursue the old system. By adopting this plan we are able to place more men under canvas this year than heretofore.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does this enable the men to receive instruction in rifle practice?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, in all cases where they have butts.

Improved Rifled Ordnance..... $3,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will this sum purchase one gun or a quarter of one of the improved rifled guns? Is there any possibility of our being able to turn this small vote to any practical account. I take it that these guns are wanted for the defence of some of our seaports. If that be the case, we are frittering our money away. Either we should go to a much larger expenditure or leave it alone.

Mr. BOWELL. This is for the purpose of purchasing improved ordnance for the Garrison and Field Batteries. I gave instructions to ascertain the cost of certain rifled ordnance for the purpose which I indicated, but I have not received that information. I know that the intention was to expend this and if necessary to add the $3,000 voted last year, which has not yet been expended.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it is for small field pieces of course it would be of some use.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes it is.

Monuments for Battlefields of Canada.. $2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where are these monuments on battle-fields to be erected?

Mr. BOWELL. The vote has been taken for two or three years and the present intention is to have one erected in the Province of Ontario and one in the Province of Quebec. The selection has not yet been made, but I think it will be at Stoney Creek, or somewhere in that neighbourhood, to commemorate one of the battles fought in that section of the country, and probably the other will be in Chateauguay.

Immigration..... $150,000

Mr. DEDWNEY. I propose to let this item stand as I may have some changes to make.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What about the item for immigration expenses, should not that stand?

Mr. DEDWNEY. No, it is in the staff that I propose to make the changes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did want to know from the hon. gentleman whether he proposed to lay a scheme of expenditure before the House, and for very good reasons, as I intimated to him on more than one occasion my impression that this expenditure of ours was to an enormous extent wasted; and as the department was now passing from one hon. gentleman to another, and as the hon. Minister of the Interior has special acquaintance with the North-West which is much the most desirable field of immigration, I desired to know if he had any special scheme for the expenditure of this $150,000. I have the strongest

ground for believing—although in the absence of the information which I have asked for many times, it is not possible to state with perfect accuracy what the results are—but I have the strongest ground for believing that a vast proportion of the immigrants who have been alleged to have been brought to Canada during the last eight or ten years, have been in the strictest sense birds of passage. If they have come here and expressed any intention of settling here at all, I do not believe that one in four, and I would not be surprised to find that not one in ten have remained here. That is one reason why I should like to know if the Minister of the Interior has thought out any plan for the use of this $150,000, or whether he proposes to proceed on the lines on which that amount has hitherto been expended.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman will recollect that when this vote was first submitted to the House, it was taken for a special purpose. There had been a strong pressure brought, especially by the western members, for a large expenditure for immigration purposes. A scheme was then thought out, which it was hoped would induce a larger number of immigrants to come and settle in Canada, particularly in the western country. The arrangement made, as the hon. gentleman knows, was to give to each settler coming from Europe $10 and to each child over 12 years of age $5, when they actually settled. This was announced in the countries from which we expected to get immigration, and now, if it were thought advisable to stop that system, we could not very well do it, because it has been published far and wide, and a great number of people are coming in every day in expectation of receiving the bonus. Of course, every one must know that $150,000 is a very insignificant amount; it would be almost impossible to formulate any large scheme of immigration with such an amount; but my impression is that very good use can be made of this money. In the first place, we can continue the inducement we have been offering and also advertise the country by issuing pamphlets and otherwise. All the information we now receive with regard to immigration generally indicates that the tide is flowing our way. Restrictions upon immigration have been adopted, both in the United States and in many of the colonies, and Canada is being looked to more than it has been for years. We are getting a large immigration from the United States, and we are getting a good sprinkling from the old country, where very much more interest is being taken in Canada than has been the case for some years. I think, therefore, that we may fairly look for a large immigration. To my mind, there are only two ways of getting immigration to this country. The first is by the tide flowing our way, and we know that at one period the tide of immigration flows in one direction, and at another period in another direction. Another way is by voting a large sum of money to promote immigration, as other countries have done. Canada has never done that, and I doubt whether the country or even this House would support the Government in asking a very large amount. The $150,000 I propose to utilize, in the first place, to pay the bonus. Of course, if we should get a large immigration, 100,000 people for instance, we would have to come to this House and ask for a $1,000,000. We do not expect to be so fortunate as that: but I think we can use the money to advantage by enabling our agents to meet immigrants when they come here, give them the best attention we can, and make them satisfied with our country until they are settled on the lands which they are to occupy. I do not think we can make a better use of the money, which I consider a very small amount for the purpose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this whole subject requires the very careful consideration of the House, and it will be impossible to give it that consideration at this hour of the evening. I venture to say that there is no other section of country in christendom where so large a sum of money has been spent with so little result as has been the case in the North-West Territories of Canada. We have not only sought to bring people from abroad, but we have disturbed the population in the older provinces of our own country, and many people have gone to the North-West and have drifted over the American border, who, if they had been left alone, would probably have remained where they were. I think that to-day you could absorb a great many more people in the Province of Ontario than you can in the North-West Territories. I think you could settle, among the farmers and on the unoccupied lands of that province, without any inconvenience, all the immigrants for a period of five years without any disturbance whatever. I am not going to detain the House at this hour, but I will undertake to show, at a fitting opportunity, that there has been an utterly inexcusable waste in the administration of affairs in the North-West Territories. I think it is impossible that the members of the Administration can realize the waste that has been going on there without anything being accomplished for the money spent; and until the attention of the House, and the attention of the country through the House, is called to the matter, I do not see much prospect of improvement. I am not going to say more at this moment on the subject, but I think I shall be able to show at the proper time that I am not overstating the matter in general terms. What we require in the administration of all our affairs in the North-West Territories is a reform almost approaching a revolution.

Tracadie Lazaretto.....$4,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know how many of these unfortunates are there at present, and whether there is any truth in certain statements or rumours in the press in regard to the disease having broken out in one or two places.

Mr. CARLING. There are about 22 or 23 patients in the institution at present. I am not aware of the disease having broken out elsewhere. Dr. Smith, who is in charge, an excellent man, is under the impression that the disease is dying out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have any of these unfortunate people been dismissed as cured?

Mr. CARLING. I do not think so.

Lachine Canal.....$175,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should be glad to know from the leader of the Government in this House whether anything has been heard or learned respecting the recent declaration by some of the American authorities that they were likely

to interfere with the free passage of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal or whether negotiations are going on?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I know nothing except from the newspapers about the message on that subject, and that has been reported within the last few days. The negotiations have been going on, and a communication had reached Washington for transmission to the Executive of the United States before the message was sent to the Senate or about that time, probably the same day, in pursuance of the understanding arrived at when the Ministers of Militia and Finance were at Washington. When these gentlemen returned, I stated to the House that a statement would be made in a few days and probably a communication laid on the Table. I had in view the communication which was subsequently transmitted, and the only reason why the statement has not been made within the last few days and since the message has been transmitted, was that we desire to know the text of the President's Message before making an anouncement to the House, because that might enlarge the scope of the communication we desired to make. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Finance, will be here to-morrow, and my hon. colleague the Minister of Militia at an early day will be ready to make the statement to the House which is desired.

Carillon and Grenville—Towards rebuilding masonry in wing walls above guard lock, Grenville..... $14,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I noticed to-day that two or three questions were put on the Notice Paper addressed to the Minister of Railways and Canals who was not here and did not answer them. This would be a convenient opportunity for him to do so. They had reference to the alleged fact that certain officials of the Government were engaged in carrying on ordinary business occupations as well.

Mr. HAGGART. The first question is: (*a*) What is the amount of salary paid to Mr. Pridham, collector of tolls on the Grenville Canal? (*b*) What are the duties of said official? (*c*) Is it within the knowledge of the Government that Mr. Pridham is actually engaged in business, and if so, is it in accordance with the regulations of the department that he should carry on business while an official of the department? The answer is that Mr. Pridham receives a salary, as collector of tolls, of $1,000, and as preventive officer of customs of $100, making a total of $1,100. His duties are to issue let passes for traffic going by way of the Ottawa River, Lachine and Chambly Canals; to examine passes issued by other canal offices to craft passing through the Grenville Canal; to collect toll on the passes issued by him according to the tariff rates; and to promptly deposit such collections to the credit of the Receiver-General. These duties have been discharged to the satisfaction of the officer of the Government who supervises collection of canal revenue. Mr. Pridham, I am informed, acts in the capacity of preventive officer of the Customs and as representative of the United States Consul for transaction of such business as the business men of that village may have to perform with that office. Then there is another question, whether Mr. Thomas Williamson is now employed as lockmaster on the Grenville Canal? Are the Government aware that Mr. Williamson is, in addition to his duties, engaged in other occupations? Is it the intention of the Government to allow Mr. Williamson to carry on any other business while engaged in the public service? To this the answer is: Yes, he has a salary of $1.25 a day. The Government has no knowledge of the fact that Mr. Williamson is engaged in other occupations, and the Government never allows its officers to engage in any work that will interfere with the proper discharge of their duties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would the Government allow a lockmaster to carry on any other business?

Mr. HAGGART. I have no knowledge of any officer who does so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the Minister of the Interior if he can bring down a statement to the House when we meet again, showing the expenditure of the Indian school fund and the Indian trust fund, and the amount of interest which has been overdrawn in each.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; I will bring it down.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 24th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OTTAWA VALLEY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved:

That Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Ottawa Valley Railway Company be placed on the Orders of this day for consideration in Committee of the Whole at 7.30 p.m.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS—REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved:

That the time for the reception of reports from the Committee on Private Bills be extended until Thursday, the 30th instant, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the twelfth report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT FOR HOLIDAYS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Some understanding should be arrived at about the days of the week that may be observed as holidays. Enquiries are continually made by members who wish to make engagements, and as Wednesday is a statutory holiday and Friday also, we propose to adjourn on these days.

Mr. LAURIER. Shall we sit Saturday?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think not.

Mr. LAURIER. Then we will sit Monday, Tuesday and Thursday?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 90) to amend the Patent Act and Acts amending the same.--(Mr. Carling.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this Bill the one which proposes to lengthen the time granted to inventors? The hon. gentleman will recollect that there was some discussion upon that and the matter was left over for consideration. I pressed upon the Government that it was very inexpedient in the public interest to add to the time of the patents. It is within my personal knowledge and the knowledge of many members of this House, that it is a matter of very constant occurrence, that at the very same instant of time, half a score of persons are engaged in experiments leading to the same results, and I think the time we grant, which is 15 years, is quite as long as should be given to any single patent, unless under very exceptional circumstances. In the vast majority of instances, we tie up the thing quite long enough when we tie it up for 15 years. I do not care what the Patent Inventors' Association should say, we ought not, in the interests of the general public, to extend the time.

Mr. CARLING. It is not the intention to extend the time for present patents now in existence, but this will apply to future patents. I understood the hon. gentleman to say it was intended to apply to patents already issued.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I was referring to the general principle. The time now given inventors is quite long enough. I am quite willing a man's invention should be recognized, and I think it is tolerably well known that, in the vast majority of cases, it is not the actual inventor that gets the benefit but some well-to-do individuals, who purchase the patents and use them for all they are worth, with very little profit indeed to the inventor. On the grounds of policy, I object to the extention of the time of patents. I repeat what is known, I think, to all hon. gentlemen who pay any attention to these matters, that in the great majority of cases nowadays, the successful patentee is only a few months, or a few days, sometimes only a few hours, in advance of half a score of other ingenious persons whose minds are working in the same direction. Under these circumstances, I doubt exceedingly the propriety of extending by two or three years the term already granted. I do not think it is in the public interest at all. In a great many manufactures, manufacturers are much hampered by the length of time for which these patents run. I am not at all sure that the patent law, as it stands, confers any great benefit on society at large, bearing in mind the well-known fact that the real inventor gets exceedingly little profit, in many cases, for his invention, and I am quite clear the extension of time is contrary to sound policy.

Mr. CARLING. The life of a patent in Great Britain is 21 years, and the life of a patent in the United States is 17 years. From experience with our patent law, and from contact with the inventors and those who are specially interested in patents, we find that by extending the time to 18 years it puts the Canadian inventor, or the man who applies for a patent in Canada, on the same footing as those in the United States. When a patent is taken out in Canada it takes from six months to a year before the patentee can get it through the United States, and in that case he will only have his patent in the United States for 14 years instead of 15. Under this provision, allowing the patent to run for 18 years, it allows the party who takes out a patent in Canada to have it for the same time in the United States as the party who takes out the patent in the United States.

Mr. McMULLEN. I endorse the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The question is whether this legislation is in the interest of the few or of the many. My hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture, must confess that the legislation he proposes is in the interest of the inventor. Now, past experience in this country has proved most clearly that the public have suffered seriously by certain patents being controlled by certain individuals. Take, for instance, the patent in regard to self-binders. Here was a patent controlled by a few individuals out of which immense sums have been made, and the result is that those in this country who used that machine have had to pay excessive prices for it, until increased facilities for manufacturing the machine reduced the price. While I contend that in the United States they may have legislated to grant the life of a patent for 17 years, it is not necessary that we should do that here, because in the United States the difficulties in the way of getting out a patent are very much more than they are here. I think, in place of extending the time to 18 years, we should shorten it to 10 years, because the legislation the Minister of Agriculture is now seeking to put through this House, is entirely in the interest of the inventor as against the consumer. On the other hand, I think we should legislate in the direction of giving the public the benefit of inventions within a reasonable time and at a reasonable price.

On section 5,

Mr. CARLING. I move to amend by providing that no application for a patent shall be withdrawn without the consent in writing of each registered assignee of the same, or any portion thereof. The reason is this: that a party may apply for a patent and may assign his interest in that patent to other parties, and afterwards he may make application to have it withdrawn, unknown to the parties to whom he has assigned; and this is to prevent him from doing so.

Mr. MULOCK. You are now undertaking to protect the assignees.

Mr. CARLING. The clause is to prevent a party who has assigned his invention from withdrawing the application afterwards, without the consent of the assignee.

Mr. MULOCK. You mean to say that if a man makes application here, the patent must come out in the name of the original application?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I should think it would be better to let the patent come out in the name of the assignee.

Mr. CARLING. The assignment does take place but often the original applicant for the patent

applies to have it withdrawn, contrary to the arrangement he has made with the party to whom he has assigned.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not see why we are called upon to protect persons in their private rights. If a person purchases an invention he must purchase it with all the risks. The assignee of an invention can apply the same as an original inventor and the patent can come out in the name of the assignee. Let the assignee protect himself by filing his assignment in the department.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The patent is sometimes issued to the assignee if the inventor so petitions. What I had in view was the difficulty of deciding between conflicting assignments. I do not think it ought to be made obligatory to issue to the assignee.

Mr. MULOCK. I thought it would be advisable for the department not to be mixed up between them and become protectors to assignees of their supposed rights, as you are proposing to do here. The proper way to protect the purchaser is to permit the purchaser to protect himself. Let him file his assignment, and it becomes a matter of record in the department, and he becomes entitled to the patent in his own name.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My observation about it was in order to avoid interfering between conflicting assignments, and the hon. gentleman's view is as mine regarding that. The provision here is that when an application has been made and there is an assignment the application shall not be withdrawn without the consent of the assignee.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think you will accomplish anything by that. Either before or after the patent issues these assignments constantly take place, and the department runs the same risk in recognizing the assignment after the patent as before it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The great object is to prevent the department being compelled to interfere in disputes between the assignor and the assignee, and the difficulty which frequently has arisen, I am told, is this: The inventor makes the assignment for value after he has made his application to the department, and after the assignment has been registered in the office a dispute arises between the inventor and the assignee, and the inventor under the present practice has power to coerce the assignee by threatening to withdraw his application. It seems he is permitted to withdraw his application, and if that be the case, it would seem to be putting an improper power into the hands of a man who has parted with his interest in the patent.

Mr. MULOCK. The trouble is that you are adjudicating on the matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, but we are preventing him from withdrawing the subject of adjudication.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think we should intervene between these two persons.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My view is the same, but the object is to prevent either party disturbing the status. If it is in his power to withdraw the application, he could without any trial of his rights obliterate the whole transaction; but if you say that he shall not withdraw it, you leave the matter in *statu quo* until the courts shall decide. The department ought require the parties concerned to settle their dispute, and in the meantime not destroy the subject-matter of the litigation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was not in the House when the clause was dealt with relating to models. Are the models insisted upon?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A clause is passed dispensing with them, unless insisted on by the department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that is a great misfortune. I would like to say a word on the subject, although the clause has passed. In the United States that rule was adopted simply for the want of room, and I have in my hands here the last report of the Commissioner of Patents for the United States, an extract of which I wish to read for the information of the committee. He said:

"A considerable percentage of the applications for patents received from day to day are found to be met and anticipated by the contents of the model case. I regret it as nothing less than a public calamity that the office was several years ago compelled to dispense with models. It should never have been done except for want of space in which to store and exhibit."

He points out that this is a source of litigation which might easily be got rid of if the models were always produced, that there is many an application for the patent that would not be received at all, and that could easily be shown to be one already patented, if the models were there. I think that the Government are making a great mistake. We are simply following in the footsteps of the United States, which the Commissioner of Patents points out has been really nothing short of a calamity.

Mr. CARLING. The Commissioner of Patents in the United States made that report some two years ago, and he has now left the service altogether. Although he made that report no action has been taken by the Government of the United States to continue asking for models. We have now on hand in the department some 35,000 models which take up a great deal of space, and if we continue to receive them it will require large additional space and extra help to take care of them. The models are not asked for in Great Britain, nor in any other country so far as I am aware of. We are furnished with drawings on tracing linen and with the cardboard drawings of every patent that is applied for, and if we find it necessary in the interest of the public to ask for models, we have the power to do so. But it puts the inventor to a very great unnecessary expense. That has been the experience of different countries. It has been the experience of the United States notwithstanding what has been said by the gentleman who was formerly Commissioner of Patents at Washington, and whose report was not acted on by the American Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But he has been Patent Commissioner for a great many years, and he has pointed out as the result of his experience that the absence of models has led to the patenting of a great many things that ought not to be patented.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is a mistake to extend the life of a patent to 18 years. I contend that 10 years is quite long enough. To extend the time to 18 years is virtually legislating in the interest of those who hold patents, because the longer the life of a patent is the more it is worth.

Mr. CARLING. As I have explained, the life of a patent in the United States is 17 years, and in Great Britain, where they have had more experience in patents than we have had, it is 21 years; and it is considered by the officers of the department, and by inventors and parties interested in patents, that 18 years would be fair and right, and would put the man who applies for a patent in Canada on the same footing as the man who applies for a patent in the United States. It usually takes nine months or a year to obtain a patent in the United States, and at present if an inventor who obtains a patent in Canada applies for a patent in the United States at the same time, his American patent would have a life of only 14 years, because the American patent expires at the same time as the foreign patent. By having one year more in Canada than in the United States, our applicants are placed on the same footing as applicants in the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be well enough if we were merely considering the case as between Canadian and American inventors; but after all the case of the inventors is only one side of the question. The great bulk of the people are those whom we should consider. I do not object to a reasonable monopoly being conceded to inventors for the purpose of encouraging that useful class; but we are speaking of something of which we have all had experience. There is no question whatever that in many instances the existence of these patents has often proved a serious injury to the community at large, and there is no doubt that these changes are being sought not in the interest of the community at large, scarcely even in the interest of the inventor, who is often obliged to part with his invention for a very small consideration. It is not in the public interest that a patent monopoly should be granted for any longer period than is required in the public interest, and every one who looks over the Patent Reports knows that there is not the slightest discouragement to the alacrity of inventors by reason of the short duration of patents in Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to suggest an amendment to the patent law to which I think inventors are entitled. In many cases the inventors are poor men, and under the provisions of the law unless they make arrangements for the manufacture of the article within a particular time, their patent interest is not protected. A man may succeed in selling his patent in the neighbouring republic and may not succeed in selling it in Canada. Now, it seems to me that while any manufacturer might, after the lapse of a certain time, say 12 months or two years, have the right to notify the inventor that unless he manufactures within the time he would undertake to manufacture the article, the law ought to provide for some compensation being given by the manufacturer to the inventor; that is, that the rights of the inventor should not be dependent upon his finding some person to manufacture the article. The manufacturer or speculator may put impedients in the way of the inventor until the time has expired, and then manufacture his invention with impunity. It seems to me only right to provide that the inventor should have some royalty, which might be fixed by the department or some court just as in the case of any other valuable interest that may be in dispute. The inventor's interest should not be a contingent but an absolute interest, whether the time is long or short.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course, the two interests have to be considered, the public interest and the interest of the inventor; and while there is a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman says, and while it is true that the inventor is very often not a manufacturer and must look to the manufacturer for the development of his invention, still we have to consider the great danger of people getting patents, and holding an invention entirely from the public in order to obtain a fancy price for it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that my suggestion is that if an inventor does not manufacture, any person who gives notice may have the right to do so, and the department or some person shall fix the value to the inventor.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That would be practically forcing the purchase of the invention for the benefit of the inventor.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is merely giving him compensation. In many cases where a man cannot manufacture, he is afraid to go on with his invention. I know of cases of that sort, simply because there is no provision for the protection of the parties interested. Make it an absolute property, contingent on proper arrangements being made that he cannot lock up his invention.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No doubt cases of great hardship have arisen for want of means on the part of the inventor, but we have to consider the general convenience, and it seems to me, from the little knowledge I have acquired on the subject, that there is practically no necessity for this. If anybody who wants to manufacture shall have to pay a royalty to the department, it would be very difficult indeed to settle what the royalty should be. It would depend on the success of the manufacture and the extent of the sale.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). All these things would be taken into consideration.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, but it would be very difficult to provide machinery for this. It seems to me that if there is a market for his invention in the country, the inventor is very likely to make a sale of his patent rights to persons willing to manufacture, unless his demands are unreasonable; and very often the manufacturer who undertakes to put an invention on the market has to undergo the greater risk of losing his money, and if we add to that risk his obligation to pay a royalty, we might debar him from going into the manufacture altogether. Is such a practice established in any other countries where the patent system is in operation?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think it is, but, notwithstanding, it appears to me that in the public interest there is a great deal to be said in favour of the suggestions of my hon. friend. It is a matter of notoriety to any one who knows anything of the working of business and the customs that prevail between the inventor and the capitalists, that the actual inventor is continually squeezed out for most insignificant sums, and that men who have conferred very great benefits on the community are practically deprived of any participation in the profits, while on the other hand capi-

talists, having money and being able to comply with the requirements of the law, frequently exact an enormous royalty, far beyond what would be given by the department to the actual inventor for the use of his patent. I am willing to encourage the inventor, and I think it would not be very difficult for a couple of provisions to be drawn up which would meet the views of my hon. friend, and the practical application of which would be attended with very little inconvenience to the manufacturer. For instance, the term might very reasonably be shortened in such cases, and in no case should the royalty be allowed to exceed a moderate percentage. The hon. gentleman, I think, if he enquires into the matter, will find that this Bill, although it operates to a certain extent in the interests of the inventor, is much more in the interests of parties who get hold of patents from the real inventor.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Apart from the difficulties of the case in which the inventor has disposed of his patent, I do not think the advantages of the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell ought to be extended to the assignee of the inventor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a different matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is difficult to distinguish between the two.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are grounds of public policy for extending consideration to the actual inventor which hardly exist in the case of the assignee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The actual inventor is a man who ought to be encouraged. The hon. gentleman asks whether in other countries the proposition of my hon. friend is in force. To the best of my knowledge it is not, but in other countries it is frequently the habit of the Government to reward inventors who have discovered inventions of real public utility, with gifts of public money and other distinctions. We do not do that here, of course, but refer them to the operation of the patent law; but practically what my hon. friend suggests has been done in the way I indicated by several continental nations. I do not know that it has ever been done in England.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There has come under my notice specially the cases of many parties who have lost their inventions by failure to manufacture, and those inventions were afterwards used by manufacturers to their very great profit. It seems to me that in cases where the manufacturer makes no very great profit, if he succeeds in showing that he has not, he would have little or nothing to pay. My suggestion would stimulate the inventor to go forward with his inventions with the view of perfecting them and of being able to get something out of them, even though he be a man without fortune.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What I was going to suggest was that in the event of any such proposition being adopted, there ought to be a distinction made between the assignee and the inventor, and some method provided that would prevent the assignee availing himself of the name of the inventor to obtain the advantage of a compulsory royalty. I do not deny for a moment that the suggestion is worthy of consideration. On the contrary, I think it is, as is anything at all which will practically give help to the inventor without means. I think it is the intention of my hon. colleague to consider very carefully a number of amendments to the Patent Act. In fact, when this Bill was introduced to amend the Act, we were showered with suggestions for its improvement, which would require its entire revision. Having met some of those who are in favour of a complete revision, we promised that during the recess we would take up the whole subject, and we may present some measure of that kind next session.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. gentleman still persist in making the life of a patent 18 years?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I move that it be reduced to 10 instead of 18. There is any number of patents taken out for fencing, which is a matter of vital importance to agriculturists. I think it unfair to lock up a patent for 18 years in the hands of one man. If the hon. Minister will consider the interests of the agriculturists, he will at once consent to reduce the time to 10 years, and the patent might be made renewable if there was any good reasons for doing so.

Mr. COATSWORTH. If we were to pass the resolution of my hon. friend, we might as well repeal the Patent Act. We have to look at this matter with reference to other countries as well as our own; and if we wish to send all our inventors to the United States, we have only to pass that resolution. With regard to the extension of time from 15 to 18 years, I may say that since the matter came up in the House for the second reading, I have had a letter from the secretary of the Manufacturers' Association in Toronto, in which he called my attention to the fact that the association is strongly in favour of the extension. In fact, they sent down some time ago a deputation to Ottawa to interview the Minister, and this was one of the subjects on which they intended to interview him. They intended asking him to do away with the necessity for models in taking out patents, and also to increase the life of the patents. But when they found on reaching Ottawa, and after disposing of their other business, that this Bill was already before the House, they did not consider it necessary to trouble the Minister about it. However, the secretary assured me that the Manufacturers' Association felt that it was very essential in the interest of the patentees and the inventors of Canada that the life of the patent should be made longer. I wish to notice what the hon. gentleman said as to a supposed remark of mine about patent solicitors. What I said the other night as to the association of inventors and patentees, had no reference to patent solicitors at all; but it was the association of men who are most interested in these matters, that is, men who have taken out patents. The position they take is this: At the present time the length of the life of a patent in Canada is 15 years, in the United States it is 17 years, but when they take out a patent in one country they can only get a patent in the other country for the balance of the life of the patent in the country where they first took it out. Therefore, if a citizen of Canada invent some device and desires to patent it both in the United States and in Canada, as he usually

does, in order to get the full length of the life of the patent in the United States, he has got to go there first and patent his invention in the United States; then he can come and patent here for 15 years; whereas if he first takes out his patent for 15 years here in Canada and then goes over to the United States, he can only get it for the balance of that term, 14 years or 14½, as has been explained. When a man takes out a patent, of course he is bound to have it for the longest period possible. I think it is only fair to our inventors here that the time should be extended, and it is in the interest of Canada if only from a revenue point of view. It is true, we do not derive much revenue from patents, although that is a matter that ought not to be overlooked. In the first place, as a matter of national sentiment, we ought not to drive our inventors to a foreign country to patent their inventions; then, as a matter of revenue, we ought to retain the fees on those patents for ourselves.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman say what difference it makes whether the applicant first applies in the United States or in Canada?

Mr. COATSWORTH. I was going to point that out. The length of the patent here is 15 years, and in the United States it is 17 years. A man can only get a patent in another country for the balance of the life of the patent in the country where it was first obtained. For instance, he takes out a patent here for 15 years, and then goes over to the United States where he can only get it for 14 years, because he has to lose the time for which it has already ran in Canada.

Mr. MULOCK. What difference does it make to the people of Canada if an applicant chooses to obtain his patent first in the United States?

Mr. COATSWORTH. The difference is this: I will assume that the hon. gentleman himself wished to take out a patent. He is a citizen of Canada, and has invented a device for which he desires to obtain a patent. Now, as is often the case, the invention has more value in his own estimation than it has in the estimation of any other person; still, he desires to obtain the patent for the full length of time. As a matter of fact, the inventors always do look at the length of time the patent will have to run, and they choose between taking it out here and in the United States. If you take it out here you can get it for 15 years; then if you choose to go over to the other side you can only get the patent for the balance of the time, and that to inventors is a practical difficulty.

Mr. MULOCK. Supposing the inventor chooses to take his patent out in the United States first, he has got 17 years there. Then he applies in Canada and obtains a 15 years patent; by so doing he gets the full benefit of the law in the one country as in the other. I want to know how we are in any way prejudiced by the circumstance of his choosing to apply in the States first?

Mr. COATSWORTH. I will tell you how we are prejudiced. In the first place, I do not think we ought to drive the citizens of our own country to a foreign country to obtain a patent. This is a matter of national sentiment. In the next place, let me give you an illustration to show how it will affect our revenue. I do not suppose that more than one-sixth of the patents ever come to anything. I say that without any reflection at all upon the inventors, because it frequently happens that the success of a patent depends rather upon the way it takes with the public than upon its own excellence. It is only the country where the device is first patented that reaps any benefit from it in the way of revenue. If we drive our patentees to the United States to take out their patents first, the United States reaps the benefit of the revenue, and the device is tested inside of another two years, and the result is, if the patent proves unsuccessful, it is not taken out here, and therefore we lose the revenue we would derive from its being taken out here first. I would like to say that the reason for making it 18 years is in order that our own patentees and inventors may obtain a patent in Canada, and after it is patented and tested to a certain extent, they can obtain the full term of the United States patent.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I wish to say a word upon the length of time the patents extend. As a farmer I wish to say that in the western part of Ontario a large number of patents are taken out with respect to fences. Fences in our country are becoming a very important item, and the cheapest and best methods of fencing that can be adopted are very much in the interest of the farmers. I am aware that parties have invented methods of fencing, and have not spent very large sums of money in experimenting upon them before the patent is taken out; therefore, I think that it would be wrong to extend the time beyond 13 years as at present. In many cases individuals who take out patents do not retain them in their possession but sell them to others who reap a handsome profit out of them. Many people have taken out patents for agricultural implements, which are a great necessity to the farming community, and if you extend the time you are legislating against the interests of the farmers. You have now been legislating in the interest of the patentees and the manufacturers, and I think you ought now to legislate in the interest of the consumers who have to pay out in many instances such large sums of money. Sometimes these patents are kept up for a number of years upon agricultural implements. I think myself that 15 years is quite sufficient for the life of a patent.

Mr. McMULLEN. I move that the time be reduced to 15 years.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MULOCK. How do these compare with the fees in the United States?

Mr. CARLING. The United States charge $35 on the inventor applying for a patent, but it is all paid down on the application being made for a 17-year patent.

Mr. MULOCK. Your fee is $60 for a similar period. Where does your national sentiment come in here?

Mr. COATSWORTH. Our fee is divided into three periods, but in the United States they have to pay the amount at once, whether the patent comes to anything or not. In Canada, the inventor pays $20 for the first six years, and he has ample opportunity to test the patent during that time. If it is not of sufficient value to pay another $20 he need not do so. Our system is much better in the interest of the inventor.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you not think that a fee of 50 cents a hundred words for the first copy, and 25

cents per hundred for the next copies is too high? In Toronto we get them type-written for 5 cents per hundred.

Mr. CARLING. I will make that 25 cents for the first copy, and 10 cents for the others. I wish to add the following clause:—

This Act shall only apply to patents issued after the passing thereof.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If you leave the old law in force as regards the old patents, it ought to be so expressed.

Bill reported.

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CURRAN. I have received an intimation from a society in Montreal interested in these matters, expressing a desire to have the age in section 269 extended from fourteen to sixteen years. The section now reads:

"Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for life, or for any term not less than five years, and to be whipped, who carnally knows any girl under the age of fourteen years, whether he believes her to be of or above that age or not. 53 V., c. 37, s. 12."

I promised the society to bring this matter before the committee, and I now move that sixteen be inserted in place of fourteen.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the society is proposing a change too radical. Perhaps a compromise might be arranged between fourteen and sixteen, and fifteen adopted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think it is wise to accede to the wish even of gentlemen who are so philanthropic, and who give their best consideration to such work. This is an offence for which a drastic punishment is provided, not only imprisonment for life but also flogging, and the intention of the Act is to extend this punishment to those who commit outrages on children. If you extend the age it will be impossible to say whether a man knew that the woman was sixteen years of age or not; but he must be responsible if it is the case of a child. We had a remarkable case under consideration from Winnipeg a short time ago, in which a man was sentenced to a long term of imprisonment and to be whipped when it was proved that the girl was under fourteen, but was a notorious prostitute. If we extend the age to sixteen, we shall be punishing offences against young women while this clause is really intended to punish those who commit offences against children.

Mr. CURRAN. Perhaps we might protect it by inserting the words "not being a prostitute."

Mr. MASSON. At that age you cannot prove it.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CURRAN. I would call attention to section 187, which reads:

"Every one who, being the owner and occupier of any premises, or having, or acting, or assisting in, the management or control thereof, induces or knowingly suffers any girl of such age as in this section mentioned to resort to or be in or upon such premises for the purpose of being unlawfully and carnally known by any man, whether such carnal knowledge is intended to be with any particular man, or generally, is guilty of an indictable offence, and—

"(*a.*) Is liable to ten years' imprisonment if such girl is under the age of fourteen years; and

"(*b.*) Is liable to two years' imprisonment if such girl is of or above the age of fourteen and under the age of sixteen years."

This society wishes to change the age from sixteen to twenty-one years. I move accordingly.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the hon. gentleman received any representations respecting section 204, which relates to betting? I have had some communication with the same society on that subject, and I thought the hon. gentleman would speak for it. I now call the Minister's attention to this section. The committee very hastily passed sub-section (*c.*) of section 204.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman will bring the matter up this afternoon we will consider it.

[At one o'clock the committee adjourned, and at three o'clock resumed.]

On section 583,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A point arises under this section in the case of stipendiary magistrates for cities. I may speak especially of offences under the Canada Temperance Act. Parties living in the city just go outside the jurisdiction, and the magistrates have to send a warrant out to bring them in, as of course they will never attend without a warrant. Take the city of Charlottetown with about 14,000 population. A large number, perhaps four or five thousand people from the County of Queen's, come into the city twice a week to market, and offences more or less venial or heinous are committed, and the stipendiary magistrate has to try them. The parties, of course, who live outside the city return home, out of the jurisdiction of the city. By this Bill it is properly provided that a summons may be served by a magistrate without his jurisdiction, but they will not acknowledge that summons, and it is open to argument whether it would not be well to let the warrant run outside the cities within the province. There may be objections against it, but I cannot see any.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The committee thought of it carefully, and seemed to think there was some danger of allowing a magistrate to issue his warrant for anywhere outside of his jurisdiction. No doubt, in the class of cases the hon. member refers to it would be convenient, but I think, as a general rule, it would not do to let the warrant run outside the jurisdiction.

On section 629,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I never could understand or justify the rule prohibiting a man from pointing out a flaw in the indictment after he had pleaded. Men are called upon very often to plead before their counsel have got time to examine the indictment. There ought to be a discretion given to the court to permit a man to move to quash the indictment even after he has formally pleaded. There are cases where, through hasty pleading or through counsel not catching the point, the flaw in the indictment was overlooked.

Mr. McLEOD. I do not believe a crimina should be barred from waiving any flaw after pleading. Why should he be precluded from moving

for the arrest of judgment even after he has pleaded?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) His right should be dependent on the permission of the judge, because otherwise his counsel would allow the trial to go on in the hope of securing an acquittal, and failing that move after trial for an arrest of judgment on the ground of a flaw in the indictment which he should have pleaded before the trial began.

Section amended by inserting the words: "except by leave of the court before which the trial takes place."

On section 630,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There were some nice points raised in Ottawa some two months ago where the Crown had a prisoner for trial and Mr. McCarthy insisted that as there was a general gaol delivery the prisoner should be discharged. The Crown prosecutor protested vigorously that his chief witness was a detective in the employ of the Crown but at that moment was absent and could not be obtained, but that he would obtain him if the trial were postponed. The judge overruled the objection and would not postpone the trial. Will this section prevent a postponement at the request of the prosecutor? I do not know whether this section was intended to extend to prosecutors, or was limited entirely to the defendants.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not intended to affect the rights of prosecutors.

On section 642,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This section proposes a change with respect to grand juries. At the present time I can go before a grand jury and prefer a bill of indictment. That right is limited by this section.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is limited in this way: There can be no bill of indictment preferred before a grand jury unless some one is bound over to prosecute, or the Attorney General, or counsel by direction of the Attorney General, or the judge gives his approval. In all other cases you must go before a magistrate first in order to secure an investigation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The grand jury has the general power to enquire into all offences within the county. Their duty is to examine into them, and make a short presentment to the court on which the Attorney General acts. Any one can go before them and say that such and such a crime has been committed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the theory; but my hon. friend will remember that by statute it is taken away in a great variety of cases, and it is taken away in all cases here unless there is an investigation before the magistrate. This is to prevent malicious persons bringing an indictment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It practically takes away the power of the grand jury to investigate and present to the court. I remember a memorable case in Prince Edward Island, where the grand jury whose duty it was to inspect the asylums and other institutions found a most horrible state of affairs existing, and they indicted the keeper and the medical officer and the different attendants for brutality. It was a tremendous presentment. The foreman happened to be a very energetic man and he pushed the matter on until he presented the facts to the court. On this presentment the Attorney General drew up his indictment. Under this section that power of the grand jury is taken away.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course they have access to the Attorney General or the officer acting for him at all times.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I remember a case where a prisoner, who was to some extent insane, had his eye knocked out by the keeper, and the sheriff did not like to report against the keeper; but the matter was brought to the attention of the court by the grand jury. In that case they named the party who committed the offence, but this section would prevent them naming the party.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, unless they have a bill of indictment; but they could very soon get one.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am referring to the salutary powers the grand juries have hitherto possessed, at all events in our province, with very great benefit to the public weal, and I fear very much that, by the way section 642 is worded, it will be withdrawn.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not intended to be withdrawn. It is only intended to refer to the proceedings of the bill of indictment, and that is exactly the statute now.

Mr. LAURIER. The contention of my hon. friend is that section 642 limits the jurisdiction of the grand jury simply to the finding of indictments and that they have no power to make any presentment except on indictments.

Mr. McLEOD. The judge always charges the grand jury that they have a right to enquire into matters in the county generally. They do not indict a man, but they present certain facts on which the court acts. The question to my mind is, whether this clause does not take away that power.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would suggest whether it would not be well to put in some proviso permitting the grand jury, under charge of the judge, to exercise the duty of investigating matters within the county. The fact is, that with us, unless the grand jury kept strict watch of the asylums, gaols and poorhouses, we have no effective supervision. There are gentlemen generally on the grand jury who take an interest in the public institutions, and at their inspection twice a year, any want of duty on the part of the officials or any improper treatment of the inmates, is brought under the notice of the court by the grand jury with very salutary results. I am very jealous of that jurisdiction of the grand jury being encroached upon or taken away.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If these functions are found so salutary, I have no objection to drop the first part of section 642 altogether, and to make sub-section two the entire section.

On section 657,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I thought the hon. gentleman was going to introduce a clause in the Bill allowing a criminal to give evidence himself.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have a separate Bill for that, because it relates not only to the Criminal Law but to all matters of evidence within our jurisdiction.

On section 660,

Mr. LAURIER. When the prisoner is in court where is he to be? At present, when accused of felony, he has to be in the dock?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This does not provide that he may not be in the dock.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The old distinction between misdemeanour and felony being abolished, where will the prisoner sit?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is subject to the discretion of the judge. There is no provision in the law now as to where he shall sit, but the practice is to compel a man charged with felony to sit in the dock, and when charged with misdemeanour he may sit elsewhere; the distinction is purely arbitrary.

Mr. LAURIER. What about bail?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When committed for trial for offences for which he is liable to a certain extent of punishment, the bail will be in the discretion of a judge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This clause is nonsense as it is now. If you take away the word "Queen's," it won't read English at all.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is very common for counsel for the private prosecutor to be associated with prosecuting counsel.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But he always prosecutes in the name of the Queen. He would contend that he was acting on behalf of the Crown.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He may be so acting if the counsel for the Crown is present at the trial and is willing to associate him with him. But it is not uncommon, I think, for counsel to state that they appear for the private prosecutor. Would there be any objection to saying "or to any counsel acting for either of them?" The object is not to allow the right of reply to the counsel for the private prosecutor. He must be representing the Attorney General or the solicitor.

On section 666,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are reasons for challenging the panel in the common law which you have not introduced here; for instance, close relations with the sheriff.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The word "partiality" would cover that. It is better to say "partiality" than "relationship," because if you say "relationship" you have to go into the degrees.

Mr. LAURIER. At the present time it seems that there is very little in the objection of relationship.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have seen several panels quashed on account of the relationship of the sheriff with the prosecution.

Mr. McLEOD. I think "partiality" would cover that.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Suppose a French-Canadian in Ontario wished to have a jury composed in part of his own countrymen?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That has been abolished for a good many years.

An hon. MEMBER. In the Province of Ontario.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. But not in the other provinces. There is a large population of French-Canadians, many of whom do not speak English at all.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think they all speak English a great deal better than many of their neighbours.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Suppose that the accused did not speak English at all, he would be deprived of one of his rights. I do not see why he should not have the same right that the speakers of English have in the Province of Quebec.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have ample provision to meet that case.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I should like to be informed why French-Canadians in Ontario should not have a jury composed in part of French-Canadians?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We formerly had that provision in all the provinces at common law, not only for the people in the localities, but for foreigners coming there, Spaniards, French and all others. It was not uncommon to see a trial take place in that way. That system has, however, been abolished for a number of years. As regards the people of our own country, if there are many French-speaking inhabitants, for instance, in the locality in which a prisoner is tried, there will be, in all probability, some of his fellow countrymen on the jury. There is ample provision made for the work of interpreting, and if a fair trial cannot be had, a change of venue may be secured.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. It is not a question of fair trial. The provision with respect to Germans or Spaniards is correct, they being foreigners coming into the Dominion; but as regards Ontario, where there are a large number of French-Canadians, I do not see why they should not possess the same right as the English-speaking people in Quebec.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the Province of Quebec the dual system prevails, and the prisoner is tried in both languages. In the other provinces the prisoner is tried in the English language, and there would be no practical utility in having a mixed jury.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law.

(In the Committee.)

On section 667,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Sub-section 6 introduces a new practice which we have not in Canada. I know it is customary in the London courts to empannel a jury to sit and try perhaps half a dozen cases, but here a new jury is empannelled for each case. I am not quite sure about the introduction of this new practice.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It can only be done by consent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In sub-section 5, you have adopted a change in practice in regard to jurors. Heretofore, in misdemeanours, the jury were allowed to disperse after the trial for the day was over, and they were not confined, but, under this Act, you keep all jurors empannelled and separated until the trial is over, whether for felony or misdemeanour.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not the intention, it means the names of the men and not the men themselves. It is just as at present when we keep the names of the panel tied up together.

On section 671,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any special provision taking away the right of election to be tried separately? I remember one time being connected with the trial of 24 men for riot, and they elected to be tried separately, and we were six weeks trying them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is in the discretion of the court.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I know that the court in that case conceded the right to them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They always endeavour to be tried separately. In defending prisoners I have tried very hard to get it done, but of late years it is never done with us. Nearly every application is refused.

On section 675,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is a very important change. At present after the jury is once formed, the trial must proceed to a finish; but this section allows the jury to be broken up and the trial adjourned to a future day just as a civil case may be, according as justice may seem to require. The committee considered it very carefully, and I hope this committee will consider it very carefully, as it is highly important.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It strikes me at first blush as of doubtful utility.

Mr. OUIMET. I should think it very wise.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to give my opinion. I may be entirely wrong, as I am speaking on the spur of the moment. If the trial proceeds for a couple of days, and the prisoner finds himself in a tight place, he may make affidavits that he has been taken entirely by surprise, and the whole case goes by the board after enormous expense has been incurred. The jury would be discharged and the whole case broken up, and it would have to be begun again, perhaps at a time when the Crown witnesses could not be secured. It is not easy to keep Crown witnesses on hand. I have known them to be detained in custody to prevent them going away. There are, no doubt, some merits in the change, but I think we should have some statement from practicing barristers that some evil has arisen from the present practice before we agree to it. I cannot recall any case in my practice in which any injustice has resulted from the rule that, after the jury is sworn and the case begun, it must continue to the end.

Mr. MASSON. We had considerable discussion on this matter in the committee, where it was very carefully considered. With regard to mentioning a particular case in which an absolute injustice has arisen from the present rule, it is very difficult to recall such a case, because the practice has been entirely the other way. But we know that in the civil cases, even when we have pleadings prepared long before the trial, surprises often occur, and occasionally they are such that the court will grant an adjournment after the trial has commenced, and generally upon terms such as the payment of the costs of the day, but of course a very strong case has to be made out. If it is necessary in civil cases, where only matters of dollars and cents are in question, how much more important is it that it should be granted in the case of criminal matters where a man's life or liberty is at stake. In criminal matters, the pleadings are not closed until a few minutes before the trial, immediately on being called the prisoner pleads, and very often his trial goes on, and he may be brought face to face with a case entirely different from what he expected; and if, on good grounds, he shows a case of surprise, an adjournment would be asked for, and if the case is sufficiently strong, it is only fair that the court should take the responsibility of granting it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This section does not only provide for an adjournment but for an absolute discharge of the jury and a postponement of the trial.

Mr. MASSON. An adjournment for two or three days might not be sufficient, and we cannot keep the jury there for ever or cause them to return at a distant day. It is better they should be discharged and the trial commenced *de novo* than that they should be kept waiting for a long time. It is certainly an innovation, but I think it is one that justice demands, under, of course, all the safeguards that can be placed around it, and I think we can trust our judges not to grant an adjournment except in extreme cases.

Mr. TISDALE. It strikes me the strongest argument in favour of this has not been mentioned, and that is our practice in criminal cases. The accused cannot get a new trial on errors of fact, and if it were not for that I should be inclined to oppose the clause, but that being so, it strikes me very favourably. Under our criminal practice there can be no new trial except on errors of law, and in errors of fact an appeal must be made to the Executive for the exercise of clemency. In many countries, in the United States for instance, they allow new trials for errors of fact, but our practice is different in order to avoid the many applications which would be made in criminal cases for new trials. Experience has shown, in civil cases where postponement is allowed for errors of fact, that the judges only grant it when a very strong case has been made, and in fact our experience is that in very few cases do the judges exercise this discretion. I only know of one or two cases in Ontario where, after a case had gone into court at any length, a new trial was granted, and those were very urgent cases indeed. I do not think we need fear to trust our judges with the exercise of this discretion, and it will relieve the accused from the application of a very hard rule.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My being candid and telling the committee my views will not prejudice anybody against the clause, considering the fair way in which the provisions have been received

throughout ; and I hope I will not be suspected of not having done my duty to the joint committee when I state I have some doubts about the clause. I mention this in order to get the opinions of those present. My own view is such that I adopted the clause with great reluctance. After some experience on both sides in criminal matters, though I am, perhaps, predisposed to look at this question from the point of view rather of a prosecuting officer than of a defending counsel, having had most experience in that way, my experience is that the prisoner always makes a desperate effort to get a postponement, if he finds an unfavourable jury or the evidence against him stronger than he expected. I am afraid this would tend to break up the trial in every case in which the prisoner feels he is getting the worst of it, and in that way might lead to considerable abuse. Considering the many avenues of escape we leave open to the prisoner, and the difficulty of securing conviction, I feel a little doubt about so radical a change, and would like the clause to be very well considered before being rejected or adopted. Its strength lies in theory, and in the fact likewise that it has been recommended in the English draft Bill.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have had some little experience in the Courts of Queen's Bench, though it is now rusty indeed, but I must say that my experience of 14 or 15 years of pretty large business before these courts leads me to consider this clause as objectionable; and I may say that the judges would not thank Parliament for passing it, as it would lead to endless difficulties and tend, in many cases, to defeat the ends of justice. The prisoners, and especially their lawyers, are very ingenious in finding means to postpone the trial or put difficulties in the way. When a case is fixed for trial, the prisoner has had all the opportunities, under our very liberal system of criminal law, for finding out what the case really is, and what witnesses are called and to be called. If we are able to boast of the administration of criminal justice in our country, it is because trials are carried on not only with liberality but with firmness and celerity, and there is no avenue open to the undue protraction of trials. We have a great advantage over our neighbours in that respect. By closing those avenues I do not mean to say that justice would be defeated, but I think we would be opening the door to a great deal of difficulty and endless obstacles in the administration of criminal justice.

Mr. OUIMET. This section provides for two cases. The first one is when a witness is produced by the Crown who has not been heard in the preliminary investigation ; the second clause applies to the case of a witness who has been examined in the preliminary investigation but who does not turn up or is not called by the Crown. No doubt, in respect to the first category, injustice might occur in very extreme cases, but still we have a right to suppose that the Crown would not do anything of that kind when they knew the accused to be taken by surprise in producing a new witness of whom the accused has never heard before. In my experience, as Crown prosecutor for five or six years in Montreal, no such case has presented itself. As to the second clause, there is certainly no reason at all why it should remain. In the case of a witness who has been heard but is not to be found, the law does provide that his deposition may be read in court ; and as the accused had had an opportunity in the preliminary investigation to cross-examine him, he can complain of no injustice in not having a second chance to cross-examine him. As to the first class of cases, I would frame the section so as not to make it a matter of course for the case to be stopped, as it looks to be now from the way it reads, and I would not let the court, on the application of the accused, adjourn the further hearing of the case, or discharge the jury. As the clause reads, it seems to me that the judge has to do so as a matter of course. But I think the language of the clause might be couched in a more guarded way so as to make it appear that in the intention of the Legislature this clause would only apply to such cases as when the judge himself would see that a glaring injustice would result from the fact that a witness had been suddenly called up, I might say fraudulently, of whom the accused knew nothing. But no such case has occurred in my experience, because we cannot believe that a Crown prosecutor, who has any respect for his dignity and his office, would resort to any such a course as bringing up suddenly a witness of whom the accused had been kept in the dark, with the intention of taking him by surprise. As I said, I would only leave the first part of the clause. As to the second one, I see no use for it. In the first one I would alter the language so as to give power to the judge in exceptional cases to act on his discretion, that is, in extreme cases, where, in his opinion, a patent injustice might be done.

Mr. McLEOD. A case might arise where a witness is produced by the prosecution without any previous notice, and the defence so taken by surprise be utterly unable, at the moment, to meet his evidence or to prepare an answer to it, although if time were given he could, and the accused would thus be very much prejudiced. That is an extreme case, but it might happen. I do not remember that the case ever did happen in my experience, yet I think it would be well to leave a case like that to the discretion of the judge, as when he sees that a witness is produced whom the prisoner has not had an opportunity of examining, a witness who has not made any deposition before, and whom the defence had no notice that the prosecution intended to produce. His deposition may not have been taken on the preliminary investigation, but still the accused may have had notice of intention to produce this witness. I take it the intention is that if a witness were produced suddenly at the trial whose evidence was of an important nature, the judge himself would see that unless the prisoner had an opportunity to answer the evidence so given in some way, it would be very injurious to him. In such a case it is open to question whether the judge should discharge the jury or simply postpone further hearing of the case. As to the second clause, I do not see any strong reason for it. The Crown, I think, ought to call the witnesses whose names are on the back of the indictment, and this is now the practice, but I cannot see at present why the Crown should be compelled to call others.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Sometimes a new witness is called up through the deposition of another witness whose name is on the back of an indictment, and the prosecutor, in calling up this new witness,

might be said to take the defence by surprise. In this case one of two things is always open to the judge. He might say that he could not accept that evidence without a large degree of diffidence or as having an absolute bearing on the case; or the judge might say: We have no objection to granting a brief adjournment in order that the defence may decide upon what course to take. But a difficulty might arise for the judge in a case where a man of means or high position finds that he has not a "friendly jury," finds that he is in a tight place, and with the great means at his command he may be able to find witnesses who will give affidavits, and the judge will either have to say that in his opinion those witnesses should be heard, and discharge the jury, or adjourn the case until the next term, or else run the risk of being accused to have been doing an injustice to the prisoner. I think it would be a cruel thing to put a judge in the position of being obliged to choose between such a trying alternative.

Mr. MASSON. I think the argument presented by the Minister of Customs, instead of weakening my view, strengthens it. I do not think that any difficulty will arise in the application of this provision. The Crown must either produce a witness they did not produce before, and the defence must be taken by surprise, or the Crown must have failed to call a witness as to whose testimony they had given notice and whose name they had placed on the indictment. In either of these two cases the accused may be taken at a great disadvantage. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) asked for examples. On the spur of the moment I could not think of an example, but I have since thought of a very serious one, in which I defended a party accused of murder. An investigation was held before a coroner and before a bench of magistrates. Before the coroner a woman was called and gave evidence, in the course of which she stated that she knew nothing about the matter. This woman was not called before the magistrates. In the meantime the detectives came into the case, and by the means detectives use she learned something, and she subsequently came forward and gave the convicting evidence. There is a case in which the defence was taken by surprise. Our information was that she knew nothing about the case and would not be a witness. The first intimation we received was the appearance of her name on the back of the indictment, but as to what she was to say we knew nothing. At all events, she gave the convicting evidence, and without her evidence I doubt whether the party would have been convicted. There are many such cases, especially where detectives have been called in to work up the evidence. Their aim is to keep all the evidence they have obtained, and one of their methods of action is to have false statements of the evidence about to be given published in the press. Thus the prisoner comes to trial entirely in the dark as to the network of evidence which has been woven around him. The only answer would be to suppose that all this evidence was undoubtedly true. From my experience of the evidence worked up by detectives, I am not prepared to say that all of it is undoubtedly true, and I hold that a prisoner should have an opportunity of rebutting it when he knows the evidence which is to be presented. It is impossible to be prepared to rebut it until the evidence is known, and when such cases arise it is only justice to say that a man on trial for his liberty or his life should be given the opportunity and time to meet it. It may be that he will require only a short time, and it is for the court to say what time shall be given. It may be that a few days will be required, but all that matter is in the discretion of the judge. I think we can safely trust that discretionary power in the hands of the judges without doing violence to the administration of justice. I sympathize with the expressions of hon. members whose principal practice has been in conducting prosecutions. Such has not been my experience, but I have had a good many years' experience on the other side, and as my leanings may perhaps be on the side of the defence, I can quite appreciate the feelings entertained by hon. gentlemen on their own line of practice.

Mr. LAURIER. I think it is most undesirable to depart from a well-known principle of law which has prevailed hitherto, unless some very strong case is made out to the contrary. The amendment in this case is one based more on suppositions than on real facts. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has cited one fact from his practice, but even that solitary case is not very conclusive. The hon. gentleman appears to have experience in defending prisoners; but the Minister of Customs has perhaps had as large an experience as the hon. gentleman, and certainly his testimony is just as valuable on this question as any testimony that can be cited in this House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have been told that on the hustings.

Mr. LAURIER. The truth is told sometimes on the hustings. The hon. gentleman stated, and it was the only argument I have heard in favour of the amendment, that it is the practice in civil cases. But there is a wide difference between civil and criminal cases. The hon. gentleman must be aware from his experience at the bar, that when a man is put on trial it is ordinarily the event of his life. He has prepared for it during days and weeks, and when the trial occurs he is fully prepared to make his defence. If he is not fully prepared, the invariable tactics pursued are to appeal to the court for a further postponement of the trial. When at length the trial is fixed he is ready to meet it with all the means available. Of course some accident may occur, but even if the prisoner is taken by surprise the court will frequently adjourn early in the day and thus give the defence an opportunity to meet the emergency that has occurred. The argument of the Minister of Customs is unanswerable, that if this amendment is adopted it must inevitably lead to numerous miscarriages of justice.

Mr. MASSON. The hon. gentleman has truly said that it is usually the event of a man's life to be put on trial. But he cannot possibly prepare to meet evidence of which he has had no notice, and evidence entirely different from that which he was called upon to meet before the investigating magistrate. In many cases, especially where the Crown employs detectives for months hunting up the evidence and weaving a network of circumstantial evidence, the prisoner may be called upon for his defence without having any notice of the network of evidence which has been drawn around him.

Mr. TISDALE. I confess that, looking at the carefully prepared clause, it seems to me that I understand what the English commissioners must have meant in preparing it. The commissioners wish to provide against, not so much taking advantage of a prisoner who has had every chance to be prepared, but to prevent the Crown going over the ground and taking advantage of an ordinary prisoner. The prisoner must satisfy the court that the Crown have been guilty of unfairness, and the court must judge of that fairness. The prisoner must either show that the Crown had neglected to call a witness that, under all the fair circumstances of a criminal trial under British practice they should have called, or that they produced a witness which they should not have produced. It is limited to these two things. These hon. gentlemen who have prosecuted a good deal must not forget, although they sometimes do, that a man is innocent until he is proved guilty, and that he should have the fairest possible trial in the world. I have seen eminent American lawyers of large experience in criminal cases, who, when they visited the courts in England and saw great criminal trials conducted there, expressed themselves as lost in admiration at the fairness of these trials. While we are proud of our courts in Canada, yet we have not the experience or the opportunity, and I am glad to say not the quantity of crime—because our population is smaller, perhaps—to investigate as have those eminent jurists in England. When these great criminal lawyers and jurists of Great Britain lay down such a principle, they must have had very strong reasons for it. I will most certainly support maintaining this in the Bill. Though I have nothing like the experience these English lawyers have, yet I have acted sometimes as prosecutor and sometimes as defending counsel, and I lean to the old principle that a prisoner who is on trial for his life or his reputation, shall have the best of it if possible, if there is any question which side shall have the best of it. I shall certainly support the retention of this clause in the Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman did not do justice to the argument presented by the Minister of Customs which seemed to me to be a very strong one. Here is a judge sitting on the bench and a man whose life is at stake is being tried. The man has had a fair jury empannelled, and he did not object at first, but as the trial goes on he sees he has very little chance of success; and suppose he submits half a dozen affidavits to prove to the judge that he is taken by surprise, the judge would be placed in an embarrassing position.

Mr. MASSON. That would not do.

Mr. TISDALE. Where is he going to get the affidavit?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, we will suppose that he presents his own affidavit, or the affidavit of his attorney. The affidavit swears that the man is taken by surprise, and the judge has only to decide on that, and you are not imposing on him a very invidious duty. In civil cases the judge may say: You can make an application for a new trial if you do not get justice, but in that criminal case no new trial can be had, and the onus is thrown on the judge to say he does not believe the affidavit.

Mr. McLEOD. It does not strike me that the affidavit has anything to do with it. The Act says "if the court is of opinion," &c.; it is not what the man says in his affidavit by which the court decides. The judge hears the evidence that is given by the witness, and he simply forms his opinion from that. It does not necessarily place the judge in any more difficult position than that in which he is placed continually in criminal trials. He has always got to decide whether evidence offered is good or not, and he need not reserve the case for the court unless he pleases. He takes the responsibility of that and there is no appeal from his decision. These are responsibilities attached to the office of judge, and this is merely giving him larger jurisdiction to protect the prisoner. A judge may see that the witness is being very injuriously prejudiced by the production of a witness of which he knew nothing, and yet he sits there powerless, and must let the prisoner suffer in consequence of that. This section puts the judge in a position to protect the prisoner. Even if it does place the judge in a worse position than he is in at present, then I submit that it is the duty of the judge to take that responsibility. We should not legislate in such a way as to relieve a judge from responsibility, but we should see that the prisoner has a fair and proper trial. The strongest reason against this section which I have heard is, that a case like this has not arisen. I can see, however, that such a case might arise, and I am strongly impressed in favour of the section because it has been enunciated by distinguished English lawyers.

Mr. OUIMET. This would happen in almost every case. If my learned friends have had experience in these criminal cases, they know that in preliminary investigations it does not happen once in five cases that all the witnesses who appear at the trial have been examined in the preliminary examination. For the preliminary examination at present, it is only necessary that there should be one or two witnesses examined to make out a *primâ facie* case, sufficient to justify the magistrate in committing. Then, when the trial comes on and the accused produces his witnesses, sometimes a large number of new witnesses who were not heard in the preliminary investigation, are called. That is the reason why the general practice has been to put on the back of the indictment the name of every witness who has to be heard during the trial; and, although a witness may be heard whose name is not placed on the back of the indictment, it would be considered unfair for the Crown to call important witnesses whose names do not appear on the back of the indictment. If this clause is adopted in its present form, there will not be one case in a dozen in which the accused will not be in a position to produce an affidavit stating that he was taken by surprise, because he did not know in advance what would be said by every witness to be called in the case. If there is any reason for this clause, it is only in the first case mentioned, that is, when a new witness is sprung upon the defence without notice; but the placing of the name of the witness on the back of the indictment is, I think, a sufficient notice in every case. If a glaring injustice were to result from that, that would be one of those extreme cases for which we could provide; but the second part of the clause is entirely useless, and would just lead to endless litigation and practical miscarriage of justice in five out of six cases.

Mr. MASSON. I still submit that the possibility of the Crown being prejudiced at the trial could easily be provided against by the Crown giving 24 or 48 hours' notice of the evidence they intended to produce. They do not need to give it in detail, but such as is given in a statement of particulars in a civil case. Then the prisoner would consider before the trial began whether he would make his application then or whether he would wait; and if he did not make it before the trial, having had such notice, the judge would refuse his application if made after the trial began.

Mr. OUIMET. In trials of professional thieves, for instance, you would never get a conviction if the accused had in advance the name of every witness, and the substance of what he was going to say. I have been six years trying cases for the Crown in Montreal, at least 200 cases every year in which I have been counsel, and my experience is that the present practice has not once proved to work unjustly to the accused.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps we had better postpone the question for to-night.

Mr. LAURIER. We have been in the habit so far of following British legislation in criminal matters; but in this case we would be anticipating British legislation. It is true, we have the report of the British Law Commissioners, which is a very high authority; but it is not law, and it is the experience of every one, except, perhaps, my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Masson), that no substantial injustice has occurred. It seems to me that is a good argument why we should wait until the practice is changed in England before we change it in Canada.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask if the hon. Minister has received any communication from the judges in Canada suggesting the introduction of such a clause as this?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, I have not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose this provision has been suggested by some of those cases in England in which innocent persons were convicted upon the evidence of persons who formed conspiracies against them, and were subjected to very serious punishment—I think in one case to transportation for life; and in another case a person suffered imprisonment for 20 years before he obtained evidence to prove his innocence, and Parliament had to compensate him for the loss he sustained. In another case, a certain property was sold at very much less than its value, and compensation was obtained from Parliament. In some of the English legal reviews published ten or twelve years ago, you will find a discussion on this subject. It seems to me that the only effect of this provision would be to compel the prosecuting counsel to inform the defendant in a larger degree than at the present time what he intends to establish, in order to avoid the very thing that this clause if carried authorizes, the postponement of the trial. If that were the effect, the trial on the whole would be a fairer trial than it would be if the law is left as it is. I do not know that in many cases such serious hardship arises under the present law, because by appeal to the Executive redress can be obtained; but that appeal after all converts the Executive into a court of review in which the decisions of the courts are reviewed and new evidence taken that was not submitted to the court at the time of the trial. The Home Secretary is doing that every day. There are two circumstances which contribute to it—the taking of the prisoner by surprise at the trial, and the question arising as to his mental soundness. In these two classes of cases appeals to the Secretary of the Home Department are rendered necessary, and I suppose the object of this provision has been largely to take from the Executive Department of the Government this duty, and vest it in the courts, where, after all, it more properly belongs.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Public Buildings—Repairs, furniture, heating, &c..... $409,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that the hon. gentleman proposes to make a considerable reduction. Is it an imaginary one; or are there reasonable grounds for supposing there will be less spent than last year?

Mr. OUIMET. I intend to ask at a future day an increase of $15,000, but I can say that we shall exert ourselves to reduce the expenditure. This is for buildings all over the Dominion, the number of which is increasing every year, and to-day we have 92 more than we had ten years ago. In the future, instead of charging the salaries of the staff of the architect branch against this item we propose taking a special vote at the end of the Supplementary Estimates for them, so as to give the House a closer estimate of what is really spent by the department. As a matter of book-keeping I think that will be an improvement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On looking at page C-174 of the Auditor General's Report, I see that public buildings, Ottawa, are put down at $131,323, special vote $1,299, Rideau Hall $20,152, Dominion buildings $40,756, making in all $193,000 for the year ending 30th June. Was that the money that was spent then?

Mr. OUIMET. That is the money that was spent for general purposes, with the exception of the special votes.

Grounds, Public Buildings, Ottawa.... $6,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that arranged for by contract or by day's work?

Mr. OUIMET. This is for keeping the grounds in connection with the public buildings on Parliament Hill in proper order. We have given the contract to Mr. Robertson for $5,600. We have given him the use of the conservatory, and not only is he entrusted with the duty of keeping the grounds in proper order, but also of taking care of the flowers and doing everything except removing the snow.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Last year Parliament sat very late in the summer, and we had an opportunity of seeing how these grounds were kept, and I have no hesitation in saying that nothing could be more reprehensible than the manner in which the beautiful grass plots around these buildings were

used. I have time and again seen the hose turned on with great violence, and the grass destroyed in large patches here and there. Some years ago there was nothing more beautiful than the grounds around the Parliament buildings; last year they were the worst kept grounds I saw anywhere in Ottawa. The sod was entirely destroyed: it was shameful to see the violence with which the men who held the hose poured the water on the beautiful turf.

Mr. OUIMET. I suppose the cricket players and the other players had something to do with that. A new mode of sprinkling has been adopted on Major's Hill by which stationary sprinklers throw the water around like rain. I am glad the hon. gentleman mentioned this matter, and I intend to have these sprinklers used here instead of hose.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman would used a perforated nozzle at the end of the hose, it would obviate a great deal of the damage. He now uses a large nozzle which looks as large as a two-inch bore, which lets the water out with great force.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have watched the men myself last year, and I saw the grass torn up by the water in many cases.

Removal of snow, Public Buildings, Ottawa..... $2,500

Mr. OUIMET. This is done by contract with the exception of Parliament Hill, for which the contract was cancelled during the winter, because we thought the work was not being properly done.

Heating Public Buildings, Ottawa..... $60,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like some explanation with reference to the fuel that is used in heating these buildings; I would like the Minister to state his experience as to the cost of using wood instead of coal. I see for mixed wood we paid $4.75 a cord for 3,337 cords; and we bought furnace coal, I suppose bituminous coal, at $5.20. Of course, that is rather higher than we pay up west. Now, it would be contrary to my experience that mixed wood at $4.75 can be as cheap as coal at $5.20.

Mr. OUIMET. We do not use bituminous coal for the furnaces, we only use it for the grates. The coal we use is large-sized hard coal.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is your experience with wood at $4.75 a cord? Is it as cheap as heating with bituminous coal?

Mr. OUIMET. We could not use bituminous coal; it would destroy the metal roof. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I have had a careful examination made as to the relative cost of wood and coal, and we have come to the conclusion that coal is cheaper, and we are gradually adopting it. But to adopt coal as the only fuel, would necessitate changing the furnaces and would involve a great expenditure. The policy we are following now is gradually to allow these furnaces to wear out and not to renew them with wood burners, but to replace them by coal burners, and it will operate a saving, we expect, of about $10,000. To use coal exclusively at once we would have to provide for 12 new boilers at a cost of $28,000; build a coal shed at $6,000, and coal cellars at a cost of $11,000; so that we would have to incur an expenditure of $37,860. As I said, none of these boilers will be replaced by boilers of the same pattern, but in future we will gradually use coal as the only fuel. I think the hon. gentleman will be of my opinion that it would be a clear loss to throw away those boilers and replace them by new boilers. They are not now fit to use coal; it would involve a large expenditure to alter them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not know that I am of the same opinion as the Minister, even with the very large figures he has given us. I think in a few years you would save more in fuel than the entire cost you have mentioned. I think you would be able to make a wood-burning furnace into a coal-burning furnace without throwing away your boiler. From my experience soft wood at $4.75 per cord and coal at $5.20, which is a very high figure and $1 per ton higher than I pay, would give results showing that in two years almost the cost of new boilers would be saved. I consider one ton of coal equivalent to two cords of this wood.

Mr. OUIMET. I am told that within a year or two the boilers will be worn out. We will then replace them with coal burners.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is no difficulty in burning coal in the present furnaces. All that is necessary is to raise the grate bars. In our mill we burnt wood, but we now use coal with the same boilers.

Mr. OUIMET. These boilers are of very old pattern and could not be adapted except at large expenditure, which could not be justified when within a short time they will be discarded altogether.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I repeat that all that is necessary is to raise the grate bars and reduce the burning space. When this would be the means of securing such a large saving it should certainly be carried out.

Mr. OUIMET. Perhaps if the hon. gentleman gave us the benefit of a personal inspection he would come to the opinion of my engineer; but I promise that next near we will put in the Estimates a vote in order to provide for the change.

Gas and Electric Light, Public Buildings, Ottawa..... $26,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the early part of the session I moved for a return showing which public buildings are lighted by electricity and which by gas, whether those lighted by electricity used the incandescent or the arc system, and a number of other particulars. I was anxious to obtain this return before we entered upon this discussion, as I think the time has arrived to determine whether we should introduce the incandescent system or use gas. The hon. Minister has brought down a return, but it is an exceedingly partial one and does not give the cost of lighting the public buildings. I hope the hon. gentleman will bring down a full return, and although I may not be able to do anything this session, I may be able to submit some statement to the House next year, if I have the honour to be here.

Mr. OUIMET. This question has been the subject of very careful examination, especially so far as these buildings are concerned. I have the summary of a report here, from which it appears that the cost of lighting the Government buildings

by electricity would be $16,726, including interest on the cost of installation, which would be $56,991.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is assuming the Government owned the plant.

Mr. OUIMET. We have to do so. We have asked for tenders from the different companies here and they have told us the plant would be so costly, and it would be used only during the session that it would have to be purchased by the Government. The light would cost half a cent per hour with our own plant, each lamp having a power of 16 candles. I repeat that the city companies have refused to go into the question of supplying that large plant unless the Government pay for it. If we provided our plant, it would be desirable to have the whole lighting under our own direction, and while the difference in cost between electricity and gas would be in favour of the former by not more than $1,000 a year, electricity would be decidedly advantageous as giving better light.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the cost of gas now amount to $16,000?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, I have these figures: gas, $18,216; lighting of post office by electricity, $1,153; coal for the dynamo house here, $2,106; street lamps, $2,833; sundry electrical supplies, $1,128, making a total of $25,487, gas and electricity together. I have had this subject very carefully examined, and my intention is to further consider the whole matter, and perhaps next session I will be able to inform the House whether it would not be better to provide for electric lighting altogether. The suggestion has been made to have electric lights placed in the library. This will likely be done during the recess.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) At the last meeting of the Library Committee, this matter came up, and two very contradictory statements were made as to the probable cost. Several members claimed that gas heated the library so much on warm nights that they could not remain there and study, and they suggested that the electric light should be introduced. I think it was the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) who gave some statement, but it was so entirely different from the one submitted by the library officers, that the committee did not take any action. Does the hon. gentleman know what the estimate was for the library?

Mr. OUIMET. I am told that the cost of increased plant would be $8,000, capital expenditure. I believe that it would be a little less than gas.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it is at all nearly the same it would be worth while putting in the electric light, because it is no doubt that the incandescent light is more wholesome in a chamber like this or like the library. The atmosphere of this House has been much better for the introduction of the electric light.

Mr. BOWELL. I have been making enquiries as to the cost of introducing the incandescent light in the military college and in the military buildings at Fort Henry, and to substitute it for gasoline which is used at present. Although the estimate is not complete yet, it shows that the electric light would cost a good deal more than the gasoline, which I have always understood is cheaper than the ordinary gas. The plant alone would cost some $12,000, and when we come to calculate the interest at 4 per cent and add it to the expenditure necessary to light the buildings, I find that it is much more expensive. I hope that before next year I will be able to give more definite information as to the actual cost of the two.

Mr. STAIRS. Does the Minister know how many lights he requires for the Military College, that the plant would cost $12,000?

Mr. BOWELL. I have simply obtained the relative cost as to the lighting.

Mr. STAIRS. A plant costing $12,000 would be a very large plant. It would supply a small town.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I should think it would supply a city of ten or twelve thousand inhabitants.

Mr. SPEAKER. I apprehend that the increased cost of the electric light would not be so great in the present case as if you were putting in an entirely new plant, because the number of men now employed in running the machines supplying the House of Commons would probably not need to be increased. It would only be the extra consumption of coal and the cost of the plant that you would have to take into account.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be worth while introducing the electric light into the library if the Minister can manage it at anything like a reasonable cost. Any one who has occasion to sit in the library knows there are two objections to gas. In the first place gas lamps heat the apartment very much more than the electric light, and in the next place they consume a very great deal of oxygen, and foul the air. The electric light is vastly more cooler and vastly more wholesome.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. Minister of Public Works comes to the conclusion to put the electric light in the library and of obtaining increased plant, I would also suggest to him the advisability of lighting all offices of this building with the incandescent light. A good many offices are at present lighted with gas, and there are complaints from the officers of the House in reference to it. I would suggest that if the library is lighted, that all the offices of the House should be lighted by electricity also.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In our establishment we substituted the electric light for gas. We paid $2 a thousand for gas, but we put in a dynamo and lighted our whole premises with electric light, and we have found it very much cheaper than gas. The sixteen-candle power lamps are guaranteed to last 600 hours, and they only cost about $35 a hundred, so that in case you have the plant the cost of lighting is only a trifle. I believe that all the buildings here should be lighted by electricity. I suppose it would be impossible to have one plant for the entire, but each departmental block might have a plant of its own, which would furnish the light required, and I feel sure that it would be cheaper in the end. I do not believe that the cost of putting in a complete plant for say 200 lights would be more than $5,000. If you are burning much gas in the Military College, it seems to me that it would be decidedly cheaper to put in a little dynamo and light the building yourselves.

Mr. OUIMET. I am told that in the Printing Bureau they have 800 lights, and the whole installation only cost $8,000. Of course, that does not

include the machinery to drive the dynamo, which they had before.

Mr. CAMPBELL. After the plant is in and the wiring all done, the expense will be only a mere trifle.

Telephone service, Public Buildings, Ottawa..... $3,500

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like a little information with reference to this vote. I see that we use something like 90 telephones at an average cost of between $35 and $40 each. But in looking over the Auditor General's Report, I see that the prices of the telephones vary very much, some being $40, some $30, and some $35. One at the house of the Minister cost $30 and one at the house of a subordinate officer $35, and some in the public offices $40. I do not understand these differences, and it seems to me that when you are using so many telephones there ought to be something like a wholesale discount. I would also ask the Minister whether it is necessary in the public interest to have telephones in so many of the houses of the officials of the departments? I am not finding fault, but I am asking for information. I had supposed that the officials would be in the offices during office hours, and that there would not be much public business attended to by them at their homes outside of office hours. Taking the Minister's own department, I find that the cost in the office of the chief architect is $27.50: in the drafting room, $27.50: for the foreman of the shops, $35; in the houses of the Deputy Minister, J. R. Arnoldi, William Smith and H. F. Perley, each $35; at the Gatineau Upper boom, $40; and at the lower one, $80—I can understand this difference—and in the office at Rideau Hall, $35. Then take, for instance, the Interior Department. The cost in the Deputy Minister's office is $35; in the Surveyor General's office, $35; in the house of the Minister, $30; and in the house of the Deputy Minister, $30; but in the house of L. C. Pereira it is $35. What I ask is why the prices should vary so much, whether all these telephones are necessary in the public interest, and if so why, with so many telephones used, they cannot be obtained at a considerably reduced rate?

Mr. OUIMET. I cannot explain why the rates vary so much as stated in the Auditor General's Report. In the estimate I have for next year, such disparity does not exist. The uniform price seems to be $35. I will make enquiries and inform the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why is it necessary to have telephones in so many officials' houses?

Mr. OUIMET. I have very often to call up my officers for information.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This seems an excessive price when the calls cannot be very frequent.

Mr. OUIMET. The price in Montreal is $50 in public offices and $35 in private houses, and there is no competition here.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Considering the number of telephones and the limited calls, the hon. gentleman might very well secure a reduction in price. I do not pay that price in my office, where I fancy there are many more calls during the day than in those officials' houses.

Mr. BOWELL. The distance may have something to do with it. The Auditor General lives two miles out of the city, and the telephone at his house costs $40, while that in his office only costs $35. That possibly may account for the difference.

Mr. BOWERS. In St. John the telephones cost from $20 to $25, and in my county they run a telephone from my house to the store at $10 a year. It seems to me that when so many telephones are used by the Government, the service should cost much cheaper than it does.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In my town we get a single telephone in a business house for $25 and in a private house for $20, and if two are used we get them for $20 apiece. It seems to me that here, where so many are used, we should get them at wholesale prices.

Mr. OUIMET. I shall instruct my officers to try and have the price reduced, and if possible the number.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Threaten to take the telephones out, and they will soon lower the price.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose there is no contract for this, and the Government can have the price reduced at any time or dispense with them.

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, the economy can be effected at once.

Heating Dominion Buildings, fuel, &c. $48,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the explanation of this reduction in this item?

Mr. OUIMET. The amount before was $60,000. During the last year it has not cost as much; we have reduced it all we could.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When the Minister is keeping up that park called Major's Hill Park he has the other side of the street covered up with wood. He has the park on one side to adorn and decorate the city, and on the other side of the street he has a wood pile for the benefit of people that come here.

Mr. OUIMET. That is a military building, belonging to the Department of Militia.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not see how the Minister, if he has got such an eye for the beautiful, is going to preserve the park here and have a wood pile on the other side—I mean on Sparks street.

Mr. OUIMET. We shall attend to that.

Lighting Dominion Public Buildings.. $37,000

Mr. LISTER. What do you pay a thousand for gas?

Mr. OUIMET. This vote is for lighting all the public buildings in the Dominion, and I suppose the price varies in different cities. I think $2 is about the average.

Dominion Immigration Buildings, repairs, furniture, &c..... $3,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do you think you will manage to keep the immigrants in the country if you get these buildings fixed up?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the officials have been superannuated at different points, have they not? How will the buildings be occupied now?

Mr. OUIMET. You may be sure if the buildings become vacant, they will be closed up, and that expenditure will be reduced.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It depends upon where the immigration sheds are. If they are in the west, the money might be required; if they are in the east, it may not be required.

Harbours and Rivers—Nova Scotia—
West Chezzetcook.....$6,800

Mr. OUIMET. This is to complete a breakwater 900 feet long now being built from the southern end of Conroy Island. It is to render the mouth of the river navigable by preventing sand to form a bar.

Digby—New pier at the Raquette.....$28,500

Mr. OUIMET. I move that this be reduced to $20,000.

Mr. BOWERS. For what reason?

Mr. OUIMET. The construction of a new pier on the north side of the Raquette has been decided upon. It was supposed it would serve for ocean navigation, and be made a point where ships could be loaded with the freight coming in by the Annapolis and Yarmouth Railway; but the railway company having decided not to bring their track there, the construction of the pier has been abandoned as not needed. It has been decided that we go instead on the south side of the Raquette, and place the old pier now there in a better state, doing some dredging around it, so as to allow the ships to load there. A contract has already been given, and a large amount of timber has been brought in by the contractors. In order to settle with them we shall probably have to buy that material, which will be used. I think $20,000 will be sufficient to put that pier in perfect order, and to pay for the dredging and labour.

Mr. BOWERS. Will the new work be on the north side of the pier so that carts can go down to the wharf?

Mr. OUIMET. It will be made to suit the commerce there.

Mr. BOWERS. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to some other expenditure required in Digby County. I have received several letters which I forwarded to the Minister this summer on the question of breakwaters in Digby, and also two petitions. One petition was from Belliveau's Cove, asking an appropriation of $3,000. The harbour is formed by two wharves, both of which are out of repair, so that teams cannot start out on them for the purpose of carrying cord-wood, lumber and produce for shipment. The Minister will understand that one of his engineers has made a report on the subject and recommended that money be given for this purpose. Church Point wharf also requires an additional amount. The Government last year expended $800 or $900, and for this sum it was put in thorough repair although the estimate was $1,500. There is still required an abutment to run out on the south side to catch the gravel which a south-west wind throws around the end of the pier. In the course of two or three weeks a ridge of gravel is thrown inside the wharf to a depth of four or five feet, which prevents vessels loading there. The wharfinger at Meteghan River was there with his vessel last season. He was caught in this way and telegraphed the department and you ordered him to have the gravel cleared away. Letters have been sent to the Government on this subject. A petition has been forwarded from there this season. The expenditure required is $1,000 or $1,200. Without this wharf the shipping facilities of that portion of the country are almost entirely useless. We next come to Comeauville River wharf. It is one where a considerable trade is carried on. Last winter the outer blocking went adrift and the logs were thrown up on the shore. The inhabitants dragged them up so that they should not go adrift. The people ask that $1,000 or $1,500 be expended in repairing that wharf. Coming down further we reach Meteghan Cove wharf. No large amount has been expended on this wharf since Confederation. It was built many years ago, and is the only wharf for shipment for eight or ten miles of country. Last winter the sea broke through it, and unless repairs are carried out it will become useless. At this wharf alone there was a revenue derived last season of $132. These wharves in Digby County are paying wharves, bringing in from five to six per cent on the capital invested. Next we come down to Salmon River. There is a good harbour inside at high water, but the abutment at the outer end is not long enough and requires an addition of 100 or 150 feet, so that vessels drawing 8 or 10 feet can go in and load. At the present time only vessels drawing 6 to 7 feet can load there, and consequently the people cannot obtain as much for their wood and lumber as they would otherwise receive, because there is no way of shipping it. At Salmon River the people have been promised during 10 or 12 years that money would be appropriated for this wharf. The outer blocking was partly carried away last winter and requires to be fixed up, and the construction of 100 or 150 feet of additional wharf is, as, I have said, also necessary. From that wharf there are no receipts but if it was placed in proper order, $150 to $200 annually would be received from it. I have received letters also from Broad Cove asking for $1,000, Gulliver's Cove asking for $3,000, Sandy Cove for $2,500, Little River for $1,500, White Cove for $1,000, East Ferry for $1,500, Tiverton for $2,500, Freeport for $2,500, and Westport for $6,000. Here are 125 or 130 miles of sea coast on which there are only two or three natural harbours, and the whole trade of the country has to be carried on by means of breakwaters. On these, $10,000 or $15,000 can be much better spent in repairs and in building new ones than for immigration purposes. For such an expenditure, we could not obtain more than 200 or 300 immigrants, but for that sum expended on these breakwaters 2,000 people could be retained in the County of Digby and would have no occasion to leave. It is impossible for the people of Digby to earn a living and remain at home, unless they obtain facilities for shipping their produce. In 1890, the total amount collected in the whole Dominion from breakwaters and piers was $7,476, of which Nova Scotia paid $4,535 and Digby County $1,151, or 16 per cent of the whole amount paid in the Dominion. I contend that money expended on public works for Digby County is not as unprofitable an investment as is the case in many other counties, because from an investment of $2,000 or $3,000, the Government can collect

wharfage dues equal to five or six per cent of the investment. In expending this money in Digby the Government will be assisting in retaining the people in the county and in saving the people from being compelled to dispose of their vessels and emigrate to the United States. The Minister should, instead of deducting $8,500 from the grant, add $3,000 more for expenditure in Digby, which would make a total vote of $11,500. I guarantee that if the Minister will repair the breakwaters which badly need repairing in Digby County, that where the receipts were only $1,100 in 1890, they will be from $1,500 to $2,000 next year, and, in addition to increasing the revenue, he will be keeping the people at home. I have had letters from Mr. Louis A. Melançon and another from Mr. John Belliveau, and Mr. Belliveau told me that he had to sell his West India vessel because he could not bring her to the wharf to load and unload. Mr. Louis Melançon wrote me that he would probably have to do the same thing, and the officer of Customs at Salmon River, Mr. Perry, also informs me that he would probably have to sell his vessel for the same reason, as she could not get into the wharf to to take his wood and lumber. I hope the Minister of Public Works and his colleagues will take Digby County into their consideration. I do not want him to look at this thing as a personal matter to me or as a political matter either, but I wish them to look at it in the light of justice. I may state to the Minister of Public Works that it requires so large an amount for these breakwaters that private parties are not able to build them, and the whole trade of the French settlements along St. Mary's Bay depends on these breakwaters, so that if they are not kept in repair it is impossible to carry on the business of the country.

Mr. OUIMET. The Government is disposed to do anything in their power that will improve the condition of the people in these counties, but I do not think that the hon. gentleman can say that, under the circumstances, we have been very niggardly about his county. We are doing pretty well, I think, and if the finances of the country allow us to do more we shall certainly do it. The number of wharves and breakwaters in that part of Nova Scotia, are very numerous I hear. I am told that one can throw a stone from one wharf to another at certain places. Most of them have come under the control of the Government, but it would be entirely out of the question to undertake to keep up every one of these piers in proper order and repair. It would certainly cost too much money for the Government to ask the approval of this House to such a large expenditure. I may say that instructions have been given by me to the resident engineers there to have very carefully prepared during the summer, a chart of all these places showing the different wharves and at the same time indicating their relative value and importance. Probably by next session I shall be in a position to state to the House a general plan for the improvement of these different piers, so as to give to the people proper accommodation, while at the same time I shall be able to assure the House that all the money which will be spent there will be spent in the interest of the country, and for the greatest benefit of the people. It would be very difficult for myself or my engineers to state just now where the money could be most usefully expended. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowers) will give me the credit of doing all that I can in the direction of dealing out justice to his people, and next session I will be better able to state exactly what the Government will be in a position to do. I would suggest that this vote would read "Digby Pier" instead of "Digby, new pier at the Raquette," because we have abandoned the idea of building a new pier as where it was intended to be built it would be of no use to any one. We have decided that it would be better to have the old pier put in good order and repair, and made to suit the commerce of the place.

Mr. BOWERS. I have no objection to that, and I think myself you are doing a wise thing, as in my opinion it is well to repair the old wharf. I believe it will be perfectly satisfactory to a great many of the inhabitants, because I do not think that some of the people who asked for a wharf at the Raquette really understood what they required at the time. The hon. Minister is labouring under a mistake when he says that you can throw a stone from one of these breakwaters to the other. I may inform him that from Digby to Westport, on the Bay of Fundy, a distance of 40 miles, there is only one breakwater, and there should be some money spent on that. On the St. Mary's Bay shore, a distance of 30 miles, there are seven piers. I would ask the Government, if they cannot do anything else this year, to try and put some money in the Estimates for Salmon River, because the place badly needs some expenditure. The people cannot really get along there at all unless that wharf is extended. They are heartsick, and they feel very bad about it. I have had as many as 12 or 15 letters from different persons complaining about the accommodation there. I would ask the hon. Minister if he would promise a grant of about $2,500 for that wharf.

Mr. OUIMET. I will do all I can.

Mr. BOWERS. Try and give us some help for Salmon River if for no other. If you put a lock there you will get from $150 to $200 a year revenue from that wharf. So badly do the people need accommodation there and so anxious are they for it, that I believe if you put a vote of $2,500 in the Estimates to help them at that wharf, they would on their part subscribe $1,000 worth of work or labour in order to make up the necessary amount. If the vote of $2,500 were made conditional on their subscribing $1,000, I believe they would do so.

Mr. OUIMET. Does the hon. gentleman offer that $1,000 will be subscribed?

Mr. BOWERS. I believe that the people would do so if you give them $2,500.

Mr. OUIMET. If such an offer were sent to the department, it would be very acceptable, I think.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a very fair offer.

Mr. BOWERS. You can make your grant conditional on the $1,000 being subscribed.

Mr. OUIMET. I cannot do it now, because I will have to submit the matter to my colleagues before any grant is made.

Great Village River..... $3,250

Mr. OUIMET. This is a revote of last year, to pay the claim of the contractor for additional work performed in 1883, 1884 and 1886 in connection with a diversion of the river. It was estimated that the work would cost $12,000, out of which $4,000 was to be paid, and has been paid, by the people of Great Village ; but the whole work has cost $3,250 more, and the vote was granted last year to satisfy that claim.

Mr. LAURIER. Was it done under contract ?

Mr. OUIMET. It was an agreement with the people there that on condition of their contributing $4,000, the contractor should undertake to do the work for $12,000. This claim has been pending since the work was completed in 1886, and I may add that it has not been settled yet. I have ordered further enquiries to be made, and the claim will certainly not be paid until it is proved to be correct.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that the contract was for $12,000.

Mr. OUIMET. Yes ; but the contract was to take a certain amount of sand away, in order to make the river navigable, and in order to accomplish that object more work had to be done than was foreseen by the department. Suppose you made a contract for the removal of 50,000 yards of earth, and you found afterwards that 75,000 yards had to be removed.

Mr. LAURIER. I should think the hon. gentleman would not ask for a vote until he has first satisfied himself as to whether the claim is well founded or not.

Mr. OUIMET. I assure the hon. gentleman that the amount will not be paid until I am perfectly satisfied that the quantity of work for which the claim is made has been done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How was the contract let ?

Mr. OUIMET. It was an agreement made on the recommendation of the Chief Engineer, who reported that there was so much earth to be removed and that it would cost so much.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was there a written contract ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then that would be specified in the contract. Is this a legal claim arising out of the contract, or merely an equitable claim pressed upon the deparment ?

Mr. OUIMET. It would be a legal claim arising out of the contract.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the contract set out the quantity of earth to be removed ?

Mr. OUIMET. The plan attached to the contract showed that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What means have the department for ascertaining whether the representations of the contractor are accurate or not as to the quantity that was removed ?

Mr. OUIMET. That is what we are trying to ascertain now through our engineers. There have been conflicting statements as to that. We are doing what ought to be done in the public interest in order not to pay one cent of public money that has not been earned. The whole thing was discussed last year, and the fact that the money has not been paid during the year, is the best evidence that the department are taking all necessary precautions not to pay what is not really due, and it will not be paid this year, unless the department are quite satisfied that it is due.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No one wants to prejudge the man's claim ; but the hon. Minister will see that he comes before the committee under circumstances somewhat suspicious.

Mr. OUIMET. How suspicious ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The claim is six years old.

Mr. OUIMET. When it was first voted, it was not six years old.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no reason to doubt the hon. Minister's statement that the matter was discussed last year, although I do not remember it ; but the very fact that it has been so long before the department naturally gives rise to questions as to why it was not paid before. Everybody will see that if there was a *bonâ fide* legal claim, there would be no disposition on the part of the department to withhold the money for six or eight years, and their having done so causes doubt and enquiry.

Big Tracadie—Repairs to breakwater....$300

Mr. FORBES. Are any expenditures going on at Summerville this year ?

Mr. OUIMET. None now, but they will be commenced immediately after the 1st of July, when the money is voted.

Mr. FORBES. Is there any prospect of dredging going on around the south shore this summer ?

Mr. OUIMET. None at all.

Repairs to piers and breakwaters, P.E.I...$6,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What does the hon. gentleman propose to do with the breakwater at Wood Island ? I discussed the matter at great length last session, and there is no need to repeat my remarks. The breakwater has cost $16,000 or $18,000, and every year you are laying out $1,000 to $1,200 there without doing any good. A report was made by Mr. Brown, which certainly showed that he made a very thorough examination of the place, and he reported it would be necessary to extend that breakwater and in that way make a reasonable harbour. The people there have no railway, and this improvement is absolutely necessary, so that vessels may be able to come alongside the harbour and load there which they cannot do at present.

Mr. OUIMET. I understand from the report that it would be entirely useless to repair the breakwater without dredging, and there are almost insuperable difficulties in the way of dredging. The department did send a dredge there, but it was so much exposed to the wind that they had to take it away to prevent its being lost. It can only work there at the top of the tide. A Mr. McCordock has been entrusted with the duty of going there to see if we cannot possibly proceed with the dredging and do something with the plant we have. I quite acknowledge the claim the hon. gentleman has put before the House on behalf of these people who have no railway communi-

cation, and am really anxious to do something to relieve them, but I could not undertake the expenditure, which I am told would be over $10,000, without having the certainty that it would be useful to the people. During the summer the matter will be attended to, and if possible something will be done. If I understand it aright, this Wood Island is about the only good harbour they have in that section of country, and we will do what we can to improve it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of course, I accept the statement the hon. gentleman makes to me in good faith. I know he is making it in good faith. He will pardon me if I seem to be a little persistent in this matter, because I have no hesitation in saying I have been deliberately misled by the department for years back. I have brought this up year after year, and the late Minister led me to believe it would be attended to—in fact, one session I had a positive promise made on the floor of this House that it would be attended to, but he did not do it. Now, the hon. gentleman is a little astray. If he will look at the report made by Mr. Brown from that department, he will see there are no insuperable difficulties at all. Mr. Brown grasped the situation, and he pointed out how much would be required to do the work. At the mouth of the harbour there is an island called Wood Island, lying off the mainland.

Mr. OUIMET. What amount did he mention?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Two amounts, $5,000 and $10,000. It depended upon the length of the breakwater, and putting it in a complete state of repair. But the department built a small breakwater from the island to meet the large one which runs out from the mainland, narrowing the entrance, and the result was that a little outside the entrance there was a hillock of sand formed which required either to be dredged away, or the same breakwater to be continued. Mr. Brown explained in his report how that can be overcome. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that a large amount of public money was laid out upon that breakwater before the Island came into Confederation, and they have been peddling money into it year after year, throwing it away. I never asked for it. I told them every year they might as well throw it into the sea; I told them that unless they could make up their mind to expend $5,000 or $6,000 upon it and put it in a good state of repair, it was throwing money away to expend only $1,000 upon it. But if the hon. gentleman can do it, he will confer a great benefit upon a large number of people.

Mr. BOWELL. What part of the Island is that?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Nearly opposite Pictou.

Mr. OUIMET. Is it not upon the south-east part of the Island?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, the south-east part. All the land south of the Hillsborough River, running down to the Northumberland Straits, what we call on the Island the Belfast district, is without any railway accommodation, and without any natural harbour accommodation. Before we came into Confederation the Local Government tried to make an artificial harbour, and laid out a great deal of money upon this. When we came into Confederation the Mackenzie Government built a small breakwater from the island that lies there to meet the main breakwater that was built off the mainland, and it accomplished good results, but it has been left to fall into decay. I have made a special point of pressing it, year after year, upon the Government, and I felt exceedingly hurt about it, because at one time the department made a promise which they did not carry out. But I will accept in good faith the statement of the hon. gentleman that he will make a *bonâ fide* examination of the report of Mr. Brown, with a desire to do what is right in the premises.

Mr. PERRY. Is this all the money the Minister intends to expend in repairing the piers and breakwaters on the Island?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, for the present.

Mr. PERRY. A few years ago Parliament voted $10,000 for repairs to piers and breakwaters, and during that year they only expended $5,155. Now, that money has never been expended, and I am sure it was not because there was no need of repairing the piers and breakwaters around Prince Edward Island which were in a dilapidated condition. The Department of Public Works never expended that money. There are 27 piers and breakwaters, and they have cost a large amount of money. They were originally built by the Government of Prince Edward Island, and taken over by the Dominion Government on paying a certain amount. Now, these are allowed to fall to the ground. Take the breakwater that was built by the Island Government at West Point some years ago, at a cost of about $8,000, for which the Government of Canada paid $6,000. They bought this wharf in 1885, and they have never spent a single dollar on it, but have allowed it to go to destruction. I have tried to press upon the notice of the department that this breakwater should be built, and the people of West Point, who are 25 miles from railway accommodation, badly need the wharf, but still the Government would do nothing. I am almost tired of asking the Government to do anything. Last year I brought this to their notice unsuccessfully. I admit I am not as good an advocate as my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Bowers); he is almost a beggar when he asks anything from the department, but I do the best I can. I know I have not got very good English, and if I had better French I would address the House in that language. But I hope and trust that the Minister of Public Works will, during the summer, cause proper surveys to be made and maps prepared, and post himself fully on these matters. There is the breakwater at Tignish which needs to be repaired. Members of this House coming from the Maritime Provinces know very well that these breakwaters are exposed to severe storms on the coast of the St. Lawrence. We know the old saying, that a stitch in time saves nine, and the Government will save money by putting these breakwaters in repair before they get any worse. I want them to understand that when we vote $10,000 in one year, they charge Prince Edward Island with this money, although it is not expended. In the next item below this I find there is a vote for Miminegash breakwater. It was first voted in 1890, again in 1891, and now it is voted for the third time.

Mr. OUIMET. It will be expended this year.

Mr. PERRY. On the eve of the general election of 1891 tenders were asked for, and a gentleman

named Mr. Macdonald got the contract some time about the time of the general elections in March, but it was too late for him to go to the woods and get the lumber required to build the breakwater. He asked the Government to give him an extension of time, and the Government refused, as the elections were over. The building of the breakwater was a political job, and as the elections were over it was left undone. Last year passed along and no contract was let. Part of the time the department was without a head. This should not occur, for there should be a head if only a sheep's head. The people of Prince Edward Island should not be allowed to suffer. The people of Miminegash, who live principally by fishing, and although they are good fishermen suffer from hard times, suffer from lack of accommodation. If these people do not get the accommodation they require to make a living, the Government may find at the next census a reduction of 500 or 1,000 in the population. Have tenders been asked for Miminegash breakwater?

Mr. OUIMET. Tenders have been advertised for.

Mr. PERRY. Two months ago the Minister told me that tenders had been asked for. Surely the contract ought to be let by this time, for the fishing season is nearly over. At all events, it is the wrong time of the year to give out a contract for that breakwater, as labour is dearer now than in winter. What guarantee have we that this amount will be expended this year? Will the Minister pass his word that this expenditure will be made before Parliament meets again?

Mr. OUIMET. If the hon. gentleman does not worry me too much, I will promise him that the amount will be expended during this year.

Mr. YEO. I invite the attention of the Minister to the necessity of giving some attention to the pier at West Point. It was one of the piers which was taken over from the Local Government by the Federal. Nothing has been done in regard to repairing that pier. I understand an engineer has recently visited the spot, but I do not know the purport of his report. A previous report stated that a large expenditure would he required, but I do not think a very large pier will be required to give the necessary accommodation. This is a very important place, the country is fine farming country; there are large quantities of produce to be disposed of every year, and it is 15 miles from the nearest railway station. If there were shipping facilities the farmers would get the same prices at the pier as at the railway, and thus save hauling 15 miles. A good deal of lumber is manufactured there, and there are many fishing establishments. I hope the Minister will take the necessary steps to have the proper work constructed. I also call the Minister's attention to the pier in course of construction at Brae. The inhabitants have expended $500 of their own money on the work, and a contract has been let for a similar amount. Unless another contract is given out, the work done will be useless, but if $500 or $1,000 more were expended it would afford a good shipping place. There is a good harbour inside, but it is shoal at the point where the pier is being constructed. I also draw attention to the pier at Victoria West. Last autumn some expenditure was incurred there, and very good work was done. Some years ago the Dominion Government laid out some money on this pier, but the party who did the work instead of filling up the pier either with stone or clay, piled sand on it, and the first high tide washed the sand into the river and filled the end of the pier. There is quite a bank at the end of the pier, and this must be removed before any use can be made of the work. An application has been made to the Government to send a dredge there, and it is claimed that this bank could be removed within a short time. The expenditure of last year will be entirely thrown away unless this sandbank is removed. I hope the amount voted for the Miminegash breakwater will be expended. The contract should be let early in the year, so that the contractor would have the opportunity of getting his lumber out during the winter, when it can be done more cheaply and effectively. Tenders I am glad to hear have been called for, and I hope the contract will soon be let. I draw the special attention of the Minister to the pier at West Point. It is an actual necessity, and I hope the report of the engineer will be more favourable than previous reports have been.

Mr. OUIMET. The engineer will receive instructions to visit the place, and if $500 are sufficient to make the necessary repairs, I think we should get the amount from the general vote.

Mr. YEO. $500 is the amount required at Brae; at West Point a larger sum would be needed.

River St. John, including Tobique.... $9,500

Mr. COLTER. I see that this item has been voted for several years, and I would ask the Minister how much has been expended there last year?

Mr. OUIMET. $2,253.58 have been expended in 1890. In 1891, only $200 was spent, but they are working there now. That expenditure is up to the 31st December. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that the session having closed so late last year, it was impossible to expend the money that had been voted and we have to revote a large proportion of it now.

Mr. COLTER. Is the whole amount to be expended this year?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. COLTER. How is it to be expended?

Mr. OUIMET. In improving the navigable channel of the river between Fredericton and Woodstock, removing obstructions from the channel above the latter place and repairing and improving the tow-path on the Tobique River. It is proposed to expend $1,500 to purchase two scows and to provide a scraper for use on the River St. John, between Fredericton and Woodstock, so as to take off the snags.

Mr. COLTER. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that last year the boat plying between Fredericton and Woodstock was unable to run, except for a few weeks in the spring, on account of a sand-bar a few miles above Fredericton. Has the Minister any report about that?

Mr. OUIMET. I do not think we have, but if this money is voted, the engineer will proceed at once there and will make a report so as to commence work.

Yamaska River, P.Q.....$1,000

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend is aware that during the construction of these works on the Yamaska River the lands in the commune of Yamaska were flooded, and the owners of the commune have been petitioning the Government to have an investigation into the extent of their damages, and to be compensated for the same. I have good reason to believe, in fact I am informed on good authority, that an investigation had been promised by the predecessor of my hon. friend in the administration of the department. So far nothing has been done. Can I hope that the hon. gentleman will do what was promised? The only thing that is asked for at this moment is that an engineer should be sent, so as to have the complaint investigated, and to see whether or not damages have been suffered on account of the dam.

Mr. OUIMET. I shall order an investigation to be made.

Kingston Harbour..... $7,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Although I am aware that it is not absolutely in the department of the hon. gentleman I would call his attention to the fact that a short distance below Kingston harbour a large floating beacon has lately been erected, and apparently no provision has been made for lighting it at night in any shape or way. It is almost in the fair-way, and the consequence is that on a dark night a vessel navigating the channel may at any moment run into it, because from the position of the ground on either side, when a vessel is coming up from the St. Lawrence, it cannot be seen at all. Any vessel which is cruising from one side to the other at night may run into it, and as the water on the so-called shoal is 13 or 14 feet deep, vessels in tacking are likely to pass over it without having regard to this beacon. A light should be placed there at once. It is almost in range of what is called Knapp's Light. I can speak of it from my own personal experience, for I passed by it a few days ago, and there is no question that there is considerable risk unless the thing is lighted up. It consists of a triangular float with heavy logs anchored to the bottom. My hon. friend beside me can tell whether damages would result to the Government if any injury were caused by it. Apparently there is considerable risk to all sailing craft, and indeed to steamers. It is about three miles below Cedar Island and Fort Henry. It is a triangular floating range. It is visible enough in the day time, but at night no mortal could see it, if a swell were on and the vessel were moving at a rapid rate, until close upon it. I have no doubt that if it is not lighted up in some way the department will be hearing of serious damage. It is an absolutely new erection, having been put up this spring.

Mr. OUIMET. It has been put there for the purpose of marking the location of a sunken rock which the Department of Marine has asked our department to remove, and after the rock is removed the float will no longer be needed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works the nature of the work being done at Rondeau Harbour in the County of Kent.

Mr. OUIMET. I have no information at present, but I will enquire and let the hon. gentleman know either before these Estimates are over or when the Supplementary Estimates come down.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Can the hon. Minister inform me how the work of removing the bar at the mouth of the River Thames is progressing?

Mr. OUIMET. The whole work was to cost $1,200, and $1,000 has already been expended, so that the work must be almost completed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have called the hon. gentleman's attention by letter to the obstructions in the Sydenham River, and I believe he has received representations from the people of Dresden and Wallaceburg in regard to them. These obstructions could be very easily removed by sending the dredge to the Sydenham River after it gets through at the Thames. The two rivers are only a few miles apart, and the work could be done in a few days. The Sydenham is a deep, narrow river, down which immense numbers of logs are floated every season, and occasionally some sink. When the water is high, trees also come down; and, as there are several steamers navigating the river to Sarnia and Detroit, they often have their wheels broken by these obstructions.

Mr. OUIMET. I will enquire and let the hon. gentleman know; but the work on the Thames is being done not by the departmental dredge, but by a special contract with the Chatham Dredging Company.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The same dredge could do the work in a shorter time, perhaps, and more cheaply than it could be done by bringing the departmental dredge from a distance.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I may say that the company is not the Chatham Dredging Company but a new company. There are many obstructions in the Sydenham River, as well as in the Thames River, up to Chatham, causing the boats navigating those rivers to break a good many wheels, which they are put to enormous expense in getting repaired; and it would be a great pity if the work should not be done when it could be done at so little expense while the dredge is there.

Dredging—Nova Scotia.....$36,300

Mr. STAIRS. There are a great many applications now for dredging in some very important harbours in Nova Scotia, which should be done. There are applications from Halifax County and many other counties, and this work cannot be performed because there are not sufficient dredges at the disposal of the department. A year or so ago one of the dredges was lost and never replaced. I would suggest to the Minister the importance of providing some additional means of carrying on this very important work, as in many cases loss is suffered by the owners of many fishing and coasting vessels because they cannot use the harbours.

Mr. OUIMET. The department is fully alive to the necessity of providing some additional dredging plant. We intend to ask for an additional vote for that purpose.

Assistance towards the construction of a telegraph line from Moosomin Station, Canadian Pacific Railway, to Cannington.....$3,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Should not this be built by the Canadian Pacific Telegraph Company?

Mr. BOWELL. It is a bonus to assist them in building it.

Telegraph line from Nanaimo to Comox. $7,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Who owns this?

Mr. OUIMET. It would be quite impossible for any private company to go into this undertaking. It is worked by the Canadian Pacific Railway the same as the other lines there built by the Government.

Mr. BOWERS. I would impress on the Minister the necessity of extending the telephone from West Port to the west end of Briar Island, a distance of only two miles, and all the ships bound on the Bay of Fundy and outward bound could be reported there at any time, as well as wrecks or anything happening to the buoys.

To provide for salaries of engineers and draughtsmen and other clerks, chief engineer's office $54,000

Mr. OUIMET. I have already stated that the intention was to have the salaries voted in a special vote instead of having them charged to votes here and there. I think as a matter of book-keeping, and also as a matter of accommodation to the House, it would be much better as it is there.

To provide for salaries of architects, draughtsmen and clerks of chief architect's office $29,500

Mr. OUIMET. This is a temporary arrangement. My idea at first was to have a thorough reorganization of the department, but it was thought better after consideration to wait until we had the report of the Civil Service Commission. Next session a scheme of reorganization will be prepared and submitted to the House for its approval. The technical organization of the department, I find, is not quite satisfactory at present.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This means over $80,000 for these two services. Won't that add enormously to the expense of the department?

Mr. OUIMET. No. These two items, with another item it will be necessary to vote later on, will bring up the expenditure of the department to a figure lower than it is at present by over $10,000. I am certain that a saving of $10,000 will be made next year.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 27th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With regard to the arrangements for this week, I may say to the House that, in addition to what I suggested on Friday, it is proposed that the House shall meet on Saturday, for Supply and Concurrence; therefore, I move:

That when the House adjourns on Tuesday next it stands adjourned till Thursday at 11 o'clock in the morning, and when the House adjourns Thursday, it stands adjourned to Saturday at 11 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it the intention to sit after six o'clock on Saturday?

Mr. FOSTER. If we are here we might as well sit.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like the Minister, if he could, to give us an idea how long this session will last, because if it is to come to a close within a very few days, I could understand sitting on Saturday; but if it is to last two weeks longer or something like that, it would be inconvenient for many members to sit on Saturday, for all we can accomplish on that day.

Mr. FOSTER. We are coming very close to the end of the financial year on the 30th instant, and that is one reason why I particularly urge that we come back on Saturday and take Concurrence. We might get Supply ready about the first of July for the more important items. Very heavy payments come directly after the first of July.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) We ought to have the Estimates down before.

Mr. FOSTER. The Estimates will be down in ten minutes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think, from what I know of the business involved in the Estimates and railway resolutions, that the House can easily finish at the end of next week.

Mr. MULOCK. When will we have the railway resolutions?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. To-day or to-morrow.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it would be well for the Minister to allow this motion to sit on Saturday to stand until the railway subsidies are proposed.

Mr. McMULLEN. A great many members are absent on Saturday, and I think it would hardly be right to take Concurrence on Saturday or go into Supply, in face of the announcement that has already been made by the Minister of Justice whom I understood to say that the House would not meet on Friday or Saturday.

Mr. FOSTER. We will take up Concurrence alone on Saturday.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The announcement that was made has led some gentlemen to make arrangements to be absent on Saturday. For my own part I would rather sit a little later at nights during the other days than to sit on Saturday for all we could accomplish on that day.

Mr. MULOCK. It seems to me that all the public measures ought to be in to-day. It is not in the public interest that important matters should

be left when there are only a corporal's guard to deal with them.

Mr. FRASER. I think it would be well to sit on Saturday, if we can, in the interest of those who live far away. We have now been here a long time, and I would like to sit on Saturday if that suits the majority of the members.

Motion agreed to.

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL.

Mr. MULOCK asked, 1. What was the estimated cost of the lowest tender for the work of deepening and forming the upper entrance to the Sault Ste. Marie Canal? 2. What was the name of such tenderer? Did he deposit any, and if so, what security along with his tender? 3. Did he comply with all the conditions required of him as such tenderer? 4. Was the contract for such work awarded to him? If not, to whom was it awarded, and at what estimated amount? 5. How much has been paid on account of such contract? 6. What amount is it estimated will yet have to be paid on such contract until its full completion? 7. If such lowest tenderer was passed over and the contract awarded to a higher tenderer, was such lowest tenderer associated with those to whom the contract was awarded in carrying on the work?

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentleman I may say: 1. Lowest tender for upper entrance to Sault Ste. Marie Canal, $231,049; 2. Name of tenderer, J. Nicholson, who deposited a marked cheque for $7,500; 3. Mr. Nicholson tendered for the upper and lower entrances, and before the contracts were awarded, he wrote to the department absolutely declining to accept the contract for the upper entrance, unless the contract for the lower entrance also was awarded to him; 4. Contract for upper entrance was not awarded to Mr. Nicholson, but to Messrs. Allan & Fleming the next lowest, for $325,926; amount paid on contract to 31st December, 1892, $237,401.88; 6. Amount required to complete, $88,525; 7. The department only dealt with the original contractors, and is not aware of any one being associated with them.

Mr. MULOCK. I think that last answer is a mistake.

Mr. HAGGART. The department is not aware of any one being associated with them.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes; the associate's name appears in the Public Accounts.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the answer I got from the department.

Mr. MULOCK. I have got some papers I will show you.

LAKE ST. JOHN RAILWAY.

Mr. MULOCK asked, 1. What has been the amount of the gross traffic earnings of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway each year since any part thereof has been opened for traffic? 2. What has been the amount of the gross working expenses of said railway each year during the same period? 3. What is the amount of the present bonded debt of said road? What is the amount of the annual interest on the bonded debt of the road?

Mr. HAGGART. The following table is submitted:—

Year.	Gross Traffic Earnings.	Gross Working Expenses.	Remarks.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	
1880–81	8,875 53	5,363 18	5 months in operation.
1882	24,410 10	20,207 36	
1883	30,665 94	24,303 62	
1884	53,081 00	40,255 73	
1885	61,381 54	46,541 75	
1886	70,904 08	57,201 95	
1887	73,537 22	52,441 16	
1888	86,242 60	58,213 91	
1889	142,958 01	109,537 13	
1890	153,360 64	137,708 45	
1891	152,633 31	148,475 65	

Present ordinary bonded debt, $3,796,00, at 5 per cent.
Annual interest on bonded debt, $189,800.

INSPECTION OF MILK CANS.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) (for Mr. FEATHERSTON) asked, Whether the Government has issued instructions to the inspectors of Inland Revenue in the Province of Ontario to have all milk cans inspected and stamped in accordance with the Weights and Measures Regulations and Inland Revenue Act? If not, is it the intention of the Government to issue instructions to the inspectors at Toronto and immediate vicinity, to have all milk cans inspected and stamped in compliance with a promise made to the milk producers supplying milk in the city of Toronto and its suburbs?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Department of Inland Revenue has issued instructions to all inspectors of weights and measures in the Dominion respecting the inspection of milk cans. The following is the circular issued in connection therewith:—

"33. G. 371.
M. & M.
8 Gal. Milk Measures.

"INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
"OTTAWA, April 4th, 1892.

"Inspectors of Weights and Measures and their assistants are hereby authorized, under paragraph 'C' of sec. 15 of schedule 'E' of regulations, to verify milk measures of 8 and 8½ gallon capacity when the same are presented for verification, charging therefor the fee specified in paragraph 'C' aforesaid.

"These milk measures must be made of good strong material, free from indentations, and must, when filled up to the neck, contain the exact quantity represented as their capacity; and, like other measures of capacity, must comply with the regulations in having the maker's name and full capacity stamped on some conspicuous part of the measure.

"The verification of these measures must be made with water, either measured in a standard measure, or weighed on a scale known to be perfectly correct.

"As it is intended to establish, expressly for the milk business, a measure of eight gallons' capacity, inspectors are requested, when verifying 8½ gallon measures, to notify the owners of the same that measures of that capacity will not be reverified.

"E. MIALL.
"*Commissioner,*

"To Inspectors and Assistant
"Inspectors of Weights and Measures,
"and to all Milk Dealers."

UNITED STATES VESSELS IN HUDSON BAY.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. CHARLTON) asked, Whether the Government has given consideration

to a report recently made to the Minister of the Interior by Lieutenant Governor Schultz, in which the latter makes the following statement:—

"While American whalers have ceased to visit that part of Keewatin seacoast, south of the mouth of Chesterfield Inlet, it is simply because they have exhausted that area and confined their efforts to the still more northern Canadian waters of Fox and other channels, Rowe's Welcome and Lyon Inlet, leaving the more southern water referred to, in which they had carried on their operations without the slightest reference to the distance from shore: while to enable them to avoid late navigation of Hudson Straits they frequently wintered, as I advised you, in one of the harbours of Marble Island, where they traded to the Esquimaux with goods upon which no duty was paid, thus violating the revenue laws of Canada, and injuring the trade of a Canadian-English Company who traded with goods upon which duties had been paid?"

If so, is it the intention of the Government to make representation of these facts to the arbitrators to whom the Behring Sea question is to be referred for settlement, or to take other steps to prevent a continuance of the alleged poaching and smuggling by United States vessels in Canadian waters in Hudson Bay?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government has not lost sight of this matter, and will take such steps as may seem necessary under the circumstances; but the present is not the most opportune time to announce any action that may seem desirable. As regards the question as to the Behring Sea arbitrators, only the questions which are fixed by treaty can be referred to that tribunal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The whole of Hudson Bay is Canadian water.

DISTRESS IN LABRADOR.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. CHARLTON) asked, Does the Government, in view of the suffering and starvation said to exist among the people upon the Labrador coast, propose to make enquiries as to the truth of the reports with a view to affording relief of such suffering and starvation as reported to be found to exist?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not aware as to what report the question refers to. I do not think any information has reached the Government as to any exceptional distress.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that Bill (No. 44) further to amend the Chinese Immigration Act be transferred from Public Bills and Orders to Government Orders. He said: The circumstance under which I make this motion is that some provision seems to be necessary to prevent fabrication of the certificates under which Chinese are entitled to return to this country. We are under the impression that a great amount of fabrication is carried on in the Chinese Empire, and that the return certificates are sold along with tickets, and under these circumstances we propose to make a regulation on the subject.

Motion agreed to.

THE MENNONITES.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call attention to a letter I received from a member of the Mennonite church, who complained that in the schedules of the census no mention is made of that denomination. The denomination is somewhat large, very respectable and is composed of some of the best citizens of Canada, and Mr. Dirstine complains that they have been overlooked in the census schedules. I ask the Minister of Agriculture to explain how this occurred, and whether the omission can be remedied and the denomination placed in that position to which they and I consider they are entitled to.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman mentioned the matter to me the other day, and I made enquiries of Mr. George Johnson, the census commissioner. He has since written me as follows:—

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
"OTTAWA, 27th June, 1892.

"Hon. JOHN CARLING,
"Minister of Agriculture.

"DEAR SIR,—The Mennonites were classed as Baptists in the different provinces in the census of 1891, inasmuch as the same thing was done in the census of 1871, for the purposes of comparison between the two census takings. When the full volume is published it will show the Mennonites separate and distinct, as was done in the Manitoba census of 1886.

"Yours, &c.,
(Sgd.) "GEO. JOHNSON."

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 90) further to amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. Carling.)

GRANTS TO NORTH-WEST MILITIA.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 96) to make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the militia force in active service in the North-West. He said: Last year land grants were given to the Home Guards at Battleford and Regina. The Act was passed late in the season and the warrants could not issue until November, and consequently the parties who were entitled to the land would have been obliged to make their selections during the winter months. They requested an extension of time, and 6 months' extension was given under this Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How many are covered by the Bill?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Probably 150 or 160.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the extent of the grants made to each?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Each man has the option of either $80 in scrip or 320 acres of land.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are these grants subject to all the conditions of settlement applied in other cases?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are subject to the same conditions.

Mr. DAVIN. The distinction between them and ordinary homesteaders is this: They have to fulfil all the conditions of ordinary homesteaders, but they get the pre-emption without paying for it.

Mr. McMULLEN. What quantity of land will be required to fulfil the conditions of this Bill?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot state at the moment, because some of the parties are professional and business men and will take scrip instead of land.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have all other members of the force who served in the North-West received similar grants?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What quantity of land has altogether been granted for this purpose up to to-day?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not the information, as some parties have taken scrip and others land. I will, however, bring it down before the third reading.

Bill reported.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1893, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, June, 1892.

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF THREE RIVERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of resolution to authorize the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers to raise a sum to be applied to the purchase of wharves or other property, or the construction of wharves or other accommodation for vessels in the harbour of Three Rivers.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers.—(Mr. Foster.)

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law.

(In the Committee.)

On section 687, sub-section 2,

Provided that if a witness whose deposition has been taken and signed in the manner aforesaid is absent from the province, and it is made to appear that his attendance at the trial cannot be had, the court may in its discretion allow such deposition to be likewise read as evidence for the prosecution.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think in every such case it ought to be open to the party on the other side to discredit a witness, although no attempt has been made to discredit him before the magistrate in the preliminary proceedings.

Mr. MULOCK. There is a good deal of objection to this clause. The examination at the preliminary investigation is not as thorough as that at the trial of the case. The preliminary examination is done, the *ex parte* examination frequently taking place without there being any one at all to cross-examine the witness. I view that sub-section with some apprehension. It is practically allowing *ex parte* evidence to be offered under such circumstances.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The ground on which the joint committee recommended it was, that it was after all leaving the matter to the discretion of the judge as to whether he would receive it or not. If it appeared that the witness had not been cross-examined or the prisoner defended, and so forth, the judge would practically refuse to admit it.

Mr. MULOCK. We should be the ones to determine whether, where there has been no cross-examination, evidence should be admissible. I would leave discretion to the judge if there has been cross-examination, but not otherwise. As a matter of principle, we should not admit the doctrine that depositions should be admissible as evidence in the absence of the witness where he has not been cross-examined. If he has been, and the judge is satisfied there has been a thorough examination, let the judge exercise discretion, and admit the evidence. If he thinks the cross-examination has been of a meagre and partial character, he would be acting wisely in refusing to admit it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will not press the section. I think it is highly doubtful.

Section dropped.

On section 691.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Some recent decisions in England have held that where a party has made confessions or admissions to an officer who had him in custody, they are not admissible as evidence. I think that, perhaps, is the fairer rule.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have the Evidence Bill to follow, and will consider the clause then, in the meantime dropping it.

Section dropped.

On section 728,

Mr. MULOCK. That does not meet the whole case. It admits that interference with the jury may produce substantial injury, but there shall be no relief unless discovery takes place before the verdict. If there has been an improper interference with the jury, it ought to be open to the prisoner to show that, even after verdict.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is so now. We endeavour to make some provision later on for a new trial in criminal cases.

Mr. MULOCK. By saying here that disobedience to this rule shall be ground for the discharge of the jury and a new trial in case it is discovered before the verdict, you imply there shall be no relief if discovery takes place after the verdict.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will let that stand. I ask the attention of the committee to the next section, which provides that ten men may find a verdict after four hours.

Mr. MULOCK. There is so much in that it would be wise not to press it this session.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not like the departure from a unanimous verdict.

Mr. MULOCK. Let us see what the country thinks of it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will let it stand for to-day, but the committee were unanimous about it.

On section 744,

Mr. MULOCK. I suggest that this section be not adopted this session, as it proposes very important changes in the criminal law. One of these is with respect to the drawing of inferences in criminal proceedings. There are cases in which juries bring in a verdict of guilty or not guilty and do substantial justice, whereas if they were compelled to answer specifically certain questions, this might not be the case. Another change appears to render a prisoner liable to be retried.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We do not intend to do so.

Mr. MULOCK. This section is, at all events, an innovation in the law as it is to-day. These two questions raised by this section are so important they should be held over and considered at a future time.

Mr. LISTER. There is this to consider: suppose a jury found a verdict of acquittal upon certain facts, upon which the court held the opinion that a conviction should be rendered, will the court order a new trial and that the man be retried? If so, that will be a complete departure from the old law, and I doubt the wisdom of it. The old English rule is, that when once a man is tried and acquitted, that is the end of it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The old rule is, that once a man is put in jeopardy he cannot again be put on trial. Under this section not only might a man be put in jeopardy, but he might be tried again after he has been acquitted.

Mr. MASSON. Personally, I am opposed to submitting questions to juries in criminal cases, and I hold that we should not depart from the old rule. In the committee, however, I stood almost alone in opposing this section. The question of new trials in cases where juries have acquitted might be held over.

Mr. LISTER. The method of submitting questions to juries as carried out under our law is a very unsatisfactory one. The judge after the trial has concluded and when the counsel have addressed the jury, submits certain questions, of which counsel have no information and on which they were unable to address the jury.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will strike out subsection 3; also in sub-section 6 the words: "if the result is acquittal, the accused shall be discharged subject to being arrested again if the court of appeal orders a new trial;" also the words in subsection 4: "unless it considers the application frivolous."

On section 748,

Mr. MASSON. I ask that the grounds for a new trial be extended. At present there can be no such motion except in case where the verdict is against the weight of evidence. I think this right should also be given in case of surprise. It is rarely that a person is convicted against the weight of evidence, but there is danger that he may be convicted for lack of evidence from being taken by surprise.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That would be extending the ground over a very wide area.

On section 749,

Mr. MASSON. This section shifts the responsibility from the Court of Appeal to the Minister of Justice. The application will have to be made to the Minister, and he will take the responsibility of deciding it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The party will have to create a doubt in the mind of the Minister of Justice as to whether the accused was properly convicted or not.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Minister had no such discretion the prisoner would either be discharged when perhaps he should not be discharged or unjustly kept in prison. In cases where there is a substantial doubt, the Minister of Justice will have the matter cleared up and the doubt removed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The question is as to which is the best place to appeal, the Minister of Justice or to the court.

Mr. LISTER. This gives more power to the Minister of Justice than to the court. If the court should refuse to grant a new trial, on the ground that the verdict was contrary to the weight of evidence, then application could be made to the Minister of Justice, and if there was any doubt he would direct a new trial.

Mr. MULOCK. Under section 748 the court of appeal may decide that the verdict is justified by the weight of evidence, but when the matter comes before the Minister of Justice he may decide that there is ground for setting aside the verdict. I think we ought to put the responsibility in one place.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am quite sure the provision will not work in that way. If the Minister of Justice saw that the case was cognizable by the court of appeal he would decline to exercise his power; but after the decision something may arise to throw doubts upon the conviction.

Mr. DICKEY. The only objection I see to this section is that if we apply the term "if the Minister of Justice entertains a doubt," to a review of the evidence given, we are introducing a new term into the law. That might be understood differently by different Ministers of Justice. There are certain definite principles on which the Court of Appeal would interpret that phrase; but there is a good deal of question as to the propriety of introducing that term, so far as the Minister of Justice is concerned, unless we limit it to a doubt produced by something that has arisen subsequent to the trial. I do not think it should be a doubt arrived at by a review of the evidence given at the trial.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have known cases to come before the Minister of Justice in which the parties were discharged without additional evidence having arisen, but in which, if such discharge had not taken place, very great wrong would have been done. In England the Home Secretary, with the aid of the Attorney General and the Solicitor General, is practically a Court of Appeal from all the courts in which the criminal law is administered. In fact, the English law as it now stands, without a proper classification of the cases of homicide, would be a very barbarous law indeed but for the powers possessed by the Home Secretary; and I think that in this country we would require to

make a very great revision of our administration of the law relating to crime, were it not for the very large discretionary powers possessed by the Minister of Justice. The question is whether he ought to have another officer to assist him than the Deputy Minister of Justice. I think there is very great advantage in this provision, unless we made radical changes in the administration of the criminal law.

Mr. MASSON. I think the full powers provided by this section should certainly be in the hands of the Minister of Justice. At present he has either to grant a reduction of the sentence, a discharge of the prisoner, or a refusal; he can only take one of these three courses. This section gives him another privilege, that of referring the case for a new trial, if the application is based on the ground that new facts have been discovered. It might be a case in which it would be very improper either to reduce the sentence or to discharge, unless he were perfectly satisfied that the new evidence was correct. So I think the right to refer for a new trial is quite proper. I do not think, however, that it meets the case I wish to cover by the suggestion I made to extend the scope of section 748. That is confined to new trials being granted where the verdict is contrary to the weight of evidence, and, as I have said, it is very rarely the case that a prisoner is convicted with the weight of evidence in his favour.

Mr. LISTER. I think what is proposed to be done in section 749 is reasonable. It is much better for the Minister of Justice, in case he thinks justice has not been done, to be in a position to direct that a new trial shall take place, than to decide that the verdict of the court was wrong. It would probably be better to have another trial, at which the accused would have an opportunity of bringing forward evidence that would satisfy the judge and jury that he was not guilty or that there was a serious doubt, than that the executive clemency should be exercised.

Mr. FRASER. I know two or three cases in which this provision would have been of great advantage. I remember one case of a man being taken, while the court was in session, on a charge of indecent assault, and he was tried on the following day and found guilty. There was a great deal of feeling and excitement about the case; but when the facts became known to the Minister of Justice, he saw that there was so little real evidence against the accused that he was discharged. This provision would work still better, because there would be no appeal to the clemency of the Minister, but an opportunity for a second trial after the facts became known. I am very much in favour of this section. I know from my own experience that there has been considerable injustice done for the want of such a provision.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have had cases in which it would have been very desirable to have the machinery for a new trial. There was one case in Prince Edward Island of a most atrocious character, if the prisoner really committed the crime. I had no doubt in my own mind that he had, but the conclusive piece of evidence was introduced after the evidence for the defence had been given. It was not evidence in rebuttal. It was evidence as to some clothing having been found in a box in the jury room. I should have liked very much to have tried him again in order to see whether he should be executed. Here is the report which the commissioners make on this subject:

"A much more difficult question arises in relation to cases which occur from time to time, where circumstances throwing doubt on the propriety of a conviction are discovered after the conviction has taken place. In these cases it was provided by the Bill that the Secretary of State should have power to give leave to the person convicted to apply to the court of appeal for a new trial. Upon the fullest consideration of the subject we do not think that such an enactment would be satisfactory. In such a case the court of appeal must either hear the new evidence itself or have it brought before it upon affidavit. In the former case the court would substantially try the case upon a motion for a new trial, and this is opposed to the principle of trial by jury. In the latter case they would have no materials for a satisfactory decision. It is possible to form an opinion on the value of evidence given on affidavit and *ex parte* until it has been checked and sifted by independent inquiry. Such duties could not be undertaken by a court of appeal. If the Secretary of State gave leave to a convict to move the court of appeal for a new trial on evidence brought before the court by affidavit, the only well-ascertained fact before the court would be that the Secretary of State considered that there were grounds for such an explanation. This would make it difficult to refuse the application. The Secretary of State would be responsible only for granting leave to move the court for a new trial. The court, in granting a trial, would always, in fact, take into account the opinion indicated by the Secretary of State's conduct. It must also be remembered that a court of justice in deciding upon such applications would, in order to avoid great abuses, be obliged to bind itself by strict rules, similar to those which are enforced in applications for new trials in civil cases on the ground of newly discovered evidence. Such applications cannot be made at all after the lapse of a very short interval of time, and are not granted if the applicant has been guilty of any negligence; and this stringency is essential to the due administration of justice and to the termination of controversies. It would be unsatisfactory to apply such rules to applications for new trials in criminal cases. No matter at what distance of time the innocence of a convicted person appeared probable, no matter how grossly a man (suppose under sentence of death) had mismanaged his case, it would be impossible to refuse him a fresh investigation on the ground of such lapse of time or mismanagement. Cases in which, under some peculiar state of facts, a miscarriage of justice takes place, may sometimes though rarely occur, but when they occur, it is under circumstances for which fixed rules of procedure cannot provide.

"Experience has shown that the Secretary of State is a better judge of the existence of such circumstances than a court of justice can be. He has every facility for inquiring into the special circumstances; he can, and does, if necessary, avail himself of the assistance of the judge who tried the case, and of the law officers. The position which he occupies is a guarantee of his own fitness to form an opinion. He is fettered by no rule, and his opinion does not form a precedent for subsequent cases. We do not see how a better means could be provided for enquiry into the circumstances of the exceptional cases in question. The powers of the Secretary of State, however, as to the disposing of the cases which come before him are not as satisfactory as his power of enquiring into their circumstances. He can advise Her Majesty to remit or commute a sentence; but, to say nothing of the inconsistency of pardoning a man for an offence on the ground that he did not commit it, such a course may be unsatisfactory. The result of the enquiries of the Secretary of State may be to show, not that the convict is clearly innocent, but that the propriety of the conviction is doubtful: that matters were left out of account which ought to have been considered; or that too little importance was attached to a view of the case, the debating of which was not sufficiently apprehended at the trial. In short, the enquiry may show that the case is one on which the opinion of a second jury ought to be given. If this is the view of the Secretary of State, he ought, we think, to have the right of asking a new trial on his own undivided responsibility.

"Such a power we accordingly propose to give him by section 545."

On section 750,

Mr. MULOCK. Why not put in hard labour? There is no reason why any further part of the

sentence should not be imposed while the appeal is pending.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That means that the sentence shall not be kept in suspension in pursuance of the sentence.

Mr. MULOCK. Not at hard labour.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, the sentence is not to be suspended. That merely means in contrast to his being let out of gaol. We might stop at the word bail.

Mr. MULOCK. We might stop at the word "bail."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It would be sufficient to give discretion to the court about bail and strike out the words "Minister of Justice."

Section, as amended, agreed to.

[At one o'clock the Committee adjourned, and at three o'clock resumed.]

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved a section (752*a*), providing that a court, in cases of extradition, may take such evidence as they may judge best to further the interests of justice.

Mr. MULOCK. This clause is the result of the statement of a case which I made to the Minister of Justice. Last summer a prisoner named Garbett was arrested, charged with an indictable offence committed in the State of Texas. He was brought before the junior judge of the County of York, and there were a number of people in court who were ready to prove that the prisoner was in the town of Wingham at the time he was said to have committed the offence in the State of Texas, but the judge held that all he had to do was to be satisfied that there was a *primâ facie* case, and he accepted the evidence of one person from Texas who identified the accused, and upon that the order for extradition was made, although there was an army of witnesses prepared to testify that the accused was in the Province of Ontario at the time. It was endeavoured to disturb that finding, but the various judges held that they could not interfere with the ruling of the judge, and Mr. Meyer, of Wingham, who was acting for the accused, showed me the injustice of this, and I felt satisfied there was a failure of justice, and that a man has been taken from Canada to a foreign country, without any money in his possession and the witnesses in his behalf being in Canada, and he is extradited on the evidence of a foreigner who is not subject to a prosecution for perjury here, and in fact may never be seen again. At this moment while we are discussing this question a *primâ facie* case might be made out against me by a stranger coming from outside this country, and, though every member of this House who is present were to be in court, his evidence that I was here at the time the offence alleged was committed would not be admissible. I think we should not leave the law in that state, and we should see that substantial justice is done.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In most of the provinces the commitment would be set aside on the ground that the evidence was not properly taken. According to the view adopted in England and in my province, the justice in a proceeding on an indictable offence, is bound to hear the evidence for the accused, and cannot take the committal simply on a *primâ facie* case.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In England there is an express statute authorizing the magistrate to hear the evidence of the party accused, and we have no such provision.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There were decisions long before that law was passed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is now an express statute. When our criminal law was under discussion, we brought that matter to the attention of the Prime Minister at the time, and he thought there was some danger in putting the power in the hands of a magistrate in this country. This section seems to go so far as to suspend the right of *habeas corpus*.

On section 780,

Mr. FRASER. I would suggest that in place of using letters throughout the Act to designate the forms, numerals be used.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object is not to confuse them with the sections, but we can do so, if it is more convenient. I think, perhaps, numerals would be better.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would also be a great improvement if we were to designate the statute by the year of Our Lord, instead of by the year of the reign of the Sovereign.

On section 871,

Mr. DICKEY. I have an amendment to this section which I have submitted to the Minister of Justice. It is merely a formal amendment to make the clause clearer than it is. In sub-section 3 it is proposed to provide for cases in which a conviction is made under an Act which does not prescribe any term of imprisonment in default of payment of a fine. I propose that this sub-section be struck out and that the contents of it be interwoven in sub-sections (*a*) and (*b*).

Amendment agreed to.

On section 961,

Mr. MULOCK. This has not been the law in Canada, and I think it was introduced in England for local reasons.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think a year is rather short. I make it five years, so as to be equivalent to a felony.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY — POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

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

Mr. McMULLEN. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a matter which came up a short time ago in connection with the superannuation of a Dominion Savings Bank official in the Province of New Brunswick. The hon. member for North Brant asked the following question :—

"Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, 1. Whether James Robinson, of the Dominion Savings Bank, St. John, has been superannuated? If so, what allowance is made him? 2. Has H. D. McLeod been appointed to a position in the savings bank at St. John? If so, at what salary? 3. What is Mr. McLeod's age, and has he passed the Civil Service examination as required by law?

"Mr. FOSTER. James Robinson, of the Dominion Savings Bank, St. John, has been superannuated. His allowance is $418 a year. Mr. McLeod has been appoint-

ed to a position in the St. John Savings Bank, at a salary of $1,100. I don't know Mr. McLeod's age. He has not passed the Civil Service examination. The hon. gentleman is not quite correct in stating the fact in the latter part of the third question."

Now, I wish to call the attention of the Houss to another statement of the Finance Minister with regard to those savings banks. In the Committee of Supply last year I drew his attention to the fact that there had been a reduction during the year in the amount voted for the maintenance of those savings banks. And the Finance Minister replied:

"That is because, according to our policy, these savings banks are being absorbed into the post office savings banks whenever by death or other cause the incumbent for the time being vacates the office. By this means, we save a considerable portion of that vote, and add very little expense to the management of the post office savings banks."

I replied:

"I am glad to learn the Government are going to carry out that policy. Has this reduction been caused by the death of any of the office holders?"

The Minister of Finance replied:

"We transferred three savings banks last year, the keepers of two having died and one keeper having resigned."

I should like very much to see the Finance Minister carry out that policy in connection with the St. John Savings Bank as well as those referred to on this occasion. I admit that the sum deposited in that particular savings bank is very large. It is one of the established Receiver General's offices for the Dominion, but at the same time I think it highly desirable that all those offices should be abolished, and that we should adopt a different means for receiving money. For instance, we could take the same means as you do in Ontario, and I cannot see any necessity for putting the country to the expenditure incurred in the maintenance of those offices. We have something like 39 altogether in the Dominion, which cost last year for salaries $58,600, or an average of $1,500 each. The Finance Minister may say that we have an enormous amount of money on deposit in St. John, the largest amount in any office in the Dominion, something like $3,500,000, the next largest being Halifax. But the amount on deposit in these banks is rapidly decreasing. In 1889 it was $19,500,000, and it is down, I notice by the recent returns, to something like $16,000,000, so that there is an actual reduction of $3,000,000. Why is it considered necessary, after the statement I have quoted, to still continue these savings banks in their present state? I would also like to know why it is necessary to superannuate the clerk who has been superannuated in the St. John office? He was only 62 years of age, and there are many members in this House, and even some Ministers of the Crown, over that age, who are efficiently discharging their duties. Not only that, but I find that the hon. gentleman is giving the incumbent now discharging the duties of the position the same salary as the gentleman who occupied it before. He has placed a man in charge at $1,100 per year as accountant or assistant clerk in the Receiver General's office at St. John to replace the official who was superannuated, though only 62 years of age, and to whom he is giving an allowance of something like $418 per year, thus increasing the actual expenditure by the amount of the superannuation allowance. The Minister may say that the intention he expressed was with regard to country savings banks; but I would like to know why the policy he indicated should not be carried out with regard to city savings banks as well. He could easily utilize the chartered banks to receive the money for the Government and to pay it out from time to time wherever they have agencies, taking the Government cheques free of charge, and I think that is one of the provisions of their renewed charters. If we have the advantage, I cannot see why we should not use it rather than be adding about $58,000 a year to any expenditure for the officials in some 39 savings banks. I thought it my duty to draw the attention of the House to the promise made by the Finance Minister with regard to those savings banks. I should like to see them all abolished and their accounts transferred to the post offices, where they can be very easily handled. In the Toronto post office savings bank there is about $1,250,000 on deposit, about one-half the amount deposited at St. John: and if the clerks can handle that sum safely and to the satisfaction of the people at Toronto, I cannot see why the post office department in St. John cannot handle the money deposited in the Government bank in that city with equal facility.

Mr. FOSTER. My explanation will be very brief and, I think, very satisfactory. In the first place, I wish to disabuse my hon. friend's mind of this impression that the promise I made upon the occasion to which he refers, and which was made in the discussion about country savings banks, had reference to what we call our Assistant Receiver General's offices, which are quite different not only on account of the amount of money on deposit there, which is a minor matter, and which the banks or post offices could very well handle, but by reason of functions which these banks exercise and which are very different from those exercised by the country savings banks, regarding which the discussion then arose and with reference to which my promise was made. It has been the policy of the Government for the last four years that whenever any one of the country savings banks, which have not the functions that attach to the Receiver General's offices in the cities, falls in, either by the death of the incumbent or his resignation or any other cause, we attach that at once to the post office, because all such banks are simply banks for the receipt and payment of deposits. This can be done equally well by the post office savings banks, and it is the policy of the Government to call in gradually, as those circumstances allow, all the Dominion savings banks which are not Receivers General's offices. So much with reference to that. My hon. friend will see that if he took that permission as extending to Receivers General's offices, he received a wrong impression. Naturally I would not then have spoken of the Receivers General's offices, because we were discussing simply the question of country savings banks. I do not hold out any hope of the transfer of the Assistant Receiver General's office at Halifax, St. John, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Victoria, B.C., to the Post Office Department, simply because it would not, in the first place, be a saving, and in the second place, it would be very cumbersome and inconvenient. The Assistant Receivers General's offices in these cities are the instrumentalities between us and the business community, so

far as the circulation of our silver and copper coinage and bank bills are concerned, and it is this function which specially belongs to them and occupies the greater part of their time. This they will have still to carry out, and I do not think, if my hon. friend will look into it, that he would find it either economy or good policy to transfer these offices in the way he indicates. It is true that Mr. Robertson was superannuated. He was, however, not superannuated on account of age, but on account of his ill-health. For several years, a large proportion of his time each year has been taken up with leave of absence, and in that way he could not perform the work of a steady and competent clerk, and in the end he applied for superannuation on account of ill-health, and was superannuated for that cause alone. It is true that Mr. McLeod was appointed and at the same salary. It is also true that there is a vacancy of another clerk at $900, which I have not filled, because I wished to see first whether, by putting in a clerk whose health was good, it would be necessary to fill up the two vacancies. It may be necessary or it may not be, but I am at present saving a salary of $900 there. Other changes will take place, and, after the reorganization takes place there, I shall be glad for the hon. gentleman to see if on the ground of efficiency or economy I have made any error.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think we ought to have some definite statement from the Government as to the railway subsidies which they propose to bring down. If the amount should be very considerable, it will be a very burdensome charge upon the public resources of the country. It is now near the close of the session, and before the House votes any additional subsidies it should know the merits of the cases for which these grants are sought. There is very little opportunity now left for this. The members in the different localities may know the grounds on which the subsidies are proposed, but there may be some delay required to enable other members to acquire the information, and there should be some time given to enable us to obtain that information, and it is simply postponing, perhaps for a very considerable time, the conclusion of the session, if the amounts should be considerable and the number of railways to which aid is given should be great, unless the information is speedily before us. We ought immediately to know what the intention of the Government is. We have been in session four months last Thursday, and to have a matter of such importance as this still kept back is in the highest degree objectionable. If we are to make appropriations of this sort, charges upon the public revenue in aid of private enterprises, using the capital of the people of this country in order to improve the private property of individuals or corporations, we ought to know it early in the session, and ought to have some time to make ourselves acquainted with the merits of the proposals. To bring down such measures at this stage is to endeavour to prevent the House from discharging its most ancient and most important function, and I think this is a fitting opportunity for the Government to give the House information on the subject, or, if they are prepared to inform us—which I have no doubt would be the most welcome announcement they could make to a large number of the House—that they are not going to propose any railway subsidies this year at all, it would facilitate the remaining work of the session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The resolutions referring to the railway subsidies will be laid on the Table to-morrow. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will be gratified to learn that the number of railways it is proposed to aid will not be great, and that the total sum which these subsidies comprise will not be large.

I. C. R.—AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS.

Mr. MULOCK. I have heard it stated that recently the Government has caused an enquiry to be made into certain transactions of the Intercolonial Railway, that the Auditor General or some other auditor has been enquiring into the alleged arrears of moneys owing to that railway. I am told that the result of the investigation shows a very large sum of money owing to the Government for freights over that railway. I desire to enquire if that is the case; if so, the extent of the arrearages, and the reason why they have been allowed to accumulate?

Mr. FOSTER. All I can say in answer to that is that no special enquiry has been ordered. The Auditor General, in pursuance of his duty as auditor of all accounts of revenue and expenditure of the Government, has been engaged in the last fortnight in making a thorough audit of the Intercolonial Railway accounts. That is in pursuance of a plan of his own which has been gradually taking in all the expenditures of the country, and also in pursuance of a request of my own that he should make a thorough audit of all the expenditures of the Intercolonial Railway. He has now returned, but he has not yet made his report to me or even indicated verbally to me any extended observations as to what he has found. If the hon. gentleman has information that the arrearages are very large or are not large, he has access to informations which are denied to me. The Auditor General is making out his report, and, when it is in my hands, we shall see whether the surmises of my hon. friend are proved correct or not. One thing I may say, and that is that the audit will be a thorough one, will go into all the branches of expenditure, and will give all the details of expenditure as far as the Auditor General and his aids can give them.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman says that I must have access to sources of information which are denied to him. I do not know what he means by that. I have heard this stated as common rumour. I have not received any information from the Auditor General. I was not aware that the Auditor General had made the investigation, but I heard that an investigation had been made and that the amount of arrears was somewhere in the neighbourhood of $400,000. Is that about the amount so far as the hon. Minister knows?

Mr. FOSTER. As I have told the hon. gentleman, I am unable to state.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the report be laid on the Table before prorogation?

THE REDISTRIBUTION BILL.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When does the hon. Minister of Justice propose to bring up the Redistribution Bill again?

Mr. MULOCK. He said to-day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said not before Monday. The Bill is before the law clerk at present, and all I understood my hon. friends opposite to wish was that they should have a few days' notice before it was again brought up.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is important to know whether the Government propose to make any further changes in this House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I shall be able to state that to-morrow.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Because it is desirable not only to know what they propose to do with the Bill in this House, but also what the Senate may do with the Bill, as early as possible.

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

(In the Committee.)

Steam communication with the Magdalen Islands..... ...$8,600

Mr. FOSTER. The increase of $600 is due to the larger number of trips. This service is paid for at so much per trip, and the seasons vary. Some seasons open earlier and close later than others, and two or three more trips may be made.

Steam communication between Canso, Arichat, Port Hood and Mabou and such other places between above limits as may be agreed upon, touching daily at Port Mulgrave, and also to provide for continuance of service during winter, on the Port Mulgrave and Canso section $4,000

Mr. FOSTER. It has been decided to run from now up to the end of the season, as follows:—Mulgrave and Guysborough, once a week; Arichat and Canso, once a week; Port Hood, twice a week.

Mr. FRASER. On what day is the boat to run to Guysborough?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell.

Mr. FRASER. I think it is a mistake to take the boat off Guysborough. There is a large fishing trade from Guysborough as well as from Canso. While I think Canso is not getting too much, I would like also that Guysborough should get as much as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to be impossible to do both.

Mr. FRASER. I think in fine weather she could make a trip to Arichat and Canso and Guysborough. I have had a good deal of representation made about this matter, and I would like the Government to enquire into it.

Mr. FOSTER. I will do that.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to know what was the reason for changing the route of the boat?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows that Guysborough lies fairly close to the railway and has communication in that way—I forget the exact distance—about 12 miles.

Mr. FRASER. It is nearer 30 miles. Arichat is only 9 miles from the ferry?

Mr. FOSTER. Arichat is not served by that.

Mr. FRASER. It is served by the lake boats which run every day. Arichat is only 9 miles from the ferry, where the boat through the lakes calls every day, going and coming, and Guysborough is 26 miles from the railway at Heatherton. Boats run through the Lennox passage every day, both ways, within 9 miles of Arichat.

Mr. FOSTER. The boat does not stop at Arichat.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to know if there is no better reason than that why the boat was changed from Guysborough? I do not say but it is right, because Canso is a thriving place, but both being in the County of Guysborough, I would like the town of Guysborough to be better served also. It is a matter that affects Guysborough very materially. It is not so well situated as Arichat to catch the boats that run through the lake. I want to be able to tell the people of Guysborough why the boat is taken away from them once a week.

Mr. FOSTER. It was to give a somewhat fair accommodation to all parties. Canso is thriving and has a good deal of business. It got but two trips per week before, and Arichat the same—if I am not mistaken. We wished to give Canso, in some way, on account of its trade, a larger facility for carrying on its business, and a great deal of correspondence ensued. I found it was impossible to do that without taking away one trip from Guysborough. We keep up communication with Guysborough, although the trade is not very large, but it is on the direct line with Canso by way of Port Mulgrave. That communication, together with the railway communication of which the people of Guysborough can avail themselves, seems to be a fair arrangement.

Mr. FRASER. I understand the boat goes to Canso two days a week.

Mr. FOSTER. Three times a week.

Mr. FRASER. Formerly it went twice to Canso, twice to Guysborough and twice to Port Hood. Why should not the boat at least go every other week to Guysborough in place of Arichat? She calls three times at Arichat, where they have communications with other steamers. The nearest point of railway communication for the people of Guysborough is 27 miles distant, at Heatherton, from which the coach runs. It is 24 miles to Mulgrave, but no stage runs there. It seems unfair that three trips a week should be made to Arichat, which is within 9 miles of the ferry, and only one trip to Guysborough. I may say that the population of Guysborough is much larger than that of Arichat.

Mr. FOSTER. I have had a great deal of correspondence in order to get this matter placed in better shape. I should be very glad to give Guysborough another trip. I thought the claims of Canso were very strong. If the boat could make every alternate week a second trip to Guysborough, I should be very glad. I will attend to the matter.

Mr. FRASER. I do not think Canso has any too much accommodation, but a number of steamers call at Canso from Halifax on their way to Prince Edward Island, and if it could be arranged so that two trips would be made to Canso and Arichat

each week, with alternate trips to Guysborough, that would be fair to all districts.

Mr. FOSTER. I will look into the matter and see what can be done.

Steam communication between San Francisco and Victoria, B.C..... $17,640

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the Minister of Finance any information as to the value of the cargoes carried between these two points ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to know what business is being done, and in that way ascertain what public interest is being promoted.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not a question so much of public service as of a condition of which the hon. gentleman is well acquainted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is of very great importance to know the volume of trade in all cases when we subsidize steamers.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman on that point, and in every contract into which I have entered, I have made it a condition that the vessels shall furnish the Government with copies of their manifests. I have this information with respect to vessels under contracts.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is there any record of the number of trips the vessel makes between San Francisco and Victoria ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no record. I know the vessel sails and performs the fortnightly trip.

Mr. FRASER. I remember last session I urged that this was one of the cases into which the Government should enquire, especially in view of the changed conditions under which this subsidy was granted.

Mr. FOSTER. Although the circumstances have changed, the condition has not changed, and under its wording we have no power to cancel the service. We did go to work three or four years ago, when Mr. McLelan was Postmaster General, and negotiations were opened between that hon. gentleman and the company, but after they had proceeded a certain distance the hon. gentleman found it was a matter between this Government and the people of British Columbia as a whole, and consequently he could not act.

Mr. FRASER. The condition was based on the state of facts which then existed. It was necessary at that time to have this service in order to secure communication with the rest of the Dominion. Now that the Canadian Pacific Railway is built, the conditions are entirely changed. Moreover, there is now railway communication between British Columbia and San Francisco. Why, then, should this Dominion pay a subsidy which does not serve the purpose intended, when the people of British Columbia have the Canadian Pacific Railway by which to reach other portions of the Dominion ? Undoubtedly very few people in that province use this steam service by which to come to Ottawa or any other part of Canada. It was necessary at the time it was granted, but the facts have entirely changed, and it should not be continued when the service fulfils no useful purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. It can scarcely be said that the service fulfils no useful purpose. When Mr. McLelan was negotiating with the company, they declared their willingness to keep on the boat, even though the subsidy was not granted. The state of facts has changed but the terms of the condition which was made with British Columbia have not changed, and unless the province chooses to change it, we cannot of our own motion change it. I should very much prefer that this amount of $17,600 should be devoted to some other purpose in British Columbia, which I think would be of greater benefit to the province, such for instance as improving postal communications with other districts not well served. However, the decision in this matter does not rest with us alone. If any arrangement of the kind I have suggested can be made, I shall be glad.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not accept the Minister's interpretation of our obligation. This subject was discussed last year. My impression is that the well-known legal maxim applies—where the reason ceases, the rule ceases; and if the Government can make it clear, as I think they can, that when that arrangement was made with British Columbia it was for the purpose of establishing communication between British Columbia and other portions of the Dominion, and that as a more effective means of communication had been established, that arrangement is at an end. My opinion is that a court would so hold. The Government ought not to acquiesce in the opposite contention. They might very easily frame a case and have the matter submitted to the Supreme Court, and if all the facts were stated, it could be shown that this arrangement was entered into for a purpose, that it was not an ordinary arrangement relating to nothing beyond the receipt of money. I have not looked over last year's debate, but I am strongly of the opinion that the subsidy cannot be upheld, as improved means of communication have now been established.

Mr. FOSTER. The stipulation is very explicit:

"The Dominion will provide an efficient mail service fortnightly, by steam communication between Victoria and San Francisco, and twice a week between Victoria and Olympia. The vessels to be adapted for the convenience of freight and passengers."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Even accepting the absolute construction; supposing there was a war between this country and the United States how are you going to fulfil that bargain ?

Mr. FOSTER. Do not suppose that, it is cruel.

Mr. BOWELL. In case of war the steamer could not run and would not earn the subsidy.

Mr. FRASER. She would probably not come back after her first trip. Be that as it may, it is clear that the intention was to give communication to San Francisco and the Union Central Pacific Railway, the only road then in operation. Since that, the Northern Pacific has been built and can be reached within a few miles from British Columbia. What reason is there now for running a boat to San Francisco ? Surely at this time when the circumstances have so materially changed we ought to be able to do something in the line of getting rid of this annual payment. I cannot agree with the contention of the Minister of Finance that the money might be diverted and given to British Columbia for other purposes, but even that would be preferable because it would open up the country. The fact that the company have stated that they

would run a boat even if they did not get a subsidy, shows that the previous subsidies have so established the line that it does not need a subsidy any longer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is another point which ought to be remembered by the Government. This steam communication is now diverting traffic from the Canadian Pacific Railway to the American lines, and it is a question of some importance as to whether the Government should subsidize a feeder to the American lines in opposition to the Canadian Pacific Railway which was constructed by the money of the people of this country.

Mr. GORDON. This steamship service is of great importance commercially, and it was because of its commercial importance at the time of the Union that this condition was proposed. It seems very strange that hon. gentlemen opposite should wish to put an end to this subsidy of $17,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You have no commerce between the United States and Canada; there is a tariff barrier which puts an end to that.

Mr. GORDON. I beg your pardon, we have, and if the manifest of the Pacific Mail Company's steamer was laid before the House, you would find that her manifest alone would equal the trade of many of your ports either of Ontario or the Maritime Provinces. There is a very roundabout way of getting at the terminal Pacific railway facilities with San Francisco. If you make that round you have to go to Vancouver and down to Portland, Oregon, through the State of Washington, through the State of Oregon, and over the mountains of California to San Francisco. That is a route which commerce does not take. Every time these steamers visit British Columbia, they take their coal there and frequently carry cargoes of coal to San Francisco, so that their trade is very important. I am astonished to think that hon. gentlemen opposite should object to this solemn compact being carried out with British Columbia, at a time when all the provinces of Canada are endeavouring to promote trade and commerce in every direction. These hon. gentlemen might as well attempt to cancel the terms of union with every other province. I may point out that our contributions to the revenue which were so small when we entered Confederation, are now three to one per head of the population as compared with any other province of the Dominion. When this obligation was entered upon by the Dominion it cost $54,000 a year, but it has been reduced by this Government until it is now cut down to something over $17,000. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will not persist in their opposition to this subsidy.

Mr. FORBES. Do I understand from the hon. gentleman that when British Columbia entered into the union, the Dominion assumed the obligation to subsidize that line?

Mr. GORDON. No particular line.

Mr. FORBES. Why is it then that the Government should subsidize an American line running from a port in Canada to an American port, when we have two lines in the Province of Nova Scotia owned by Canadians which are not so handsomely treated?

Mr. FOSTER. Send them out there and we will give them a chance to compete.

Mr. FORBES. That is the only place I believe they can get a chance. If this subsidy is paid as part of the price of the bond of union, I understand it, but if it is solely on the ground of encouraging trade, I fail to see why the Dominion should pay it. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether any application has ever been made on behalf of the Yarmouth Steamship Company or Canada Atlantic Steamship Company to subsidize a steamboat line between Nova Scotia and the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. "Ever" is a long time, and I cannot answer that; but it has not been made during my time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am somewhat surprised at the indignation of my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Gordon). He considers that it is vital to British Columbia that she should trade with San Francisco. I agree with him that the trade of San Francisco is important, and I believe it would be in the interest of this country to furnish facilities for foreign trade. But that is not the policy for which my hon. friend votes in this House. Every opportunity that my hon. friend gets he votes for higher tariffs, and he seeks to put an impediment in the way of trade with the United States.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am speaking to the question. The hon. member says that it is important we should have this trade with San Francisco, and I agree with him in that, but what I understood from the Minister was that this line of American steamers would be continued on this route whether it received a subsidy or not. Then why should my hon. friend wish to be so generous? It does not help British Columbia if the line of steamers would be continued under any circumstances, but simply helps a line of steamboats in San Francisco, and gives them larger dividends than they would otherwise have. I do not propose that British Columbia shall have fewer outlets for her trade than she now has. I would be glad to see them extended, but I think, if this line of steamers would be maintained without this subsidy, that better use of the money could be made in the interests of British Columbia and of the whole Dominion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was understood when we built the Canadian Pacific Railway that we should have an all-rail route through our own territory. Now we are diverting the trade from that route. If the money has to be used, it had better be used in developing the resources of British Columbia, especially if the steamer will run without the subsidy. My hon. friend from Nanaimo seems to have developed a wonderful interest in the steamship line from San Francisco.

For three lines of steamers running between the ports of Halifax and St. John, N.B., or either, and the West Indies and South America.....	$103,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Finance whether he has any statement with regard to the amount of the trade between the West Indies and the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. FOSTER. The trade has increased very materially during the past year and is constantly increasing from trip to trip. The cargoes on "C" service,

outward, beginning with the eleventh trip, were valued as follows:—The eleventh trip, on 6th July, 1891, $17,878; the twelfth trip, on 12th July, $17,844; the thirteenth trip, on 20th August, $31,202; the fourteenth trip, in September, $52,434; the fifteenth trip, in October, $40,638; the sixteenth trip, in November, $38,035; the seventeenth trip, in December, $45,100; the eighteenth trip, in January, $31,717; the nineteenth trip, in February, $56,046; the twentieth trip, in March, $44,064; the twenty-first trip, in April, $49,936. The average is largely in excess of that of the preceding year. The cargoes are varied, taking in chairs, organs, hardware, matches, eggs, all sorts of agricultural produce, lobsters, syrups, lard, bread, hams, baking powder, extracts, varnish, drugs, brooms, groceries of different kinds, pianos, mattresses, camp chairs, carriages, biscuits, apples, fish, machinery, paper, furniture, cars, sawdust, extracts of beef, wooden goods of different kinds, paints and paint oils, wire mattresses, &c.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The return cargoes?

Mr. FOSTER. The return cargoes, as my hon. friend knows, are not so valuable or so heavy. I have not the values of the cargoes inwards. They consist, however, of sugar, molasses, potatoes from Bermuda in season, cocoa, cocoanuts, oranges, bananas, other fruits of different kinds, liquors, hides, lime juice, and packages unenumerated.

Mr. HAZEN. Here is a statement of the cargo that went out from St. John on the 16th of June, published in the St. John *Globe*. In the cargo were included carriages, 195 bundles of laths, 149 pieces of scantling, 193 bags of sawdust, 5 cases of canned goods, 1,000 onion crates, 50 bundles of hay, 6 tubs of butter, 500 boxes smoked herrings, 20 crates of potatoes, one barrel of beans, 10 boxes of dry fish, and so on—a very large cargo.

Mr. FOSTER. The eleven cargoes of which I read the details, amounted to $425,434, nearly half a million dollars.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. Has the hon. gentleman the figures as to return cargoes from the West Indies?

Mr. FOSTER. I have the quantities but not the values.

Mr. LAURIER. Is there any reason why you have not the values? Perhaps that is significant.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I thought they were there but they are not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is there anything of consequence besides the sugar which the refiners bring back?

Mr. FOSTER. Take for instance, voyage No. 11, the first of the fiscal year 1891-92. There are 100 hogsheads of sugar, 3 tons of molasses, 1,746 bushels of potatoes, 55 bags of cocoanuts, 21 crates of fruits, 35 barrels, 6 hogsheads, 20 tons of liquors, 34 empty casks, 2 cases of preserves, three casks and 2 barrels brass, half a barrel lead, one case merchandise. Take voyage No. 13. 38 hogsheads sugar, 150 puncheons of molasses, 102 bushels of potatoes, 1,969 bags of potatoes, 100 bags of cocoanuts, 10,000 cocoanuts, 19 crates of oranges, 15 bunches of bananas, 41 crates of fruit, 30 tons and 15 barrels of liquor, *lignum vitæ*, a number of packages of merchandise, bananas, brass, copper and lead. That is from the "C" service. Some of the voyages show larger and some very much smaller returns.

Mr. McMULLEN. When was the contract for this subsidy entered into, and for how long?

Mr. FOSTER. Two years ago, and for five years.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was the contract submitted to Parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, with all the papers, and discussed for a long while.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the trade with the West Indies satisfactory to the Minister? Is it growing as he would like to see it?

Mr. FOSTER. It is advancing.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice in the Trade and Navigation Returns, taking the period of 1875, 1876 and 1877, that we exported these three years goods to the value of $11,409,648 for the West Indies, and in 1885, 1886 and 1887, we exported only $6,582,269 worth, showing a falling off in the latter period of $4,827,415. Is that what the hon. gentleman regards as satisfactory? Has our trade with other countries fallen off in the same proportion, and is that satisfactory? I think the Minister will have to go down to the Islands and stay there, as we have not yet seen anything very beneficial accrue from his mission, nor from that of the late commissioner sent there. There has to be some change in our tariff, or this trade will dwindle into insignificance.

Mr. STAIRS. There may be some causes to explain the falling off to which the hon. gentleman alludes. Very likely there is a large amount of goods going to the West Indies from Canada in latter years indirectly which previously went by direct shipment. There is a large amount now going in an indirect way, which fifteen years ago went by direct shipment. It is well known to all in the West India trade, a trade in which I am not directly interested, that during late years steamships have developed to an enormous extent, and at present there are about 100 steamers sailing from New York to different points in the West Indies while twelve or fifteen years ago there were comparatively few. During later years a very large amount of business has been diverted by way of New York, and that is a strong argument in favour of our establishing a steam service from this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite must not be too impatient if it takes a good while to work up business by these steamship lines. I feel gratified at the development of the exports of Canada, for it is in those that we are more directly interested. It appears, according to the figures given by the hon. gentleman, that our exports are not as large now as they were many years ago, but I think if he went into this question he would find the falling off is partly due to the cause I have given. If he will turn up the statistics of 10 or 15 years ago, he will find the larger amount of the exports of Canada consisted of fish

and lumber, I do not think there was any considerable quantity of manufactured goods. Now, I understand that one of the objects in the establishment of steam service was not so much in the interests of the Maritime Province and our exports of fish and lumber, because very little rough lumber is shipped by steamer, as to promote the export of flour and manufactured goods; and from what has been said by the hon. Minister, that trade is growing. I have a rough memorandum before me which gives some of the exports to the West Indies of manufactured goods of Canada for the last nine months. This memorandum was prepared about the latter end of March. These exports included 245 horses, 2,500 tons of hay, 20,000 barrels of flour, 1,200 hogsheads of ale, 2,650 bags of oats, 750 packages of furniture, 945 packages of different kinds of manufactured goods including dry goods, clothing, machinery, boots and shoes, printed matter, organs, pianos, carriages, &c. It may be said that these are not very large quantities, and for some of the articles they are not, but hon. gentlemen opposite must bear in mind that it takes a long time to divert trade from one channel to another, and this trade has been largely held hitherto by the merchants of the United States. It is well worth the efforts of our Canadian merchants to try and secure this trade, but it cannot be done at the present time by sailing vessels which in years gone by did such a large amount of business between Nova Scotia and the West Indies. If we are to increase our exports in manufactured goods it must be done by steamship lines. Into the ports at which the steamships of the Windward line trade, that is the "C" service, there were imported each year about 755,000 barrels of flour and 44,000 barrels of bread,—the memo. says that the bread was baked principally from the lower grades of flour; 16,000 barrels of split pease, 25,000 bags round pease, and in addition large quantities of cheese and butter. Nearly all of these imports have gone previously from the United States to these Islands, and I think we in Canada would be able to supply almost the whole of them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does the hon. gentleman wish to convey the idea that these goods now appear to the credit of the export of the United States?

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. gentleman will notice that most of these articles to which I refer are produced in Ontario and the upper provinces, but until these steamship lines were established Canada secured but a small portion of the trade of the West Indies in these articles. The question of the export of flour to the West Indies is a very important one, as hon. gentlemen opposite will see. The ports of the Windward Islands take in a year about 750,000 barrels, and the other ports in the West Indies must take even a larger quantity. For many years it was doubted whether Canadian flour would keep in the West Indies and would suit the market, but owing to the efforts made particularly at the Jamaica Exhibition, and also by commercial travellers representing our business men who visit the ports of the West Indies, the merits of Canadian flour are becoming pretty well known, and I believe our trade in that article is fairly established. I trust I may be permitted now to read a short extract from a letter from a Barbadoes firm with reference to Canadian flour. It says:

"As far as the flour itself was concerned, there was not much left to be desired. It was white, soft and smooth, and compared favourably with such brands as "Superlative" and "White light" two of the principal fancy brands coming here from New York."

I feel confident that perseverance and enterprise will secure to Canadian manufacturers a very large trade with these West Indian Islands, and to my mind it will be secured largely through the establishment of lines of steamers, which at first must be maintained by the system we have adopted in the way of subsidies.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In looking through this list presented by the Minister of Finance as to the inward cargoes, I find that sometimes the steamers seem to have returned without any cargo at all, or next to nothing. In February, 1891, the cargo brought back to Halifax was 100 boxes of cocoa and nothing else. On the 8th of April, the cargo was 125 puncheons of molasses, eight bags of cocoa nuts and 13 boxes of oranges. Coming to the year 1892, I find, that St. John on the 7th January received as an inward cargo, two boxes of oranges, and that was all. On the 18th March the cargo to St. John was nothing at all; there was nothing brought back. The cargo on the 19th of April to St. John was nothing at all; there is the entry of the vessel and that is all. On the 20th May there were 579 puncheons of molasses, 100 bags of cocoa and 109 bunches of bananas only. On the 21st of June, there were 425 puncheons of molasses and five barrels of oranges. I notice all through that there is next to nothing imported into St. John. Halifax in some cases is a little better, but even in Halifax there seems to be occasionally the return of a vessel with scarcely any cargo, so that whatever may be the outward-bound trade, there seems to be next to nothing brought back, and what little is brought back, so far as I can see, consists of liquors, sugars and molasses. I suppose the sugar and molasses are for refining purposes in Canada. But there are certainly indications that there is very little importation into Canada from the West India Islands. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) referred to the exportation of flour to the West India Islands, but it seems to be to a very small extent. I find there were 62 barrels from St. John, in July, 1891; 50 barrels from Halifax, in August; 36 barrels from St. John in August; 51 barrels from Halifax on the 27th August, and 36 in St. John, and on the 17th September, 579 barrels from Halifax. The largest number I see entered was on the 12th February, this year, 3,685.

Mr. STAIRS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what is the latest return?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The latest return from St. John is five barrels, on April 14th; April 9th, from Halifax, 1,942 barrels; in March there were 2,452 barrels from Halifax; nothing from St. John; in February there were 166 barrels from St. John, and 3,685 from Halifax. So that the quantity of flour sent to the West India Islands has been very little so far, indeed. However, the outward-bound cargo is larger than the inward-bound, according to the returns which the Minister has brought down. The inward-bound is certainly so insignificant that it would be hardly worth while to take it into account.

Mr. STAIRS. I think there must be some misunderstanding as to the quantity of flour that has been shipped. I have a return here from a firm in Halifax which gives the shipments they made themselves in some of the late trips. The steamer that sailed on the 11th March this year took 1,800 barrels of flour and pease from Halifax to some of the Windward Islands, for one firm; the steamer that sailed on the 7th April took 1,200 barrels; the vessel that left on the 17th of May took 600 barrels of flour and pease from this one firm. The total shipments from Halifax for these sailings were 3,730 barrels on the 11th March; 2,296 barrels on the 7th April; and 1,435 barrels on the 17th May. Besides that, I was under the impression that there was a much larger quantity shipped from St. John, and the merchants from Halifax complained very much that a good deal of the flour they had shipped was shut out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Scarcely anything from St. John.

Mr. STAIRS. I am correct that some went, because a good deal was shut out from Halifax that could have gone, and after the sailing that took place on the 17th of May, there were 450 barrels shipped by one sailing vessel, 1,075 by another, and 450 by the steamer *Havana*. I am assured by my correspondent in Halifax, that were it not that a good deal of flour had been shut out by these late trips, a much larger quantity would have been sent. With reference to what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stated about return cargoes, of course that is one of the difficulties in connection with this service. It is hard for the steamers to get return cargoes, and that is one of the reasons why the Government have granted a subsidy, but we trust that in time these return cargoes will be developed. There is a large amount of products from the West Indies coming into Canada in an indirect way through the United States, that might just as well come direct to our own ports. It takes time to secure this, but we can do it if we have patience.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have the Trade and Navigation Returns for the year ending 1891 which speak of the large growth of trade with the West Indies from the Province of Ontario. The British West Indies imported from the Province of Ontario, of the mines, nothing; of the fisheries, nothing; of the forests, $3,822; animals and their produce, $1,184; agricultural products, $32,813; manufactures, $41,303—of this $720 is not the produce of Canada; miscellaneous articles, $879; or a total of $80,001, from the Province of Ontario. From the Province of Quebec there were shipped, of the mines, nothing; of the fisheries, $27,742; of the forest, $14,562; of animals and their produce, nothing; agricultural products, $167; manufactures, $6,034; total, $48,445. From the Province of Nova Scotia there were shipped, of the mines, $15,505; of the fisheries, $1,031,703; of the forest, $520,223; of animals and their produce, $10,347; of agricultural products, $26,239; of manufactures, $92,892; total, $1,397,909 from the Province of Nova Scotia. So we see that the trade is of very minor consequence to the other provinces, and it has been fallling off with Nova Scotia as compared with what it formerly was.

Mr. McMULLEN. While the member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) endeavoured to impress upon the House the importance of the export trade from the Maritime Provinces to the West India Islands, I may say that had it not been for the influence that was exercised by the sugar refiners of the Maritime Provinces in order to lower the standard of the imports of sugar from 16 Dutch standard to 14, the probabilities are that we would have had a much larger trade with the West India Islands. The Minister of Finance went down there, no doubt, with an honest purpose of entering into trade relations, but owing to the fact that his hands were tied by the sugar refiners of the country, when these people came here with the anticipation of doing a trade with Canada, they were met by the reply that none of their sugar could be admitted into our ports above 14 Dutch standard. The result is, that after subsidizing a line of steamers to work up a trade between Canada and those Islands in order to protect the interests of the sugar refiners, the profit was cut down to a point that prevented these people from entering into extended trade with us, taking from us the commodities that they required and that we could lucratively send them, and we taking from them the commodities we required. The money spent on that commission was entirely thrown away, because the Finance Minister being hampered by the influences exercised upon him by the sugar refiners, the whole scheme fell through. Now, I have no doubt the steamship subsidy is quite an advantage to the refiners. I have no doubt that they get their raw material——

Mr. STAIRS. Not at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no doubt that they get their raw material carried for very much less than they otherwise would.

Mr. STAIRS. Not at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman may say so.

Mr. STAIRS. I know it.

Mr. McMULLEN. He speaks from an interested stand-point.

Mr. STAIRS. It is a fact.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite clear that the principal cargo these steamers bring to Canada is raw sugars. The refiners are protected by $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent per pound and their sugars are placed in Canada just up to the notch that they could afford to sell them if they were brought in from the American side. The cheaper the raw material can be brought in, the better for them; but it does not matter a farthing to the consumers of this country. The $103,000 paid to the steamship company in order to keep these lines running and facilitate the importation of raw sugars at a nominal price, is of no benefit to the people of Canada. No doubt the company would rather carry it at a very low price than not carry it at all, and the result is that the people of this country are not only paying $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent per pound upon the sugar they use to the refiners of this country to produce that commodity for them; but they are paying the steamship company a subsidy to carry the raw material for them that they may produce the sugar at a low price. Then they turn round and say to the unsubsidized lines: We can get our raw material carried by the subsidized steamship line for a certain rate, and if you are not disposed to carry it at that rate, we cannot give you any-

thing to do. That takes away a very desirable competition in securing the raw material, and the people of this country are paying for that competition and $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent per pound in addition to the sugar refiners. That is the object, that is evidently the advantage reaped by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not much wonder at the hon. gentleman rising to defend, maintain and encourage the existence of this particular line of steamers. He does well to take that course. He is interested personally, the city in which he lives is interested, and while such is the case, he is advocating something that directly benefits his own pocket and those who are interested in the sugar refinery, for this line gives them a great advantage.

Mr. FOSTER. I can easily see that this line of argument might be adopted if we were proposing the initial service for the West Indies, and a subsidy for a certain number of years; or even if after a certain number of years we were approaching the time of the completion of that contract, and were proposing to renew it for another term. Neither of these proposals is being made at the present time. We have thoroughly discussed this contract during two previous sessions. We have entered into it. The policy of the Government and the policy of the Opposition have been stated in regard to it. We may talk as much as we like but it will not affect the permanence of the contract during the three years it has to run. But such discussion as the present has this effect, that if hon. gentlemen opposite will persist in looking upon none but the unfavourable side, and magnifying the difficulties of the trade, we cannot hope the people of the country will take full advantage of the service and the facilities provided. For instance, what would a good Liberal reading, to-morrow or next day, the remarks made some hon. gentleman opposite, and believing what they read, but will say in his heart: "It is no use trying to do any trade with the West Indies, I will not trouble myself in that matter at all." There is another side that may be taken. I do not wish to minimize the troubles and difficulties of building up trade with the West Indies; on the contrary, I have honestly stated over and over again the difficulties, and they are these: Competition commenced at a late date by steamship service, while the United States were wise enough, 12 years ago, to establish such steamship service, increasing it year by year until they had gained very large control by the directness of trade and the persistency of trade in the various markets of the West Indies. This country, without a single steamship line during all this time, was crowded out of the markets in the competition along the lines of steamships rather than along the lines of sailing ships. These were the circumstances that had to be overcome. Much allusion has been made to my trip to the West Indies. My trip had a certain object in view, and it accomplished that object to a certain extent, although it did not result in the negotiation of a reciprocity treaty. That would have been almost impossible, in view of the peculiar position sustained by the West Indies towards the United States as the great market for its sugar. That has not taken place; but what has taken place as the result of my visit and of the Jamaica Exhibition is that Canada and Canadian wares have been made better known to the people of the West Indies, and the people have a better knowledge and warmer interest in the trade of Canada than they possessed before. Take one single article that has been spoken of and minimized, flour. There was not at that time a single barrel of Canadian flour entering the West Indies, or used there. I went to the Islands and I mentioned this subject, and the people said: We would like to take your flour, but it will not keep here. There was a prejudice existing against it, a prejudice cultivated by our competitors. What happened? Some Canadian flour was sent down: it was tried by the bakers, samples were tried by families in different places, and it was found to make good bread. It was kept three months before bread was made from it, which demonstrated that the flour would keep as long as it is required to be kept in the West Indies. The Jamaica Exhibition proved the same fact, and to-day we are sending thousands of barrels there. An hon. gentleman has said that there was not much flour going—that 5 barrels went from St. John. Taking the shipments on a single route, I find the following:—62 barrels by one vessel, 52 by another, 338 by another, 880 by another, 400 by another, 1,380 by another, 810 by another, 1,936 by another, 3,700 by another, 2,452 by another, 1,947 by another—these were all on the "C" route. There is another point to be taken into account as well. There are certain periods of the year when the freight going out becomes congested; then during three or four months these vessels are not able to take all the freight offering, and special vessels have to be chartered. Special vessels have been chartered during three months and more, and these were loaded very largely with flour. We can claim this, that to-day Canada flour has gained a name for itself in the West Indies, and that our merchants and the manufacturers of flour, and consequently our farmers who raised the wheat, are benefited. A point was attempted to be made that our trade has fallen away comparing 1875 with recent years. To what does that point? The fact that the quick steamship service between New York and Boston and the West Indies has gradually eaten away our trade should stir us up to enter on the same line. Take away these steamships, and the produce and goods we send there now will be supplied from the United States. It is an argument, in fact, for putting on steamship service, if by that means it is possible to build up trade between Canada and the West Indies and so to assist the volume of our exports. It is certainly a gratifying result that in the last fiscal year $880,000 worth of exports had been sent by those steamships to the West Indies, whereas during the first year the exports were very small. However, they are constantly increasing, and it is largely for the sake of the exports and for the sake of obtaining a market for our produce that this steamship line was subsidized. It is true, as hon. gentlemen opposite have stated, we do not get large return cargoes. We got smaller when we commenced, but they are not sufficiently large now. This is the great difficulty of the West India trade felt in the United States. When I visited the West Indies I sailed from New York, and I talked with those interested in the trade, and the difficulty stated was that while there were good cargoes out adequate return cargoes could not be secured, that at some seasons scarcely anything could be got, but in other seasons there were better cargoes. The truth is our exports have largely

increased, that our imports have increased, and while they were small at first, and they are small as yet, they are gradually growing and we hope to have them increase still further. An hon. gentleman attempted to make a point that Ontario sent nothing to the West Indies. That is illusory to a great extent. Halifax and St. John, which ship flour to the West Indies, obtained that flour in the west. It is true, it does not appear as exported from Ontario, but appears as an export of the province in which the port from which it is shipped is situated and from which the trade is carried on. If hon. gentlemen opposite would inform themselves as to the activity which is being displayed in this matter, the manufacturers and those who are conducting the industries of our country in the Upper Provinces, they would at once see the deep and general interest which is taken in this trade. Perhaps hon. gentlemen do not come in contact with this class of our people so much as I do who have to a certain extent charge of the service, and have correspondence and hear about these things. Travellers are going to the West Indies from different firms in the Upper Provinces and are meeting with a good reception, and their goods are having a ready sale there. The exports include various kinds of manufactured articles, and I may mention that carriages are sent from Ontario in quite large quantities, which are increasing every month. Seeing that our trade with the West Indies was falling off, finding that the great reason it fell off was because a rapid steamship communication, which is now the courier and in fact the carrier of trade, did not exist between our country and the West Indies, and knowing that such a service did exist between the United States and the West Indies, and that the United States manufacturers and producers had gotten hold of the markets to such an extent that we could only displace them by the keen force of competition; in view of these facts I believe it was our duty to try whether or not, by a system of steamship communication, we could not ameliorate the condition of that trade. We are ameliorating the trade, and as the Trade and Navigation Returns, and the reports which I have presented to the House show, that trade has been increasing for the last few years. Let us give the enterprise a fair and honest trial, without hon. gentlemen opposite throwing a douche of cold water on it every time they discuss it. Let us try whether our people cannot carry on a trade with the West Indies by taking advantage of this means of rapid transit which we have given them. If at the end of five years we find that we have not made some progress towards attaining a trade which shall give promise of sustaining itself, then let us review the whole question and come to a conclusion on it. It is the poorest of all arguments for an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House—when an hon. gentleman on this side says that he is in favour of this means of communication with the West Indies— to state that he does it from interested motives, and that he and his friends in the city of Halifax have a selfish interest in it. This service is not meant to be a Halifax or a St. John service alone. If it were so, then this Parliament might have been justified in not giving it. It was meant for a Canadian service, and in order to get wider markets in the West Indies for our products, which markets are largely held at the present time by United States products, which are no better and no cheaper than our own. It was to endeavour to find a market there for our flour, our vegetables, our manufactured goods, our animals, our butter and our cheese that this service was initiated, and the result shows that the merchants and manufacturers of Canada are availing themselves of the facilities thus afforded them. Let us give them all the encouragement that we as a Parliament can, and let us experiment on this trade for five years at least. We can then find out whether it is worth while continuing or not; my own belief is, that taking all the circumstances into account, we have developed and have made very fair progress and that we are laying the foundation for a much more extended market for our goods in the West Indies, and a much larger and more remmnerative trade with that country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not know that I should have troubled the committee with my remarks upon this question, had it not been for the effort made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) to try and show this House the advantages which were being reaped, by the producers of grain which is manufactured into flour, on account of this steamship arrangement between Canada and the West Indies. I believe myself that had the contemplated arrangement made between the Minister of Finance and the people of the West Indies, with regard to our taking their sugar, been carried out, we would have been able to cultivate a much larger trade with them. Had we taken their sugar up to 16 Dutch standard they would have been able to send it to us in very large quantities, but we are not receiving that grade from them now because a heavy duty is placed upon it. We are only taking 14 Dutch standard which excludes all the clean sugar products of the West Indies, and we are doing that so as to protect the sugar manufacturers in this country and make sugar dearer to our people. That is where the secret of our contracted trade with the West Indies comes in. When Mr. Solomon came here to try and make arrangements for an exchange of trade between Canada and the West Indies, on the promise made by the Finance Minister that Canada would be willing to enter into trade relations on a uniform basis, he was surprised to find that he was hampered by the fact that we had amended our laws so as to prevent the importation of sugar above 14 Dutch standard, unless a duty of eight-tenths of a cent per pound was paid on it. In the face of that embargo on West India trade this subsidy of $103,000 a year to this steamship company is virtually wasted. The change in the sugar tariff was made in order to satisfy the refiners of this country, and for the purpose of enabling them to get control of the supply of all grades of sugar in Canada. It was for that reason that our trade with the West Indies was crippled. I would not have spoken had it not been for the effort made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) to try and show the advantages the farming community were reaping under this arrangement, while he and the hon. gentleman who sits beside him were reaping a rich harvest out of the charges made in the refined sugar tariff. It ill becomes the hon. gentleman, in my humble opinion, to endeavour to defend the condition of things as they now stand.

Mr. STAIRS. Permit me to say one word in reply to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Mc

Mullen), as I do not wish the committee to be under any misapprehension about this matter. The hon. gentleman, as he often does in this House, has spoken of something he knows nothing at all about. I deny altogether that either my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Kenny), or myself, or any sugar refinery, has an interest at all in the establishment of this steamship line other than the general interest which every citizen of Canada has, or should have, in the prosperity of the country and the encouragement of trade between Canada and the outside world. I tell the hon. gentleman that as emphatically as I possibly can, and if he repeats the statement I can only say that he is repeating a statement which is not true in any sense whatever. If the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) looks into the return of the sugar brought from the West Indies to Canada by these steamships he will find, as has already been pointed out, that one of the difficulties in the way of these steamships getting return cargoes is that the quantity of sugar imported is infinitesimal as compared with the consumption of sugars by the refiners of Canada. I doubt if there is more than 2,000 tons last year, so the refiners have no interest in it. I was arguing in favour of these steamers far more from the stand-point of the Ontario producer than I am from the point of view of the merchants or exporters of the Maritime Provinces. It is true, I believe, that the establishment of these steamers is a boon to the exporters of the Maritime Provinces, but not to such an extent as it is to the producers and manufacturers of Ontario. It is the people of Ontario who have to look to the West Indies to endeavour to secure a market for a large amount of their produce, which, as the hon. Minister of Finance has pointed out, is now supplied to these Islands principally from the port of New York. I do not like to be misrepresented in a matter of this kind, and I think the hon. member will take my word when I tell him that he is mistaken in what he has said. As to the reference he has made to the tariff, no change has been made such as he speaks of. No variation has been made in the colour of the sugar which comes in for refining purposes and that which has to pay duty. The tariff previous to 1891, admitted sugar for refining purposes at a certain rate of duty, and all sugars above that grade paid a much higher duty. The change made last year simply admitted sugar for refining purposes free, and imposed a very much lower duty on refined sugars. That is exactly the state of the case. No change was made in the interest of the refiners at all. The only thing the refiners pressed for, when the change was made, was that they should not be placed in a worse position than they were before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They were, in fact, to be allowed to plunder the people to the tune of $2,000,000 a year. That is what they asked, and that is what they did before.

Mr. STAIRS. What the hon. member for South Oxford says is on a par with what has been said by the hon. member for North Wentworth, and with what the hon. gentleman has been saying in the country. They have not the facts with them, and they have not been able to convince the country for the last thirteen years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I asked for this return, as I was anxious to see what the in bound cargoes were on these subsidized vessels; because I assume —at least it is open to controversy if the Minister thinks it is not a sound assumption—that you cannot carry on trade with a country for any length of time if you refuse to purchase what that country has to sell.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not follow at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When the hon. gentleman wants to discuss that question, I will be ready to discuss it with him, and I will undertake to show that that is the case; and if the hon. gentleman expects that the West Indies are going to buy large quantities of Canadian products while Canadians will purchase next to nothing from them in return, I think he is going on a very illusory assumption. It is important to discuss this question, not merely on account of the subsidy itself, but also because, if we do pay a subsidy, we ought to have an opportunity of making the most of it; and we have not that opportunity when you undertake to prohibit the importation of the products of the West Indies which would be available for return cargoes. Now, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) has referred to the importation of sugars; but this much is, I think, pretty clear, that while the Americans import free all sugars below 16 Dutch standard, and Canada only imports those of 14 Dutch standard and below, the trade of the United States will be preferred to the trade of Canada, whether you have a subsidized line of steamers or not. Then, the Minister of Finance undertook to show that a very large quantity of flour was sent to the West Indies by other means of carriage than the subsidized steamers. If that be so, it seems that we are subsidizing one agency to carry freight to the West Indies, while we are unfairly putting an unsubsidized agency into competition with it. That matter was brought to the attention of the House before. The hon. Minister says that these contracts have two years to run after this year, having been made with the Government for five years. I have no recollection of their having been submitted to Parliament for approval, and without such submission Parliament is only bound by the appropriation which it makes from year to year, whatever may have been the obligation entered into by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that these contracts were not laid on the Table of Parliament?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not know as to that. I ask the Minister whether they were?

Mr. FOSTER. I understood the hon. gentleman to make a very emphatic statement that they were not. Now, he says he does not know; but the fact is that they were laid on the Table, and were discussed day after day in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not remember that Parliament was ever called upon to approve of these contracts. If it was, the hon. gentleman can tell us when. However, I am not going to discuss that question at the present time. I am pointing out that the Minister has brought down to us a return which shows that for the whole year but a very few thousand dollars' worth of goods were imported from the West Indies into Canada, and I am pointing out, and the Minister knows well, that the reason why that importation is so small, is, the hon. gentleman has by a tariff regulation deliberately entered into and

sanctioned by the House I admit, put impediments in the way of further importation. He knows right well that if he were to admit free sugars up to 16 Dutch standard, our trade with the West Indies would largely increase.

Mr. FOSTER. By how much, suppose we got it all?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). To a very considerable extent.

Mr. FOSTER. Ten per cent?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, considerably more than 10 per cent. The hon. gentleman knows that he is increasing largely the price of sugar to the consumers of this country by the tax he imposes on sugar between No. 14 and No. 16 without any advantage to the revenue. Now, the hon. gentleman speaks about the flour which is being sent to the West Indies. Who is benefited by that? The miller may be to a limited extent; but the farmer is not benefited to the extent of one farthing. What difference does it make to me as a farmer, when my wheat is sold, whether the product of that wheat is carried to the West Indies or to Liverpool? Not the least; it does not give me any better price or stimulate the market. If the miller has any difficulty in finding a market for his flour, he may have some advantage from the West Indian market being open to him. I am not disputing that; but when the hon. gentleman undertakes to hold out to the House the prospect of that trade growing to any extent while we receive so little in return, he is stating what will ultimately mislead the House if it puts any reliance upon his statement, and certainly, if he relies upon it himself, it is contrary to the experience of every country in the world. Just take the case of the United States trade with Chili. The United States had an opportunity of carrying on an extensive trade with Chili; but while the United States sold next to nothing of the products of her cotton mills in the markets of Chili, the English sold a thousand-fold more, and sold it because they were willing to take in exchange what the people of Chili had to sell. And what is true there, is true of every other country in South America. Just look at the change made in the trade between the United States and Venezuela, a few years ago, when the United States took the duty off coffee and hides. It was doubled within a year and trebled within two years and a half; and the same increase would result between Canada and the West Indies, if Canada did not oppose such very serious barriers in the way of trade with the West Indies. We are dealing with this matter precisely as we did with another to which allusion was made a few hours ago, when it was said that first we proposed to facilitate trade by public works and improvements and by subsidies to steam lines, and then we turned round and put impediments in the way of trade in the form of high duty. And so, while we put forward efforts at the expense of the public in one direction, we neutralized them by taxes, and the result is the same as if no facilities for transportation were afforded. The hon. gentleman either was mistaken in the figures he gave before 6 o'clock or those he gave since. I think he said before 6 o'clock that the value of our trade with the West Indies was something over $400,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. FOSTER. I will not allow the hon. gentleman to misrepresent me. I was reading the "C" service at the time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman was referring to the importations from the West Indies in these ships.

Mr. FOSTER. We were discussing the "C" service, and I had not "A" and "B" before me.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not know whether the hon. gentleman used his figures in the same sense before as after. I did not suppose he was seeking to mislead the House or the committee at all, and I was not making any such charge, but simply stated that, as I understood him, he was mistaken in one case or the other. In any case, however, we are paying $100,000 on less than $1,000,000 of trade; we are paying a bounty of $100,000 to secure $800,000 worth of trade. And if the greater portion of that trade comes through other channels, then it is clear we are paying $100,000 by way of bounty for something over $400,000 of trade.

Mr. FOSTER. How is that?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We are paying $100,000 on the steamships, and the hon. gentleman represents the imports, I think, at something over $400,000 by these same steamships.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman ought not to persist in that. He is taking the whole subsidy we pay to the three services, and then, for his own purposes, he takes in connection with that the results of one of the services. If the $103,000 is paid for the three services, the hon. gentleman ought to calculate in his comparison the exports by the three and not simply the one.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not counting exports but am speaking of the imports.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave the hon. gentleman no figures as to the value of the imports.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am speaking of the imports and the imports alone. The hon. gentleman will see, if he looks at the figures he has brought down, that trade with the city of St. John amounts to scarcely anything. If he will give us now the amount of exports from the city of St. John for the last few years, the committee will see how very small that trade is compared with the subsidy which is now being paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Why does not the hon. gentleman make his argument still stronger? Why does he not take the port of Guelph and show how little is sent from Guelph?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am taking the point from which the steamers we subsidized do sail.

Mr. FOSTER. They are subsidized to sail from ports from which they can sail. These ports are the ports of the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says they are the ports of the country, but if he will look at the figures he has before him he will see that he is subsidizing a steamer to sail from a certain port.

Mr. FOSTER. Most of them do.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Some of them sail from very uncertain ports, and the hon. gentleman might make arrangements for some steamer to sail

from some harbour where there is no city or town at all.

Mr. FOSTER. And no water.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman perhaps might succeed in that, but ordinary people cannot. He has come down and asked us for a subsidy for a line of steamers to sail from a certain port, and I am calling the attention of the House to the fact that scarcely anything is either imported into or exported from that port, and that is what the hon. gentleman seems anxious to conceal from the attention of the committee. The hon. gentleman may think it is of no consequence whether there is much or little sent from that port, but it does seems to me, and I think it will to most members of this House, that it is a matter of some consequence that we should give subsidies where there is something to be done; and if the figures of the hon. gentleman are accurate, he has represented scarcely anything as exported from the port of St. John and still less imported to that port. Well, either there is something wrong with the hon. gentleman's trade regulations, or the hon. gentleman has made a mistake, and it is for him to explain to the House how it is that so little is done from the port of St. John. I have always understood that it is a city of very considerable trade. It has commerce with some countries, whether it has with the West Indies or not, and the hon. gentleman has asked for a large subsidy to cause a line of steamers to sail from that port to various points in the West India Islands, and the report which the hon. gentleman brings down shows that very little is carried out and next to nothing carried in. I do not think that is a satisfactory condition of things, and it is for the hon. gentleman to see what the impediment is in the way to trade. He has told us about the United States. My hon. friend behind me has pointed out to him, as I have, that one impediment is his tax upon certain grades of sugar; and if that is not a serious impediment in the way, it is pretty clear that the hon. gentleman's whole system is a failure.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would just say a few words in reply to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs). He challenged the statement I made that he was interested; but if public rumour is exact, the hon. gentleman is a stockholder in the sugar refinery in Halifax.

Mr. STAIRS. What I did challenge was the statement that any stockholder in the sugar refinery is directly interested in the subsidy to these steamers, either personally or as a stockholder. In neither capacity has any one of them any interest whatever in the steamship line, and they can get their sugars whenever they want them, without that steamship line.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am referring to the fact of the interest the sugar refiners have in the existence of this line of steamers. Another pretension of the hon. gentleman was that the duty on sugar was not altered. If the correspondence and the references which have been made to the interview that took place between the Finance Minister and the representatives of the West India Islands are to be relied on, there was an understanding come to, or it was expected by them, that the standard would be raised to 16 in place of 14 Dutch standard, and Mr. Solomon, who is a large sugar dealer in the West Indies, came to Canada with the expectation that sugar up to 16 Dutch standard would be received free of duty. He was under that impression; but when the Minister of Finance came back and interviewed the sugar refiners, he said we could never consent to that. You would admit one-third of all the sugars consumed in Canada ready for the counter; muscovado and grocery sugar would come in free, and the result would be to deprive us of one-third of the entire consumption of sugar in this country. It is well known that we have followed the course adopted in the United States in regard to their duty on sugar. When they took their duty off sugar down to $\frac{2}{10}$ of a cent, we took it off down to $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent, because our Government realized that while the people on the other side were getting their sugar at so much less than the Canadians, our people never would stand the extortion to which they were subjected. Now, what has the American Government done? They take in from the West Indies all the sugar they produce up to 16 Dutch standard, and the result is that it opens the gates for extended trade between the United States and the West Indies. On the other hand, we confine our importations from the West Indies to the lowest grade that has to be refined. They clean an immense quantity of their sugar in the West Indies, which leaves it ready for common use; but we take none of that. The Minister of Finance says that an exchange of trade between countries is not the basis upon which the trade is generally conducted, that there may be a large trade secured without taking anything from other countries in return. I say that the hon. Minister sets at defiance all the trading ability of the United States. The McKinley Bill was introduced for the purpose of securing extended trade relations on the basis of sending out manufactured goods and taking in return the raw commodities of other countries; and under the operations of that Bill they have extended their trade with 21,000,000 of people. Yet the Minister of Finance says that an exchange of trade between two countries is not the essential basis of an extensive trade being carried on between those countries. I would like the Minister of Finance to point out where he got his idea. We take largely from Great Britain and we send largely to Great Britain, and the same with the United States. In every case I know of that principle is carried out; and just as you facilitate the sending to another country of commodities which they require, and we take from them in return those commodities they have to sell, just in proportion you will increase your trade with that country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the Minister of Finance will look at the Trade and Navigation Returns for the last twenty years, he will find that since the increase of the tariff our trade with the West Indies has fallen off. I understand that, until recently, we had not any such subsidized steamers—the Minister of Finance will, perhaps, correct me if I am wrong. We did not require to subsidize steamers before the tariff was increased. But now it is sought to bolster up a falling trade by a large subsidy. Almost immediately after the increase of the tariff the trade began to decline, and if the people of this country have to pay a subsidy to encourage trade with the West Indies, it is time they should know it, because it is clearly estab-

lished that the high duty has had the effect of killing off the trade we had with the West Indies. Twenty years ago we had a larger trade than we have now. I have shown in the Trade and Navigation Returns that 15 years ago, during three years, we had a trade of $5,000,000 more than we had in 1885-86-87. If you wish to get that trade back again, lower your tariff and allow the products of the West Indies to come in at a rate which will allow our people to exchange with them. The tariff has proved a fallacy in keeping up this trade.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Heretofore the flour that has gone from Canada to the West Indies has mostly gone by way of New York, but last year an effort was made to get flour to go *viâ* Halifax, and an extremely low rate of freight was granted to the West Indies *viâ* Halifax; in fact, the freight from points in the west to the West Indies was only a trifle higher than the rate to Halifax alone. Although the trade increased somewhat last year, it was forced in that direction by extremely low freight rates. Now, in January and February there were large quantities of flour bought in western Ontario to be shipped to the West India Islands, but during the last three months that trade has almost ceased, and hereafter I think that the benefits to be derived from our West India trade will be very slight indeed. It is natural that where they sell their goods they will buy in return. I think we are making a great mistake: we are almost throwing away this $103,000 owing to the regulations that we have in force in reference to our sugar. I believe that sugar is one of the principal articles that we export from the West Indies. When the United States admitted sugar from the West India Islands up to 16 Dutch standard free, then we ought to have done the same thing, and had we done so, we would have retained the trade we had with the West Indies and we could have developed it every year. But having regulated our tariff so that we can only import sugar of 14 Dutch standard free, it throws nearly the whole trade into the hands of the United States. I say it was a great mistake on our part that we did not immediately admit sugar up to 16 Dutch standard free as well as the United States. Now, it seems to me under the circumstances that the time has come when we cannot expect, under our present regulation, to buy much from the West India Islands, because where they sell their goods they will naturally buy the goods they want. The Americans are now dealing with the people of the West India Islands far more liberally than we are; they will get sugar from the West India Islands and will sell them their flour and other goods in return. I will venture to say that next year our Trade and Navigation Returns will show that the trade with the West India Islands has greatly fallen off. We cannot expect that trade to increase while we maintain our present tariff; I think, therefore, it is well to consider whether it is wise to throw away this $103,000 in order to cultivate a trade under such adverse circumstances. If the Finance Minister would change the sugar duties so that we could get in sugar under 16 Dutch standard free, then I would hold up both hands to continue this subsidy because then I could see how our trade would be developed. I contend that the giving of this subsidy to the steamship lines is going to be of considerable advantage to the sugar manufacturers. Here is a line of steamers running regularly that is largely subsidized by the Dominion Government, and they can say to these and other vessels: If you do not carry this sugar at a very low rate, why, we will give it to other subsidized lines. We are giving the sugar manufacturers large advantages. We are highly protecting them and we are subsidizing a line of steamships to enable them to obtain their raw products cheaply. The time has arrived when the Government should consider the desirability of changing the present system.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The exports to the British West Indies in 1875 from Nova Scotia were of the value of $1,973,740, while last year they were of the value of $1,411,600. From New Brunswick in 1875 they were of the value of $173,013, and last year of the value of $147,617. The exports to the Spanish West Indies in 1875 were of the value of $258,091, last year they were of the value of $1,026. Any one looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns for these periods and feeling satisfied with the growth of our trade between the West Indies and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, is easily gratified. It is evidently high time that this question should be considered not only by the representatives of those provinces but by the people of this Dominion. The time has arrived when our people should face the question that we cannot bolster up a trade, and at the same time cut it off by a high tariff.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Finance mentioned in connection with the trade with the West Indies the difficulties experienced in building up such a trade. The hon. gentleman might learn something by looking at the results that have followed the efforts made by other countries. Take the trade of the United States. The trade returns of the United States show a retrograde movement throughout nearly the whole of their export trade with the nations of the world. It is not a mere accident, but it is the exact result of the tariff. Between 1881 and 1889 the export trade of the United States as regards their whole output, including manufactured and raw materials declined as follows:—

	Russia.	Germany.	Holland.	Belgium.	United Kingdom.
1881.....	£ ·04	£ ·32	£1·32	£1·33	£2·84
1889.....	·02	·28	·68	·76	2·05

Those nations had in that ratio ceased to be consumers of the products of the United States. If you take the trade of Great Britain as illustrating the results of an opposite policy, you find that its trade with these various countries has advanced, showing that the Minister has not correctly stated the cause of the trouble when he is endeavouring in this particular way to stimulate the trade, ignoring the fact that the true way to stimulate it is to place the trade on a sound and healthy basis. The hon. gentleman is very indignant if any one suggests that he is deceiving the people, but at all events he is deceiving himself if he cannot see the manifest cause of his failure up to the present moment in producing the results which we all desire.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) I desire to ask the ex-Minister of Customs whether he has noticed during the past year any increase in the imports of sugars over No. 14 Dutch standard?

Mr. BOWELL. No, I have not.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It would be very important if we could obtain this information. It was contended that there would be very large importations of sugar over No. 14, and if we knew whether such was the case or not, we could discuss this matter more intelligently. The arguments of the hon. member for Wellington and the hon. member for Kent have great force. When we have placed our standard at No. 14, while the Americans have placed theirs at No. 16, it is apparent that we have placed an impediment in the way of trade. The Minister of Finance thought the House could not find fault with the subsidy proposed, for the Government were thereby endeavouring to improve trade, and he pointed out that the United States had present certain advantages in having earlier commenced to develop its trade with the West Indies; but the hon. gentleman cannot fail to perceive that if he enters on a scheme of encouraging trade on the one hand and adopts measures to repress trade on the other by placing obstacles in the way, it is useless to expend public money. I thought perhaps the Minister could state whether there had been an increase in quantity of sugars imported over No. 14. I doubt it myself, but I desired the information on that point.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is aware that the information for which he is asking could only be contained in the Trade and Navigation Returns for the year ending 30th of this month, and as they have not been aggregated, it is impossible for me to say what the relative importations have been compared with former years. Speaking now under correction, for I have no data before me, I think the importations of sugar from all the West Indies under No. 14 have materially increased. I desire also to draw attention to another point. I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen opposite can come to the conclusion that, as regards our trade with the West Indies, it has fallen off since the increase of duties. The total trade between Canada in 1878 and the West Indies, this being the year before the duties were increased, was of the value of $4,397,996, as compared with $6,360,926 in 1891; or nearly two millions increase. I do not say that the increase in our trade is as large as we would wish, but the returns certainly do not bear out the assertion that our trade with the British West Indies has materially fallen off since the imposition of the present tariff. The exports show an increase in about the same ratio. In 1888 the exports from Canada to the West Indies were of the value of $2,601,486, while last year they were of the value of $3,122,770.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What were they in 1875?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not picking out the years. The hon. gentleman must see that it is very inconvenient to interrupt a speaker. The only real increase has been upon the amount of duties that have been collected upon goods imported into Canada from that country. In 1878, before the increase of the tariff, we collected upon articles imported from the West Indies, $341,240.28, and in the year ending 30th June, 1891, $1,337,754.14. I am merely giving these figures to show that the hon. gentleman has come to improper conclusions by quoting figures applicable to certain portions of the Dominion, and upon that basing a statement that the total trade had fallen off both in the aggregate and the exports to the West Indies. I repeat again that the trade has not increased as every Canadian would like to see it, but there is this fact, that both in the aggregate trade and in our exports to the West India Islands, the trade is increasing and not decreasing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is partially correct as regards the short period which the hon. gentleman took, but as far as regards our export trade to the West Indies, I find that in 1873, it was $38,988,000, while in 1891, it was only $3,122,000, or nearly $900,000 less in 1891. The same figures substantially prevail throughout 1874, 1885, 1876, 1877 and 1878; in all of which years, when our population was very considerably smaller than it is at present, the export trade was very much larger.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a great difference in values.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The difference in value in our exports was certainly not great during these years. The difference in value in our imports may have been considerable, but I am speaking at present of the export trade. I notice that my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) made a statement to which the attention of the House might as well be directed. He stated that a most extraordinary low rate had been given from Ontario to the West Indies *viâ* Halifax. That practically means that these articles brought from Ontario and particularly the flour, have been conveyed and are being conveyed at a dead loss over the Intercolonial Railway, and that the enormous deficit now existing on that road is partly caused by that very circumstance. It has been called to our notice often that at this present moment the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway amounts to many hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, and that that is very considerably due to the practice of conveying goods at rates very much below cost. I should like to know from the Minister of Railways at what rate per barrel flour was conveyed for the purposes of this steamship service along the Intercolonial Railway. If my information is correct, it has been carried at a rate which renders it utterly impossible that the railroad could have been paid, and I must say that this practice of forcing trade by conveying goods for far less than cost—particularly on a railway which involves a charge on this country of about $1,000,000 a year for working expenses over receipts—does not at all commend itself to my mind as a wholesome or business-like transaction. Perhaps the Minister of Railways could tell us what rate is charged for flour conveyed to Halifax?

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot tell at what rate flour is at present carried from Chaudière to Halifax, but last season it was carried at a very low rate. I think between $13 and $15 a car load for 676 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) who has a very large experience in this matter, tells me that a car load would mean about 15 tons.

Mr. HAGGART. The car load rates would be I think for about 10 tons.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has referred to

the remarks that were made by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) in reference to the cost of the transportation of flour from the points at which it was manufactured in Ontario, to the West Indies by the Canadian route. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) makes the contention, as I judge from his remarks, that we have been carrying that flour at an exceedingly low rate. I listened attentively to the remarks of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell). He pointed out to the committee the fact that a few years past the flour which is exported from Canada to the West Indies went by way of New York. We must recognize that an effort has been made during the past year or two to divert the transportation of that flour over the Canadian route. In the discussion of matters connected with the transit of flour over the Intercolonial Railway my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) always takes an active and intelligent part, but I never heard the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) yet contend that flour was carried at too low a rate either to the West Indies or to any points over the Intercolonial Railway. One hon. gentleman opposite pointed out to us that if we desire to have trade with foreign countries, we must have facilities for conducting that commerce. I understand that the object that the Parliament of Canada had, in subsidizing a line of steamers to the West Indies, was exactly to do what that hon. gentleman thinks we should do, namely, that we should have the same facilities as our American neighbours have in order to secure for Canada a portion of the West Indian trade in articles which Canada has for export. It must be remembered by the committee that there are, I think, 90 steamers plying between the United States and different points in the West India Islands. If we desire a portion of that trade, we can only secure it by having the same facilities for steam transportation as our American competitors enjoy. Another hon. gentleman in the course of his remarks made the statement that one-third of the muscovado sugars made in the West Indies graded between 14 and 16 Dutch standard: in other words, if the tariff of Canada admitted sugars up to 16 Dutch standard free, we would import one-third more muscovado sugars than we do to-day. I think the hon. gentleman who made that statement is very seriously mistaken. I do not suppose that he intended to mislead the House, but that was the actual result of his statement; because, if I am correctly informed, the quantity of muscovado sugar made in the West Indies grading between 14 and 16 Dutch standard is not more than 10 per cent of the whole product. It has also been said this evening that this subsidy and the sugar tariff result injuriously to the trade of Canada, and that the Canadian consumer is, consequently, paying more for his sugar than the American consumer. As a matter of fact, during the past week granulated sugar has been selling in Canada at 4 cents a pound, while it has been selling in New York at from 4¼ to 4 $\frac{5}{16}$ cents a pound; in other words, granulated sugar, largely manufactured from the sugar imported from the West Indies, was selling last week in the city of Halifax at from $\frac{1}{16}$ to $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent per pound less than it was in the city of New York. Consequently, it must be apparent to the committee, and I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite will be glad to hear it, that the Canadian consumer under what they regard as this objectionable clause in the tariff, is paying no more for his sugar than the American consumer—in fact, he is paying less.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. An excellent reason for the reduction of the duty. However, that does not meet the point I was referring to. According to the figures given by the Minister of Railways, apparently for the purpose of promoting this trade, if it can be promoted, we have been conveying flour at the rate of one-seventh of a cent per ton per mile.

Mr. HAGGART. I find that I was mistaken. I was thinking of the rate for wheat. The rate per mile is about $\frac{33}{100}$, or about $\frac{1}{3}$ of a cent per ton per mile.

Steam communication between Halifax and St. John *viâ* Yarmouth.....$5,000

Mr. BOWERS. Before this resolution is adopted, I would call the attention of the House and of the Finance Minister in particular, to this item, which I suppose is for the purpose of encouraging interprovincial trade and commerce. I would ask the hon. gentleman, if, in arranging this matter with the Yarmouth Steamship Company, he could not provide for the steamship calling at Westport and Freeport on the way from Yarmouth to St. John and also on her return. It is not out of the steamer's way, as she passes through the Grand Passage between Freeport and Westport. There is a large passenger trade there. Last year I think there were 1,000 or 1,200 passengers carried from these islands by this company. From these two ports $100,000 worth of salted fish, from $15,000 to $25,000 worth of fresh fish, and from $10,000 to $15,000 worth of live lobsters, are shipped every year. The population of the two places is from 1,500 to 1,800, and it is very essential to the people to have communication with St. John and Yarmouth. The two islands, Briar Island and Long Island, have had communication by steam with St. John and Yarmouth for the last fifteen or twenty years, and it is only this year that the steamboat has neglected to call. This is due to the local subsidy having been withdrawn. For a number of years the steamer received $1,500 a year. The subsidy was then cut down to $1,000, and last year it was still further reduced to $600, and the company refused to call for that amount; but if this Government will take the matter in hand and insist on the Yarmouth Steamship Company calling at Westport and Freeport it will be a great advantage to those places in the way of trade and commerce, and will also add to the receipts of the steamship company. I cannot see any reason why, as it is, the steamer does not call, as it would be to their financial advantage to do so. The position in which we are placed at present leaves us at a great disadvantage in trading with other ports of the Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. In reply to the hon. gentleman I may say that I am in correspondence with the company at present in reference to that matter. There are some difficulties in the way. I do not know whether they can be overcome or not.

Maintenance and Repairs of Government Steamers..... $116,600

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is this amount to be applied? Is there any additional steamer to be got, or is it just for the ordinary maintenance of the steamers?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it is the ordinary maintenance of the steamers. There is no extra work so far as this vote is concerned.

Canadian Registration of Shipping.....$2,500

Mr. FOSTER. This is to provide for the triennial registration list.

Tidal Observations $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This matter may have been discussed before, but I would like to know what are those tidal observations, and what has been done in respect to them?

Mr. FOSTER. This vote was discussed last year, and the same vote appears in the service this year. It is for the establishment of tidal gauges at different points. The idea is to make an accurate record of the rise and fall of the tide, extending along the whole line of coast up to Quebec, so as to get at the state of the currents and height of the tide. The matter is dealt with in the report of the Minister of Marine. The object is to enable us to make the time of high and low water on any day, and it is one which has particularly interested the attention of those engaged in shipping. Many ships are run ashore and wrecked in consequence of their masters being mistaken as to the state of the tide, and supposing that they were far off the shore. The American authorities are making similar observations along their coast.

Salaries, allowances, &c., of lighthouse keepers $197,200

Mr. FOSTER. Every year there is an increase in the number of lighthouses through new lighthouses being built and new fog-alarms and other precautions, which of course makes an increase in the salaries and allowances of those attending to them.

Maintenance and Repairs to lights, fog-whistles, buoys and beacons and humane establishments..... $259,100

Mr. BOWERS. I would call the attention of the Government to the dangerous character of the Blonde Rock at the entrance of the Bay of Fundy, and I would ask if any steps have been taken to have another light built on Seal Island or have any different plans been devised whereby the safety of shipping may be better attended to? The Board of Trade of St. John has called the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this matter, and also to the buoy stationed on the north-west ledge, 3 miles north-west of Briar Island. These buoys go adrift every few months, and something should be done to keep them longer in their positions. At present they are anchored with heavy chains, and after a few months the chains snap apart and the buoys go adrift, causing large expense to the Government, and their absence is a great danger to shipping. After they go adrift they are advertised for a short time in the papers, and then the advertisement is allowed to drop. In all cases, as soon as the buoys are off the ledges, the advertisement should be kept in the daily newspapers until they are replaced, so that shipmasters would be able to see when at any time the buoys are off the ledges. The Board of Trade of St. John addressed an earnest remonstrance to the Marine Department this year on these subjects. Possibly heavy wire hawsers might be employed with better effect than these heavy chains for fastening these buoys in position.

Mr. HAZEN. The matter to which the hon. member for Digby refers is one which has attracted a great deal of attention and consideration on the part of people in St. John interested in shipping and in the navigation in the Bay of Fundy. It appears that Blonde Rock is a very dangerous point on the coast, off the County of Yarmouth, several accidents having occurred there; and it is said by parties well versed in the matter that proper precautions have not been so far taken by the Government to prevent the losses which have occurred. The Government have paid some attention to the matter, and have had a buoy placed there which affords some protection against disaster; but the trouble is that the chains which anchor the buoys are washed against the rocks in the gales and chafed and cut in two, and then they go adrift, so that it is necessary, in the interests of shipping, that some other protection should be afforded. My colleague and I had an interview with the Minister of Marine before he went to England, and he promised us he would have very careful enquiry made to ascertain what was the best mode of dealing with this danger to navigation. The rock could be removed, but it would cost millions to do it. The Government have now before them statements made by experienced pilots and others about this work, and the Minister promised that he would have careful enquiries made and endeavour to have the place so protected that the danger of accidents would be minimized as much as possible. It is a matter of great importance to the whole shipping of the Bay of Fundy. It requires one or two more men on Seal Island properly to handle the light. There is supposed to be a force of four men on Seal Island all the time. A complaint was made to the department that on one occasion when an accident occurred there were only two men available to man the boat. The Minister said he would enquire into the matter and there would no cause of complaint in the future. So far as the department knew, there were four men there, but for some reason or other they were not all attending to their duty when the accident occurred.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to call the attention of the Government to the importance of lighting the harbour of Nanaimo in British Columbia. The trade at that port has become so great that I think the Minister will acknowledge that this subject deserves his attention. So far back as 1872, when Sir Hector Langevin visited that province, he reported upon the necessity of lighting the entrance to that harbour. At that time the output of coal at that port was 29,843 tons. Up to the present time, although many efforts have been made to induce the Government to build a lighthouse there, it has been deemed more important to light other points leading to other ports. Now, in order to show the increase of the shipping at that port which has taken place since Sir Hector Langevin recognized the importance of the lighting the harbour of Nanaimo, I will read a few statistics:

STATEMENT of the Number, Tonnage and Crews of Vessels which arrived at and departed from the Port of Nanaimo, B.C., during the year ending 30th June, 1891.

ARRIVED.

Under what Flag.	No.	Tons.	Crew, No.
British	49	50,385	1,066
United States	402	272,894	7,778
German	3	5,109	77
Hawaiian	14	32,088	432
Nicaraguan	30	29,304	639
Total	498	389,780	9,992

DEPARTED.

British	58	64,847	1,435
United States	444	334,130	10,372
German	4	6,812	89
Hawaiian	14	32,088	433
Nicaraguan	33	32,274	712
Total	553	470,151	13,041

STATEMENT of Vessels, British and Foreign, employed in the coasting trade.

Sailing Vessels.

ARRIVED.

Under what Flag.	No.	Tonnage.	Crew, No.
British	53	7,594	133

DEPARTED.

British	66	7,740	152

Steamers.

ARRIVED.

British	1,345	160,954	13,192

DEPARTED.

British	1,350	167,424	14,408

GRAND TOTAL.

—	No.	Tonnage.	Crew.
Grand total arrived	1,893	558,328	23,317
do departed	1,969	645,315	27,601

The 553 vessels that cleared from the port of Nanaimo during that year conveyed to foreign countries

Mr. GORDON.

641,526 tons weight of the products of that part of Vancouver Island District, valued at $2,506,859. The duties collected during the same period were $58,747.10. The sick mariners' dues collected during the same period were $3,323.78, being $497.88 more that at all the other ports in the province, and was only exceeded in Nova Scotia at the port of Halifax, in New Brunswick at the port of St. John, in Quebec at the ports of Montreal and Quebec, and was over seven times greater than all the sick mariners' dues collected in Prince Edward Island. Now, for every ton of coal carried from that port there is so much wealth added to the Dominion through the industry and labour that are involved. I am sure the Government will not disregard the claims of British Columbia to public works of this nature while they are constructing similar works on the Atlantic coast and on the lakes where the tonnage is nothing as compared with the tonnage I have mentioned. I can think of no other reason which the Government can urge to excuse their palpable neglect, than the fact that we are at so great a distance from the central government, and that our representation in this House is so small that our earnest representations are almost entirely disregarded. I wish the Minister who presides over that department were here, because it is with him especially that I have a bone to pick in this matter. I hope the Government will, at least, place two small lights, one at Sharp's Point the other at Departure Bay, in that harbour this year. If they will inform themselves of the facts they will recognize the importance of guarding against collisions and giving facilities to steamers entering that port to load and discharge their cargoes as fast as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The other evening I called the attention of the Minister in charge to the condition of a certain beacon a little below the harbour of Kingston, and he promised to make enquiry and let me know whether any light was going to be erected. I think it appertains to the department of the Minister of Public Works. I would like to know if he has ascertained the exact state of the case there.

Mr. OUIMET. I could not give any information to the hon. gentleman on this point. I have asked my officers to communicate with the Department of Marine.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If no light is placed there, some accident will occur before the season is over. I desire to enquire what is the cause of no less than $14,000 being required for gunpowder and tubes.

Mr. FOSTER. The department is substituting bombs at the different stations. These are more modern and have proved useful, and experiments are being conducted with them at different stations. As regards the remarks of hon. members as to Blonde Rock, the only way of giving warning is by lights and automatic buoys, and every care will be taken to have the buoys kept as permanently as possible. They will break away at times, but the department will exercise strict supervision over them and give them more frequent overhauling. I do not think that newspaper advertising will help us much, as mariners will not see the newspapers. These notices are posted up in

the custom houses and are seen by mariners when they come on shore.

Mr. GORDON. It is all very well to experiment with these buoy lights. They were of no advantage to shipping entering the harbour; one was fully a mile within the harbour entrance. Those two buoy lights will be of great service to vessels within the harbour and have already been duly appreciated. No vessel approaching Nanaimo harbour from Fairway or Middle Channel, however, could see either of those lights until the vessel got abreast of the harbour. It was essential to have a lighthouse erected on the point, in order to lead vessels safely into the entrance. Such a lighthouse would not cost more than $2,000 or $3,000, and I hope the Minister will take that sum this year out of the aggregate vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that the expenditure under the head of fuel, freight, cartage, and so forth, has increased from $22,600 to nearly $30,000. This seems an unreasonable expenditure and cannot be accounted for by additional lighthouses.

Mr. FOSTER. These are the estimated details of the general vote. The details are put down approximately for each particular branch, and it has been found that the amount entered for that expenditure is too small, and consequently more was expended on that branch and less on other branches. The actual expenditure is not greater.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If transfers can be made *ad libitum*, these details will have no practical value. I will not say it is an absolute rule, but I thought there was an understanding that this should not be done, and that the Auditor General has raised objections.

Mr. FOSTER. The Auditor General has raised objections. Take, for instance, the militia vote: The practice had been in dealing with this vote, which consisted of 8 or 10 items, to over-expend one and under-expend another, provided the department did not exceed the total amount. That was what the Auditor General objected to, and that is what we entirely avoid at the present time; but this is the one vote, and these details although for the information of the House approximately and ought to be as correct as possible, do not yet come under that rule.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to ask the acting Minister to give a promise that he will take something out of the aggregate vote for a small lighthouse in Nanaimo harbour which is badly needed there. Any one who is acquainted with the amount of shipping in that place, or who has visited the harbour, will agree that this place is badly lighted

Mr. FOSTER. I am in the unfortunate position of not being even the Acting Minister, but I have called the deputy's attention to it and will see the acting Minister about it personally. I have already stated that whatever the department thinks is best should be done, will be done in respect to Nanaimo harbour.

Meteorological Service..... $62,900

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the extreme northern points that this service touches?

Mr. FOSTER. There are stations in British Columbia, one at Edmonton, one near Fort Churchill, and one in the Hudson Bay Territory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does it go so high as latitude 60?

Mr. FOSTER. Not so high as that. The Hudson Bay station sends in written reports, which are used for the purposes of comparison.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the furthest point north to which we have telegraphic communication?

Mr. FOSTER. Edmonton has a telegraphic connection, but I cannot say whether they report by telegraph or by letter.

Marine Hospitals..... $30,000

Mr. LAURIER. What marine hospitals are there in the Province of Quebec now?

Mr. FOSTER. There has been a change made in the hospital in the city of Quebec, but the Government still take charge of the disabled seamen and pay 90 cents a day to the hospital for them, the same as is done in Montreal.

Mr. BOWERS. Is that cheaper than maintaining a marine hospital?

Mr. FOSTER. It is more economical and far less bother.

Fishery Officers, Ontario..... $25,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that in Picton there is a man named Joseph Redmond who receives $300 a year salary and $173.85 for travelling expenses. That is very much in excess of many of the others.

Mr. FOSTER. He has acted as an overseer.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that at Napanee Mr. A. D. Sills gets $150, while at Picton Redmond gets $300.

Mr. FOSTER. That depends entirely on the extent of the district. The district at Napanee may be very much smaller and less important than the one at Picton. My hon. friend will find a similar disparity all through the list for the same reason.

Mr. FORBES. Has the fishery overseer at Liverpool, Thomas Day, for the western half of Queen's County, been dismissed?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not able to say. I will enquire.

Salaries, Inspectors and Overseers, Que.... $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a considerable increase here.

Mr. FOSTER. There are at present no inspectors of fisheries in Quebec. The want of one or two such officers is much felt, and the increase of $2,000 in this vote is to supply that want.

Mr. LAURIER. Where are they to be located?

Mr. FOSTER. It has not yet been decided.

Fisheries, Nova Scotia..... $22,500

Mr. FRASER. I made an enquiry some time ago in regard to the inspectors and overseers in the county which I represent. At present there is only one officer in the county; and having examined the matter, I think the service performed is not at all commensurate with the amount of money paid. I would like to ask the Minister if his attention has been called to the matter, with the view of revising

it. I understand that all the officers, except one for the district of St. Mary's, have been dismissed.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows, of course, that a change has been made in the system, and is now being carried out in the different parts of the Dominion as rapidly as the circumstances will permit. The old system of having wardens appointed for life, who draw $20 or $30 a year, has proved to be just about what my hon. friend has said, useless. They thought they were not paid enough to make a business of their work, and many of them came to think that the proper thing to do was to pocket the money and do nothing. Therefore, that system has been done away with, and what the Minister is doing is to appoint certain overseers over larger districts with a remuneration sufficient to make it an object to them to give their time to the work. Then, in special seasons, when help is required, it is intended to allow those overseers to hire guardians by the day temporarily, and when their work is done they are no longer in the service of the Government. This system is being introduced in the different counties, and I suppose that dismissals have taken place in the hon. gentleman's county as well as in many others in pursuance of that policy. That system is, I think, the proper one. Still, under whatever system, there is a great difficulty in having a thorough supervision even over our officers, so widely are they scattered and so many posts need to be looked after.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to ask whether a saving is to be effected, and what will be the position of the special officers employed, so far as their authority is concerned while engaged under the chief overseers.

Mr. FOSTER. There will not be much change either way, so far as the expenditure is concerned. I do not think the work can be done for much less money under the new system than under the old, but much better work will be done for the money. The special officer will have the authority of a fishery officer during the time he is on the beat. Of course, when the time for which he is employed, be it a month or a month and a half, is over, he is no longer a fishery officer.

Mr. FRASER. That is to say, during the time of his appointment he will have the same authority as the various sub-inspectors used to have in a locality?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to enquire who fixes the travelling expenses of the assistant inspectors? I see that Mr. Bertram at North Sydney gets a salary of $600 a year and $479.60 for travelling expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Bertram, although he lives at Sydney, has the whole district of Cape Breton under his supervision, and has to travel from one part to another. His expenses are sent in itemized showing every mile he travels every day and the outlay. If his charge is considered too much it is audited down, and the amount paid is that approved by the audit of the department. Besides, every inspector has to keep an itinerary, which he sends to the department.

Mr. FRASER.

Disbursements, inspectors and overseers.
Prince Edward Island $700

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Some overseers are wanted in Prince Edward Island at present, and I do not know whether we can get them appointed in the absence of the Minister of Marine; but the rivers there are being netted very frequently at present, and this is just the time they should be protected. I hope the department will see their way clear to give us a few wardens there to look after the fisheries. Last year, owing to the change in the system, the old wardens were all dismissed and new ones were not appointed in their place, and it is very necessary that the rivers we have there should be looked after during the fishing season.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will make his representations to the department, they will be taken into immediate consideration, because, although the Minister is away, the department must go on, and the acting Minister will attend to the business. Mr. Hackett, who is the superintendent of the Island, has the supervision of the matter, and I suppose is now attending to the appointment of day and night men as they are required.

Mr. YEO. In the appointments of these guardians and wardens, great care should be taken to have competent men. These wardens who report on the fishery claims are very often extremely zealous to serve the party to which they belong, and their reports are not always as correct as they should be.

Mr. McMULLEN. While Mr. Hackett gets a salary of $800, and travelling expenses $200, I see that the revenue is only $112.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Hackett is superintendent for the whole Island, and the fish caught there are chiefly lobsters which are free fish. Consequently, there is not much chance of getting fees from the Island, but at the same time most careful supervision is required, because the lobster season is very strict and there are inducements to break through it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand that he only works three months in the year altogether, and that appears to be a large salary in connection with travelling expenses for that much work.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. The fishery season extends for at least six or seven months, and then he has the whole office work to do, besides enquiring carefully into the fishery claims, all of which go through his hands, so that he has not many spare days.

Mr. YEO. I think the fishery inspector is employed nearly the whole time from the opening of navigation, not only with lobsters but with oyster and other fisheries.

Mr. FRASER. I would call attention to the question of the fish bounties. Special efforts should be made to see that only those who are entitled to the bounties should receive them. I know myself of several cases, and brought them to the notice of the department, in which parties received bounties who are not entitled to them. I am satisfied that if a thorough investigation were made, it will be found that quite a large amount is paid to parties who do not live in the country at all. It is not fair to those who do legitimate work, that others, very often boys, who do no work, should receive

their share and thus reduce the amount that ought to go through the proper channel. I hope that during recess a vigilant enquiry will be made into this and it will be found that what I have said will be substantiated. Many of them have much more work to do to make both ends meet than is generally supposed.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I concur, to a large extent, with the remarks of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) so far as the past is concerned, but I know that the department has taken steps to overcome that difficulty, and the people who are foolish enough to make false statements with respect to their bounty are beginning to find that they will be prevented from getting bounties in the future. That fact alone is having a very good effect. I think that the supervision that is now being made of the bounty claims, and the strict manner in which the department has been examining the claims of the people whom they have reason to suspect, will have such an effect in the future there will be much less complaint. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is necessary to keep a strict supervision over all parties having claims of that kind, because sometimes they are put in, I believe, in the names of boys and others who are under age. However, that thing is likely to cure itself. So strict are they in our part of the country that I am afraid, occasionally, people who have really good claims are, perhaps, prevented from getting their just dues on account of the information laid before the department not being always correct. However, the intention of the department is good, and I have no doubt that in the future there will be less irregularity than there has been in the past.

Mr. FRASER. I think the department would do well to settle with others than their own political friends. These bounties are for all the fishermen, irrespective of their party proclivities. I am sure there are a good many in all the counties who are anxious to see that the bounty reached the hands of those who were entitled to it. For myself, I would be glad to give the fullest information to the Government to prevent frauds and to assist in the proper distribution of the bounties, and I am sure that there is no member from the lower provinces, whatever may be his political views, who has any other desire than to see this fund equitably and honestly distributed.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt this fund is for the encouragement of the honest fishermen, and every dollar of it that is bestowed wrongfully is taken out of the pockets of the honest fishermen. But when you take into consideration the large number of claims, I think but a very small proportion of them are fraudulent. There are some fraudulent claims, no doubt. The schedule of the steps necessary to get a bounty is published; they know well what they have to do to get their claims proved, and the gauntlet that has to be run at the present time is a very severe one. Of course, it is possible, by the ingenuity of the party himself, aided by the connivance of those before whom he has to go for certificates, to impose upon the department. I know that the Minister takes great care to prevent any unworthy man from receiving a bounty; and I think the members from the Maritime Provinces would do a great service to the department if they would, when any such information comes to them, as sometimes it will, inform the department of it. It is only right to the fishermen and right to the department, in order that the honest man may be protected and the dishonest man detected. No doubt the utility and permanency of the system depends on its honest administration.

Mr. FRASER. I did not mean to say anything against the department as being a party to dishonesty, but I do know that some of the petty officers in the various counties are not what they ought to be. I would suggest as a method of preventing fraud, that a list of all fishermen entitled to receive bounties be sent to the collector of customs to be posted up, so that every fisherman coming in can see the names who are on the list. That is never done. You will find in that way the fishermen themselves will see that no fraudulent claims will succeed, and they will look after it much better than the officials.

Mr. FOSTER. It would cost something to post up forty or fifty thousand names.

Mr. FRASER. In each county there may be some little outlay, but I fancy the Government will save a great deal more by publishing these lists in the various counties than they are losing now.

Mr. KAULBACH. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) in suggesting that a list be placed in the possession of the customs officers. That would be as much as to say that the overseer of the fisheries is inclined to do what is dishonourable.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, no.

Mr. KAULBACH. It would be hardly fair on the part of the Government towards the overseer. I think the overseers of fisheries are, as a class, above any imputations of that kind. This bounty has been given by the Government for the encouragement of shipbuilding, as well as the encouragement of fishing, and I, as representing a county largely engaged in both industries, am anxious to see that the bounty reaches those for whom it is intended. There may be some isolated cases where parties are receiving the bounty improperly. I do not know that at present there is any rule whereby parties who are not Canadians and going into the deep-sea fisheries would be deprived of the privilege of receiving a bounty. I think the rule has been that they receive it as well as their neighbours. If that is not the case, perhaps it would be as well for the department to consider it carefully and ascertain whether they were entitled to it or not. I think myself they would be entitled to it. If they are not Canadian-born subjects, they would be parties who came into the country and desired to remain and continue as citizens, and it would be pretty hard were they to be deprived of the privilege of receiving the bounty with their neighbours. As regards bounties improperly paid, I will only speak so far as my own county is concerned, and say that the overseers employed are very honourable men and so careful that I do not think a solitary instance can be found of wilful fraud or careless payments to claimants. I think bounties are given to boys of a certain age who are entitled to receive them. Boys have received bounties, but only those who were able to do a certain portion of work in assisting their parents and those in charge

of the boats. I think they naturally would be entitled to receive bounties, and no person would object in any way. The bounty lists of claims are now so rigidly examined by the Department of Fisheries, that I scarcely think there can be one case in which a party would receive a bounty to which he was not entitled. I know of some cases in which parties were entitled to the bounty and did not receive it, simply, as I view it, from the disposition on the part of the department to economize as much as possible, and those parties, by accident or otherwise, were prevented from receiving the bounty to which I consider they were properly entitled. The Department of Fisheries has a staff of officials in charge of the bounty list which renders it unnecessary, with the aid of the overseers, that the list should be placed in the hands of the customs, as those officers are made parties to check the overseers. I am, therefore, obliged to dissent from the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Guysborough.

Mr. FORBES. I heartily concur in the view expressed by the hon. member for Guysborough. I can see no reason why the hon. member for Lunenburg should object to the list being placed in the custom houses in his county. The fishermen are usually fair and honest and not afraid of their neighbours knowing the amount they receive as bounty. As regards frauds perpetrated in the distribution of the bounty, it is patent to everyone who makes enquiries that gross frauds are perpetrated. In one county in New Brunswick over $5,000 worth of fraudulent claims were put in.

Mr. KAULBACK. In which county?

Mr. FORBES. I will not say the county. I have been told this by the Minister of Marine himself. There are counties in Nova Scotia where enquiries are going on with a view to ascertain the amount so fraudulently taken out of the funds to the detriment of other fishermen who were honestly entitled to it. There is no quicker or more effective way by which the Government can ascertain the guilty parties than that of posting up this list in the custom houses. Those who are interested in the business will know whether the amounts have been honestly earned, and whether the fishermen have been engaged in fishing or some other occupation. In my own county I know of no fraudulent claims having been discovered; I will not say none were put in, as I am not prepared to speak on that point. I shall be only too glad to have these lists posted in the custom houses, and the suggestion is one that should be adopted by the Government.

Mr. FRASER. I have sufficient interest in this subject to not make it a matter of public attack on the Government, but a matter of suggestion. If we followed the advice of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), we would have no Auditor General's Report presented. We have more confidence that the Government will pay out the money correctly than we have that money will be properly expended by parties who are not responsible to the Government. It is not an action derogatory to the officers that the parties who receive bounties should be known. If this plan were adopted irritation would be removed, because the fishermen would see the amounts received by each and fraudulent claims would rapidly be detected. As to the matter of boats, it would assist and encourage those connected with the industry. When you take the people into your confidence, the law is much more closely administered than by officials. As to the expense, a list would have to be prepared before payments were made, and copies of it could be made and left with the different officers. I hope the Government will carry out this suggestion which I submit, because I desire the fund to be honestly distributed, and even a little extra expense should be incurred in preparing the list in order to carry out the matter, the result of which would be to relieve the Government of much difficulty in being called upon to meet cases in which the officials were not properly carrying out the law.

Mr. BOWERS. When you find a vessel of 57 tons, such as the *Viridesco* hailing from Lunenburg with two men drawing $54.97, it is a fraud on the face of it, because two men cannot navigate a vessel of that tonnage, and for the fishing business a crew of ten or twelve men is needed. In King's County there are six vessels ranging from 11 to 29 tons, each of which carried only two men. These twelve men drew somewhere between $140 and $150 in bounty, showing that if those bounty lists had been posted in each county it would have been in the interest of the fishermen to have seen that those fraudulent claims were not allowed and that no man should draw a bounty that was not entitled to the same. Some two or three fraudulent claims were called to my attention during this session, and I asked that reports and correspondence on the bounty question should be laid before Parliament some months ago, in order to see about them, but they have not been laid before the House yet. I now bring the matter again before the attention of the Government and I trust it will be attended to.

Mr. KAULBACH. I cannot understand the position in which the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) is placing these two parties to whom he has referred as receiving a larger portion of the bounty than they were entitled to. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) must know that when the bounty was given in 1882 the then Minister of Finance (Sir Leonard Tilley) was led to understand that a number of our fishermen were leaving the shores of the Maritime Provinces and seeking a living in the United States. To avoid that exodus he considered, and it was wisely considered by him too, that this bounty should be given for the encouragement of shipbuilders as well as fishermen, in order that they might build a class of vessels equal to those in the United States, and that they should be as well equipped and maintained as the American vessels, so that our fishermen might be able to prosecute the industry of the deep-sea fisheries which was then, as it were, in its infancy, whilst our shore fisheries were all but completely exhausted. The object of the bounty, therefore, was mainly for the encouragement of shipbuilding, and in view of that fact the argument of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) is most futile. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has asked that the bounty lists should be posted up in the customs offices. I have no objection to them being placed there, but I would suggest that it would be far better to place them in the office of the overseer of fisheries where they would be seen by the fishermen when they go for the bounty. In the office of customs the list would only

be seen by those who go for the purpose of entering or clearing vessels. If they are posted in the overseer's office they can be seen there, and if any one has received bounty to which he is not entitled it can be readily discovered.

Mr. BOWERS. The hon. gentleman entirely misunderstood my remarks. I did not refer to the subject he enlarged on at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes) has stated to the House that $5,000 has been paid out fraudulently in connection with these fishery bounties. That is a most serious statement and one which the Government should enquire into at once. In view of this fact, it seems to be a very necessary thing that these lists should be posted in some public place, that the request of the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) should be granted. If this were done fraud would be more easily detected.

Mr. FRASER. My object is to have these lists posted where they can be seen by the fishermen, and if the office of the overseer is a better place, I have no objection at all to their being posted there. Having made a convert of the redoubtable member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), I know that the Government will have no objection to my request, and that the names of those who received the bounty will be published.

Fishery Overseers, &c., British Columbia.....$10,000

Mr. GORDON. I wish to call the attention of the Government to the fact that all the fishery guardians of Vancouver Island, outside of the district of Victoria, have been dismissed, and the latest report I have had with reference to the matter is that one has been reappointed. If the fishery guardians had been dismissed, I would like to ask why should not the Government as well dismiss the fishery guardians of the other provinces, because it is just as essential to protect the fisheries in British Columbia as in any other part of the Dominion. There are eight or ten valuable fish rivers in Vancouver Island, and 20 or 30 fine lakes where fish were plentiful, but where, through over-fishing, or fishing out of season, they are now becoming scarce. I call the attention of the Government to this fact, that they may all know what has occurred, and that they may rectify what has been done, and have guardians appointed to look after the fishery there at the proper season.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase in this vote for British Columbia and that is no doubt intended to provide proper inspectors and overseers. I understand that the inspector for British Columbia has instructions to employ what help is necessary in order to protect these rivers. I will also call the attention of the acting Minister to what the hon. gentleman has stated.

To cover the cost of building Lobster Hatcheries $5,000

Mr. FRASER. Will the hon. Minister please give the House the information where these lobster hatcheries are? I understand there is one at Pictou?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, there is one at Bay View, which I understand is near Pictou. That is the only one that is fully established in the Province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. FRASER. What success has attended it so far?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is in its initiatory stage; but 7,000,000 young lobsters were hatched there last spring.

Mr. FRASER. I do not say that this is not a wise expenditure, but I am somewhat doubtful of the result. Have any others been established in the Dominion, and if so have they been successful?

Mr. FOSTER. I think this is the only one that has been established.

Mr. FRASER. Then this $5,000 is for that lobster hatchery?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I understand that the Bay View lobster hatchery is built, its total cost having been $4,121. This $5,000, I suppose, is for maintenance of that and for extending operations. I understand that the department are having incubators prepared, which are to be given to the different lobster factories, and they are to collect in these the berry of the lobster which they catch, and breed them. In that way operations are to be extended.

Mr. FRASER. I trust, for the county I represent, that this hatchery will be successful, the more so because it gives employment to the gentleman who opposed me, as evidently he was able to hatch more young lobsters than votes.

Mr. KAULBACH. I quite approve of an appropriation of this kind for lobster hatcheries, and I would ask the hon. Minister whether it is his intention to establish fish hatcheries for other kinds of fish than lobsters. I think it would be very advisable that he should do so, and in that way restore the fish to their normal quantity. I would also urge that the incubators should be distributed along the shore and given to the packers as much as possible, so that they or any other person who feels disposed may have an opportunity to make use of them. In that way I think the shores would have restored to them the quantity of fish they had in days gone by. The western shore of Nova Scotia has been considerably depleted, whilst the eastern shore is as yet well supplied with lobsters. I think the distribution of the incubators along the western shore would be advisable.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister where the vote for fish hatcheries is being expended—whether in one establishment or several, or in completing something that has already been undertaken?

Mr. FOSTER. It is for the maintenance of all the hatcheries, quite a large number, which we have in the different provinces. I do not understand that it is intended from this vote to establish any new ones.

Mr. BOWERS. Before this item is passed, I would call the attention of the Government to the claims of the western part of Nova Scotia to these lobster hatcheries.

Mr. FOSTER. The incubators are going to go around the coast.

Mr. BOWERS. Will they be in Digby County?

Mr. FOSTER. They will be there.

Mr. BOWERS. The lobsters have nearly deserted the western part of our province.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to enquire of the Minister whether it is proposed to establish a lobster hatchery in British Columbia? I may remark that the late Mr. Mowat was very enthusiastic in his endeavours to induce the Government to establish a lobster hatchery in that province, and, during his lifetime, he reported strongly in favour of it. At one time an assurance was given us that as soon as the test then being made by the American Government in Washington Territory had settled the question of the cultivation of the lobster, this Government would take some steps in that direction. I am informed that the test on the American side has proved a perfect success, and that the lobsters are being developed very rapidly. I would like to have some assurance from the Government on this point, because we like variety in our fish.

Mr. FOSTER, The hon. gentleman will remember that on two occasions we attempted to transport the lobster across the country to British Columbia, but in those instances the lobster unfortunately did not survive the journey. The United States had several experiences of the same kind. I have not followed the subject closely, and I do not know whether the later experiments in the United States have succeeded or not. If they do succeed, and it is better we should wait the result of their experiment, the Minister will have lobsters planted on the coast of British Columbia, provided the conditions are equal, and I suppose they will be, but during the present year nothing will be done.

To provide for the cost, maintenance and repair of fishery protection steamers and vessels..... $100,000

Mr. FOSTER. Under the existing *modus vivendi*, the same number of steamers has to be kept up and the same amount of supervision. Last year about $76,000 was spent on the *Acadian*, *La Canadienne*, the *Stanley*, the *Cruiser*, the *Dream*, the *Vigilant* and the *Agnes Macdonald*.

Mr. FRASER. I understand that a change has been made in the command of one of the vessels in the lower provinces and that Captain Gordon has been replaced. Who has taken his place?

Mr. FOSTER. Captain Spain of the Royal Navy. He has been in the country for some years, but the whole charge of the fleet is under the commander of *La Canadienne*, one of our oldest and most competent fishery officers, supervised at Ottawa by Lieut. Gordon.

Mr. FRASER. What were the special reasons for his appointment?

Mr. FOSTER. The department wished to get the most valuable men, and it is of some considerable importance to have on that service men who command confidence, not only of our own people, but of the Home Government, and men who have been trained in the Royal Navy are particularly well adapted in the work.

Mr. FRASER. There may be a difference of opinion, but I am inclined to think that a first-class Nova Scotia captain, who understands all about Nova Scotia, would be a man better fitted for the work. I say nothing about this gentleman, who no doubt is an admirable man in the Royal Navy, but there are other qualifications, such as a full knowledge of the fisheries and the people and the coast, which that gentleman may not have, and which would be more apt to be found in a Nova Scotia captain.

Mr. GORDON. Last year the inspector of fisheries of British Columbia was directed to proceed to Sproat's Lake on the west coast of Vancouver Island to examine the approach to that lake from the Stamp or Sumas River, with the view of facilitating the passage of fish to that lake as a spawning ground. The fish have great trouble in getting over the falls except when the water is very high. The inspector reported favourably on the lake, and suggested that certain improvements should be made. He estimated the cost of connecting Sproat's Lake with Sumas River at $750, and of an approach to Central Lake at about $1,500. This report was forwarded to me by the department, and I recommended that the connection with Sproat's Lake should be made this year, leaving the connection with the great Central Lake for some future time. Has anything been done with regard to that?

Mr. FOSTER. I have noted the enquiry, and the Deputy Minister will see about it. He does not recollect at present whether anything was done or not. This vote is particularly for purposes of that kind.

Survey of Oyster beds and Oyster culture.. $5,000

Mr. YEO. What parts of Prince Edward Island are to be served by this?

Mr. FOSTER. They are engaged at present inspecting Shediac Harbour, and when the work is over there they shall go to Summerside Harbour. The work is under the immediate direction of the inspectors at the respective places.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 28th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the North-West Mounted Police.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

DOMINION DAY.

Mr. KAULBACH. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments with respect to the announcement made the other day by the hon. leader as to the celebration of Friday next as Canada's holiday. The announcement was received with very great favour by the House, conceiving that every one feeling the pride of being a Canadian desired that that day should be celebrated in every sense of the term as Canada's national holiday. On

1st July, Friday, Canada will have completed her 25th year of existence as a Dominion,——

Mr. SPEAKER. I presume the hon. gentleman is not going to make a speech. If the hon. gentleman desires to ask a question, he can do so.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to offer just a few imperfect remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot proceed to make a speech on the calling of the Orders of the Day.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 76) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In section 2 I would like a verbal amendment to this purpose. In various parts of the Bill we use the words: "and this district shall return one member." I propose to insert words which will suffice for that purpose without having to repeat the words I have mentioned, and the words I suggest to add are: "each of the representative districts shall, unless herein provided to the contrary, return one member."

Amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I move that the following new section be added as section 5: "This Act shall take effect only after the dissolution of the present Parliament."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Chairman, before you report the Bill I wish to make a suggestion. As there are a large number of the members of the House who hold very strong views as to the power of the House to enact a measure of this sort, I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that we make provision in the Bill to the effect that a judgment of the Supreme Court shall be had upon the question, as to the interpretation of section 51.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That course could be taken at any time without a clause being put in the Bill, and therefore it is not necessary to insert it. I do not wish the House to suppose, however, that that course will be taken. The view is held very strongly on this side of the House, that we have power to deal with the subject, and we propose to proceed now as Parliament did in 1872 and 1882 and whenever a measure of redistribution came before it.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman is not ready to put a clause in the Bill to that effect, I cannot for my part say that I find very serious fault. The hon. gentleman will agree with us that this is a very important point and would require consideration, and I trust he will not make up his mind altogether not to take the opinion of the court upon this point. It is manifest that at some time or other this question must be decided by the court, no matter what may be the respective opinions of members of this House. It would be preferable, I should think, to have the constitutional point decided by the court in every way.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course the Minister of Justice might refuse to take the judgment of the court upon a question of this sort, but it seems to me the question can be raised by a private party in reference to any electoral district, the boundaries of which were fixed by the British North America Act of 1867, about the validity of which there can be no doubt, and which have, for the first time, been altered by this Bill. Take, for instance, all these constituencies south of the St. Lawrence, in the Province of Quebec, which are altered for the first time. I am of opinion that in any one of these cases the question might be brought before the courts as to the validity of the election, and that question ought to be determined before a general election is held. If we are right in our contention that this House has not the power to legislate in this way, we had better ascertain that fact before there is a general election so that we may conform to the law. If the view taken by the majority of the House is upheld, then no harm is done, but it would be extremely inconvenient to have a general election, and to find that the election would be invalid in a large number of the constituencies of that province, because the boundaries as fixed by the British North America Act have been altered by an authority not authorized by the constitution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to ask the Minister of Justice how this clause which has been inserted, that this Act does not take effect until the dissolution of this Parliament, is likely to affect the operation of the revision of voters' lists under the Franchise Bill? If this Act does not take effect in any shape or form until Parliament is dissolved, it seems to me that the various voters' lists must be revised on the lines of the present constituencies.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, undoubtedly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not that likely to produce a considerable practical inconvenience? You are altering some 40 or 50 constituencies at least by this Bill, and it certainly will be a matter of convenience for the members on both sides that the revision of the voters' lists should be conducted on the lines of the constituencies that are to be the subject of elections. It may not be possible to avoid the difficulty, but it will be a practical difficulty, I suspect.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Assuming that the Franchise Act is to remain as it is, the revision must take place on the old lines in view of the possibility of a bye-election in any constituency, and it will be useless until the last revision before dissolution to revise upon the new lines, because the lists would not be available until after dissolution. Next session, when the amendments to the Franchise Act are being considered, it will be necessary to consider the way in which this revision is to take place. in view of a dissolution, and it will be necessary likewise to make provision for the appointment of revising officers in the new electoral districts which are created in this Bill, because the boundaries of many of them are changed, and the jurisdiction is changed for the revising officers. Necessarily that whole subject will come up next session, and, as I have said, the revision in view of a dissolution of the present Parliament must be provided for.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest to my hon. friend that if he were to revert to the old system of municipalities making the list, we would avoid all these difficulties.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a novel idea.

Mr. MULOCK. You never heard it before.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Chairman, before you report the Bill I beg to bring a matter before the attention of the House. When the Minister of Justice was defining the electoral district of South Brant the other day, I suggested that it would be desirable that he should add to it the townships of Burford and Oakland, which had been taken from it and placed in the County of Oxford. I thought the hon. gentleman was giving this consideration, but I find he has said nothing about the matter, and I wish to have an opportunity now of proposing that this change be made. There may be objections taken to adding the township of Burford to South Brant, as it is a large township and might have an effect upon the population; but I will waive that point in the meantime, and make this simple proposition now: that the township of Oakland shall be added to the electoral district of South Brant. I do not see any reason why the committee should object to that. Territorially, the change is demanded, because as I pointed out before, this is a little three-cornered township which squares off the township of West Brantford. It is eight or ten miles from the County of Oxford to which it is now attached, and the population is only some 858 souls. Geographically, commercially, municipally and in every way it is connected with the County of Brant. The city of Brantford is the trading place of the people; they have no interest with any other county, and it would be a matter of pleasure to them to be placed back among their old associations. No political consideration enters into this proposition. Political considerations did enter into the change that was made in 1882, but there are none now. The electoral district of South Brant is Liberal and has gone Liberal at three successive elections since 1882. It had a Liberal majority in 1882 of between 200 and 300, in 1887 of over 500, and last year of over 500; while South Oxford is also overwhelmingly Liberal in all its municipalities. Every individual municipality in South Brant is Liberal, and the representative, so far as I know, has not lost confidence there. Therefore, there is no political consideration standing in the way: but the people feel wholly isolated from the County of Oxford, municipally and in every other way. Of course they are very proud to be represented by the present member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), as any people would be who knew the talents of that hon. gentleman; but there is no object in the direction of strengthening or weakening either county, and I make the motion as a matter of justice to those people, who wish to be again associated with their old friends in the south riding of Brant.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When I moved that the committee rise and report the Bill, members of the committee will remember that we passed over two amendments which were upon the Paper, and I cannot say how many others have been urged upon us which are not consequent upon the changes we have made as regards new constituencies. If we yielded to this amendment we should have to entertain all the others, and I think at this stage the hon. member would do well not to press the amendment, especially as he says it has not any political significance.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the committee rises, I wish to make a motion relative to the riding of East Simcoe. When the Redistribution Bill of 1882 was passed, I think a reference to *Hansard* will show that no constituency then created was received with such marks of dissatisfaction as that of East Simcoe. It was not denied that the riding had been constituted with no other object than to diminish the importance of the Liberal party in two ridings, and virtually to make what has been known, until the last election, as the Liberal hive of East Simcoe; and I appeal to hon. gentlemen here, irrespective of politics, who wish to see a wrong rectified, if the representation of that riding should not be changed, and changed to the direction indicated in my motion. That riding is entirely different from the riding of East Simcoe for the Local Legislature. In the first place, it is made up in part of the local riding of West Simcoe, in part of the local riding of East Simcoe, and in part of the local riding of Muskoka; so the glaring anomaly is presented of a riding for this House composed of parts of three ridings for the Local House. In the next place, the portion of the riding of which we complain, that is, the Muskoka portion, is not in any way connected with East Simcoe for judicial purposes. The district of Muskoka has its own assize court, its own county courts and its own division courts. The result is that men who sit on juries in the district of Muskoka and men who sit on juries in the County of Simcoe never see each other, and the only occasion on which they are ever brought face to face is once in five years when the party caucuses are held. In the next place, they are divided for county purposes. There is a county council for the district of Muskoka, and there is a county council also for the County of Simcoe. The result is that the members of the County Council of Simcoe and the members of the County Council of Muskoka never meet face to face. They have also separate agricultural societies; there is an electoral division society for Muskoka, and also an electoral division society for East Simcoe. But the most ludicrous part of the matter is, that in order to go from the Simcoe portion of the riding to the Muskoka portion, you have to travel through 20 miles of another riding. This is a glaring instance of a wrong that should be rectified. Not only should the present standing of the riding be considered, but when a wrong has been done it should be rectified; and in this case there was a grievous wrong, so grievous that no one in this House rose to defend the measure when it was attacked in 1882. The old riding of North Simcoe had a very large population in 1882. In 1878 there was polled in North Simcoe 5,836 votes. When the constituency was divided, the vote in the portion given to East Simcoe and the portion given to North Simcoe remained fairly proportionate. In 1878 the district of Muskoka polled 2,455 votes, while the riding of East Simcoe proper polled 2,524 votes. But in order to give a member to the north riding of Ontario population, it was found necessary to detach certain portions of the district of Muskoka, and the result was that the

vote of Muskoka was reduced to 1,988, therefore a vast disproportion in population existed between the riding of East Simcoe and the remaining part of Muskoka. But a further deduction was made for East Simcoe, with the result, according to the figures of 1878, that the present constituency of East Simcoe had 2,524 votes and the district of Muskoka 1,678 votes. I regret that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) is not in his place to-day, because, although I do not contend that he was interested in or engineered the arrangement carried into effect in 1882, still there is this fact, that he had been defeated in the general elections of 1878 by a narrow majority, and this portion of Muskoka that was thrown into the riding of East Simcoe had polled a majority of 164 in favour of the Liberal party. Now, I say it is a gross injustice that the riding of East Simcoe, with its vast population to-day, numbering nearly 10,000 souls more than that of Muskoka, should have thrown upon it a part of a riding with which it is in no wise connected, either municipally or judicially, and to reach which you must travel 20 miles through another riding. Hon. gentlemen to your left have contended in favour of county boundaries: they have also contended for an advance towards an equality of population; and hon. gentlemen to your right have not denied that these principles are right. Then, why should their application be denied to the riding of East Simcoe? To myself it is no concern which way that portion of the riding may go. What I propose is that there should be placed in the riding of Muskoka, the townships of Monck, Medora and Wood; and this change, so far as party results are concerned, makes very little difference. The population of the electoral district of Muskoka would then be 28,290, while the population of East Simcoe would be 31,380. From the remaining portion, the town of Gravenhurst and the township of Muskoka should be taken and added to North Ontario, which would make the population there 23,363. Even then the population of East Simcoe would be nearly 10,000 more than that of the adjoining riding of North Ontario, and some 3,000 more than the riding of Muskoka; and this change would place together a number of people who are associated by reason of county boundaries, in county councils and judicial districts. I sincerely trust that the Minister of Justice will see fit to make this amendment in the Act, because it will be consonant with the wishes of the people of both political parties there. Any political advantage that may be derived from the change will be very trifling, but it will improve an unwieldy riding, one which is certainly not a credit to those who constituted it, and which will be less creditable to hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House if they favour a continuance of it. There is also this to be borne in mind, that the riding of East Simcoe to-day, which would then have 31,380 souls, is a growing riding, having grown in the last ten years 10,000, while the other two ridings are stationary; in fact, Muskoka is rather retrograding, by reason of the fact that the lumber interest, which was formerly carried on there extensively, is now declining. I do trust that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will be consistent in this matter. If it is right to have a continuance of county boundaries and an advance towards the equalization of population, then my amendment will be adopted without a dissenting voice. I move:

That the riding of East Simcoe consist of the townships of Tiny, Tay, Medonte, Oro, Matchedash, North and South Orillia, and the towns of Orillia, Midland and Penetanguishene.

Mr. McNEILL. I, personally, am not interested in this matter. I do not understand much about the proposed arrangements, but the hon. member for Muskoka has written me to say that he does not wish it to be supposed he is a consenting party to this arrangement or approves of it. On the contrary, he disapproves of it.

Mr. BENNETT. I have a sketch here which I think will convince hon. gentlemen. The riding of East Simcoe in the main lies to the west, there is a large river running between the riding proper and the Muskoka part, and I ask in fairness that he should have those townships. The hon. gentleman had the ridings taken out in 1882 to save himself, and surely he should have now a trial of the reverse. In the election of 1878, that portion situated in East Simcoe gave an adverse majority of 164, and in the succeeding election the hon. member for Muskoka was elected by 2, so it is easy to see what would have been the result had the 164 been left in. The hon. gentleman is not here to oppose this, and that is an intimation that he acquiesces in my amendment. The hon. member for Muskoka, in the discussion on the second reading, asked: "Why should the riding of East Simcoe be left with a population of 35,800 while there are small constituencies? No person, he said, ever would defend the Bill of 1882, and he took occasion to denounce that Bill." He has placed himself on record as being in favour of nothing else than the continuance of county boundaries, and no doubt he is not here to-day because he does not wish to stultify himself.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What does the hon. gentleman intend to do with the part he takes off East Simcoe? It will not do to leave it out in the cold?

Mr. BENNETT. If from the riding of East Simcoe, which has nearly 3,600 souls, a portion be added to Muskoka, to which it belongs, that would increase the population of Muskoka to about 28,000. If the other portion be added to North Ontario, which in part was made up of the district of Muskoka, it would place the population of North Ontario at 23,360.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). If the hon. member for Muskoka were here, it would not be necessary for me to say a word, but I think it is the duty of some one to point out the effect this amendment would have on his constituency. The hon. member for East Simcoe proposes to give to Muskoka the following townships:—Monck containing a population of 854: Medora and Wood, 921. Now, the hon. gentleman will notice, on looking over the returns of the last general election, that Monck gave a Liberal majority of 30, and Medora and Wood a Liberal majority of 5, and therefore he proposes to take away a Liberal majority of 5 from East Simcoe and hand it over to his friend Muskoka. That is not all. There are two other from districts proposed to be taken from North Ontario, namely, the township of Muskoka which gave a Liberal majority of 12 at the last general election, and the town of Gravenhurst which gave a Liberal

majority of 20, and these are proposed to be added to North Ontario.

Mr. MADILL. It is proposed to place them in North Ontario.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Yes, but that takes from East Simcoe a majority of 12 Liberal votes for the township of Muskoka and 20 for the town of Gravenhurst. The hon. gentleman proposes to take away from East Simcoe no less than a majority of 67 Liberal votes, increasing his majority to that extent over what it was at the last election. That majority was 16, and this addition would give the hon. gentleman a majority at the next election of 83. North Ontario, by this amendment, would give Muskoka a majority of 43 Liberal votes, which, with the 35 given from East Simcoe, would give to the present sitting member for Muskoka a majority of 78 Liberal votes to contend against more than he has now. He had only a majority of 130, and this amendment, if carried, will cut down his majority 78, leaving him only 52 to come and go upon. In addition to giving these Liberal votes, the hon. gentleman is giving additional territory with 4,000 more population to work. North Ontario is to receive from East Simcoe a majority of 32 Liberal votes.

Mr. MADILL. Is the hon. gentleman taking the general election or the bye-election?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am taking the bye-election. North Ontario gives to Muskoka 43 Liberal votes and receives from East Simcoe 32, so North Ontario gains 11 votes by that transaction. North Ontario gives to North Victoria the townships of McLean, Ridout and Oakland.

Mr. BENNETT. The motion now before the Chair is not the first motion which I made, which is dropped.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It does not say what you will do with the other townships.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not asking for any interference with Victoria at all.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Then it is more selfish than ever. The hon. gentleman seeks by this amendment to thrust on the member for Muskoka a majority of 78 Liberal votes, relieves himself of 67, and North Ontario is given a majority of 32 Liberal votes and Muskoka 35, giving himself an advantage of 67 for no other purpose than to decrease the Liberal majority in the riding he represents, and thrust the disadvantage on one of his own friends who appears to be more independent than the Government would like him to be. To my mind, that does not appear to be a very gentlemanly course to take in the absence of a member who cannot defend himself. The only reason I rose was to call the attention of the colleagues of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) to the facts, and, if the Government deems it advisable to change the Bill in such a way that the member for Muskoka will have a majority of 78 additional Liberal votes and 4,000 additional people to deal with, well and good, but they must take the responsibility of it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) seems to share the independence which he says is unpalatable to the Government on the part of the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), though I should think his statement must be decidedly unpalatable to those among whom he sits when he says it is a most ungentlemanly thing to propose to put a number of Liberals into another man's riding. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to concur in the suggestions of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), and I think he has presented strong reasons why this should be done if we were starting afresh, and the member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) has also presented reasons in the same direction, but neither hon. gentleman has convinced me that we should yield at this stage of the Bill. Representations have been made to us, as I stated a few minutes ago, in regard to various changes, and many proposals have been made in reference to the district of Quebec, but we have stated time and again that we could not undertake to redress what hon. gentlemen thought grievances in the Act of 1882, and therefore it would be unwise at this stage of the Bill to accept the proposal of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MADILL. The hon. member for Huron seems to insinuate that this proposal emanates from the member for North Ontario.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. MADILL. I am quite satisfied to have my riding as it is. According to the motion of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), if it were carried out in its entirety, I would have no objection, but North Ontario to-day is 125 miles long. Under the Redistribution Bill of 1882 a portion of Muskoka was added to that riding. It was made a Reform riding and carried by the Liberals at the following election. If we have redeemed North Ontario and held it for two elections since that, it is not because of the Redistribution Bill, because North, South and West Ontario were carried by the Reform party at the election which followed the Redistribution Act of 1882. I was willing to give the township of Macaulay and the town of Bracebridge, and to take in the town of Gravenhurst with the township of Muskoka though the result would be that I would lose 14 votes. My riding is almost up to the average of population, and at the last election we polled more votes than Muskoka, more votes than the city of London, and more than half the votes polled in Hamilton with its two representatives. It polled more votes than the city of Ottawa with its two members. There are 63 ridings out of the 92 in the Province of Ontario, that polled less votes than North Ontario, which I think is up to, if not beyond, the average constituency in Ontario as regards the number of electors and the number of votes. However, after hearing the remarks of the Minister of Justice, I have nothing more to say. I was prepared to support the original proposition of the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), but I was not prepared to consent that all these additional townships and territories should be dumped upon North Ontario. Now, as there are only 29 constituencies in Ontario which polled more votes at the last election than my riding, and as it has so extensive a territory, I think it has a fair claim to be entitled to remain as it is.

Mr. BENNETT. Since the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) has insinuated that the action taken by me was not of my own accord, but was rather prompted by the Government, I wish

to make this statement. In the early part of the session when I understood a Redistribution Bill was to be brought down, I took occasion to confer with a gentleman who I believed was in the confidence of the Government, and I was led to believe there was to be such a change made in Simcoe as would be consistent with the principles of representation by population. I was afterwards assured that if such a change was not made as was suggested by that gentleman, at least a measure that contained in itself every element of fairness and of impartiality like the present one, would be reasonably entertained by the House. I now wish to state that I had no communication with any hon. gentleman of the Cabinet relative to this matter until I spoke about it to the Minister of Justice, who told me that it would be better that I should place a notice on the Paper of my intention to move. I have moved in the matter solely because it is consistent with the wishes of both political parties in my riding; I have moved in the matter because I believed hon. gentlemen in this House were actuated by a desire to do what was right, to do what was fair, and that my proposition would be consistent with their utterances. As for hon. gentlemen on the Government benches, I can only say that I presume the same liberty of thought and action is given to them that the Minister of Justice stated was vouchsafed to all the other evening, and I presume that same principle has effect on your left. If that feeling actuates hon. gentlemen, then I trust that the motion will be carried.

Amendment negatived.

Bill reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the third reading of the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before this Bill is read the third time I desire to place before the House an amendment of which I have given notice, in order that there may be no misunderstanding. Those hon. gentlemen who took part in the discussions on this Bill will recollect perfectly well that certain principles were laid down as being those by which the Government desired to be guided. Now, I have considered those principles carefully, and I believe that the amendment which I am about to place in your hands will give the Government an opportunity of acting up to their principles, which I cannot doubt they most sincerely desire to do; although, in consequence of the want of knowledge of the peculiar position of Ontario, which, no doubt, stood in the way of the hon. Minister of Justice acting up to his principles, he has not been able, in the case of my province, at all to carry them out in the way that I am sure he desires to do. However, as all I have got to say is pretty well embodied in the motion, I am not going at this moment to delay the House by a long disquisition on the subject, but I will simply place the motion in your hands. My motion is as follows:—

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that inasmuch as the members of the Government have repeatedly stated in their places in this House:

1. That so far as the Province of Ontario was concerned their only reason for disturbing the existing constituencies was that it was necessary to provide two additional members, one for the city of Toronto and the other for the district of Algoma and Nipissing;

2. That they desired to effect this object with the minimum possible disturbance of existing constituencies;

3. That so far as was consistent with the said objects they wished to equalize the numerical representation; and whereas it appears from the official returns of the census—(1) That the 35 constituencies which lie east of the County of York, in the Province of Ontario, contain 688,000 people, and have at present by this Bill thirty-five representatives; (2) that the 51 constituencies of the said Province of Ontario which lie west of the County of York, contain 1,184,000 people, and have been heretofore represented by 51 members of this House; and (3) whereas it further appears that the exact unit of representation for the Province of Ontario is 23,965; and (4) that the 35 ridings lying east of Toronto fall below the said unit by an average of 3,265 each and collectively by about 114,000 souls, and have consequently a representation of about five members in excess of the number to which they are entitled in proportion to their numbers; and (5) whereas the said 51 ridings lying west of the city of Toronto, contain on an average a population of 23,200 souls, being nearly 250 on the average in excess of the unit of representation, and collectively about 12,000 souls; and whereas it is proposed by the said Bill to reduce the number of the representatives heretofore given to the said western division of Ontario, and for that purpose to disturb the boundaries of not less than 17 different ridings: and whereas the said two additional representatives required for the city of Toronto and the district of Algoma and Nipissing can be obtained with a minimum of disturbance, and with far better results as regards the equalization of the population of the several districts by uniting together the four smaller electoral districts now existing in the Province of Ontario, to wit, the riding of

South Grenville, with	12,931
North Leeds and Grenville, with	13,523
Frontenac, with	12,425
Lennox, with	14,902

this Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend sub-section 2 of section 2 by striking out the said sub-section and by providing that the electoral districts of South Grenville and of North Leeds and Grenville be united and henceforward return one member, and that the electoral districts of Frontenac and Lennox be united and henceforward return one member, and that the two members so obtained be given to the city of Toronto and to the district of Algoma and Nipissing, and that the rest of the constituencies in the Province of Ontario remain unaltered.

Mr. CALVIN. I have had the privilege of being in this House only a few days, but there is one image on my mind which is very distinct, and it is this, the respect which hon. members of the Opposition entertain for county lines. This has been the burden of the song of those hon. gentlemen day after day—respect for county lines. But now the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) proposes to divide these counties, to separate entirely the north from south, to bring together two ridings which have no community of interest, and to utterly disregard county lines. And why? There must be some reason for this action. May we not reasonably suppose, may we not suspect at least that there is, perhaps, something of a personal character in this proposal? The hon. gentleman resides in Frontenac; the hon. gentleman has large business interests in Lennox; but in spite of these facts, and in spite of the well-known urbanity of manner and honeyed words and melting eloquence of the hon. member for South Oxford, he represents not Frontenac, not Lennox, but South Oxford in the west.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words on this matter, because this amendment comes with particularly bad grace from a gentleman who represented Lennox from 1863 to 1878 in Parliament. When this hon. gentleman, who is now the member for South Oxford, was first elected, he was returned for the riding of Lennox and Addington. So far as my memory serves me, he represented the municipal County of Lennox and Addington. But at Confederation those boun-

daries were changed very peculiarly, because the township of Camden, which would have made Lennox a square and compact constituency with about the unit of population was left out; and, I think, for a very good reason, because at the previous general election it had gone pretty strongly against the hon. member then sitting for Lennox and Addington. Is it to be supposed that this change was made at Confederation without the member who represented that riding being consulted? He was a strong supporter at the time of Sir John Macdonald, and I have no doubt but that he was consulted and that the lines laid down for the riding of Lennox were marked out by that hon. gentleman. Perhaps he found the riding of Lennox and Addington a pretty expensive riding, because at his first election there were heaps of American silver carried around in bags, and every doubtful voter, after he had voted for the hon. gentleman, put his hand into the bag, pulled out a handful of silver, and that was the price of his vote. In 1867 there was a general election, and the hon. gentleman on that occasion was opposed by Mr. J. T. Greene, a resident of Napanee, and we had two days' polling. On the first day, the hon. member for South Oxford happened to be behind by about 20 votes, but on the next day when evening came, he was elected. And why? He was president of the old Commercial Bank at the time, and it was said that after banking hours large amounts of money were drawn from the bank and distributed in the county. That hon. gentleman was elected in 1867 as a strong supporter of the Administration of Sir John Macdonald; but it will be remembered, that before another general election came round, Sir Francis Hincks happened to be appointed Minister of Finance, and the hon. gentleman took a short turn, became independent, and when he came back for re-election in 1872 he was elected as an independent supporter of the Government. When he came before his constituents in 1873, after he had taken office in the Mackenzie Administration, with a pledge that he was tired of corruption, that he would give the people a strong and honest administration, he was elected by a majority of 800. When the general election came round in 1874, the hon. gentleman was elected by acclamation. But, after the people had an experience of his work in the Cabinet during five years, and of his mismanagement of the affairs of the country, when he came back for re-election, his opponent, whom he had beaten in 1873 by 800 votes, defeated him by 57, and since that time he has been a wanderer all over Ontario, taking any constituency wherever one could be found. He has been in Huron and in South Oxford, and I am told the people are getting tired of him in his present constituency, and I give him a cordial invitation to return to Lennox, where his great wealth lies, where he owns all the water power in Napanee and other property outside of Napanee, and I promise him a warm reception. Since 1878 only two Reform members have been returned for Lennox, and they were only able to hold their seat for one session each. Why? When that hon. member was elected in 1883 and was subsequently compelled to go into the courts, a large number of his friends found it convenient to absent themselves in the United States; he was unseated, and he was simply saved from being disqualified by the absence of his friends. What was the result of the last general election? A candidate of the hon. gentleman's political faith was elected, but when he came to court he forthwith threw up the sponge and paid all the expenses, including the expenses on the personal charges. I think it is most unfair that the hon. gentleman who has received so many favours at the hands of the people of Lennox should now endeavour to wipe out the constituency, and add them to the riding of Frontenac, which would make it a long narrow constituency along the front, and to connect us with people with whom we have no business relations, with whom we have no municipal connection, and with whom we have no dealings whatever. I trust that this House will see its way, as I have no doubt it will, to vote down the amendment of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to say a few words upon this question before the Bill is disposed of. We were all rather pleased to listen to the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Calvin) making his maiden speech in this Chamber. We can all remember at the time of his election that it was understood he came to this House as an Independent member, but, Sir, I think we must conclude from his introductory speech that he is independent all to one side like the handle of a jug. He has taken the first opportunity afforded him to vent his bitterness upon the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have this to say also with regard to the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson). When he was first member for that constituency there was a post office promised to the town of Napanee, and that post office has been built, at a cost of $56,000 to this country, in order, if possible to secure that riding for him. Before the Public Accounts Committee last session, there were exposures made with regard to the extravagances in the construction of that building, and it was proved that the clock alone cost $1,850. I contend that the slurs that have been cast on the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright are quite uncalled for, for the reason that on every occasion hon. gentlemen opposite could get, they endeavoured to gerrymander him out of his seat. He was in Huron, and they gerrymandered him out of that. They have pursued him with bitterness on every possible opportunity, but notwithstanding that fact he is still in Parliament and is an honoured member of this House. He has never been turned out of this Chamber on a Pacific scandal. My hon. friend refers to his having been rejected in Lennox. Why, Sir, the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite was rejected in the Conservative hive of Kingston in 1882 when his acts were such that even the people of Kingston could not swallow the crime that was laid at the door of himself and his colleagues. There is nothing said about that now, but after hunting the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) for 15 to 20 years, gerrymandering him from constituency to constituency, and spending all the power and means and influence that could be used against him, the gentlemen opposite have never been able to turn him out of this Chamber, and they never will be able. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stands to-day untarnished by any political crime or any political disgrace. He has sat in Parliament 25 years, and there has never been any Pacific scandal against him. There has never

been a single contract by which he has taken the money of the people of this country fastened on him, and hon. gentlemen should be ashamed in this House to make an uncourteous remark towards that distinguished member.

Mr. BOYLE. I shall detain the House but a few moments. I would not have spoken at all were it not that the interests of the constituency which I represent are somewhat concerned in the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I shall not touch upon the history of any of the parties to this amendment or of those who have spoken upon it. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) referred to the unfair means which have been taken to gerrymander the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) out of his position; but it remained for his own friend (Mr. Paterson) to give him the unkindest cut of all, by endeavouring to tack on to his county the township of Oakland. That is the only gerrymander that has been attempted on the hon. member for South Oxford this session at all events. So far as I have been able to gather from the amendment before the House, I think the intention is to allow the constituencies of North Wentworth and Monck to remain as they are at present, and to make the necessary changes in the constituencies east of Toronto; Frontenac and Lennox to be united, and also the Counties of South Grenville and Leeds and Grenville. In regard to the equalization of population, I am unable to see that very much will be obtained by that, because if Frontenac and Lennox are united, they will make a constituency of 28,347 in population, something like 5,000 over the unit, and the other constituencies if united will give a population of 26,454, or 3,500 above the unit. But, Sir, I do not object on that ground, but because it seems to me that notwithstanding the disposition of the hon. gentleman to do fairly by western Ontario, the real motive is to wipe out two Conservative constituencies in order to make the necessary additions to Toronto and Algoma. If it were not for this apparent object I would give the amendment more hearty support. In regard to equalization of population, I do not think there is much to complain of in the scheme proposed by the Minister of Justice. The constituencies of South Norfolk, Haldimand, Monck, North Wentworth, North Brant and South Wentworth are all very much below the unit. In fact I think that either east or west of Toronto, scarcely six constituencies can be found near by each other in which the population is so small. Therefore, I think it would not be unjust to allow one of these constituencies to be wiped out of that group, and as North Brant is the smallest of the lot, I think that is the one that ought to be sacrificed. If the hon. gentleman had made an amendment by which one of these constituencies in the west and one in the east had been extinguished, and in which the political balance of the parties would not have been disturbed, I would have supported it more cordially. But, Sir, although I think that his motive may not be a good one, nevertheless I am here first, and above all, to represent the constituency of Monck. It is my duty to fight for that constituency, and, notwithstanding all the objections which I have to the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) I feel it my duty to support it.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Laurier,
Armstrong,	Lavergne,
Bain (Wentworth),	Leduc,
Béchard,	Legris,
Beith,	Lister,
Bernier,	Livingston,
Bourassa,	Lowell,
Bowers,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bowman,	McMillan (Huron),
Boyle,	McMullen,
Brown,	Mignault,
Campbell,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Monet,
Christie,	Mulock,
Colter,	Paterson (Brant),
Delisle,	Perry,
Fauvel,	Rider,
Featherston,	Rinfret,
Forbes,	Rowand,
Geoffrion,	Sanborn,
Gibson,	Scriver,
Godbout,	Semple,
Grieve,	Somerville,
Guay,	Vaillancourt,
Innes,	Yeo.—51.
Landerkin,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Macdonald (King's),
Baker,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bennett,	Maclean (York),
Bergeron,	McAlister,
Bergin,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bowell,	McDougald (Pictou),
Calvin,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cargill,	McKay,
Carignan,	McLean (King's),
Carling,	McLennan,
Carpenter,	McLeod,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McNeill,
Chapleau,	Madill,
Coatsworth,	Mara,
Cochrane,	Masson,
Cockburn,	Miller,
Corby,	Mills (Annapolis),
Costigan,	Montague,
Craig,	Northrup,
Davin,	Ouimet,
Davis,	Patterson (Colchester),
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Patterson (Huron),
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Pelletier,
Dewdney,	Pope,
Dickey,	Pridham,
Dugas,	Putman,
Dupont,	Reid,
Dyer,	Rosamond,
Fairbairn,	Ross (Dundas),
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Ross (Lisgar),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Skinner,
Foster,	Smith (Ontario),
Fréchette,	Sproule,
Gillies,	Stairs,
Guillet,	Temple,
Haggart,	Thompson (Sir John),
Henderson,	Tisdale,
Hughes,	Turcotte,
Ingram,	Tyrwhitt,
Jeannotte,	Wallace,
Kenny,	Weldon,
Langevin (Sir Hector),	White (Cardwell),
LaRivière,	Wilmot,
Lépine,	Wilson,
Lippé,	Wood (Brockville).—90.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Taylor,	Mr. Sutherland,
Mr. Macdonald (Winnipeg),	Mr. Choquette,
Mr. Ryckman,	Mr. Devlin,
Mr. McKeen,	Mr. Borden,

Mr. Ives.	Mr. Edgar.
Mr. Cleveland.	Mr. Carroll.
Mr. Cameron.	Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Hazen.	Mr. Gillmor.
Mr. Tupper.	Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Jones.	Mr. Bruneau.
Mr. Monerieff.	Mr. Brodeur.
Mr. Hearn.	Mr. Frémont.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. member for West Lambton, the hon. member for Guysborough, the hon. member for Charlotte, and the hon. member for Ottawa County, have not voted.

Mr. LISTER. I understood that I was paired with the hon. member for East Lambton. I find that such is not the case, and I desire to vote for the amendment.

Mr. McKAY. The hon. member for West Lambton was paired, but I may say that the hon. member is justly entitled to vote.

Mr. DEVLIN. I did not hear the amendment read.

Mr. GILLMOR. I am paired with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen).

Mr. FRASER. I am paired with the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron).

Amendment negatived.

Mr. YEO. Before the question is put, I beg leave to move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with power to amend the same as follows:—

That section 6 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

In Prince Edward Island there shall be three electoral districts as at present constituted and designated, of which the electoral district of Prince County shall continue to return two members, the electoral district of Queen's County shall continue to return two members, and the electoral district of King's County shall return one member.

I need scarcely say that the effect of this amendment will be to leave county lines as they are at present established.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Yeo:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan.	Laurier,
Armstrong,	Lavergne,
Bain (Wentworth),	Leduc,
Béchard,	Legris.
Beith,	Lister.
Bernier,	Livingston,
Bourassa,	Lowell,
Bowers.	Macdonald (Huron),
Bowman,	Maclean (York),
Brown,	McMillan (Huron),
Campbell,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mignault,
Christie,	Mills (Bothwell),
Colter,	Monet.
Delisle.	Mulock.
Devlin,	Paterson (Brant),
Dickey,	Perry,
Fauvel,	Rider,
Featherston,	Rinfret.
Forbes,	Rowand,
Geoffrion.	Sanborn.
Gibson,	Scriver,
Godbout,	Semple,
Grieve,	Somerville,
Guay,	Vaillancourt,
Innes.	Weldon,
Landerkin,	Yeo.—54.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Lippé,
Baker.	Macdonald (King's),
Bennett,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bergeron,	McAlister,
Bergin,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bowell,	McDougald (Pictou),
Boyle.	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Calvin,	McKay,
Cargill,	McLean (King's),
Carignan,	McLennan,
Carling,	McLeod,
Carpenter,	Madill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe).	Mara,
Chapleau,	Masson,
Coatsworth,	Metcalfe,
Cochrane.	Miller,
Cockburn,	Mills (Annapolis).
Corby.	Montague,
Costigan,	Northrup,
Craig.	Ouimet,
Davin,.	Patterson (Colchester).
Davis.	Patterson (Huron).
Desjardins (Hochelaga).	Pelletier,
Desjardins (L'Islet).	Pope.
Dewdney,	Pridham,
Dugas,	Putnam,
Dupont,	Reid,
Dyer.	Rosamond,
Fairbairn.	Ross (Dundas),
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.).	Ross (Lisgar),
Ferguson (Renfrew).	Skinner.
Foster.	Smith (Ontario),
Fréchette,	Sproule.
Gillies,	Stairs.
Guillet,	Temple.
Haggart.	Thompson (Sir John),
Henderson,	Tisdale.
Hughes.	Turcotte.
Ingram.	Tyrwhitt,
Jeannotte,	Wallace,
Kenny.	Wilmot,
Langevin (Sir Hector),.	Wilson.
LaRivière,	Wood (Brockville).—87.
Lépine,	

[Pairs same as previous division.]

Amendment negatived.

[At one o'clock the House adjourned, and at three o'clock resumed.]

Mr. BÉCHARD. I move an amendment:

That this Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House in order that it be so amended as to provide that the localities called Notre Dame des Anges and Notre Dame de Stanbridge village be declared as continuing to form part of the electoral district of Missisquoi.

When, on Wednesday of last week, the House, in Committee of the Whole, was dealing with the Bill, a motion was made to the effect that these two municipalities should be severed from the County of Missisquoi, of which they were forming part, and be annexed to the County of Iberville. I must say that this motion was a surprise to me and to the people whom it affects, because it did not form part of the Bill as prepared by the Government, and the people had no notice of it; and because, further, it was not a part of the arrangement which I understood was made between members of the Government and the leader of the Opposition during the afternoon of Wednesday last, concerning the Province of Quebec. It was a surprise to me for this other reason, that during the morning sitting of this House, on the same date, the Government, by the mouth of the Minister of Public Works, declared, in answer to a question put by the leader of the Opposition, that with regard to the Counties of Iberville and St. John's, it was a settled question that there would be no change. Now, as the House knows, I made on that day strenuous efforts to oppose the proposed transfer of those two municipalities from the County of Missisquoi to the County of Iberville. I showed that it would be a gross violation of the principle of equalization of population, which I understand the Government have undertaken to

apply, as it could conveniently be done, in the preparation of this Bill. I showed that by the Bill, as prepared by the Government, while the population of Missisquoi would be 21,077 souls, that of the new electoral district of Iberville and St. John's would be only 21,396, a difference of over 200 souls. That was as perfect an equalization of the population as could be had under present circumstances. I showed also that by the annexation of those two municipalities to the County of Iberville, the respective populations of the two counties would be as follows: Iberville, 23,017; Missisquoi, 19,456, a difference of 4,000 between. These figures prove that by adopting this motion of annexing those two municipalities from Missisquoi to Iberville and St. John's, we would not effect that close approximation of the principle of equalization adopted by the Government in this Bill. I said that these people had no community of interests with St. John's and Iberville. The centre of those two municipalities to-day is only four miles distant from the shire-town of Missisquoi, Bedford. It is in that town their banking business is done, and their judicial business is done either in Bedford or Sweetsburg, the place of residence of the hon. member for Missisquoi; and by removing them from Missisquoi to annex them to Iberville and St. John's, you place them at about 20 miles from the town of Iberville and St. John's where they have no business to go. Certainly, if they want to make large purchases of goods, they will go to Montreal rather than to St. John's, as they have more business with Montreal than with the latter city, and all the other business is done in Missisquoi. Since the other day, I have received a protest from the people of those two municipalities to whom I gave notice of what was taking place. Of course they had no notice of this change. It was not comprised in the Bill as at first prepared, so that they had no notice as the rest of the people had, who had what was proposed to be done in the Bill before them several weeks before the measure was submitted to the House. These people, however, had no notice whatever of this change, as it was not in the Bill, and further, it did not form part of the arrangement arrived at between members of the Government and the leader of the Opposition, concerning the Province of Quebec. The following is the document which I have received, and which I will submit to this House:—

"At a public meeting of the freeholders of the municipalities of Notre Dame des Anges West, held on Sunday, June the 26th, 1892, in the village of Notre Dame de Stanbridge, after mass, in order to ascertain what was the opinion of the electors on the Bill now before the House of Commons, by which it is proposed to take the said municipalities from the County of Missisquoi and to add them to the County of Iberville:

"Mr. J. J. B. Gosselin moved, seconded by Léon Lacoste and J. B. Bouchard:

"That François Marchessault and Charles Wehr, mayors of the said municipalities, be appointed presidents of the said meeting, and that Mr. J. G. Trahan be appointed secretary.

"Messrs. Sobel Hébert and Jean Bouchard moved, seconded by Messrs. Charles Côté and John Farrell, that the electors of the said municipalities disapprove of the Bill by which it is proposed to annex the said municipalities of the County of Missisquoi to the County of Iberville.—Carried unanimously.

"Messrs. Charles Côté and John Farrell moved, seconded by Sobel Hébert and J. B. Bouchard, that this meeting disapprove of the Hon. G. B. Baker using his influence as a member of the House to take such an important portion of the County of Missisquoi and annex it to the County of Iberville without even consulting the electors.—Carried unanimously.

"FRANÇOIS MARCHESSAULT.
President.
"CHARLES C. WEHR.
President.
"J. G. TRAHAN.
Secretary."

Besides this, there is a petition addressed to the members of this House, which I received yesterday at about one o'clock:

"NOTRE DAME DE STANBRIDGE, 27th June, 1892.

"To the Honourable Members of the House of Commons of Canada.

"The undersigned electors of the municipalities of Notre Dame de Stanbridge and of Notre Dame des Anges West, for the federal elections, respectfully submit:

"1st. That their interests are closely connected with those of the electors of the County of Missisquoi, the shire-town of which is only four miles distant from the centre of said municipalities.

"2nd. That they have no business relations with the people of the County of Iberville.

"Therefore they pray that the aforesaid municipalities shall not be taken from the County of Missisquoi and annexed to the Counties of St. John's and Iberville.

"And your humble petitioners will ever pray."

Then follow 127 names which I will not read. This petition is made according to our rules, and all the signatures are certified. This, I think, is sufficient to justify the position I took the other day when I said I had reason to believe the people of these two municipalities were hostile to their proposed annexation to the County of Iberville. I was told the other day that I was raising a prejudice. I answered to that that I had never done it, and, after 25 years passed in this House, I can claim that I have never made any appeal to racial or religious prejudices, and I have always disdained to do it upon the hustings. I believe in a country like this, composed of men belonging to different races and different creeds, every man holding a position as a public man should feel it his duty to teach his fellow-men who may be less informed, that they must take the means to live in peace with their fellow citizens of different origin, and consider them as brethren; but, while I stand above prejudice, and would denounce any appeal to prejudice, that is no reason why, holding a position in this House, I should not attempt to defend the rights of some of my fellow citizens because they are Frenchmen. I would have been very glad if my hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Baker) had come to the conclusion to have that proposed annexation of a part of his constituency to Iberville dropped and abandoned, because, as he has given no reason, no legitimate, even no plausible reason, to justify the transfer, we will be left to make conjecture as to what the reason is. The only reason he alleged was that of symmetry as to the boundaries of the two counties. Surely he fails to recollect that by crossing the river and invading the large municipality of Lacolle, he is making a larger departure from symmetry than he desires to rectify. I stated that these two municipalities are nearly all French. The hon. gentleman said I was mistaken. I cannot say as to that, but I am sure there is a large majority of French in the population, and they may think it is on account of their nationality that they are removed to Iberville, which is a French constituency. I have English-speaking people in my county, and I would strenuously object to their being re-

moved. They are good, peaceable citizens. Some of them support me and some vote against me, but there would be no reason on account of their nationality for their being removed from that constituency. I do not say that nationality is the ground for this proposed change, but it may be interested in that way by those who are affected by this Bill. Of course, in the Province of Quebec both races live in harmony, and there are many counties which are represented in this House by gentlemen speaking the English language, where three-fourths of the people are French-Canadians. They have done well to elect those gentlemen. They had to consider whether they were worthy of their confidence or not, and then, no matter what language they speak, they had good reason to elect them. At the same time, while the minority in the Province of Quebec is generously treated by the majority, I think, whenever the minority is French, and is found in the neighbourhood of an English-speaking population, they should be as generously treated and their rights should be taken into consideration. I think these documents speak for themselves, and I will, therefore, add no more to what I have said.

Mr. BAKER. It is no doubt the duty of every member of this House to receive with meekness and humiliation criticism and even castigation at the hands of those who have done their utmost to prevent him from becoming a member of Parliament, and in that condition of affairs I accept the condemnation that is offered by the resolution that has been read to the House by my hon. friend the member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard). But I think that, if the history of that resolution were made known to the House, it would be found to have emanated with the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. BÉCHARD. Ha! ha!

Mr. BAKER. I have not the slightest doubt that that resolution was inspired from the seat of the hon. member for Iberville, and I ask him to state frankly whether he has not communicated with Mr. Gosselin, the Rouge leader in that parish, in connection with this subject.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I have no hesitation in saying that these people having had no notice of the change proposed by the Minister of Customs with regard to them, I gave notice of it to one person only there. I told that person what was being done, and I said to him: I give you notice, and you may do as you think proper, but if you like to protest against it now is your time to do so.

Mr. BAKER. How the patriotic efforts of my hon. friend melt away in the light of the facts. This Mr. Gosselin has called, not a town meeting in the proper sense of the word, but he has called together a few kindred spirits whose names I know, and whom I have known ever since I have been in politics as the most active and virulent Grits in the Dominion of Canada, who have taken upon themselves to speak for the whole county. But these gentlemen were under an entire misapprehension. The reasons set forth by them and the reasons given by the hon. gentleman from his seat in this House, were that their banking arrangements will be disturbed, that their business relations will be thrown out of gear, that their judicial business cannot be accomplished as easily as it has been in the past. Can it be possible that these men do not understand that they are not to be detached from the County of Missisquoi, they are not sent to the *chef-lieu* of another district to do their judicial business, but they remain exactly where they were. More than that, they put their votes into the very ballot box where they would have put them if they had remained a part of the County of Missisquoi. They can exercise their discretion in going either to the *chef-lieu* of St. John's and Iberville to listen to the political expositions of my hon. friend on nomination day, or they can take themselves to Missisquoi where I promise them they will hear political affairs discussed with considerable vehemence. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to fight over again the battles that were fought in committee. The committee considered this matter and decided upon a certain line of conduct. They decided to adopt the amendment that was offered in committee, and I submit that at this stage of the proceedings it is not expedient to go over the same ground again. My hon. friend has said that it was no part of the arrangement that was arrived at between the members of the Government and the members of the Opposition. I was not present at that conference, and consequently took no part in it, but I certainly understood that the whole matter was considered, and that this amendment was offered as a part of the understanding that was entered into upon that occasion. So far as the hon. gentleman imputes blame to me, I state frankly that I would have been just as well pleased if Missisquoi had been left within its old lines, but for reasons which were obvious to those who had charge of the Bill, Lacolle was brought into Missisquoi. It was brought into the County of Missisquoi for reasons that were held to be sufficient, and the same reasons made it expedient to detach these two parishes and make them form part of the County of Iberville. As to the pretension that this is done for the purpose of getting rid of the French population, it has not the slightest shadow of foundation. The relations between the English and French population will not be disturbed by bringing in Lacolle, and detaching these two parishes. There are as many French-Canadians in the parish of Lacolle, who are brought into Missisquoi, as are taken away by detaching these two parishes. The census returns will show that there are more French-Canadians in the parish of Lacolle than in these two parishes. Sir, I do not think it necessary to go over the arguments that were offered at the time this amendment was adopted in committee, but I submit to my hon. friend that, having inspired his friends in the County of Missisquoi to take action, and having succeeded in getting this resolution upon the records of the House, he has obtained his object, and I suggest that he withdraw his amendment.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Baker) treats this amendment in a jocular way, and perhaps after all that is the wisest way to deal with it. It is an old saying that whenever you have no argument to offer, the best way to get out of a bad position is to treat it as a joke. These are the tactics adopted by the hon. gentleman to-day. I did hope, however, that the Government would see their way to accept this

proposition of my hon. friend from Iberville (Mr. Béchard). No serious argument whatever has been offered in favour of the change that is now contemplated by the Bill. The only reason alleged the other day by the member for Missisquoi was that detaching these two parishes from Missisquoi and adding them to Iberville, would improve the symmetry of the constituency. This pretension has the resemblance of an argument, but after all, that is not the primary motive. The hon. gentleman says that he is perfectly indifferent, that he would, in fact, have preferred that these two parishes remain where they are, and I do not see why his wishes should not be gratified in this matter. The hon. gentleman says that my hon. friend communicated with the people in those interested parishes. So he did, and I think it was not only his right, but his duty to do so; it was perfectly proper that those people should be made aware of what is going on. The hon. gentleman knows that the discontent created by the removal of these two parishes is not confined alone to those parishes, but, I understand, pretty generally through the County of Missisquoi. I submit that all the reasons that prevailed the other day to maintain the township of Clarence in the County of Russell, apply with still greater force to keep these two parishes in the County of Missisquoi where they have been for so many years.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend knows that the same reasons do not apply and cannot apply in this case.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, let us see.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In the case of Clarence, a township of 6,000 people was put into another county, where the majority did not want it, and where the unit of representation was already exceeded. This addition to the County of Missisquoi was not made at the request of my hon. friend. Lacolle was a parish which, in 1871, had over 3,000 population. It diminished in 1881, and in 1891 it had fallen to 2,528. The exodus from the parish has not been French, and I deny the statement of my hon. friend who says that this change is proposed to take away the influence of the French-Canadian electors from the County of Missisquoi. There is no foundation whatever for that statement, because the French-Canadian vote and French-Canadian influence added to the County of Missisquoi by the admission of Lacolle, are equivalent in numbers and in influence, to what it loses by these two parishes. There are at least as many, if not more, French-speaking electors in Lacolle added to Missisquoi, as there are French-Canadians added to St. John's and Iberville.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Béchard:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Laurier,
Armstrong,	Lavergne,
Bain (Wentworth),	Leduc,
Béchard,	Lépine,
Beith,	Lister,
Bernier,	Livingston,
Bourassa,	Lowell,
Bowers,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bowman,	McMillan (Huron),
Brown,	McMullen,
Campbell,	Mignault,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mills (Bothwell),
Christie,	Monet,
Colter,	Mulock,
Delisle,	Paterson (Brant),
Devlin,	Pelletier,
Fauvel,	Perry,
Featherston,	Pope,
Flint,	Rider,
Forbes,	Rinfret,
Geoffrion,	Rowand,
Gibson,	Sanborn,
Godbout,	Scriver,
Grieve,	Semple,
Guay,	Somerville,
Innes,	Vaillancourt,
Landerkin,	Yeo.—54.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Lippé,
Baker,	Macdonald (King's),
Bennett,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bergeron,	Maclean (York),
Bergin,	McAlister,
Bowell,	McDonald (Victoria),
Boyle,	McDougald (Pictou),
Calvin,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cargill,	McKay,
Carignan,	McLean (King's),
Carpenter,	McLennan,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McLeod,
Chapleau,	Madill,
Coatsworth,	Mara,
Cochrane,	Masson,
Cockburn,	Metcalfe,
Corby,	Miller,
Costigan,	Mills (Annapolis),
Craig,	Montague,
Davin,	Northrup,
Davis,	Ouimet,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Patterson (Colchester),
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Patterson (Huron),
Dewdney,	Pridham,
Dickey,	Putnam,
Dugas,	Reid,
Dyer,	Robillard,
Earle,	Roome,
Fairbairn,	Rosamond,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Simard,
Foster,	Skinner,
Frechette,	Smith (Ontario),
Gillies,	Sproule,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Stairs,
Gordon,	Temple,
Guillet,	Thompson (Sir John),
Haggart,	Tisdale,
Henderson,	Turcotte,
Hughes,	Tyrwhitt,
Ingram,	Wallace,
Jeannotte,	Weldon,
Kaulbach,	Wilmot,
Kenny,	Wilson,
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (Brockville).—89.
LaRivière,	

[Pairs, same as previous division, substituting Mr. Edwards for Mr. Devlin in Opposition list.]

Amendment negatived.

Mr. PELLETIER. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before this Bill is read a third time, I wish to make some few observations. By this Bill, as amended, the Counties of Laprairie and Napierville are annexed to each other. During the delate on this matter there were brought up two questions: the question of equalizing the population by the Government, and the question of political equalizing by the Opposition. Although anxious to see these two counties now united still return two members as before, when I happen to notice that the Government are coming to an understanding with the gentlemen opposite, I am bound to consider one thing, that is, that it is an utter impossibility on my part to prevent this being done. But if both the Counties of Laprairie and Napierville are united, let us at all events respect the rules that proceed from these two questions of equalizing brought up in respect to population and the political views of the voters affected by this Bill

I cannot see why, according to this understanding accepted by both sides in this House and under which both the Counties of Laprairie and Napierville will return only one member,—I say I cannot see why the Indian reserve of Caughnawaga should be taken from Laprairie and thrown into the County of Chateauguay. The Iroquois who live on that reserve always belonged to the County of Laprairie since they have a right to vote. It is through the voters of the County of Laprairie that they became familiar with the exercise of that right; it is through the voters in Laprairie, St. Constant and St. Isidore, three parishes of the present County of Laprairie with which they are in steady relations,—I repeat it is with these three parishes that they have joined interest. That was the natural path they had to follow. Annexing them to the County of Chateauguay as proposed, will compel them to reascend the river, will bind them to a path they have never followed up to this time; it is causing them to walk in an unknown direction; it is coupling them with people with which they never had any connection whatever; while compelling them to desert other people alongside of whom they were used to fighting. On Sunday last I went and visited a certain number of the voters of my county and I went to the Caughnawaga reserve. I talked the matter over with the inhabitants on that reserve. They all said they regretted to be thrown away in another county, thereby being torn in a violent way from an electoral riding where they had steady connections. For these reasons, and at the instance of my electors from Laprairie, and also at the instance of the electors of Caughnawaga, I think it my duty to move, seconded by the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas):

That the Bill (No. 76) be not now read the third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole to amend it by striking out in paragraph (*p.*) of sub-section 3 of section 2 the words "and St. Louis (or Indian village and reserve of Caughnawaga)" and adding the said words to paragraph (*q*) of section 3.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The amendment made in the Bill is the result of suggestions which were made at a conference between leading members on both sides of the House. The proposition which came from the other side of the House was that these two counties should be united, and that was acceded to on a condition with respect to the locality mentioned in this amendment. If there has been any misunderstanding on that point, it is very much to be regretted, but we must give the hon. gentleman the same answer we have given to our other friends, that we cannot yield to any proposition now made to amend the Bill in committee. The proposal respecting the Caughnawaga Indians was certainly fully understood by the committee when the section was adopted.

Amendment negatived.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to amend section 2 so that the Act shall not come into force until the first day of July, 1893, instead of first of January, 1893. There was a good deal of discussion on section 6, because it undertakes to state the extent to which the criminal law of Canada is applicable, and it can only state it correctly by referring to the statutes of the United Kingdom which extend the authority of our courts beyond our legislative jurisdiction. Although the section is instructive as it stands, and, I think, correctly states the law, yet I propose to drop it in order to avoid ambiguity.

On section 5,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We had some discussion about the question of easement, and I propose to strike out this section altogether, and leave the matter as it is by common law.

On section 63,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Sub-section 2 of that stood over in order that we might redraft it to make provision for the husband not being accessory to the fact, by the mere fact that he shelters his wife:

"No married person whose husband or wife has been a party to the offence shall become an accessory after the fact thereto by receiving, comforting or assisting the other of them, and no married woman whose husband has been a party to the offence shall become an accessory after the fact thereto by receiving, comforting, or assisting, in his presence or by his authority, any other person who has been a party to such offence in order to enable her husband or other persons to escape."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On page 4, we will alter a definition, which will remove some difficulties that we are just coming to. I propose to strike out the two last lines of sub-section (*w*), in the middle of the page. There are various provisions as we go on for the punishment by heavy penalties, of any one who interferes with a public officer in the discharge of his duty, and the objection was made that that would include even a messenger. I propose to strike out the two last lines, 25 and 26 of paragraph (*w*) of clause 3 on page 4, finishing the clause with the word "Canada."

On section 75,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that is all right. There was some question as to whether holding out inducements to a man not to turn out on parade would be inducing him to desert. We have ascertained that is not the case.

On section 110,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is worded rather ambiguously. I propose to alter that by making it read thus:

"Every one, not thereto required by his lawful trade or calling, who is found in any town or city carrying about his person any sheath knife, and so on."

On section 111,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to insert after the word "soldier" in the first line the words: "public officer or peace officer." I want penitentiary officers to be authorized to carry arms in the discharge of their duty.

On section 122,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is the one about which we had a discussion as to sedition. I think the amendment I propose will meet all views about that, I propose to strike out all the words of the section down to line 22, including the words, "Provided that" in clause 2 of sub-section (*d*);

so that we shall make no definition of seditious intention, but will simply go on to say what shall not be seditious, leaving the definition of sedition to common law. The section will begin with: "No one shall be" on the twenty-second line.

On section 265,

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Featherston) has received a letter from a member of the Ontario bar who gives his opinion that this section makes the punishment of a party guilty of an indictable offence, on summary conviction, liable to both a fine and imprisonment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Where a clause says that a convicted person is subject to two kinds of punishment either kind may be inflicted, in the discretion of the court; as for instance, when we say that a man shall be liable to be imprisoned and to be whipped, it does not follow that he is to suffer both.

On sections 191, 192 and 193,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These sections were left at the request of the committee, but I think they are all right after we leave out the words "property or comfort" in section 191.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). These were the sections that were left to be dealt with as matters of civil right.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it is all right to pass them. It gives a right to abate a nuisance without being liable criminally. It has that effect under our jurisdiction.

Mr. MULOCK. Take the enforcement of municipal by-laws. It is a man's legal duty to comply with a by-law. Supposing he neglects to comply with it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That does not touch a by-law unless the nuisance affects health, safety, life or property.

Mr. MULOCK. Supposing there is a by-law requiring people to clean away the snow in front of their premises. By allowing the snow and ice to accumulate a person runs the risk of falling, and the owner is liable to be indicted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If it affects public safety.

Mr. MULOCK. Any person who is a defaulter in regard to snow cleaning is subject to certain penalties under the municipal by-laws, but we are now making the individual liable to imprisonment. I think this section is going too far. The matter should be left to be enforced by municipal authorities.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The mere enforcement of the by-law would not be sufficient. Any one is now indictable who leaves the sidewalk in a condition that is dangerous to the public safety. We are doing nothing more than affirming that principle. But after the word "imprisonment" we should add the words, "or a fine."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Long ago this question ceased to be dealt with by the criminal law and became a part of the police regulations. It is a question whether we should deal with it, or whether we leave it to be dealt with by the Local Legislature.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The only change in recent times has been in the procedure: although they are offences against the criminal law, the procedure is that of a civil case. We should retain control of all matters connected with the life, safety and health of the people.

On section 205,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I move to strike out the first two lines and substitute the following: "Every one is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to two years' imprisonment and a fine of $2,000 who." I also move the following sub-section: "Every one is guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty of $20, who buys or raffles any lottery ticket." I propose to add as sub-section (*d*) the following: "Any company or association heretofore incorporated by or authorized under the provisions of any Act of the Parliament of Canada, or any statute of the Provincial Legislature to do any of the acts in this section specified." In the Province of Quebec authority is given to certain incorporated companies to dispose of their bonds to a certain extent in that way. The provision, I think, is that the bond shall be subject to redemption by lot, and that the person to whom the lot falls loses his investment, but is compensated by a prize. The intention is to say that the penalty shall not apply to that.

Mr. MULOCK. It is an ordinary thing to provide in the issue of bonds that they shall be redeemed by lots.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, but there is a prize given in these cases also.

On section 326,

Mr. FLINT. When this section was before the committee, I think the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) expressed the opinion that the term of five years was a little too long; but the Minister of Justice thought that as the offence was a very serious one, that of stealing letters, the section had better remain as it was. In conversation very recently with a person who had an opportunity of knowing something of the inside feelings of a jury who tried a prisoner at the Hull or Aylmer assizes not long ago for this very offence, I learned that the prisoner was acquitted by two juries in succession, and this was because the penalty being compulsory to the extent of five years had a great influence on the minds of a large number of the jury. I would submit whether the ends of justice might not be better served by giving the judge a little more discretion to reduce the punishment where the circumstances are such that would meet the case—say three years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. For the reasons I gave to the committee, I should not like to reduce the term much; but I would have no objection to reducing it to four years.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 504,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is the section which was discussed by the hon. member for Queen's when he spoke of the mortgagor removing a house from the property. This is his amendment, with a few words added:

"Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to five years' imprisonment who, being possessed of any dwelling-house or other building, or part of any dwelling-

house or any building, which is built on lands subject to a mortgage, or which is held for any term of years or other less term, or at will, or held over after the termination of any tenancy, wilfully and to the prejudice of the mortgagee or owner:

"(*a.*) Pulls down or demolishes, or begins to pull down or demolish, the same or any part thereof, or removes or begins to remove the same or any part thereof, from the premises on which it is first erected; or,

"(*b.*) Pulls down or severs from the freehold any fixture fixed in or to such dwelling-house or building, or part of such dwelling-house or building."

Mr. McLEOD. Suppose the mortgagor, being in possession, proposes to effect some changes in the premises without asking the permission of the mortgagee, as is frequently done, he might come under this clause.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that the changes must be to the prejudice of the mortgagee.

Mr. McLEOD. Suppose the mortgagor makes some changes in the premises, the mortgagee may say they are to his prejudice and the mortgagor will be liable to criminal prosecution.

Mr. MULOCK. He has the protection of the jury.

Mr. McLEOD. He should not be liable to prosecution.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are cases of this sort. The mortgagee cannot take possession unless the mortgagor is in default. Take the case where the mortgagor is the owner of the adjoining property, and the principal value of the property for which he has given the mortgage is the buildings on it, and he removes them to property owned by himself. I have in my mind a case of that sort, and it is necessary to protect against such fraud.

Mr. McLEOD. The mortgagee is the legal owner and has the right to take possession in our law. As a matter of fact the mortgagor is left in possession and he goes on making improvements with which the mortgagee does not interfere, so long as his interest is paid.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose they are made for the purpose of wilfully prejudicing the interests of the owner.

Mr. McLEOD. The difficulty is to tell whether they are or not. Take the case of a mortgagor who, of his own motion and without any authority from the mortgagee, did make changes. The mortgagee might say they did prejudice him. That brings him within this section, and the section should not be so drawn as to have that effect.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is the mortgagee protected?

Mr. McLEOD. He can take possession of the property.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have in my mind cases where buildings were moved off the property weeks before the mortgagee knew anything about it. The mortgagee was living in another part of the country and found his property damaged to one-half its value.

Mr. FLINT. The amendment suggested is not to prevent any changes or alterations that would be deemed reasonable or prudent. They must be to the prejudice of the mortgagee.

Mr. McLEOD. The prejudice is that it makes the property less valuable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On page 128, those five sections were allowed to stand in order that we might have a debate on trade combinations. I propose that they now pass so as to leave the law as it is?

Sections agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. For the purpose of providing as nearly as possible for the separate trial of children, I propose a clause which will come in conveniently as 550½. It is as follows:—

"The trials of all persons apparently under the age of 16 years shall, so far as it appears expedient and practicable, take place without publicity and separately, and apart from other accused persons, and at suitable time to be designated and appointed for that purpose."

On section 557,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to strike out sub-section 3. We have no means of providing how the constable shall be paid and who shall pay him, as that is not within our jurisdiction, and therefore it is not worth while saying that he shall be entitled to be paid.

On section 558,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose that this section be left as it was originally printed. The joint committee altered it, but I think they made it a little out of shape as regards the technical language.

On section 765,

Mr. OUIMET. I suggest that the option allowed to the accused of taking a speedy trial before a judge instead of waiting to go before a jury, should be allowed him even during the sitting of the court. In the city of Montreal we have five terms every year, a term always lasts more than a month, and sometimes it lasts nearly two months, so that the court is practically sitting all the time. I do not see why this option of having a speedy trial, which also amounts to having a trial before a judge instead of before a jury, should not be left to the accused. I propose he shall have the power to elect at any time, whether the court is sitting or not, as to the tribunal before which he shall be tried.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there will be a great objection to introduce a system of leaving it optional to the prisoner to decide whether he shall be tried before a jury. The only reason of the Act introduced by Mr. Sandfield Macdonald shortly after Confederation, was to get rid of the expense of maintaining a prisoner for a long term in gaol, or keeping an innocent party who may have been accused, for a long period before his trial began; and so the trial was allowed to take place before a judge.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY—PUBLICATIONS IN THE *GLOBE* *RE* ELECTION EXPENSES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I desire to take the opportunity of calling the attention of the House to certain statements which have been placed officially on the records of this Legislature. I cannot say that the task is a pleasant one, but at the same time I hold that it is our clear duty, once these documents have been put on record, to see that the full force and intent of them is thoroughly understood. The House has had an opportunity of hearing these documents read, and also of inspecting them if it sees fit, and it likewise has had an opportunity of hearing the replies which the Government, after full opportunity for deliberation, has thought proper to make to them. I have simply to say with respect to these statements: They appear to be of a very extraordinary character. I have had, as probably you know, a considerable experience of parliamentary affairs in this country. I have had my full share of the vicissitudes of parliamentary life. It is almost thirty years since I first took my seat in the Parliament of old Canada, and, since that time, with scarcely any interruption, I have held a seat in this Chamber. Sir, I have been a member of this House during sessions in which the fate of Ministries depended upon a single vote. I have been a member of overpowering majorities, and I have likewise been a member of defeated but by no manner of means vanquished minorities, and I will say, that in all those thirty years I cannot call to mind any single instance in which documents of an equally incriminatory kind have ever been placed on the official record of this Parliament, nor do I remember having ever read in any other country of similar documents having been placed on the records of the Legislatures of those countries. To-day it is my purpose to enquire how far the House is satisfied with the explanation which it has received from Ministers in respect to these documents. I will not conceal my own opinion, an opinion which has been growing for a considerable number of years, that our parliamentary system in Canada is in very great danger of an utter break-down. Although it may be true that in former times our parliamentary system did fairly represent the people, and although I am not prepared to say that in other places and in other countries a similar parliamentary system may not work well, yet, in our country at this present time I am compelled to say that I cannot regard the Parliament of Canada as in any proper sense or shape a really representative body. On the contrary, Sir, I say that our system is one which presents the most tremendous premium to fraud and to bribery, and that this Parliament, as also other Parliaments in past times, is to an enormous extent the outcome in the first place of deliberate legislative fraud, assisted, and largely assisted too, by organized corruption. I am not going to deny, Sir, that these are very hard words, but I say that they are supported by still harder facts. I say that these statements to which I have called the attention of the House are in themselves a proof of the accuracy of what I say, and I state further that these legislative enactments which we have seen driven through this House—such legislative enactments as the Gerrymander Act of 1882, as the Franchise Bill of 1885, and (though in a lesser degree) the very Act which we have sent to the Upper Chamber this day—all go strongly to confirm the truth of my statement. I desire to call your attention, Sir, to what these statements are and what they imply. They are, in the first place, clear, absolute and perfect proof and evidence of the truth of those particular charges advanced by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), which this House recently, on motion of the Government, saw fit to suppress and erase. They have had the utmost possible publicity for many days and many weeks. There can be no mistake about these documents. They are at once charges and proofs. They give with all possible particularity of place and time and circumstances, full and ample details confirming most minutely the allegations which were made by that hon. gentleman to whom I have alluded when he recently preferred his charges in Parliament against the hon. the Postmaster General. Sir, up to the present time the silence with which these things have been received has been most strange. I doubt very much if there is another parliamentary body on the face of the earth, which, after the publication of such charges, much more, after these charges had been made matters of official record, would not have insisted at any cost and at all hazards on their being investigated and probed to the bottom. Sir, if these charges be true—and the House will remember that their authenticity has not been denied by the parties whose names were brought most prominently before the public—they prove nothing less than a prolonged conspiracy against the state—a conspiracy in which a part of the Government of Canada were active participators, in which the remainder of the Government, to say the least of it, were passive accomplices, and of which all were cognizant. One thing is certain: all the members of the Government have profited by these things, and all up to the present time have remained dumb respecting them, as have also their paid press, as have also their subsidized supporters. Now, Sir, I would like to ask this House what is the object of this conspiracy? As I understand the constitution of this country, the object of this conspiracy is in the very strictest sense high treason against the State. Our constitution places supreme power in the hands of the representatives of the people, and the object of this conspiracy is to debauch the electorate who send these representatives here, and to defeat completely the true will and honest intent of the people of Canada; and the means are worthy of the object. The means, as is alleged, and as it is abundantly clear from the information which has been given to this House, not on this occasion alone, but on many other occasions, was the robbery, by direct or indirect methods, of public funds, and the application of those funds to the purpose of debauching the electorate of Canada, with this inevitable result: that, in so far as they have been successful, they tend utterly and wholly to destroy parliamentary government here, and, what is worse, to make a very large number of the elected representatives in this House who are accomplices in these transactions, no better, to all intents and purposes, than men who have conspired and assisted to defraud the State. And here, Mr. Speaker, I for my part desire to draw a distinction. It has been urged against myself and against other gentlemen who have found it their unpleasant duty to bring these matters to light, that in reproaching the Government, and in reproaching the parliamentary ma-

jority which supports them, we cast a slur on the majority of the electors of Canada who return them to power. I say a distinction is to be observed here. There is no doubt whatever in my mind, there never has been any doubt, that a corrupt Government does indeed prove and presuppose the existence of a corrupt majority of representatives; but I never have gone, and I do not propose to go, the extreme length of saying that a corrupt majority of the representatives of the people does necessarily imply that the great mass of the people are also corrupt. Sir, it is quite possible for you to have a corrupt majority of representatives while at the same time the electors who send them here may be grossly deceived; or, for the matter of that, as we have seen and know, the majority of the electors may be gerrymandered out of the exercise of their just rights; and we may see the spectacle of a majority of the representatives unjustly affecting to represent the people of Canada here. Or, what is more dangerous, and I fear is more common, the parliamentary system of any country may be so arranged that a small corrupt section of each constituency may practically control the balance of power, and it may come to pass, therefore, that while the majority of the electors are reasonably and fairly honest, nevertheless a majority of the representatives may be sent here wholly and entirely by corrupt means. Now, Sir, I am very well aware that such things have been done elsewhere. There is no doubt that in other representative bodies, although in but few of equal dignity and importance with this, similar things have been done and similar results have been attained; but here alone, so far as I know, on proof having been given, has it been found possible for those who are clearly proved to have committed these things to escape punishment. Canada at present has this evil distinction, that in Canada alone, so far as I know, has investigation into charges so preferred ever been refused; and in Canada alone, what is even worse than a blunt refusal of investigation, has the attempt been made to substitute a mock trial—a sham trial for a real one. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a perfectly open secret that for a great many years the Government of Canada has been carried on by means of deliberate organized corruption. A very large number of the supporters of those hon. gentlemen, when this matter is discussed in private, do not hesitate to admit, as, indeed, in face of the evidence, it is scarcely possible for them to deny, that such is the case; but they are in the habit of pleading—and I have noticed that their press is in the habit of echoing, more or less, that apology—that in a country like Canada, and under the conditions existing in Canada, it is practically impossible to carry on government by any other means. Now, Sir, I wholly and entirely deny that assertion; but I am perfectly well aware, and I have been aware for many years, that the Government of Canada was deliberately carried on by corrupt means; and I have also been perfectly well aware of the proceedings of the three rings, through whose instrumentality these corrupt means were chiefly furnished. I am perfectly well aware that ever since the initiation of the National Policy there has been a protected manufacturers' ring ready, in consideration of being allowed to rob the people for their own special benefit, to divide the spoils for the purposes of electoral corruption. I am perfectly well aware that for a great many years past there has been a contractors' ring, although in that case, I am free to say that I hold the contractors to have been in a great number of cases rather the victims of the Government than their willing partners; and I am perfectly well aware that there has been a railway promoters' ring, of all sorts and sizes and conditions of men, who likewise have been perfectly ready, in consideration of railway subsidies, to share the spoils with the Government that enriched them. Now, Sir, it is an interesting thing to observe how these various rings have been working in this country; and, not to dwell too long upon this portion of my remarks, I will take the liberty of quoting briefly from a speech which I delivered two or three years ago——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,—in which I took the liberty to call the attention of the people of Canada to the mode in which those several rings were carrying on their operations.

An hon. MEMBER. Did nobody read it then?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, it was read, but I am afraid it was not profited by, and I mean to give these hon. gentlemen, too, the opportunity of reading, marking, learning and inwardly digesting at least a part of it. I am speaking, Sir, of the influence in the first place of this same protective system; and what I said was this:

"But perhaps of all the several deleterious influences which have combined to bring about the present disgraceful state of things none have contributed so much to make politics and political relations a mere thing of barter and sale as the introduction of the protective system.

"I do not intend to occupy your time by any discussion of the economic merits of free trade and protection. You know my views, but let us admit that something may be said from the economic point of view in favour of protection.

"Were everything that could be urged as true as I believe it to be false, it would leave its effects on practical politics untouched. This is aside of the question which is far too commonly passed over. Now, I know something of the effect of the protective system on politics in the United States, and a good deal more of the way it works out in Canada, and I say this in all seriousness, if your object is by direct legislative enactment to make honest government impossible—to establish a large, permanent, effective corruption fund and generally to demoralize all political relations you could hardly imagine a better agency than the protective system. It is not so much the fault of the men who clamour for it and make profit of it. It is inherent in the thing itself. Why, just look at its everyday practical results.

"Here by direct operation of law you make it the interest of a number of the most pushing, energetic business men in the community—men who, if not always wealthy, have, almost always, a large command of ready money—you make it, I say, the direct interest of these men to control legislation and the legislature for their own ends. Of course, they will try to do it, and there is only one way they can do it Being subsidized, they must subsidize in return.

"Here, if nowhere else, you will find a most complete and perfect unrestricted reciprocity.

"It is a most profitable thing to have the arrangement of the tariff absolutely in your own hands, and a few investments pay better than to turn the Minister of Finance into a speaking trumpet for the benefit of the manufacturers' association. Sir, I don't greatly blame the protected manufacturers, who, after all, form in truth but a small portion of the whole body of manufacturers, most of whom cannot be protected, and many of whom lose more by a protective tariff than they can ever gain by it. Nor do I allege even that all protected manufacturers give bribes. There are exceptions, but we are talking of the natural and general tendency, and as to that I say that the inevitable effect of making it by law these men's pecuniary interest to control legislation is to put an overwhelming inducement in their way to use their money (as they themselves would and do say) to protect their busi-

ness interests, without caring or indeed knowing what the merits or demerits of either political party may chance to be. Hence, it is in obedience to the ordinary laws of human nature that, wherever a protective system is established you have, as in the United States, and as in Canada to-day, a steady perennial source of corruption—a continual temptation—a perpetual blister applied to the most peccant parts of frail mortality."

And this holds true of your railway subsidies and of your contractors' rings. Every man here knows perfectly well that, by the terms of the ordinary contracts entered into between the Government and contractors, the fortunes of those contractors are placed at the absolute mercy of the Minister of the day. Every one knows that it is in his power to make the public contractors feel that they are dependent on him to an extraordinary extent, so that when he demands of them subsidies or subscriptions, they have practically, to all intents and purposes, no choice but to comply. And I may remind this House that, time and again, when it was proposed from this side of Parliament to check that evil and to make it penal for these men to subscribe to election funds and for corrupt purposes, four times in succession those motions were voted down and thrown out by the majority. Now, I will not go at length into the question of railway subsidies further than to say this: I believe that, with a very few exceptions, the whole of the subsidies are granted in direct violation of the fundamental principles of our constitution, and that whether they are or not so granted, one thing is certain, that these railways have continuously and systematically been used for the purpose of debauching the representatives of constituencies, and, in some cases, for the purpose of debauching whole provinces. Now, Sir, what I said in 1889 I proved at the time, and proved conclusively, although I had, it is true, a very much smaller number of facts to lay before the electors of Canada than it is unhappily in my power to do to-day. But I call the attention of the House to the fact that all these things were brought to light and were tolerably well known—so far, at any rate, as their general operation went—a matter of some three years ago; and that the subsequent developments which have occurred ought surely, in all conscience, to be enough to convince every reasonable and impartial man that in no respect did I overstate the case when I said in 1889 what I repeat here on the floor of Parliament, that for years past the Government of Canada has been carried on by means of organized corruption. What had we in 1890? This House will hardly forget—I am quite sure the hon. Minister of Justice will not forget—the exhibition which was given this House of the effect of this corrupt system on individual members in the case of Mr. John Charles Rykert. I remember very well on that occasion certain critics took great exception to the metaphor I used, when I said that if the truth were known Mr. Rykert would be found to be standing on the peak of a mountain of submerged corruption; I might have said a continent and told no lie. Then, in 1891, we had the case of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin) and his department, and now, in 1892, we have, to all intents and purposes, the case of the whole Government. It is a very pretty progressive exhibit and a most suggestive one. In the case of Mr. Rykert, we have the case of an individual member of Parliament, and we see how he was affected by this corrupt system, and I may recall to the House the declaration, the somewhat celebrated declaration, made by this hon. gentleman to his electors, when he declared that he was most harshly and hardly treated, saying that he was made the sole scapegoat when there were twenty others worse than he. In the case of the ex-Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin), we have the case of an individual minister and of an individual department at stake; and now, in the case of the hon. Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron), we have practically the case of the whole Government, inasmuch as they, by their own action, have made and confessed themselves accomplices with him, both before and after the act. Sir, it is very interesting to see how these successive developments were treated by hon. gentlemen opposite. At first there were certain spasms of virtue; and it is very curious to observe how differently the conscience of the Minister of Justice seems to work at different periods. This House will well remember the righteous wrath of that hon. gentleman in the case of Mr. Rykert. This House will well remember the very fitting terms in which he denounced "the most shocking correspondence" brought to light in that gentleman's case. A still more shocking correspondence, not conducted by individual members of Parliament, but conducted by his own colleagues, was lately put into the hands of the Minister of Justice and brought under his notice, and I have as yet failed to hear any similar indignation and remonstrance on his part. I do not doubt that the hon. gentleman, who has the reputation, by the way, of being somewhat of a theologian, has pondered deeply and long on the profound wisdom of the statement that there are times and seasons for all things. I do not doubt that it is with a profound conviction of the truth of that declaration of Holy Writ that the hon. gentleman saw that there was a time to denounce Mr. Rykert, and also that there was a time to abstain from denouncing the Minister of Railways. He saw there was a time for getting rid of the ex-Minister of Public Works, and that there was a time for standing firm and fast as the champion of the Postmaster General. Sir, his conscience works with singular discretion; in the case of Mr. Rykert, we have the exhibition of his conscience in a glow of red hot zeal, particularly before a general election; in the case of the ex-Minister of Public Works, we see it still warm, although not at fever heat, preparatory to the late bye-elections; and in the case of the Postmaster General, we see how the same conscience worked when the general and bye-elections were both disposed of. It appears to me that the hon. Minister has a curious dual nature after all. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman has to a certain extent taken for his model that celebrated lady immortalized by Pope, who was "a sad, good christian at the heart, a very heathen in the carnal part." But the House may think that, after all said and done, like most of the rest of us, there are two natures working in him. The old Adam and the new Adam are contending against one another, or, as we read in Persian stories, sometimes Ahriman gets the advantage and sometimes Ormuzd. We may find in him no bad instance of the tendencies illustrated in the modern parable of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. But at last and at long, I am afraid that Thompson the sinner has entirely got the better of Thompson the saint.

I speak more in sorrow than in anger. The House will bear me witness that more than a year ago, while the hon. gentleman had still, I think, some good intentions, although they seem to have gone to that place where good intentions are generally sent, I did my best to guide his tottering steps in the way they should go, and even now that he has fallen from grace, I still promise him that I will use my very best endeavours, by sincere expostulation and honest plain dealing, to arouse him to a sense of his errors. I have a word or two to say as to the rings from which we have been suffering. There can be no doubt whatever that one of these rings has been a legalized form of corruption. We have been at great pains to create a permanent corruption fund, and there can be no doubt that that fund has been used and is being used, and very largely used, to supply the means of political corruption. For a very long time, we have had information as to the organization of these agencies against us from one end of the country to the other. The facts which have lately come before the public have been for a long time no secret to me or to many other gentlemen on this side of the House, but legal proof of these transactions is very difficult to obtain. These deeds of darkness shun the light, and you have no chance of getting the legal proof of them until the time arrives when the rogues happen to fall out and some of them turn Queen's evidence, and then the proof becomes available, but even then you cannot entirely depend upon it unless their statements are substantiated by documentary evidence. You will find the same influences operating on every side. As to the Red Parlour, whether it be in Nova Scotia, in Ontario or even in the North-West, there is no place in the country where we do not find its heavy hand. Had we the opportunity of proving the facts, we could have shown what Section "B" and its congeners had been doing throughout the Province of Ontario. As to the Province of Quebec, you have only to read the results of the investigations of last session to understand what means were brought to bear on the electorate of that province, while contractors and railway promoters are likewise distributed everywhere, and, though they may have no legal habitation, it is probable that they may be found working most largely in the Maritime Provinces. Then, as to the *modus operandi*. In regard to the district of Quebec, the House is in possession of information as to how some of this fund has been administered by Mr. McGreevy and his friends. As to the district of Montreal, the Minister of Customs and his allies could give us some information if they chose. These things have been brought forward time and again, they have been alluded to times without number on the floor of Parliament and on the hustings, and twice over formal charges have been made on the floor of Parliament, and either they have been refused to be entertained or they have been evaded. I desire to call the attention of the House to this circumstance: When a case of this kind was brought before Parliament to whom did the members of the Opposition propose to refer the investigation? Did they ask that the conduct of the Government and their friends should be investigated by a hostile tribunal or by a tribunal of which the majority were unfriendly to the present Administration? They simply asked to be allowed to proceed with the proof of the facts which they alleged before a tribunal two-thirds of whom had been named by the Government, two-thirds of whom, to say the least, were strongly interested in making use of every possible point against the accuser, two-thirds of whom had a heavy stake in declaring the Ministers innocent; and yet the charges were either refused to be investigated at all, or they were deliberately evaded, the charges were deliberately redrawn, and the accused was allowed not only to choose his own judges but also to frame his own charges. When the Parliament of Canada thus refuses to discharge the chief function for which a Parliament exists—that chief function being to investigate the conduct of the Government of the day and to see that charges against them are fairly tried—it is time that we should seriously consider the result. Under these circumstances, what the third estate declined to do, the fourth estate has taken upon itself, and it is to the public energy and enterprise of the proprietors of the *Globe* newspaper that we owe it that these charges have been brought forward in such a way that silence is no longer possible. These things have been for weeks before Parliament, and these statements contain in themselves proof with every possible detail of time, place and matter. Scores, if not hundreds, of facsimiles of receipts have been produced, and scores, if not hundreds, of facsimiles of letters have been printed. Just read the very last charge to which I called the attention of the hon. gentleman. Here is what is called the official list of expenditures in the counties named:

Presse	$ 5,500	Mégantic	$ 2,500
Quebec Centre	4,100	Lotbinière	1,350
Quebec East	2,300	Drummond	700
Montmagny	2,200	Dorchester	3,000
Montmorency	2,700	Jos. Hamel, petty	2,500
Lévis	3,500		$68,000
Berthier	1,600		
Gaspé	1,500	Quebec County	
Bellechasse	3,900	do West	
Rimouski	2,750	Three Rivers	
Kamouraska	3,000	Charlevoix, 2nd election	1,000
Temiscouata	2,250		18,500
Yamaska	4,000		16,800
Champlain	3,000		68,300
St. Maurice	2,500		8,000
Charlevoix	3,000		$112,700
Chicoutimi	2,250		
Portneuf	3,000		
L'Islet	2,500		
Beauce	2,500		
	$58,250		

Sir, do hon. gentlemen now pretend to say that there is any vagueness about these details? After every single one of these items I have enumerated have been supported by the publication of these vouchers and letters, giving every possible detail of place, time and circumstances, do they dare to pretend that these charges are not specific enough, are not clear enough, are not distinct enough, for this Assembly, or for any other assembly on the face of the earth, to deal with? Now, what do these establish? They establish these three things, first of all. They establish in the first place, the existence of a huge reptile fund; they establish in the second place, the systematic corruption, or attempted corruption, of a great group of counties numerous enough to determine entirely the fate of parties in this House; and they establish in the third place, the full privity of the Government with all that is going on. First, you have the orders of the ex-Minister of Public Works and the orders of the Postmaster General—not one, not two, but scores of them, all showing absolute and

full knowledge on their part of what is going on. Then you have clear proof of the complicity of the late Premier in the whole transaction. You have not merely letters from him to the Hon. Thomas Mc Greevy, but we have had it stated in this House, in his own presence, authoritatively by Mr. Tarte, that years before the investigation which we conducted last session, full and perfect details of all that had been going on, all that had taken place, had been placed in the hands of that right hon. gentleman. Now, with respect to the Postmaster General I have a word to say. For my part, I do not at all believe, I do not at all intend to say, that the Postmaster General, whatever his offences may be—and I am not here to defend them—is one whit worse than any of his colleagues; on the contrary, I am rather inclined to think that he is the more honest, because he ran the risk and they took the profits. Sir, for my part, if there is a choice, I very decidedly prefer a bold burglar to the fence who eggs him on and pockets the largest share of the booty. It is a matter of taste; but I for one prefer your gallant highwayman—your political Dick Turpin—to Mr. Jonathan Wild, or even those eminent thieves' lawyers, Messrs. Twist, Gammon & Snap. Now, Sir, there are certain questions which must inevitably present themselves when the attention of the House is called to these facts. First of all, where did this money come from? No human being supposes that it was subscribed by voluntary beneficiaries; no human being in this House or out of it has the slightest doubt where this $112,000 came from, and, if they have a shadow of doubt, I recall to the recollection of members of this Parliament the evidence of last session; I recall to them the way in which the Department of Public Works is administered; I recall to them the proof which was submitted over and over again, all going to show that in two or three individual works, $3,000,000 were charged to the people of Canada for work which ought not to have cost $2,000,000. I say there is no possible doubt as to the source that money came from. Now, I have spoken so far simply of what we have actual proof of. I speak now of what there is an overwhelming presumption of. I say, Mr. Speaker, all this is merely a specimen brick; I say we have only lifted, on one occasion, one corner of the veil. Everything here, every one of these statements I have submitted to the House, bespeaks long practice; everything here shows that these men are experienced in their evil ways. Now, the Minister of Justice has shown that he is well versed in all matters affecting criminal law, and I have no doubt that the Minister of Justice in his time has also shown that he was an expert defender of dangerous criminals, and, being so, he will know that if there is one thing better established in criminal practice than another it is this: that an experienced officer can always tell when he examines the spot where a burglary was committed whether it was done by an old hand or not. I propose to apply that test to the present case, and I ask the House to consider it. Looked at in a business aspect, it is altogether most creditable. Here you have a regular debitor and creditor account, a very well-kept debitor and creditor account, with each of these separate constituencies. Each has its appropriation, which appropriation it is not allowed to exceed, unless, peradventure, in the case of Ministers of the Crown, who, I presume, on the principle that you must not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn, seem to have been allowed several mouthfulls. But in all other cases perfect business accuracy is required. You have the vouchers and letters carefully preserved; all things seem to be done decently and in order. They had all been there before and often too. It is so clear that he who runs may read. 1882, 1887 and 1891 were all lineal successors of 1872. This was no case of mere local rascality. This is a specimen of what has been going on all over Canada for the last 14 years, and if you will apply the rule of proportion in these matters, you may fairly say that as 24 is to 215, so is $112,000 to the sum which it was necessary to spend to carry a general election in Canada. Hon. gentlemen can work that sum out for themselves, but as some of them are not very good at that kind of work, I may tell them that the result is about $1,045,000. The merest tyro knows perfectly well what that means; the merest tyro in public affairs knows that if this kind of thing was done in one corner of a province in 1887, there can be no doubt the same thing was being done in other parts, and on a larger scale. It is wholly and utterly absurd to suppose that this huge sum was spent in that quarter alone, and none elsewhere, and largely—and that is a curious incident in the case—in hopeless cases. A very considerable portion of the amount was spent in counties which the Government did not expect to carry, where they fought a desperate battle and where all, at the outside, they hoped to attain was to keep some of their opponents at home. So far from believing that there was nothing like this elsewhere, I am persuaded, or rather I happen to know, that this kind of thing was going on in every quarter. It was not limited to the district of Quebec alone, it was not the Quebec Harbour Works alone that were taxed; precisely the same things were going on in the district of Montreal, with its twenty millionaires, any one of whom could have afforded to have spent the sum expended in Quebec district on receiving from the Government in return the right to tax the people at his own sweet will. What was going on in Ontario we are not legally aware, because we were refused an investigation into Section "B." As to what was going on in the Maritime Provinces, let those who have examined the workings of the Intercolonial Railway speak. That Intercolonial Railway for many years has been a perfect sink for public money. During this very last year of which we have record, I find that the expenses have exceeded the receipts by no less than $684,946, the revenue being $2,977,395, and the expenditure $3,662,341. Any other railway, I believe, of similar size and magnitude, if properly managed, could be worked, and would be worked for, at the very outside, 75 or 80 per cent of the gross receipts. We know that the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has great difficulties to contend with, which for a very large number of miles runs through an utterly unproductive country, is worked for 64 or 65 per cent, and I do not hesitate to say, that under proper business management, the Intercolonial, at the outside, should not cost more than 75 per cent of its total earnings. What does it cost? It costs 25 per cent more than all its earnings, and the difference between what it ought, and what it does cost this House, particularly if hon. members will take the trouble to read the recent report of the

Civil Service Commissioners, can learn as well as what it means to use a great public work simply and solely as a political machine. That report has not yet been printed, but I had an opportunity of perusing it, and I found it there laid down by the officer in charge, that it was impossible to appoint any one except on the recommendation, for political reasons, of the various members through whose counties the railway passes, and that when he desired to dismiss men the same political influences stood in his way. In one word, in every shape and form the Intercolonial Railway is being used as a great machine for political corruption. This shows well how fields were won. This leaves no room for doubt, any more, if there ever was any room for doubt, how the general elections of 1882 as well as the general elections of 1891 were carried, and it shows clearly how the recent bye-elections in Ontario were carried. I am perfectly well aware that unfortunately in every section and constituency there is a number, not a very large number in proportion to the total number of electors, but still a very considerable number of men whose votes are for sale; and I have no doubt that the men who applied $112,000 to the purchase or attempted purchase of 24 constituencies in Quebec were not the men to shirk from finding that amount or double that amount when occasion required them to purchase a dozen constituencies in Ontario. The plain facts are simply these: Under our present system every item in our protective tariff in one way or other is either a bribe, or is being made the means of obtaining funds for corrupt purposes. There is the strongest reason for believing, after what we have seen, that every contract in the Public Works Department at all events has been discounted for the same purpose, and every railway subsidy granted has in all probability been tolled. All these facts beyond doubt reflect the most intolerable discredit on the people of Canada. I pause here to call attention to one of the most impudent complaints ever yet made by the parties whose conduct is impugned. We are told, forsooth, that as patriotic men we should be silent about these offenders, because if we expose these villainies we shall hurt the country. In this connection, I may very well recall the language which was used, not a very long time ago, by the hon. gentleman who sits opposite me and his leader when the latter, Mr. Abbott, said:

"I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to join with us in trying to find out what the facts are about this alleged rascality. We ask them to give us the benefit of their experience in this enquiry, to assist us in ascertaining the facts and placing them before the public, in order that they may be dealt with properly, and, if found guilty, that summary vengeance may be exercised upon those who are found guilty of appropriating public money—stealing—be they high or low. That is the determination of this Government and this side of the House."

The Minister of Justice also repeated the invitation he had given elsewhere, and said:

"He [Sir John Thompson] repeated the invitation made elsewhere, that if any one has any evidence of wrong-doing against any official or member of Parliament, he pledged his honour that the fullest investigation should be made, and the information used in the prosecution and punishment of the guilty party. Mr. Abbott's Government was fully determined and pledged to investigate, root out and punish wrong-doing wherever they found it."

Sir, there are their promises, these are their statements. I have just given in detail the several charges preferred by the *Globe*, and I ask now how those pledges have been redeemed. They have been redeemed by allowing the accused party, as I have said, to appoint a commission of his own friends to try him, and by allowing him to alter the charges preferred against him, and by allowing what never yet was done in any court of justice or in any assembly like this in the world, by allowing a man who is charged with one offence to substitute for that charge another and different charge of his own drawing. I say, in view of all these facts, that, for the last ten years at least, to speak of no longer period, to go no further back than the Gerrymander Act of 1882, which was very properly denounced by hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, these statements, and later on this other evidence which has been collected, afford clear and conclusive proof that this Government has owed its majority in Parliament to direct fraud. To a Parliament and a Government so elected and so selected no allegiance is due, and I use these words with a full understanding of all they mean and all they imply. I tell hon. gentlemen that in all this there is danger and great danger in the very near future. Let them say what they please as to the majority they possess, they cannot deny that, even if we give them credit for all the manufactured votes which the franchise list gives them, if we give them credit for their plural votes, for votes polled under the names of people who have left Canada, and for votes given by men who have been brought back to this country at great expense at the various general elections to cast their votes against the Liberal party—still the fact remains, that although hon. gentlemen on this side of the House do not possess one-half the seats in the House, yet they do represent a full half, or nearly a full half, of all the people of this country. If we do represent them, Sir, and if we do express their sentiments—and I know that we do—I say to hon. gentlemen, that half the people of Canada are convinced that the Government of Canada lives and moves by bribery and corruption, and that the Government of Canada is wholly and utterly unworthy of respect and obedience by reason of the fraud to which it owes its origin. Then, Sir, I say to these gentlemen opposite that the attempt to build a nation upon such a foundation, is about as hopeless as to make ropes of the sea sand. Hon. gentlemen opposite ask us sometimes: Why, if the people of Canada hold these convictions, why, if we do truly represent the feelings of so large a mass of the people, why no overt resistance has been made to them? I am sorry to say, Sir, that the census returns are here to tell you why. Stop the exodus and you will defeat this Government to a certainty, whether it be at the polls or elsewhere. But unhappily the country's grievous loss is that party's very great political gain, as some of the more indiscreet of hon. gentlemen's own colleagues have not hesitated on more than one occasion to admit. Now, Sir, I desire to ask whether hon. gentlemen consider that the answer which was given by the Minister of Justice to the questions which I put the other day, are at all the replies which were worthy of the occasion or worthy of a Government that desired to redeem such pledges as these men have given? What was that answer? When I enquired of the Government, whether in view of the facts which I had placed on record, facts which I repeat were in themselves at once charges and proofs; whether the Government were

or were not disposed to reconsider their determination; whether the Government were or were not disposed even at the twelfth, even at the thirteenth, hour to cause these to be investigated as they ought and should be investigated, what did the hon. Minister reply to me? Why, Sir, he replied as follows:—

"The publication of the statements and documents quoted in the preceding questions, referring as they do to expenditures alleged to have been made in the year 1887 in the elections for the Parliament whose term expired in 1891, was evidently made in pursuance of the charges which were preferred in this House by the hon. member for West Ontario, and which were interpreted by that gentleman and two or three other members of this House in opposition to the Government, as charges that the Postmaster General had diverted railway subsidies from the purpose for which they were granted, by receiving for election purposes large sums of money out of such subsidies and out of moneys raised on the credit of such subsidies, and so forth, as stated in the resolution of this House passed on the 4th of May, 1892. This House, on that day, resolved that it was expedient that enquiry should be made as to the truth or falsity of the allegations and charges, and that the evidence relating to the same should be taken by commissioners under the statute which provides for such enquiries being made by commissioners, and that the evidence, when taken, should be laid before this House. Two eminent judges have been selected to be such commissioners, and their appointment has been approved by the House, without any dissent being expressed as to their fitness and impartiality. Ample powers are being conferred on the commissioners, and when their labours are concluded the result of such labours will be laid before the House for such action as may seem proper under the circumstances."

I have this to say in the first place with respect to that answer: That the whole answer from first to last is an evasion. That answer would imply that the House had appointed a commission for the purpose of investigating into those charges and allegations to which I have called the attention of the House. The House knows very well that nothing at all of that kind was done. I take the hon. gentleman's answer in detail, and I say as to his first assertion, that it was entirely inaccurate. I say that the statement which he puts into the mouth of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) was not in the slightest degree the statement or the charge made by that hon. member and which is on record on our files. I say, Sir, that when the hon. Minister gave the House to infer that these allegations and charges contained in these documents would be investigated by that commission, the hon. Minister made a statement utterly destitute of foundation, in fact, seeing that he himself had been the very first and foremost to strike out these charges from the charges brought by Mr. Edgar, and to substitute for them other charges bearing a totally different construction. And so it is with regard to the allegation that ample powers were conferred on this commission. Ample powers may be conferred on these commissioners, but powers for what? To try charges which were not made by Mr. Edgar. The Minister tells us that the Government will not interfere. Well, Sir, the Government no doubt will not interfere. Having interfered already to erase these charges, there is not the slightest need or occasion for them to interfere with their commissioners. When the Minister of Justice implies that there was no dissent as to the commissioners, and that there was no objection to them, the hon. gentleman knows full well that the question was not raised at all, that the Opposition took objection, and took very strong objection, to the reference to the commission altogether, but, that the character of these commissioners was in no respect in question in one way or other, and that this side of the House, as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) reminds me, had no voice in their appointment. There has been a good deal of what I must call deliberate cant about the propriety of referring these charges to an impartial tribunal Sir, I think that on this point, too, it is well that we should speak out, and I for my part am prepared to contend that judges are often the most unfit possible persons to be appointed to try a question involving grave political issues. We know too well in this House that a bit of parchment is not going to change men's characters. We know that judges who are partisans, very often, and too often, remain partisans always. Sir, I am not going to pretend that there are not many men on the Canadian bench who would be an honour to that bench, or an honour to any judiciary in the world. But, Sir, I have not held a seat in Parliament for 30 years, I have not seen who were appointed judges, and how they came to be appointed judges, without knowing that on the Canadian bench in the several provinces there are a very considerable number of men who are the direct opposite. I have known men of very indifferent character to be appointed judges. I have known men of notoriously intemperate habits appointed judges. I have known men who were known to be ignorant of law appointed judges. I have known party hacks appointed in return for having done the very dirtiest political work. I have even known men appointed because they belonged to special sects. But, Sir, worse yet. We talk of the impartiality of judges. Why, Sir, I have known cases in which seats in this House have been bartered and sold for seats on the bench, and I would like to enquire of the hon. Minister of Justice whether in the course of his long experience he has ever heard of a case in which a member of the Opposition was induced to sell his seat in Parliament in consideration of a judgeship, to provide the means of enabling a Minister obtaining a seat here.

An hon. MEMBER. Never remember any case like that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman never heard of such a case, did he not?

[Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds) exhibited a placard at this stage, with the following inscription: "Another corrupt election—Pontiac, 600 majority."]

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is only one thing remains for the hon. gentleman to add to that placard, and that is a statement of how much the Pontiac election cost the country. When he has given that information, we will understand how the election was carried.

Mr. FERGUSON. You would use it next year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If he gives us that information then we will be able to judge of the moral value of this sort of certificate of character. But, Sir, perhaps the Minister of Justice never heard of a case in which a seat was purchased for a gentleman who desired to enter Parliament by the gift of a judgeship. If he has not, I think there are some in this House who could enlighten him. Now, Sir, while I admit frankly that there are many members of the judiciary who are an honour to it, and who would be an honour to any judiciary, yet, we all know right well that there are likewise plenty of judges who have been the most humble suppliants for the

offices they now hold; and we know right well, that there have been a few judges, I am very sorry to say, who have been constantly intriguing for promotion at the hands of the Government of the day. And with the knowledge of these facts staring us in the face, known to every man of any political experience, these hon. gentlemen rise in their places and tell us that those men are of all men the fittest to try important political issues involving peradventure the downfall of the very Government that appointed them. Sir, I am sorry to have to say it, but the language of the Minister of Justice in the statements I have just read, inferring as he does or as he tried to infer, that the Opposition had full confidence in the judges who are appointed, is really neither more nor less than a *suggestio falsi*. Nothing of that kind was suggested; and, speaking for myself, I have simply to say that these men may be good or they may be bad, but they are persons whose names are not at all known outside of their own province, and being outside of their own province obscure and unknown men, it is in the last degree inexpedient that a great political issue such as is involved in this question should be relegated to a couple of gentlemen of that sort. Sir, it is well to understand and mark that the Government, when cross-questioned, have not ventured to deny or dispute the authenticity of any one of these vouchers and documents which I read to the House and placed upon the official record; and for good reason. They were obliged to remain silent; they were obliged to confess that those documents were authentic, or there would have been no escape for them. The responsibility would have been thrown upon them to bring an action and to have the whole matter adjudicated upon in a court of law—the very last thing, I venture to say, that these hon. gentlemen desire. Then, in reply to another question, the hon. gentleman intimated that the Government had explained the case to the Governor General. Well, Sir, I fear that there was not perfect candour in that matter either. I should like to know what they explained to His Excellency. I should like to know when they explained it. I should like to know very much if those explanations were made after the conclusion of the publication of the documents in the *Globe* newspaper. Unless that was done, I say that the explanation given to His Excellency was of no value whatever. More than that, I say if it is implied in the statement of the Minister of Justice that an explanation of these things was given to His Excellency, then that explanation should be laid before the House. I say that if His Excellency called upon his Ministers to give explanations, and these Ministers gave explanations, this Parliament has a right now to declare that having been informed that explanations have been given, it has a right to have these explanations. More, I say it is the duty of the advisers of the Crown, as a mere matter of fair-play to His Excellency himself, to lay those explanations before the House and the country, in order that the people of Canada may understand why it is and how it is that His Excellency has been satisfied that the men who now advise him are fit to retain that position. Now, Mr. Speaker, the House, and the Government too, will do well to remember that these matters are now on record for ever, and that they cannot remove them from our journals or from our official records. There is no longer the smallest pretense for saying that the House is ignorant of these facts; there is no pretense for saying that any individual member of this House is not in full possession of them. What have these gentlemen to say to it? Sir, so far, as I have seen, there is but one plea—a most pitiable and contemptible plea it is—advanced in their behalf. We are told, Sir, that though these things be true, nevertheless they ought to be gently and tenderly dealt with, because Mr. Mercier was as bad as they are. Out of their own mouths let them be judged, Sir. Now, I am not here to defend or excuse Mr. Mercier; but let the House consider what sort of a confession is theirs. Let the House consider what desperate demoralization is implied in offering such a plea. Sir, I grant that Mr. Mercier sinned grievously, and grievously has Mr. Mercier been punished. But who are they that condemn him? Who are they who prosecute Mr. Mercier? Which of them would have a right to cast the first stone, if the truth were told? Sir, Mr. Mercier followed a very bad example set for him in the highest quarters of this Dominion; and he did not follow it until long after that evil example had been apparently condoned and approved of by the majority of the people of Canada. And this at least has been said for Mr. Mercier, that he appears to have left office a great deal poorer man than he entered it, which I fear is a great deal more than those who have persecuted and condemned him could say. Now, Sir, I say distinctly that whatever may have been the case when my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) first presented his charges to the House, there can be no doubt whatever as to the duty of Parliament to take action now. Either those vouchers and those letters are most audacious forgeries, or else they prove a vast conspiracy against the welfare of this commonwealth: and, Sir, if Parliament fails to do its duty, then the duty reverts to the people of Canada. It is quite true—and I give the gentlemen the benefit of the statement—that so far a great number of the people of Canada have been grossly recreant to their duty. I shall not deny that, and I shall not deny either that my own Province of Ontario has been the worst of all. I say here that I am ashamed of my province, and ashamed for it, judging from the results of the recent bye-election. Those elections show beyond doubt that a considerable number of the people are intolerably dishonest, and have been ready to take the thirty pieces of silver and betray their birthright, and also that a very considerable number of them were dead to all sense of honour and decency and self-respect. Sir, I say it with shame and regret, that there is no other English-speaking country possessing representative institutions where the publication of such evidences and documents as have been made public in Canada during the last few weeks, would not at once have produced a most formidable agitation—public meetings, letters from constituents to their representatives, petitions to Parliament and to His Excellency; denunciations from press and pulpit, in one word, all engines capable of exerting an influence on public opinion would have combined to bring the delinquents to justice. Sir, no people have ever had such proofs placed before them of the existence of a system of organized corruption on the part of their governors, and no people have had such manifest and incontrovertible warnings of the consequences of allowing such corrupt action

to exist. I admit, if it be any consolation to hon. gentlemen opposite and particularly to the hon. gentleman who recently displayed yonder placard, that the taint has spread. I admit that, as a natural result of those causes to which I have alluded, corruption is everywhere in Canada. It is not merely the case of whole departments being so saturated with corruption, it is the case of the whole Government being so afflicted. It is not merely the case of whole districts and provinces, but I very much fear of the whole Dominion. At any rate this much has been done, and this much has been gained, that these rascalities have been made plain: at any rate, the foundations of the power of government have been laid bare; at any rate these hypocrisies and hypocrites have been exposed, and we know who and what manner of men they are. And now, what next? I say the future of Canada to a very great extent hangs on the answer. I know that the Government is more than ever corrupt. Canada to-day stands at the parting of the ways. There is no doubt—I do not conceal it from myself, it would be impossible to conceal it from myself and no thoughtful man can fail to see it, that it is entirely out of the question that such exposures as these recently made could fail of producing a very great effect, but whether for good or evil is more than I can say. Sir, one of two results is inevitable. Whenever such proof as I have given and as has been laid before this House has been brought to the notice of any community, either you will have, and that shortly, a purification of politics and morals, or you will have a very great acceleration of degradation and corruption all through. If the nation chooses to do its duty, the country will emerge very considerably benefited and regenerated. If the nation neglects its duty, there is no doubt whatever, on the other hand, that the cancer will speedily destroy the vitals of the whole community. For my part, I take no stock; I never took stock in that cheap optimism which some people indulge in on these occasions. I do not believe in the slightest degree that things are going to right themselves of themselves. It is a very comforting morality, no doubt, for those who believe it; but I tell the House, history does not say so, reason does not say so, analogy and experience do not say so, and that it is very much more likely that things will go from bad to worse than that they will right themselves without the earnest intervention of the people. I know that the case of Canada is peculiar in many ways. These things could not happen at any worse time in our history than now, and I know quite well that it is more difficult for us to shake off this corruption than for older nations, who have a long historic past to appeal to. One of the worst results of all these things to which I have alluded, all these evidences of corruption which have been accumulating, not for one or two or three years but for many years back, is this: that they tend, and tend very largely, to destroy the patriotic instincts of our people. There can be no doubt, whatever there may have been in times past, that nowadays it is utterly impossible to cherish a healthy, patriotic instinct unless one is able at the same time to respect the country in which one lives, and no honest man can respect a people who, with such proofs as are now before the people of Canada, permit these things to go unpunished. The case is wholly different and always was wholly different in the case of nations who were oppressed and down-trodden into slavery. Here in Canada if we do wrong, a very large section of the people must feel themselves accomplices in their own degradation. And now, I have to call the attention of the House and the Government to the questions which are being asked to-day from one end of the country to the other. These hon. gentlemen may not know it, they may not be in the way of hearing questions which men are putting to one another on these points; but I can tell them that wherever men are meeting to-day, it is a common matter to hear the question raised, whether, in all the circumstances and under such conditions, it is possible for Canada to exist politically much longer. I tell them that that question is being put.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, and they will very soon find that that question has a very grave and important meaning for all of us. The question is being put, aye, from one end of the country to the other, whether our parliamentary system is not an utter and down-right failure, whether it is anything more than a mere mask for a system of intolerable corruption. I tell them that the question is being put whether, if it be unhappily true, as some of their apologists assert, that the condition of things in Canada is such that you can only keep Confederation together by these corrupt methods—whether, if that be true, which heaven forbid, Confederation would not be a moral nuisance to be extinguished from the face of the earth. They are asking whether the exodus, besides draining our physical manhood, is draining all the moral and political manhood out of Canada as well. The practical answer is given to this question, an answer, I am sorry to say, not in words but in deeds. You will find it contained in this most pregnant and significant fact, that in the last ten years, if the official statements given are to be relied upon, Canada has lost 1,500,000 people. You will find it in the fact that a country which might well sustain 50,000,000, and has a present population of less than 5,000,000, has lost nearly one-third, or the equivalent of one-third of its population, and they have gone because they have lost faith and hope in their country. I ask this House whether the fiercest civil war that ever raged in any country would have done more harm to Canada than the decade of misgovernment we have just closed. The answer is not far to seek. I have here a statement of the results of the fiercest civil war that has raged on this continent for this century. I have here a statement of the results to the entire Southern Confederacy, and it is well worth while for the people of Canada and for this House to consider what those results were. I find that the population of the States of Virginia, Florida, Georgia, Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Missouri, North and South Carolina, and Tennessee, was in 1860 exactly 11,000,000. I find that in 1870 that had grown to 12,487,385 souls, so that in the Southern Confederacy, which for four years was desolated by the very fiercest civil war almost that the world has seen for this century at least, the growth of those southern states, all of which were the scene of bloody hostilities, amounted in ten years to very nearly fifteen per cent; whereas I find that in Old Canada and the Maritime Provinces, in the decade from 1881 to 1891, the total

growth of its population was just 325,000 over the original population of 4,156,645, a little less than eight per cent, about half the growth which occurred in the southern states in the decade marked by the civil war I have alluded to. I say that that fact alone ought to open the eyes of the people of this country and the eyes of this House to the enormous cost and waste, not to speak of the wickedness and folly, of the system under which we have been governed for this last ten years. And now, let me briefly sum up the results we have attained in these same fourteen years, materially and morally. Materially, as this House knows, our taxes, in the space of about fourteen years, have been very nearly trebled, if you have regard to the amount which is taken out of the pockets of the people and not merely to the amount which is paid into the federal treasury. And more than that, so unjust and so oppressive is the distribution of this taxation that it is a literal fact that to-day in Canada, the man who is most severely and oppressively taxed is the farmer and the labourer and the artisan with a large family—the very man of all other whom wise and prudent statesmen should endeavour to spare. I find as another result, that whereas, a matter of 25 years ago, we started with a debt per head for federal purposes of exactly one-third of the then debt of the United States, our debt is now quadruple the debt of that country. I find that in vast sections of Canada the property of the people has depreciated enormously in value, and I find what is worse, that all through this period there has been a huge exodus of the very best and bravest and choicest of our whole population. I find also that in the territory which we obtained in the North-West, we have fooled an empire away with absolutely nothing to show. We have parted with all control of about 200,000 square miles, and we have absolutely not realized enough to pay the cost of management, and as for immigration, we have not added in the last twenty years one family for every square league. As for the moral results, there is no occasion to dwell on them more. No one who has paid any attention to what occurred last session, no one who has paid any attention to what was said of us by the journals of all English-speaking nations throughout the world, but must confess that the reputation of Canada has sunk to a frightfully low ebb. We have a fiscal system, which, as I have already stated, is nothing but an instrument of organized robbery, and our people to a very great extent have been reduced to the condition of being virtually the serfs and slaves of the several rings I have alluded to. Within a few hours, or a few days, our Dominion Day will arrive, and in every quarter of Canada a thousand orators will explain to a thousand audiences that we are the best and bravest, the most virtuous and enlightened and intelligent people in the world. So far as the natural advantages of the country is concerned, I am not going to object to that, but for once I could wish that these gentlemen would drop this tawdry and useless bombast, which is neither good for them to utter nor for others to hear, and would warn their hearers that if these things are allowed to go unredressed, if the people and the Parliament of Canada can permit such things as have been brought to the attention of this House to pass without proper investigation, they ought to haul down the old flag which they have disgraced and dishonoured and which they have dared to make a cloak for their own misdeeds, and hoist the black ensign which is the one fit and proper emblem for a people, of whom the majority are willing accomplices in their own dishonour.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I find I must detain the House from going into Committee of Supply and ask you for a few moments not to leave the Chair, not at all because the speech we have just listened to contained anything new or true, but because I have certain obligations to express to the hon. gentleman who delivered it which may be uttered more fervently now than if time were allowed to elapse. When the hon. gentleman was good enough this afternoon to intimate that he desired very much that I should be present when he delivered himself as he has done this evening, and that he had forborne for a long time from staying the other business of the House in order that, in the full House and in my presence, he might utter that long preserved, not to say kiln-dried specimen which he has given this evening, I asked one of my friends what it could possibly be that engaged the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) so earnestly and made him so anxious at the closing hours of the session, and when we at least, if not he and his friends, feel ourselves somewhat overtaxed with the exertions necessary to bring the deliberations of Parliament to a close, to deliver himself of a great speech. My friend told me that probably in ransacking his speeches of the past, the hon. member had found that there was some adjective which he had missed, and he wanted to get it into *Hansard*. As far as I am concerned I am gratified that the hon. gentleman has been favoured with the opportunity, although I feel that he has not even found the new adjective, and although we have but heard the old battered stock of superlatives and the old stale invective which has caused this House and the electorate of this country so often to listen to the hon. gentleman with disgust and to regard his name with disdain, though we have had to listen to this on the eve of a patriotic occasion like the first of July, to which the hon. gentleman made allusion at the close of his remarks. I am deeply indebted personally to the hon. member for having waited to deliver these observations until I was present, because it appears I was to be the subject of many of them, but apart from that it was a great delight to me to sit here for an hour and a-half and hear the hon. gentleman with eye and finger pointed to his supporters, lecturing them on political corruption, and to see how they took it without a murmur or a cheer, and to see how the stricken consciences which the countenances of his followers showed mirrored the misery he showed in his. I am deeply indebted for another thing, and that is for the picture which the hon. member presented to us, if not in new tones and colours, at least in faithful and living portraiture, of the faithless Minister, the corrupt politician, the scheming scandal-monger, who goes abroad through this country, and the man who, when himself in office, jobbed the treasury for the purpose of political prostitution, lent the money of the public to banks without interest in order that men interested in those banks might go through the by-ways of the country and bribe the electors to keep him in office. I am obliged to the hon.

gentleman for that portraiture, because I know that a great author has said: "Never does a man portray his own character so vividly as in his manner of portraying another." I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for the kindness which he showed to myself, for the care he says he exercised over my tottering footsteps when I entered public life. When I entered public life in this arena, my steps may have been tottering, but, although I had not seen the hon. gentleman, I had learnt of him in history as being one of the most miserable totterers that ever crossed the stage of public life in Canada. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman, further, for not allowing Parliament to separate, after a session of nearly five months, without his giving us another of those war, famine and pestilence speeches which have so often carried constituencies for the Government. I am obliged to him, when, in reiteration of the denunciations of his country and his countrymen all over Canada, he felt obliged to appeal for support to some authority, he appealed only to himself and read for corroboration one of his own speeches, thus presenting the kind of endorsations which is known in the slang of commerce as "Pork on Bacon." I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman that on the eve of a patriotic occasion such as the celebration of the natal day of this country he has laid aside the mask, even if only for a few hours, and if, when Friday shall have come, the hon. gentleman will blandly smile with satisfaction, we, at least, shall have upon the *Hansard* the record that here, within a few hours of the dawn of the natal day of this country, the hon. member declared from his place in Parliament, the most public place in Canada, that resistance was lawful to a Government like this, and that men were going about the streets asking how long this country ought to be allowed to stand. Sir, it is gratifying for us to know that he has laid aside the mask, even if only for to-night, and though he may masquerade in other disguises, on Friday next, at least the country and the House will have taken the weight of the hon. gentleman, and will have realized, as we all have done, and as the country has done, that the traitor is generally the truckling corruptionist as well. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman paid me a very high compliment; the hon. gentleman, after denouncing his party as guilty of every legislative and electoral crime that a party could be guilty of, turned at last, almost for the first time in the course of an hour's harangue, and pointing at me, declared that I had shown an intimate knowledge of criminal law, and had no doubt been a successful defender of dangerous criminals. Sir, I decline the hon. gentleman's brief.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You must have the fee first.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have had some experience, both in defending criminals and in prosecuting them; I have never shrunk in my calling as a member of the bar, from taking any man's case, no matter how desperate it might be, for the purpose of saying for him what he might properly say for himself; but I have sometimes spurned the fee of a blatent scoundrel who denounced everybody else in the world, and was himself the truculent savage of them all. I doubt that the gratitude with which I listened to the hon. gentleman's address, will be shared by his followers; I doubt that they will consider that the occasion was the most timely the hon. gentleman could have chosen. They will think that the hon. gentleman might have got off his address at one of the earlier stages of the business of the House, when he forbore to intrude himself upon the attention of Parliament. I think they will recall this evening the sad fact for them, that he, by his personal influence, by the power of his language, by the force of his invective, and by his close criticism of public affairs in this country, has reduced their ranks by 50 per cent since we met last; and they will recall the fact that not only did every constituency which he addressed give a verdict against them, but that every city, town and hamlet in his own province which he addressed, gave a rolling majority against his party; and they will recall the fact that he chose for the occasion of his speech to-day, when they were celebrating another defeat—the wresting of another constituency, almost within sound of my voice, by the Liberal-Conservative party from the hands into which it fell at the last general election. Now, if I cannot elicit from his own supporters the gratitude which I feel towards him, I can at least do this for the purpose of showing my personal gratitude; although the hon. gentleman supposes, I fancy, that he has reflected upon me, that he has even attacked me, and that, perhaps, he has made me feel badly for a moment, notwithstanding that, I, as a member of the Liberal-Conservative party, owe him such a debt of gratitude that if it shall be necessary to retain the hon. gentleman's services in the party which he does not lead, and which would not have him for a leader, and which barely tolerates him as a supporter—if it be necessary to retain him in that capacity I, for one, will propose a subsidy to Parliament to keep him there. I know, Sir, that the hon. gentleman did not do himself half justice when he declared that the task before him was not a pleasant one. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman would rather abuse his country and defame it, than eat his breakfast any day. I can tell the hon. gentleman that, strong as his language was, doleful as his forecast was, of the future of this country, alarming to some people of delicate nerves, as it might be if they had not heard it before, as we have so often heard it, language about the future of Canada, about the people who are asking how long this country can stand, and about people who are advising resistance to authority in this country, we, for our part, believe that on the part of the great majority of the people of this country, there is no fear and no alarm. Confident of the position which this country has obtained in spite of the efforts of the hon. member for South Oxford, confident in the path that she has chosen for herself, they are not to be alarmed even by the threats of a leading public man who counsels resistance, and declares that the fate of his country is sealed; because they know as well as we know, that when the hon. gentleman talks of resistance, and the death of his country, and all that kind of stuff, his courage is all in his tongue, and that the motto which he carries upon his escutcheon is "Words, not deeds." Sir, the hon. gentleman has made an allusion to me which I may refer to while it is in my memory. Having stigmatized his own party to whom he was point-

ing and whom he was addressing, with every crime in the political calendar, and many in the moral calendar as well, having reminded them of the sad fact that they had so polluted certain constituencies of this country with stolen money, that this Assembly was hardly to be regarded as a representative body, the hon. gentleman proceeded to attack the judges of this country. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman has good cause for quarrel with the judges. The hon. gentleman has the same cause for quarrel with the judges of the country that the culprit has for the lash which smacks his back. The judges of the country have found him and his party, while their mouths were full of virtue, guilty of every degrading crime which the electoral law punishes and declares to be a fraud, and have unseated in this Parliament upwards of 30 of his supporters; and the constituencies to the number of 16, taking advantage of that fact, in his own province and in the Province of Quebec, have reversed the votes and repented of the support which they gave the hon. gentleman less than two years ago. But the hon. gentleman having his quarrel with the judges, thought he might drag me into the quarrel, too, and declared that, forsooth, the judges were not fit people to try cases, because they were not impartial. The hon. gentleman is the only kind of man who ought to try a case, and above all is the only kind of judge who should sit on the trial of a political opponent. He is so pure, he is so above reproach, he is so well known outside of his own province, which those unfortunate judges who are appointed are not, that he above all others made in the same mould—which thank God nature broke when she cast him—was fit to sit in judgment in cases whether political or civil in this country. Let us imagine what the outcome must be, if having judges to hear evidence this Parliament is to be told that they are the most unfit men in the country to perform this duty, because they are men unworthy of their positions, men who do not know the law and who were appointed because they were party hacks. I do not know, I have not looked at the record of the hon. gentleman's appointments, but it may be so as to some. But for the party which is in power now I stigmatize that as disgraceful a misstatement as can be uttered in Parliament, and I have only to appeal to the recollection of every man who hears me to corroborate me in stating that above all other things the late leader of the Liberal-Conservative party achieved public respect for the course he took in selecting proper men to occupy the judgment seats of this country. But, again I say, the hon. gentleman tried to drag me into his quarrel with the judges, the quarrel of a convicted man against the bench, because we all know that when a man has lost his case and been convicted of a disgraceful crime he has but two options—one is to appeal and the other is to abuse the judge, and the hon. gentleman has chosen the latter course. He has dragged me into that controversy for the purpose of making the miserable insinuation that I bought the position I now fill by giving a seat upon the bench to a member of this House. That statement is absolutely untrue; it has not a shadow of foundation. I suppose there are few persons present who know what actually occurred when I was invited to be a member of Sir John Macdonald's Cabinet, and as I am not fond of referring to personal details, I shall not go into this matter at length, but I can say this, as the matter has been brought up for the first time in Parliament in my hearing, that the invitation to come here was not regarded by me as a very tempting one, or one that would induce me to bribe any man to give me a seat. If I had followed my personal choice and inclination of what I preferred—while I do not regret the change I have made—I would have stayed where I was. But the seat upon the county bench which a supporter of the hon. gentleman for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) took, and which made a vacancy which I stood for, was vacated by the death of Judge Campbell, and it was intimated to me not only that my presence would be desirable as a member of the Cabinet and in the capacity of Minister of Justice, but that I would have an opportunity, if I desired it, of standing for the old county which I had always represented in the Provincial Legislature, because it was probable that Mr. McIsaac would be offered the vacancy on the county bench. Mr. McIsaac was the leading barrister and leading counsel in that district beyond all comparison. I declined not once but more than once the invitation, and in doing so I stated that from the knowledge I had of that judicial district the appointment ought to be given to Mr. McIsaac, if he were willing to accept it, regardless altogether of any appointment of myself. Those who knew him, those who knew his relations in the county, and know the way in which he has discharged his duties, will say that I was right and gave sound advice, and they will not, stalwart Reformers as they are to this day, my leading opponents as they are to this day, thank the old-time leader behind whom their friend Mr. McIsaac sat, for the unworthy insinuation, even if it were true, that he was bought with a seat on the bench for the purpose of giving me a place in this House. I dare say if the judge were to express his own opinion, it would be this, that he was willing to accept a seat on the bench or any other place because he had sat quite too long behind the member for South Oxford. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are told that parliamentary institutions in this country are in danger, that this House can hardly be regarded as a representative body, that legislative fraud has been supported by organized corruption, that the Government is silent and its subsidized press and paid supporters are equally silent, and all this because it is said we have refused an investigation and substituted for it a mock trial. I will not make so little of the House as to ask the House whether that statement is true or whether it is false; but I ask the House whether it thinks a man worthy to sit within its walls who stigmatizes as a mock trial an investigation to be held by two of the highest judges of this country, who have not yet taken their seat and opened the investigation. I should like to ask the House if that is not on a par with the vehemence with which the hon. gentleman has criticized these proceedings from the beginning to the end, and not vehemence only but disgraceful unfairness, which has never been paralleled in the history of parliamentary debate. The hon. gentleman denounced the accused person as guilty almost before he had made an answer in his defence, and the judges had no sooner been named by this House and an investigation proposed by which they will take evidence than it is declared that everything is wrong in the country, that the Government is cor-

rupting the country by legislative fraud and authorized corruption, and that the investigation which those judges are going to conduct is a mock trial. Well, Sir, upon that point I have only to add this: I am quite sure that whether those two gentlemen who have been selected are known to the hon. member for South Oxford or not, the people who do know them, and they are widely known in their own province, and well known, too, by members of their profession in other provinces as well, will know how to characterize as fair or baselessly false and malicious the accusation that any trial they are to conduct is a mock trial. Is it true or false that we have suppressed the charge which has been made? Is that statement not disgraceful to the man who uttered it again? Why, time and time again, I have shown to the House, unnecessarily as regards the great majority, uselessly as regards the hon. member for South Oxford, that we have not suppressed the charge, that we have refused to allow hon. members to try a large number of contested election cases, many of which had been already tried in the courts. But as regards anything to connect a member of this Parliament or a member of this Government with these electoral corruptions, the charges are there and are to be investigated if the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has the courage to come forward to sustain them, or if he is not simply lying when he tells this House that these charges can be proved. One or the other. The investigation has been refused, Sir, has it? The charges have been suppressed, have they? Why, Sir, there are the charges to-day as framed by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) as emphasized by the hon. member for South Oxford himself (Sir Richard Cartwright) and in so far as we have changed them, we have simply changed them to conform to the violent language with which the hon. member for South Oxford sought to enforce them; and if they are not proved, the result will be to stamp him with the name upon his forehead that he deserves. Now, Mr. Speaker, in place after place in the charges we have not hesitated to put before this commission these statements that the Postmaster General is charged with a conspiracy to obtain public money for companies, to obtain that money for companies for electoral purposes and for the purpose of corrupting constituencies—although it makes not a particle of difference as far as he is concerned, for he must fall, if it be true, that he was engaged in such a conspiracy whether he used the money for the elections or not. We put that in, too, so that these hon. gentlemen might prove it if they could, and in every respect the charges are just as full and specific, so far as the Postmaster General is concerned, as they were the day they were brought by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar). One thing which we have eliminated is the general charge that other persons interested in these subsidies may have given these moneys too, and the general charge that these moneys were used in some 24 or 25 constituencies, and in some three or four elections in each of these constituencies. But, so far as the charges against the Government are concerned, and so far as the charges against the Postmaster General are concerned, they are just as clear and just as precise and just as open for investigation as the day they were made. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) challenged me to state if they are vague now. They are not vague now, thanks to the hon. member who made them, thanks to the hon. member for Bothwell who supported them, and thanks to the hon. member for South Oxford who sought to drive them home with invective which he is sorry for now because he cannot sustain it. These charges have been made precise and they have been made specific, and if the hon. Postmaster General is not afraid to meet them, there are three men who are afraid; because they have just sought to shelter themselves on the plea of privilege against appearing before the commission at all. They are the member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar), the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. member for South Oxford has declared that these commissioners are the appointees of the Postmaster General himself. No statement more utterly at variance with the truth can be put upon *Hansard*, because, as a fact, they have been appointed by this House and by a vote of this House practically unanimous as regards their qualifications. The Opposition abstained from committing themselves to the principle of appointing commissioners at all, but every member of the House knows that it was perfectly consistent for the Opposition to say: that if the House should eventually appoint commissioners these men were unfit by reason of this or that disqualification, or this or that unfitness of temperament. If these commissioners were the villains whom the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) portrays as sitting on the bench of this country from one end to the other, if they were partisans, if they were party hacks, if they were men not versed in the law, if they were men not likely to be impartial, every member who sits within these walls was challenged to say so. He had an opportunity to say so; he was bound to say so, notwithstanding he thought that no commission should be appointed at all; but hon. gentlemen opposite did not dare to say so, and in spite of the repudiation of the hon. member for South Oxford, I declare that these commissioners were fully sanctioned by this House without a single dissent as to their fitness or disqualification, and after dissent had been challenged or defied, for I defied it myself standing in my place here. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has declared that the details which are published in his reptile story, in his organ in Toronto, to which organ he says we are so deeply indebted for these disclosures—as we are, of course, also to him, as I have already explained in the opening remarks I have offered to the House—the hon. member has declared that such a set of documents with regard to electoral corruption never in previous times was laid before this country. The hon. gentleman's memory is short. He forgets that about nine times what was alleged to have been expended in any one of these constituencies—saving the election of Three Rivers as to which the statement is very vague—he forgets that about nine times what was spent in the most expensive of these constituencies was spent, at the election of 1887, to secure him a supporter in a county within 100 miles from where I stand, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was not so virtuous or so regretful then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps you would give us particulars of your election?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will give the hon. gentleman particulars fast enough, and I will tell him where to find what I refer to. I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was not such a purist then, or was not such a hypocrite then, whichever it may be, and he was not ashamed to sit cheek by jowl with a man who got his seat by the expenditure of $36,000. If the hon. gentleman wants proof of details, he can find them in the election courts which he shudders to think of as being presided over by men of such doubtful character, and after that, if he goes to the highest tribunal in this country he will find the record there, and he will find, furthermore, that that man held his seat by the purest technicality in the world, and that the judgment as to the corruption stands unreversed to this day. Yes, Sir, and more than that, when the appeal from the decision unseating that member had succeeded by reason of a technicality, and that member appeared in the House in the afternoon, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) led the cheers of congratulation which greeted him. If the hon. gentleman wants proof of details like that, his memory can serve him, if he goes back to the record of the London trial and of a good many others too.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Lennox trial.

Mr. BOWELL. The Cook trial.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, he can find the records of a good many others too in which for disgraceful bribery candidates were rewarded by favours from the Cabinet in which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) sat. If the hon. gentleman wants his record and wants his details, he has only to give us another war, pestilence and famine speech, and he will have enough of them for the night. Sir, I could not help being amused at the story which was trotted out about the "Red Parlour" for the thousandth time here—but, Sir, while that passes through deaf ears wherever it is uttered now, because every one in this country has found out by this time that it is all a phantom, and that the subscriptions which are supposed to have been given by the manufacturers at the so-called "Red Parlour" would not carry any one of the constituencies, which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has been accustomed to run for within the last 20 or 30 years—when that is so well known and understood in this country, the way it is echoed and re-echoed excites laughter wherever the phrase is used; yet the hon. gentleman got one of his sympathizers and satellites to attend to his business in Washington while we were there in April last. He got him to write a leading article in a Washington paper, which greeted us the morning we arrived in Washington, and before we were introduced to the authorities of the United States, for the purpose of putting the subject and the object of our mission just in the favourite language of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is making a statement absolutely destitute of foundation in fact, as he knows.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can produce the article and anybody who reads it and who has heard the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) cannot fail to recognize the author.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman has been told——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—that I did so, I would tell him that I did nothing of the kind, and he states what is false.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not mean to say that the hon. member for South Oxford was the author; and if he denies it, I am willing to withdraw the statement that he induced the author to write that article.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman knows that it is a falsehood.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know anything of the kind, but if anything would induce me to believe it, it is the hon. gentleman's denial. What I was going on to say, Mr. Speaker, was this, that the author, whoever he was—and there can be no doubt as to who he was—reflected exactly the sentiments and opinions of the hon. member for South Oxford; this is his duty and his work, such as it is, in certain important publications in the city of Toronto and elsewhere. And in re-echoing the hon. gentleman's story about corruption in this country and the imposture of our mission to Washington, of course it could not be a faithful portrayal of his master's words and ideas unless the "Red Parlour" were introduced too, although I suppose Washington would open its eyes to know what "Red Parlour" had to do with it or what "Red Parlour" meant; and so little was known or understood of the term there that the innocent printers published it to the world as the "bed parlour." The hon. member for South Oxford has undertaken to speak biographically of this Government, and he has declared that we have gradually progressed—by rapid stages, but still by stages—and that we began at a period when, as he says, my steps were tottering and faltering, and when he accused a member sitting on this side of the House of being the top of a mountain range of undefined corruption—a submerged mountain top, or similar picturesque language; there was, at any rate something mountainous about the hon. gentleman's statement, we all knew at the time how much truth there was in the allusion of the hon. member; but his candour and sagacity are at any rate remarkable for this circumstance, that although he was at that time, and has ever since been accusing Mr. Rykert of being guilty of falsehood, and corrupt falsehood, in all the letters and statements he had made with regard to that matter; yet now, when it suits his purpose, he quotes the words of that gentleman as a witness on his behalf, for the statement that dozens of members among whom he sat were just as corrupt as he had been, and had been guilty of just as many breaches of parliamentary decorum. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that if Mr. Rykert was worthy of the strong invectives which the hon. member for South Oxford has applied to him in times past—and we know that the English language affords no stronger—he is a worthy witness for the hon. member for South

Oxford this evening. I have said, Sir, that we thought we knew how much of truth there was in the hon. gentleman's statement; but until the hon. gentleman and his party went a few stages forward, and we found that, not only in this Province of Ontario, but everywhere else throughout this country, and even in the Maritime Provinces, of which the hon. gentleman has spoken as having been corrupted by Government influences, the money that was stolen from the treasury of a neighbouring province was used to help them in the elections; until we heard that development, and until we found men sitting in this House by means of that money, we could not suspect how much truth that hon. gentleman had uttered. The hon. gentleman has spoken of railway subsidies. When we consider that one railway company gave for his purpose as much as is alleged to have been spent in all these 25 constituencies, we can see that there was more truth than poetry in the hon. gentleman's remarks about a great mountain range of which Mr. Rykert was the visible top. Now, I have referred to the only matters that required attention in the hon. gentleman's remarks, and they did require some attention from me as a grateful tribute to the debt which I felt I owed him for the notice he took of me, and for the kind care and guardianship which he has shown for me in the past, but which I trust I have explained to him will not be a welcome attention in the future. I have only to say this, that speaking as the hon. gentleman has done with regard to being ashamed of his country, he has laid himself open to the very obvious answer that the history of the past twelve months has proved that this country is desperately ashamed of him. In the stigmatization and denunciation of his country, its institutions and his countrymen, which the hon. gentleman has used abroad without effect, and which he has used at home with desperate effect to his friends, the hon. gentleman felt that he needed some authority, and he failed to find any corroboration except himself. But, Sir, I venture to say this, that when on the 1st of July, the people of this country will meet in their various gatherings to be addressed by patriotic men, from east to west, while those who speak and those who hear will, I am sure, express, as they naturally would, the greatest desire for good government and good institutions in this country, there is not one of them who has a heart for his country but will repudiate in every breath of his patriotism, every word which the hon. gentleman has used with regard to his country to-night.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, if anything were wanting to vindicate the strong arraignment delivered a few moments ago against the Government of the day by the hon. member for South Oxford, it is the language we have just heard from the Minister of Justice in answer to the charges which my hon. friend has made. In answer—no; not a word did we hear in answer to the charges made by the hon. member for South Oxford; but from first to last the hon. gentleman had nothing in his mouth but personal abuse of my hon. friend. Usually cautious in his language, he stooped on this occasion from the language of parliamentary government to the invective of Billingsgate. My hon. friend beside me, I am sure, does not care to be defended from hard language; he is accustomed to that. Time and again he has been assailed from that side of the House in a manner to which I am sure he has become callous many years ago. But there is just one word of the hon. gentleman which I care to bring to the attention of the House on this occasion; it is his statement that when my hon. friend was in office he jobbed the public treasury for party purposes. Sir, every man in this broad Dominion knows that never was a more wanton slander uttered. There is no love lost on the other side of the House for my hon. friend from South Oxford; but no man up to this moment has ever dared, in any manner whatever, to utter a single breath against his personal honour. Hon. gentlemen opposite feel so hardly against him that not one of them can forgive him for this, that he is above all things an honest man; and if they could by any means attack his honour or his honesty, man after man of them would rise and take advantage of the opportunity. But, Sir, he is proof against all these accusations; and, whatever may be said of my hon. friend, when the history of this country comes to be written, it will be written of him that, living in an age of corruption, he proved to the last an honest man. The hon. gentleman said a moment afterwards that my hon. friend had appealed to resistance. I did not so understand the language of my hon. friend; but even if he had, he would have the authority of a gentleman held in high honour on the other side of the House. He would have the authority of Lord Salisbury who, not many weeks ago, stated that on certain occasions men were free to disregard the opinion of Parliament and to take arms against the majority if the actions of the majority did not suit them, the minority. But there was not, as I said a moment ago, one word of answer in all the language of the hon. gentleman to the charges brought on this occasion by my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman resented the expression of my hon. friend when he spoke of the trial by the commission appointed to sit on the charges brought some time ago by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) as being a mock trial. I have no hesitation in repeating the words of my hon. friend, and I do so advisedly. The trial, if trial it be, which is to take place before the royal commission, is to be a mock trial. Not that I want to impugn in any way the character or the reputation of the judges who are to hold this investigation; I would refuse on this occasion, as I did on a former occasion, to utter a single word against them; I will not even challenge the praise the hon. gentleman has expressed of those judges. But, as the hon. gentleman well knows, it is to be a mock trial because the charges are not only emasculated but made unrecognizable. He has again stated that he did not in any way alter the charges, that they were the same to-day as when uttered by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), with the exception only that they were emphasized by the comments of the hon. members for Bothwell and South Oxford. These very words show to what extent the trial is to be a mockery. Whoever heard that charges brought by an hon. member against another were to be tried not upon the language in which they were clothed, but upon comments made by other members or by anybody else speaking on the same subject? This is not all. The hon. gentleman

knows that when my hon. friend from West Ontario accused the Postmaster General of having corruptly offered certain railway companies money which Parliament had voted, upon the assertion by these companies that they wanted public funds to meet their indebtedness, which they were not able, out of their own private means, to meet—he knows very well that the tenth item of those charges stated in so many words that $100,000 of these moneys had been expended in some 20 or 22 different constituencies or districts of the Province of Quebec, which were in charge of the Postmaster General and which he had undertaken to carry for the Administration. Although this charge was there recited in so many words, although the names of the counties in which the moneys had been expended were given, the hon. gentleman knows that with his own hand he erased that paragraph from the charges. The hon. gentleman is aware that this commission which is to sit upon the charges brought by the hon. member for West Ontario have it not in their authority now to investigate in what manner these $100,000 were expended in those counties. He knows perfectly well that if my hon. friend from West Ontario were to go before this commission and say, I want to prove not only that the money has been accepted and received by the Postmaster General, but that, as I stated in my indictment and as I am prepared to prove, they were expended in such counties for such purposes, he would be met by the judges with the statement: We have no authority to enquire into these matters, as they have not been referred to us. These matters were excised from the charges, and I remember, if the hon. gentleman has forgotten, the very reasons which he gave for excising them. It was that the investigation into them would be tantamount to trying members for their seats, that it would be converting this investigation into an election court. I am not disputing this point with the hon. gentleman. It would not have been trying those members for their seats, but there was something more than the holding of the seats by the hon. gentlemen elected by means of that money. It was the bringing to the attention of the House and the country the corrupt method by which the Government have been enabled, year after year, to carry the country. This was the reason the charge should have been investigated, and the hon. gentleman knows it is not now in the power of the commission to investigate them. After the House had taken this course of eliminating this charge at the dictation of the hon. gentleman, the *Globe* newspaper began publishing a series of letters and papers and vouchers, which, unless they are claimed to be forgeries, prove conclusively that every word stated by the hon. member for West Ontario in that tenth paragraph is true to the letter. And we know something more. We know that after the publication in the *Globe* newspaper of these letters and vouchers a communication took place between His Excellency and his advisers. Whether this communication took place at the request of His Excellency or whether it was the result of the spontaneous action of his advisers the hon. gentleman did not tell us, but this is not material. Neither did the hon. gentleman tell us what was the nature of the advice which he and his colleagues offered His Excellency. Though invited so to do, the hon. gentleman did not venture to give the House the nature of the advice given by him and his colleagues to His Excellency, but we know very well what it was. We know from his own mouth in this House, though not in answer to that interrogatory, what it was; and I say at once that the advice given by him and his colleagues to His Excellency was not the same as that given to this House, but very different. In this House he stated that there was no occasion to enquire where the money obtained by the Postmaster General, if he obtained it at all, was expended, because that would be trying the seats of some hon. members. But to His Excellency he addressed different language. We have it in his statement to this House in answer to the hon. member for South Oxford. He said:

> "The Government did not intend to ask the House to interfere with that investigation or substitute for it a method of investigation which would be less complete and less impartial, nor do they propose in the meantime to express any opinion on the question which that enquiry will involve or on the facts which are to be proved or disproved before the commissioners."

This implies, since we have to wait for this investigation, that there is a matter to be investigated after all. There is an implication also that the matter therein referred to will be enquired into by the commission. Now, I do not hesitate to say to the hon. gentleman that in the answer he gave there is falsehood and deceit. The hon. gentleman is aware that under the order of reference to the commission, not a word of truth will be known with regard to the application of these moneys alleged to have been received by the Postmaster General from these companies. And, therefore, when the hon. gentleman tells us that we must wait until we have the result of the commission before anything further can be done, there is in his answer falsehood and deceit unworthy of his position as adviser to His Excellency. There is something more in this matter. It is not simply whether the Postmaster General had or had not done what he is accused of having done, but we must go, once for all, to the bottom of the system whereby the Government have been enabled, from time to time, to carry the country. They boast of their strength in the country. But there never was an occasion when they dared to meet their opponents in a fair field on an equal footing. I venture to say that, whenever it may come, as it must come, when we shall be able to meet the Government on their own record and on the record of the Opposition, upon their policy and the policy of the Opposition, they will be swept out of sight. They boast to-day of a large majority in the County of Pontiac. That should be the last thing they should boast of, because their victory has been won by the same methods they have ever employed, and I know whereof I am speaking. The House is aware, because it was brought before the House by the then member, Mr. Murray, that there is in the County of Pontiac a question deeply affecting the people. The people there voted $150,000 in support of certain individuals who were to carry on a railway. The member then in this House asked the Government for help to pay that bonus. He was refused. The Minister of Railways and the Minister of Militia said it was not possible to do that, and now it is true that the gentleman who has just been elected boasts that he has in his pocket a letter which promises aid and help, and states that, if the people wish to be rid of that bonus which they have voted, they have only to elect him and they will have satisfaction from the

Government. That is the manner in which they work.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Bryson has not said so, there is no such letter.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not say that there is any such letter, but the hon. gentleman will not tell me that Mr. Bryson did not say so.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). He never said so.

Mr. BOWELL. It is impossible to sustain the charge that any member of the Government ever made such a promise.

Mr. LAURIER. Oh! I see. The election is now won and the promises are repudiated. If the Minister of Militia had been in the county yesterday, and had made the statement which he just made, Mr. Murray would have been elected to-day and not Mr. Bryson. It is very well for gentlemen opposite to say that Mr. Bryson did not say so. Mr. Bryson stated on the platforms and from house to house: "I am not at liberty to give you particulars, but vote for me and you will have satisfaction, which you cannot have if you elect Mr. Murray." The hon. gentleman referred to the plundered treasury of a neighbouring province which had gone to help the Liberal party. I have only this to say in regard to this accusation. If the hon. gentleman can substantiate the charge he has now made, as my name has been more than once connected with these accusations, I say, let him bring up his charges against me and I will be the first man to move for a committee of the House to investigate them. I do not pretend to be a puritan. I do not pretend to be better than my fellowmen. I have my faults and my shortcomings, but I am no hypocrite, and my faults are not the faults on which I accuse my opponents. I fight a fair battle. I want to win upon fair grounds, and, if to obtain victory it is necessary to corrupt the people, I and my friends are willing to remain 25 years more in Opposition. It is very well for gentlemen to make vague charges as they have done. I repel those charges and hurl them back at them, unless they have the manliness to bring them before the House in such a way that they can be investigated.

Mr. OUIMET. I do not intend to delay the House from going into Committee of Supply very long. I only intend to answer a few words of my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, who has been kind enough to tell us that we have never dared to meet him on the hustings. I had the honour at the last bye-elections to meet my hon. friend on the hustings, and I know the means he adopted to win the electors, and especially the country electors, to his cause. He says he does not want any money. He may not want any money, because there is not a bad instinct in the people to which he does not appeal during an election. During that election did he not tell these people at St. Scholastique, in the County of Two Mountains, that they had to revolt against the city people, that it was a fight and a struggle between the farmers and the manufacturers, that these manufacturers were taking away all their money, and that they had to fight monopolies? Did he not tell them that he had to fight the cities just the same as he has done during discussion on the Redistribution Bill when, according to his liberal principles, he was refusing to the city people their proper share of representation? Did he not tell them that the only reason why they could not sell their horses or their grain or their produce generally was that the Government refused to make an arrangement with the United States Government in order to allow them the benefit of the American market? Was that true or false? It was false. Was it the fault of the Government if the Americans refused us a market for our produce? I say no. Whenever there is a Liberal member on the hustings, his theme is always this. If you are poor to-day and obliged to work without benefit and have difficulties to meet, it is the fault of the Conservatives, because their policy is an anti-national policy, and it would be better for the country to be annexed to the United States than to continue to go on with this Government in power.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is what your Premier said when he signed the manifesto.

Mr. OUIMET. We tell the people that every man is protected by this Government on their policy. We tell them to work and they will have the benefit of their work. If a man is a capitalist his money can be invested; if he is a manufacturer, he can have work; if he is an artisan, he can make a living; if he is a farmer, we are trying to get for him a remunerative and good market. During the last campaign we met the hon. gentleman everywhere, and everywhere he met with defeat. Now it has been stated that the Province of Quebec has been corrupted by this Government. This Government in my knowledge never spent any money in that province but what was for legitimate expenses. Hon. gentlemen might have tried to prove their statement before the courts. Did they try to prove it? How many of our friends fell victims? How many of our men were repudiated by the people? Every one was elected, and was elected on fair grounds. The only exception was in Richelieu, and what was the cause? The cause was this: That while they were charging this Government with not doing its duty in prosecuting the Connollys and Mr. Mc Greevy, these very men were preventing us from holding that constituency. We did our duty fearlessly and to our own detriment, and we paid the penalty; but the people have rewarded us since by continual victories. The hon. gentleman speaks of Pontiac. Well, there is a witness here, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), who says that the county was deceived by declarations on the part of the Liberal speakers that the bonus they now owe to the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway ought to be paid by this Government. Well, these gentlemen are very much to be pitied. After they have made in Parliament the most solemn declarations that this Government ought, on no account, to assume that bonus, they dare go before the people of Pontiac and state just the contrary. It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that these men believe that the country electors are a lot of fools, that there is not a particle of intelligence or honesty among them. They do not dare to go before the electors and tell them so to their faces, but they will stay here for four or five months at the public expense, talking to the *Hansard* and repeating their stale stories about corruption, and all that kind of thing. Why don't they go into L'Assomption? Why don't they go into Frontenac? Why don't they go into Pontiac? They tell the people in that county that this corrupt Government is spending money elsewhere, but

we are not generous enough to give them a little relief for their railway, although they have solemnly declared in this House that they could not do it with justice to the rest of the country. Why don't they say these things in Pontiac and elsewhere? No, Sir; they prefer to speak to the *Hansard*; they spend thousands and thousands of dollars to keep this Parliament sitting, because here they have reporters paid by the people to report the stories which they think the people will finally believe by constant repetition, and they have the privilege of members of Parliament to shelter themselves against the wrath of the people who refuse to believe them, and who repudiate them every time they have a chance. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Quebec has been mentioned. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that he had nothing to do with Mr. Mercier's money. I will admit it; but is it not true that Mr. Mercier never left the city of Quebec until after Mr. Pacaud had telegraphed to the leader of the Opposition that if he came down to Mr. Mercier's terms and conditions the latter would go to Montreal and be present on the same platform with the hon. gentleman to endorse his policy and his party? Is it not a fact that after the answer to this telegram had been received by Mr. Pacaud, the leader of the Opposition, having thought that everything was all right, Mr. Mercier turned up six hours after, by the next train, in the Bonsecours market.

Mr. LAURIER. That is not true.

Mr. OUIMET. It is on record.

Mr. LAURIER. I challenge you to make a formal accusation.

Mr. DELISLE. It is not true.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, Mr. Speaker, it would be funny if it were serious. The more serious the hon. gentleman is, the more funny it looks. Did he not, that very night in the presence of Mr. Mercier, promise him that if he and his party were returned to power the Province of Quebec would receive a slice of public money in the way of increased subsidy? Did he not state there that Mr. Mercier could go on with his extravagant expenditure, with his wasting the money of the province, because if the leader of the Opposition came into power he would give to Mr. Mercier the necessary resources to carry on the affairs of the country, to pay the interest on the increased debt, and to make a further loan on the Paris market for another ten millions, at conditions which would have allowed Mr. Mercier and his friends to have a nice commission, by which they could shelter themselves from the wrath of the people of the province? Are these facts not known? If we followed the example of hon. gentlemen opposite we could bring the hon. member to his trial before this House. We might do it, and then he might laugh, and justly laugh, in our faces, because he would say that he only mode political promises. These promises were made to the electors, he would say, and although the electors accepted them and were influenced by them, the House had nothing to do with them. We know very well that they have great courage in their speeches before this House, because they shelter themselves under cover of their privileges as members of Parliament. When we offer to send the charges they make against this Government to a commission, they say we have emasculated their charges. Sir, we have emphasized them with their own language, and now if they dare not go before that commission, as the leader of this House has said, they will be marked on their forehead with the brand they deserve. Sir, I will only add that we are ready at any time to submit our case to the people. They are our natural judges, and we are willing to appeal to them, as we have already done on many occasions. The people have shown that although they may be deceived they are not long in discovering it, and in meting out the proper reward to the deceivers. Mr. Mercier was a great man for four years. He was a great man because he had succeeded in convincing the people after the Riel affair that he was a patriotic defender of their nationality, that he was the avenger of their wrongs; and, more than that, he succeeded in convincing them that his policy was one of true progress and of true patriotism. Then it was discovered that he was nothing but a man ready to put his hand in the treasury of his province in order to assist his friends, as he has done, for it cannot be denied that at least $150,000 or $200,000 was spent by them during the last election. I might give the names of some of those who supplied that money. About $200,000 in 1891 were placed at the disposal of the hon. gentleman for carrying his elections.

Mr. LAURIER. Not a cent of it.

Mr. OUIMET. If circumstantial evidence was worth something, and the books say it is after all the best evidence that can be adduced when it is complete, I could tell him about $25,000 which were sent to Montreal. He will not deny that $25,000 were deposited by Mr. Langlois to Mr. Mercier's credit in Quebec and transferred to the Banque Jacques Cartier in the name of Mr. Mercier or his brother; and further, that the money was placed to the credit of Mr. Geoffrion, the hon. gentleman's right-hand man in Montreal. He will not deny that the very evening after the money had been deposited the faces of all his friends showed that something had turned up to elevate their spirits, and that he himself, in a restaurant not very far from St James street, was dining with Mr. Mercier and Mr. Geoffrion.

Mr. LAURIER. I deny that most positively. I cannot characterize the hon. gentleman's language. This statement has been repeated often in the press, I know, but I never take any notice of a newspaper article; but now that a charge has been made by a member here, I declare that I never dined with Mr. Mercier and Mr. Geoffrion during the elections.

Mr. OUIMET. Suppose the hon. gentleman had not dined. He may have lunched perhaps.

Mr. LAURIER. That is one of those slanders created and repeated, and easily believed by the hon. gentleman, who is of a very credulous nature. I never took a meal with Mr. Geoffrion and Mr. Mercier during the elections.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, Mr. Speaker, I never said that Mr. Geoffrion had told the hon. gentleman that the money had come up; but the hon. gentleman might have known, if he had followed his election, that the next day his friends, who were a day or two previous in a state of despair, boomed up and were all happy, and left Montreal like a flock of birds, happy to carry around the good news that at last Mr. Mercier had come to the res-

cue, and everything was to be all right for the Liberal party. Now, the hon. gentleman says he did not know that. But in view of these facts, how can the hon. gentleman accuse every one on this side of the House with knowing that money was given by Mr. McGreevy or any other man? How can the hon. gentleman say he is meting out even justice to us? How can he say, for instance, that I for one was an accomplice of Mr. McGreevy or any man when I was in Montreal and those parties were in Quebec? How can the hon. member for South Oxford charge us with being accomplices with Mr. McGreevy or any other man when he knows very well that such is not the fact? But the hon. gentleman had control of his own campaign. He knew very well when Mr. Geoffrion, the secretary-treasurer, had his hands full of money or when he had no funds. When he had none and Mr. Mercier turned up the next day, his hands suddenly became full of money. They had money, because in my own county where I was elected by 500 votes, or equal to a two-thirds majority, $1,700 were spent for the sake of keeping me in my county. Imagine when hon. gentlemen opposite had a fighting chance in the county how much they would spend? It is a fact that Dr. Ladouceur received $1,700, $200 for his deposit, $1,000 at one time and $500 afterwards. Where did the $14,000 go which Mr. Charlebois declared under oath he gave Mr. Mercier for the elections? But that was only a trifle, for hon. gentlemen opposite consider $14,000 a very small sum. Money was pouring like water around the hon. gentleman; but he was so high that he would not even cast his eyes down in order to see the money that was passing and thus his virtue would never be tainted. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am disposed to accept the challenge of the hon. gentleman, but I may not be credited with much courage because it appears at present as if we could not meet the hon. gentleman until this Parliament dies its natural death. At the bye-elections we do not see them anywhere; but the hon. gentleman has given me the opportunity to tell him that at the next election we will be ready to meet them. If the hon. gentleman had gone to L'Assomption our friends would have met him there. As he has not thought proper or in consonance with his dignity to go to Pontiac, our friends were not able to meet him there. But our opponents have not the same fate all round. There is nothing new in what has been brought before the House to-night. This House has affirmed its confidence in the Government, which has declared that the charges in question will be fully investigated by a proper tribunal composed of two impartial judges. This trial will take place as soon as the House will have risen, and I contend that it was in the best interest of the country and in the best interests of this Parliament that we should not again witness here a repetition of what took place last session. I for one am ready to declare that this House is, perhaps, the worst place to take evidence in a trial of the kind we had last year, and of the kind the hon. Postmaster General is going to have in a short time. Not later than a month ago, I proved here that my predecessor in the Department of Public Works, had wrongly succumbed under one special accusation, besides the others, and that was the accusation of having corruptly given the contract for the building of the Kingston graving dock. I had some opportunity since then of examining the whole record which was recently discussed before this House, and I was gratified to be able to show hon. gentlemen here, that not only was there no special favour granted to the Connollys, but if there was a mistake in the whole thing, it was a mistake in favour of another contractor than the Connollys. This will show to the House how unjust an enquiry of the kind which took place last year may be. Hon. gentlemen who are on the committee of enquiry take care to bring evidence against every one which ought not to be brought in at all, and injustice will certainly follow, because, as was the case last session, a mass of evidence was not properly adduced, and there was not a proper record for this Parliament to pass a fair and equitable judgment upon. If the hon. Postmaster General is going to succumb, he will at least have a fair trial. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite who declare here in advance that the hon. Postmaster General is guilty before he has had his trial, is just the specimen of the measure of justice that the Postmaster General might expect if he was brought up in that committee room where we spent three months last year. I should think that every one looking back to what passed there will always be sorry to have taken a part in such a proceeding.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman ought to resign and let the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) back to his office.

Mr. OUIMET. If the hon. member says so he might have a chance. I did not want to occupy the hon. gentleman's position, nor never did I expect it, or never did I seek it, and if I can only discharge my duty with credit to myself, I do not think I will die in the office either. Hon. gentlemen opposite have only one way of dealing out justice to their opponents and that is to have them convicted before they are tried. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) the other day told us of a case in which when the court rose at 12 o'clock they said to the judge that probably there would be no necessity for going on with the proceedings in the afternoon. Some people foresaw that the verdict would not be quite in accord with the popular sympathy, and at 2 o'clock when the judge came back there was no trial to be had because there was no accused to be tried. He had been disposed of during the interval. That is the way hon. gentlemen opposite proceed with their trial of a political opponent. They hang him first and try him afterwards.

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

(In the Committee.)

Geological Survey..... $60,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is this money to be expended?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Many of the geological engineers will work in the examination of the same districts as last year. It is the intention of Dr. Dawson to work at British Columbia in the Crows Nest Pass and surrounding districts, and Mr. McElroy in the country adjoining; Mr. McConnell will be engaged in the Rocky Mountains west of Alberta; Mr. Tyrrell in the district south of Athabasca Lake and west of Reindeer Lake; Dr. Bell will complete the work in the Sudbury district; Mr. Barlow is woking in the office, mapping out the Sudbury

district; Dr. Ells will be in Argenteuil and counties north of the Ottawa River; Mr. Giroux, mapping out certain portions of the Eastern Townships; Mr. Low will continue exploration in the waters north of James Bay and will cross the waters of the East Main River to work there, in accordance with the request made by Sir Hector Langevin in reference to the northern boundaries of Quebec. In New Brunswick, Mr. Chalmers will continue his work of mapping soils and distribution of forests. In Nova Scotia, Mr. Fletcher will continue his work in the Counties of Cumberland and Colchester, and Mr. Faribault in Halifax County. Prof. Bell will be engaged in Digby, Shelburne and Yarmouth Counties. Mr. Ingall will give most of the summer to the investigation of the new district in Kootenay and the south-western portion of British Columbia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is only one point on which I would like to have some information in a little more detail; that is, what information has the hon. gentleman to give us about the discoveries in the petroleum district, and what do the Government propose to do in the way of disposing of petroleum licenses or lands? More particularly, I would like to know if the Government propose to reserve any particular portion of these petroleum-bearing lands for further developments?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In reference to any further developments, there have been none since last session. Mr. McConnell, who was then just about returning from his investigations there, has described what he thinks is an extensive petroleum area, about 400 miles square. There has been no basin discovered, because no borings have been made; but the indications appear over a very large district. He calculates that there are some 58 square miles of what he calls tar-sand, that is, immense banks saturated with tar; and so dense is the tar that it will burn freely in a fire. I fancy it would make a first-class natural asphalt for making roads. There having been no boring, it is only possible to surmise the depth of these petroleum beds. It is thought that in the neighbourhood of Athabasca Landing, some 80 miles north of Edmonton, you would have to bore 1,500 feet in order to reach the basin; and it is estimated that a little farther north on the Athabasca River it would be necessary to bore to a lower depth. Mr. McConnell's investigations this year will be extended further east over a track of country almost the same size as that explored before, and in which no white man has ever been. The Government have not yet considered what disposition they will make of these lands. There have been some applications made from parties in England, and also from parties in Canada, but no scheme has been formulated and no determination come to. The question was raised a short time ago whether it would be wise for the Government to send up boring machines and do some boring ourselves; but I did not feel inclined to advocate that course, because in sending machinery where it would be difficult to obtain renewal parts and repairs in case it should get out of order, there is no knowing where the expense would end. With regard to the disposition of the lands, the Government have come to no conclusion at all—in fact, they have hardly thought of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask whether the Government have agreed upon any terms as to leasing these lands? I have a strong opinion that in the case of great resources of this kind, the state should not part with its right, but should impose a royalty. I am quite aware that this is against the opinion of speculators in such lands, and I am quite aware also of all that has been said as to the desirability of encouraging enterprise, and so on. But in other countries very considerable revenues have been obtained from royalties on resources of this kind, and I do not see why we should not derive a similar benefit from these resources, more particularly as our properties in the North-West have not benefited us financially to any great extent so far. I would like the hon. Minister to state what policy the Government propose to pursue with regard to the property—whether they think it desirable to part with it, or whether they intend to preserve some kind of interest in it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I may state that there were regulations framed under our Dominion Lands Act for the working of minerals, amongst others petroleum, but they were found to be utterly unworkable. I think they were to this effect: that any parties in petroleum districts could stake off 160 acres, and by expending a small amount every year could hold that property for five years at $100 a year. A great many parties in Southern Alberta located and took up a large quantity of these lands. Twenty or thirty of them clubbed together and applied to be allowed to bunch their expenditure at one spot. They were given that privilege, but their work did not amount to anything. They endeavoured to make arrangements with capitalists to bore for them, but the negotiations fell through. I came to the conclusion that the regulations were unworkable, and they were cancelled, and no more petroleum lands were allowed to be taken up under them; and as soon as these entries that were made fall in, the lands will, of course, become public property as they were before. There have been applications for petroleum lands, but there being no regulations the Government have not disposed of them. I look on petroleum property as somewhat different from ordinary mining property, with regard to royalties. I do not think if the Government were to resolve this royalty on petroleum, there would be the same objection to it that there is among capitalists to royalties on mining properties generally. I will bring the matter before my colleagues, and if we can come to any conclusion I will inform the House of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know, when we come to concurrence, what has been decided upon, as the matter is one of considerable practical interest?

Mr. FLINT. If I am not mistaken, there are 20,000 volumes of the large reports and a large number of volumes of the smaller reports, which are bound together to make the larger reports, in the possession of the librarian of the Geological Survey and not given to the public. I would suggest that a number of the copies be placed in the Parliamentary Library, and that some scheme be devised by which the surplus now encumbering the cellars of the Geological Department should be distributed to public libraries and schools and people generally throughout the country. If an hon. member desires special reports, there is a cast-iron rule by which he has to pay for them,

and I think arrangements should be made by which every member could obtain copies for distribution among his friends in foreign countries and in this country. The amount received by the Government for copies sold is so insignificant that it is hardly worth considering. If any person requires the report of the Geological Survey, he ought to be able to obtain it without charge, if his request be endorsed by a member of Parliament, and the loss to the Government would be very slight. I think it would be well if the department would adopt some rule for the distribution of these reports upon a more satisfactory basis, always retaining a sufficient number in the department to meet all possible contingencies in the future. It would be also well to consider the advisability of the amalgamation of the Geological Library with the Parliamentary Library. We have in the Geological Library probably one of the most valuable collection of books on this continent, but I think it is a mistake to have that library distinct from the Parliamentary Library. If that cannot be done, a duplicate of every work in the Geological Library should be placed in the Parliamentary Library for more convenient reference.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That question has been once or twice before this House already. I brought a return down last session or the session before showing the number of reports we had in the library not distributed, and it was found that, while in some years, when I suppose the report was not so interesting as in others, a large number remained in stock, in other years they were almost completely run out, and it would be impossible to distribute full sets of the geological reports to any parties now, even to institutions which consider them of so much value. There is a regulation by which the distribution is guided. So many are allowed to each governor of a province, so many to each member and senator, and a large number are exchanges with scientific institutions all over the world. When any large public institution applies, we give sets as far as our means allow. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman that all these volumes now in the museum should be distributed, because we would then find ourselves in the same position in regard to them as we are in regard to some years' reports which are now out of print. When individual applications have been made by members for themselves or friends, I do not think any have been refused, if we found we had a sufficient number in stock, though I am not sure whether it was within my right to authorize an issue of that kind. The reports are sold at different points throughout the Dominion, and generally the places where they can be purchased are mentioned in the reports. The hon. gentleman knows that they are really valuable books and they are sold at the lowest possible price, which I do not think any of those who interest themselves in the geology of this country hesitate to give. With regard to the amalgamation of the Museum Library with the Parliamentary Library, this is the first time the matter has been brought to my notice. The Museum Library is becoming very valuable and extensive, and we have not room now for the books we have there and are applying to the Public Works Department to increase the capacity. The bulk of the books we get are exchanges from various countries. The director has authority to purchase books which he considers absolutely necessary for his department, and also works which he considers necessary to be kept in the library. I do not think I could recommend that an amalgamation should be made, because so many of the books in the library of the museum are needed for constant reference by the engineers, who spend nearly half a year on their work there. The building we have is altogether too small for the work we are carrying on, the samples are increasing every year and the work is increasing, and complaints are made by the director that he has not sufficient room for his work. I know that some members have visited the museum and have seen some men working in the basement and consider it unhealthy and not fit for men to work in. I hope the time is not far distant when the country will see that it is necessary to provide better accommodation for this work.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have often been to get additional copies and have been told that they could be got only on being paid for. I would suggest that those which are in stock should be distributed amongst the mechanics' institutes throughout the province. I think the Printing Committee made a recommendation on this subject this year, though I do not know whether the report has been adopted or not.

Mr. STAIRS. The Minister will remember that strong representations have been made to him by those interested in mines in Nova Scotia as to the scale adopted for maps in that province. At first it was one mile to the inch, but in the last map it was reduced to 4 miles to the inch, and practical men have found that this scale was of very little use and did not bring out the features of the country in the way in which it was intended they should be. I would ask the Minister what progress he has made towards complying with the desires of those to whom I refer?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I agree with the Minister that the building where the branch is now situated is not convenient, not very suitable, and not very safe, and I think it was a pity it was ever purchased for that purpose. I think a building erected on Major's Hill, as close to the bank of the river as possible, would be in the right location. You require unobstructed light in an institution like that, and it should be placed in a locality where it would be as free as possible from dust. Neither of those conditions is fulfilled in its present location, and I think both would be fulfilled if it were situated in the place I suggest. I would say with regard to the library of the Geological Branch, that it is technical in its character, and professional, and it is one that requires to be at the immediate disposal of parties who are engaged there. I do not see how, unless you were to remove the whole branch up to the library here, you can remove the library away from those who require constantly to use it. Then, with regard to the publications. While it is important to supply liberally all the institutions where such works may be useful, nevertheless it is necessary not to deal with these publications improvidently, because there are always new establishments coming into existence with whom you desire to make exchanges, and who call for your publications of previous years, and if you distribute them until you have scarcely any left, you will not be able to supply

these when they are required, and so it will always be necessary to keep a considerable number, perhaps not so many as are kept at the present time, on hand in the department. While perhaps the department has carried the principle of economy to the extreme, it is nevertheless desirable not to distribute them, so as to retain none in your possession for future distribution, if it is found necessary.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I must reply to the question put by the hon. member in reference to a matter in which I know the Province of Nova Scotia takes a great interest, that is in regard to the scale which has lately been adopted for the maps we make of that country. Some years ago, as the hon. gentleman probably knows, arrangements were made with the Nova Scotia Government by which we agreed to publish maps of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton at a scale of one mile to the inch, provided some assistance was given by Nova Scotia. The same arrangement was made with British Columbia, both being important mining countries. British Columbia paid $5,000, and Nova Scotia paid $1,500. I suppose as soon as the money stopped that came from Nova Scotia, the scale was reduced in order not to overdraw the expenditure on the Geological vote. The matter was referred to me by several scientific gentlemen in Nova Scotia who pressed it very strongly. I also received letters from the hon. member for Guysborough, and indeed from nearly every member from Nova Scotia, and I made it my business to make a very careful enquiry into the cause of the change of scale, and I was told by the director that it was entirely owing to financial reasons. He found that the finances would not allow him to continue drawing plans on this large scale. As every one knows, the difference between a scale of one mile to the inch and four miles to the inch means sixteen times the quantity of paper, and besides very much extra work in regard to drawing and engraving. I, therefore, made enquiries whether it would be possible to do our work by the photo-lithographic system rather than by engraving, and in order to see if that could be done I set our best draughtsman at work to prepare one of the sheets of Nova Scotia for that purpose. It was found that although a very fair impression could be made by that process, it was not anything like as satisfactory as was the engraving. I then calculated the time it would take for a redrawing of all these maps that would have to be done in this way, and I found it would cost very little more to have the maps engraved. Consequently, I came to the conclusion that our vote would be able to stand it. I also took into consideration that the last portion of Nova Scotia had been drawn on that scale, and the country being essentially a mining country, I appreciated the difficulty that mining men and the scientific men in Nova Scotia had in studying out the features of that country, and I gave instructions to have the scale increased as far as Nova Scotia was concerned. I hope that I shall not have the same demand from all the other provinces, and I think there is no necessity for it, because it depends so much upon the nature of the country and how the rocks lie, as to what the scale shall be. In a country where the rocks lie horizontally it is not so important, but where they stand almost perpendicularly, as they do generally in mining countries, or at an angle, it is very difficult to show the features of the country on a small scale.

Committee reported resolutions.

ADJOURNMENT—LAND OFFICE AT EDMONTON.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the House adjourns I would like to know the intention of the Minister of the Interior with regard to the land office at Edmonton. I received a telegram from Edmonton the other day, and called the attention of the Government to the fact that there was great dissatisfaction in Edmonton because the people believed that the Government were going to remove the land office to the other side of the river. I have to-day received this telegram from Edmonton:

"Napoléon Gagné and others applied for homestead entry on Stoney Plain, north side, at Edmonton land office this morning. Officer in charge unable to take entry as books on south side. Consider this breach of faith. Want to know if Government intend to keep faith or not. Excitement rising."

Mr. DEWDNEY. When the matter was brought up in the House I was not present, and the leader of the House answered the hon. gentleman. He stated then that there had been some trouble on account of the impression among the people that the land office was going to be removed from the north side of the river to the south side. It appears there was some misunderstanding with regard to that, because the agent on the north side had instruction to move the office on the south side to give the immigrants who were coming in from the south an opportunity to make arrangements there without having to make a long trip across the river and back again. That created some difficulty. At that time I was continually receiving telegrams, one of which was to this effect: That there were some nine parties waiting to make entry at the office north of the river, which had been closed, and that there were several hundred waiting to take out hay permits. This was at a time when there was a little block in transferring the books from one side of the river to the other. When I found there was a misunderstanding, I telegraphed to the agent to this effect: If there has been any misunderstanding with regard to my instructions, you must consider this telegram your instruction. Keep the office open on the north side of the river, but take such documents as are necessary to give entries to the immigrants who are coming in on the south side. A few hours after that I received a telegram saying it was satisfactory, and that the office was open on the north side. I received a telegram from the agent stating that it appeared in the papers there were a number of people waiting to make entries on the north side, and that a large number of farmers were also waiting to take out hay permits, that the office had been open for two days, and that although there had been a little block, there was no longer any trouble. That is the position on the north side.

Mr. LAURIER. I received a telegram on Friday.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That was the state of the case.

Mr. LAURIER. Then the office will be kept open at Edmonton, on the north side?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The main office is kept open on the north side. There is a temporary office, in a car loaned to us, on the south side, in order to obviate the necessity of men crossing the river. I received a telegram from there yesterday, stating that a delegate had arrived there with 20 settlers, that they had made entries on the south side of the river and were very well satisfied with the accommodation given them.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 30th June, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a communication from Robert Watson, Esq., resigning his seat as representative for the electoral district of Marquette.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ for the said electoral district.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY—COAL CONTRACT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether any contract for the supply of coal to the Kingston penitentiary has been granted, and if so, to whom, and at what rate per ton for the several qualities of coal supplied?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. Coal contract for Kingston penitentiary has been awarded. 2. To John Gaskin. 3. American smiths, $6 per ton, 30 tons; screened egg, $4.30 per ton, 2,300 tons; Briar Hill, $6 per ton, 50 tons; screened chestnut, $4.30 per ton, 15 tons; Newcastle smiths, $7 per ton, 10 tons.

I.C.R.—RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What are the receipts and expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway to the 1st days of May and June in the years 1891 and 1892 respectively?

Mr. HAGGART. The receipts and expenditures are as follows:—

To 1st May, 1891.

Receipts	$2,504,285 07
Working expenses	3,021,269 26
Loss	$ 516,984 19

To 1st May, 1892.

Receipts	$2,456,337 06
Working expenses	3,032,314 05
Loss	$. 575,976 99

To 1st June, 1891.

Receipts	$2,739,238 61
Working expenses	3,278,986 63
Loss	$ 539,748 02

To 1st June, 1892.

Receipts	$2,694,816 33
Working expenses	3,240,642 29
Loss	$ 545,825 96

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the House resolve itself, on Saturday next, into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:

To the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company, for 58 miles of their railway from a point at or near Cedar Creek to the town of Ridgetown, in lieu of the subsidies granted to the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company (provincial charter) by the Acts 53 Victoria, chapter 2, and 52 Victoria, chapter 3, $224,000.

To the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company, for 55 miles of their railway from Barry's Bay towards the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, a subsidy not exceeding $6,400 per mile on the first 27½ miles out from Barry's Bay and not exceeding $3,200 per mile on the second 27½ miles, nor exceeding in the whole $264,000.

For a railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Revelstoke to the head of Arrow Lake, for 25 miles of such railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $80,000.

For a railway from the north end of the 11 miles for which a subsidy was granted by the 53 Victoria, chapter 2, to Plaister Rock Island, for 3 miles of such railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $9,600.

To the Monfort Colonization Railway Company, for 21 miles of their railway from Lachute or St. Jérôme westward, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $67,200.

To the Ontario, Belmont and Northern Railway Company, for 10 miles of their railway from the Belmont Iron Mines to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Central Ontario Railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $32,000.

To the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidies granted by the Acts 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, and 51 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy of $15,100.

To the Buctouche and Moncton Railway Company, for 32 miles of their railway from Moncton to Buctouche, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, granted by the Acts 49 Victoria, chapter 10, and 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, nor exceeding in the whole $35,480.

To the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company, for 19 miles of their railway from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway (in addition to the subsidy granted by the Act 53 Victoria, chapter 2), a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $60,800.

For a railway from the parish of St. Rémi, in the County of Napierville, to St. Cyprien, in the said county, for 12 miles of such railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $38,400.

To the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company (or any other company undertaking the work), for 25 miles of their railway from a point on the Cape Breton Railway, at or near Orangedale, to Broadcove, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, in lieu of the subsidy of $50,000 granted for the said railway company by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, and on the same conditions, nor exceeding in the whole $80,000.

To the Nicola Valley Railway Company, for 25 miles of their railway from a point to the Canadian Pacific Railway, at or near Spence's Bridge towards Nicola Lake, $80,000.

To the Lotbinière and Mégantic Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway from St. Jean des Chaillons towards Glen Lloyd, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

For a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway, through the Stewiacke Valley, on a line which will afford facilities of communication with the iron mines at Springside, Upper Stewiacke and Musquodoboit settlements, 25 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $80,000.

To the Philipsburg Junction Railway and Quarry Company, for 6 75-100 miles of their railway from Stanbridge Station to Philipsburg, in the County of Missisquoi, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $21,600.

To the Kingston, Napanee and Tamworth Railway Company, for 3 miles of their railway from a point at or near Harrowsmith to a point at or near Sydenham, in lieu of the subsidy granted for this section of road by 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $9,600.

For a railway from Cape Tormenti towards Murray Bay, 20 miles, in the Province of Quebec, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

For a railway from Truro, or a point between Truro and Stewiacke, to New Port or to Windsor, in the Province of Nova Scotia, for 49 miles of such railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $156,800.

To the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway from Campbellton towards Grand Falls, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

For a railway from St. John to St. Rosalie, 32 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $102,400.

For a railway from St. Placide to St. Andrews, 8 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $25,600.

For a railway to complete the connection between Sydney and Louisburg, in the County of Cape Breton, for 28 miles of such railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $89,600.

To the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway from Belleville to Tweed and thence to Bridgewater, in lieu of the subsidy granted, 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

To the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company, for 56 miles of their railway from the city of Kingston to Smith's Falls, in lieu of the subsidies, not to exceed $179,200, granted by the Acts 53 Victoria, chapter 3, and 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy calculated on a basis of 3½ per cent on the amount of such subsidies so granted, to be paid in semi-annual instalments for such period not exceeding 21 years, as the company may elect, which represents a grant, in cash, of $179,200.

Provided that upon the completion of 28 miles of the said railway a semi-annual subsidy may be paid proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole 56 miles: Provided also, that the company may deposit with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, a sum not exceeding $1,170,000.

In consideration whereof there shall be paid to the company for such period, not exceeding 20 years, as the company may elect, a semi-annual annuity calculated on a basis of 3½ per cent on the amount so deposited: Provided further, that the Governor in Council may permit the company to assign the said subsidy and annuity to trustees by way of security, for any bonds or securities which may be issued by the company in respect of their undertaking, and the subsidy to the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway shall be paid in instalments, the first semi-annual payment upon which shall be made at the end of the six months from the date of the Chief Engineer's certificate of the completion of the 28 miles of railway, and each subsequent payment at the end of six months thereafter, for the term of 20 years or less.

To the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway from the end of the line subsidized by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, at St. Catharines, towards the city of Hamilton, in the Province of Ontario, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the

Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

For a railway from Woodstock towards Centreville, 20 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

To the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, for the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the 52 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and also for the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the 53 Victoria, chapter 2, nor exceeding in the whole $96,800.

For a railway connecting the works of the New Glasgow Iron, Coal and Railway Company with the Intercolonial Railway at Eureka, for 12½ miles of such railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $40,000.

To the Thousand Islands Railway Company, for 13 miles of their railway from Gananoque Junction of the Grand Trunk Railway to a junction with the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway, in the Province of Ontario, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 53 Victoria, chapter 3, for this section of road, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile; also the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the same Act for 4 miles of their railway from a point near the St. Lawrence River, in the Gananoque Village, to Gananoque Junction of the Grand Trunk Railway, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $44,000.

To the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway from Little Current to the Algoma Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

To the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company, for 16 miles of their railway from the end of subsidy granted by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, at junction of Midland Railway to Pontypool, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $51,200.

For 75 miles of the railway from Sand Point, Shelburne Harbour, in Nova Scotia, to a junction at or near New Germany on the Nova Scotia Central Railway and to Annapolis, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, in lieu of the subsidy to the like amount granted by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, for the same length of railway from Shelburne and from Liverpool towards Annapolis, nor exceeding in the whole $240,000.

To the Kingston, Napanee and Tamworth Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway, being extension in the Counties of Hastings and Addington towards the iron deposits, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

To the St. John Valley and Rivière du Loup Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway from the north end of the line subsidized by the 53 Victoria, chapter 2, to the town of Woodstock, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

To the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway, for 30 miles of their railway from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

To the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway from Eganville to Barry's Bay, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

To the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company, for 32 miles of their railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Eganville, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the 51 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $70,400.

To the Lake Témiscamingue Colonization Railway Company, for 35 miles of their railway from Mattawa to the Long Sault, in lieu of the subsidies granted by the 52 Victoria, chapter 3, and 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $112,000.

To the Temiscouata Railway Company, for 12 miles of their railway from the north end of the section of the St. François Branch, subsidized by the 51 Victoria, chapter 3, being the first 12 miles on the section subsidized by the 51 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $1,800 per mile, in addition to the subsidy already granted, nor exceeding in the whole $21,600.

To the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway, for 16 miles of their railway from Port Burwell to Tilsonburg, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $51,200.

To the Woodstock and Centreville Railway Company, for 6 miles of their railway from the west end of the 20 miles subsidized by the 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, to the international boundary between the Province of New Brunswick and the State of Maine, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $19,200.

To the Lake Témiscamingue Colonization Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway from the Long Sault to the crossing of the Kippewa River, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and a subsidy of 15 per cent on the value of a wooden truss bridge over the Ottawa River near Mattawa, not exceeding $15,000, and not exceeding in the whole $63,000.

To the Goderich and Wingham Railway Company, for 31 miles of their railway from Goderich to Wingham *viâ* Port Albert, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $99,200.

To the Joliette and St. Jean de Matha Railway Company, for 8 miles of their railway from St. Félix de Valois to St. Jean de Matha, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $25,600.

To the Bracebridge and Baysville Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway from Bracebridge towards Baysville, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

To the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company, for 25 miles of their railway from at or near North Bay station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, towards James Bay, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $80,000.

For a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway between Ste. Flavie and Little Métis Station to Matane, for 50 miles of such railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $160,000.

To the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company, for 2 40-100 miles of their railway from the end of the section subsidized by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, at Huntingdon, towards the international boundary, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $7,680.

To the Hereford Railway Company, for 3 miles of their railway between Hereford and the International Railway, Cookshire, at the Quebec Central Railway, at Dudswell, uncovered by the subsidies granted by the 49 Victoria, chapter 10, and 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $9,600.

To the Ontario and Pacific Railway Company, for 53 87-100 miles of their railway from Cornwall to Ottawa, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $172,490.

For a railway from a point on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the Island of Jesus, in the County of Laval, towards St. Eustache, for 12 miles of such railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, to the Carillon and Grenville Railway Company, for 12 miles of their railway, from St. Eustache to Sault au Recollet, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $38,400.

For a railway from St. Eustache to St. Placide, in the County of Two Mountains, for 18 miles of such railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the 49 Victoria, chapter 10, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $57,600.

2. *Resolved*, That the subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose shall be granted to such companies respectively; all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council; and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, and which the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location, also, of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and all the said subsidies respectively shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister, or upon the completion of the work subsidized, except as to the subsidy granted to the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company, the first semi-annual payment upon which shall be made at the end of six months from the date of the Chief Engineer's certificate of the completion of twenty-eight miles of the railway, and each subsequent payment at the end of each six months thereafter, for the term of twenty years or less.

3. *Resolved*, That the granting of such subsidies respectively shall be subject to such conditions for securing such running powers or traffic arrangements and other rights as will afford all reasonable facilities and equal mileage rates to all railways connecting with those so subsidized, as the Governor in Council determines.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I have to make a very strong remonstrance against the manner in which these resolutions are brought into the House. Here are some sixty different resolutions involving the appropriation of over two millions of dollars brought in at the last day of the session, when prorogation is almost within sight. The hon. member must admit, and every member of the House must be impressed that such a large expenditure of money as is here demanded ought to be introduced as early as possible in the session.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that a discussion cannot take place until the House is moved.

Mr. LAURIER. I want to come to this, moreover, which I am sure will be in order, namely, that we have not a scrap of paper laid on the Table of the House with regard to this appropriation. It has been customary for the Government under such circumstances to lay on the Table of the House all the correspondence with regard to this appropriation. As the hon. gentleman intends to move the House on Saturday, we should have that correspondence before we go into committee.

Motion agreed to.

ST. JOHN, N.B., HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself, on Saturday next, into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to raise by the issue of debentures, the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, which sum may be advanced and paid to the Harbour Commissioners of St. John, in the Province of New Brunswick, for the purposes and subject to the provisions set forth in the Act relating to the Harbour of St. John, being chapter fifty-one of the Statutes of 1882, and be in addition to the sum of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars by the said Act authorized to be so advanced.

Motion agreed to.

IMPERFECT POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to call the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to the unsatisfactory mail service between here and the eastern portion of the Province of Nova Scotia. Passengers leaving Sydney by train on Monday morning arrive here on Tuesday night, but the mails do not arrive here until 9 o'clock or noon on the following day. Letters mailed here on Wednesday night only arrrive at Sydney on Saturday night, while passengers leaving on Thursday at noon arrive at the same time. I do not know why these irregularities exist unless it is that proper connections are not made at Montreal. During

the last few months many passengers who have been in the habit of coming by way of St. John and the Canadian Pacific Railway have reached Ottawa about half-past 9 o'clock on the evening preceding the day on which the mails arrive. I call the attention of the Postmaster General to the matter in the hope that these irregularities will be corrected.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My attention has already been called to the irregularities which my hon. friend mentions, and I have caused enquiry to be made by the officers of the department. I think they must be due to the fact that no connection is made at Montreal by the Short Line. I expect to receive in a few days all the reports which I require to show exactly the cause of these irregularities, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that if it is within the power of the department to rectify them, that shall be done.

GRANTS TO NORTH-WEST MILITIA.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved third reading of Bill (No. 96) to make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia Force in active service in the North-West. He said: I promised on the third reading of the Bill to give to the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) some information in reference to the number of land warrants and scrip notes that had been issued. Up to the 28th of June of this year 4,999 scrip notes were issued for $80 each, amounting in all to $399,920, and 1,263 land warrants had been issued. But, subsequently, 279 exchanged land warrants for scrip, leaving the number at 984. With regard to the present Bill, I find that the Prince Albert Company, which I was uncertain about, comes within the provisions of the Bill, which increases the number to 244.

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

SUPPLY—DOMINION DAY CELEBRATION.

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

Mr. KAULBACH. Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I desire to offer the few remarks which I attempted to make the other day, thinking that you would indulge me in that privilege. It is not my intention to occupy the time of this House at this late stage of the session, more than to offer a few words regarding the announcement made by the hon. leader respecting Friday next as a Canadian holiday. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the announcement was received with much favour by this House, much as we all desire to see business despatched and we get to our respective homes, as it was very generally felt that all Canadians, whether by adoption or birth, would have an inclination to do their utmost on that day to make it one of pleasure, and have it kept in every sense of the term, Canada's national holiday. On the 1st of July next—Dominion Day—Canada will have completed the 25th year of its existence. Twenty-five years ago Canada confederated, comprising Lower Canada and Upper Canada, better known as Canada East and Canada West, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Now we comprise the entire area of continental British North America, and it is to be hoped ere long to bring in with us our sister colony, Newfoundland, and form one grand whole. It is a pleasing recollection to know that when our neighbours to the south of us, across the border, just previous to Confederation refused us trade relations with them, and we had no other alternative but to encourage trade of an interprovincial character, that the historic old band of faithful ones as pioneers, nothing daunted, the fathers of Confederation, with our late lamented and grand old chieftain at its head, worked out the great national scheme of Confederation, which has, since its founding, proved such incalculable success to us, and so far beyond our most sanguine expectations. Many of the faithful ones—the fathers of Confederation—have ceased from their work of usefulness, and joined the great majority, but their names, with their great old leader, will live in history. We have a number still spared to us who will, I feel, be only too anxious to join with us in this national holiday, and assist with their presence, in making it indeed a gala one for us all. Ottawa as the metropolitan city should be foremost in this movement, and there is no city in Canada better calculated this year, and better able to do honour to this day, not only as being the metropolitan city, but being as it has Parliament in session and every county in the Dominion represented from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It may be that not every one is seeing eye to eye with the Government in matters politic, still they will be actuated by honourable, generous and patriotic motives as Canadians to advance this great Dominion of ours, and join heartily with us in our sports. A quarter of a century's experience shows us to day how rapidly we have advanced with the age of progress and how steadily we are increasing as a country in material greatness, having completed as a body confederated that gigantic work, the Canadian Pacific Railway—that iron road across this continent—the high road to the world, thanks to the patriotism, the wisdom, and the skilful guidance of our leaders at the helm of state, backed by a people full of energy, and true-hearted loyalty in sentiment and feeling for Canada, her constitution and her laws. We are told Canada is "the brightest gem in the Crown of the British Empire"—a beautiful sentiment, and of which we may be justly proud. Then may I ask, how has she acquired the proud position? Has not the harbinger of all her success been in the fact of the separate provinces having become one confederated whole? Then as a great and prosperous country having acquired greatness in the way I have referred to, let us keep Friday next, "Dominion Day"—our national holiday—in a becoming manner, and consider it a day worthy of all the recognition we as Canadians can give it. Let the day contrast favourably with the celebrations of Independence kept by our neighbours across the border, and let us prove our faith, our devotion and our attachment to Canada by our works. I do not desire exactly to dictate as to what should be done here, not being a resident of this city, but would merely suggest that it would add greatly to the enjoyment of the day were the Dragoon Guards, Troop of Cavalry, Batteries of Artillery and the companies of Infantry, with their bands, to parade on that day. A salute to be fired in the morning, or at noon, or both. In fact anything available to attract should be

brought into requisition on that day. If the hon. the Minister of War will give an encouraging word in this direction, I feel certain the General will do his part, and the citizens their part to have a programme well carried out. We have material in this Chamber glad to do their part, in giving an oration suitable for the occasion as an educator to the growing youth of the country.

BRITISH FARMERS' DELEGATES REPORTS.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I wish to make a few remarks on the farmer delegates' reports. The first report is that of Mr. McQueen, on which I propose to make a few comments. He states that he got into Halifax on the 30th of August, and on the 1st of September they started on a tour through the province. He comments on everything worthy of commendation, and I believe gives a fair and honest statement of all he saw in that province. Owing to an unfortunate hitch, he says, between the Dominion and Provincial Governments as to who was to guide them through the province, they could not leave for Windsor until 3.20 p.m. railway time or 4.20 Halifax time. It is most unfortunate that the tenant farmers were not allowed to be shown through the province by members of the Provincial Government, or the parties appointed for that purpose, as it was at the instigation of the Provincial Government the delegates visited the provinces. Some of the farms he found well kept and the stock in good condition, and he made special mention of the Government farm and the good work it was doing. He points out the very excellent crop of swedes, mangels and Indian corn, and praises the country in that locality as a capital grass-growing country and capable of producing lots of good wheat, barley and oats. He shows conclusively that the natural conditions are such that farming could be carried on there successfully; then he goes on to speak of the cheese industry, and shows that 10 cents per pound is realized on cheese. In this line also he found everything in good condition. He then went into New Brunswick and visited the woollen and cotton factories, and found the goods of excellent quality in certain lines. After that visit, he gives the prices of cows in Nova Scotia, as ranging from £4 to £7 for fairly good animals, the milk selling at 5 pence or 10 cents per gallon. Let me say that this is equal to the amount realized by the farmers who bring their milk to the cheese factories in Ontario. He goes on to show that lambs are not selling at such very good prices, as many can be got at 8 shillings to 10 shillings per head. He describes the cattle at a show in New Brunswick, and says they have some very fair thorough-bred cattle and excellent Ayrshires, and that the country is well fitted to produce cattle of that description, and shows what both the Provincial and Dominion Governments are doing in the interests of farmers in that locality. Then he goes on to show that in certain localities there is a large quantity of land for sale, and mentions particularly the Amherst district. He mentions also the Skye River district in the Province of Nova Scotia, where there are a great many farms for sale. He mentions also that a large number of the farms are mortgaged, and that the farmers are not in a prosperous condition. A great many of the farms in the Skye River Valley are for sale cheap, but he adds:

"Yet I consider workingmen getting good wages in the old country are ever so much better off than the farmers in this district."

I draw the attention of the Government particularly to this statement, as it has attracted great attention in the old country. He goes on and shows that some of the farms are well cultivated and others only moderately cultivated. Summing up, he shows there is a quantity of good land in the various provinces valuable for settlement purposes. He describes particularly the soil in Prince Edward Island and says it is well fitted for raising potatoes, large quantities of which are raised, but which, since the McKinley Bill, cannot be sold except at a loss, the price at the time of the delegate's visit being only 7½ pence per bushel, or 14 or 15 cents, which would not pay for the growing of them. What I want more particularly to call the attention of the House to is Mr. McQueen's general conclusions after visiting the provinces:

"I must now give the conclusions I have formed, from an immigration point of view, of the capabilities and resources of the Maritime Provinces. Any one reading my report will have some idea of what they are. I may say my co-delegate and I held exactly the same views and came to the same conclusions regarding the state of the country. As many former delegates to Canada and the Maritime Provinces have given such glowing, and I think rather misleading and overdrawn reports of the country, it places me in a delicate and unenviable position to be compelled to do the reverse. I cannot say anything derogatory of the resources and capabilities of the provinces; they are great and capable of great development, particularly the mineral. But facts prove that agriculture and farming has for a number of years, but more clearly since the McKinley Bill came into operation, been on the down grade, and in a very depressed state. Nearly all the young people are leaving the old folks on their farms and going to the United States. Land, consequently, is badly farmed and getting run down; houses and buildings in many instances falling out of repair. Any number of farms can be purchased at a very low figure, often at less than the houses and buildings on them cost. A large number of farms are heavily mortgaged. The output of coal is increasing very slowly, and the iron industry is not developing as it ought to do. The census returns issued some months ago showed that the increase of population in the Maritime Provinces during the last ten years was very small, not at all commensurate with the natural increase of the population and the number of immigrants coming into the provinces. The questions naturally arise: What is the cause of this depression? and can I recommend farmers, labourers or artisans to emigrate to the Maritime Provinces? In answer to the first question, from my own observations and from all I could hear and learn, it is from the want of better trade relations with the United States, the natural market for the surplus produce. Some may say, 'you have nothing to do with the question, it is out of your province and touches on politics,' but I hold it is so closely associated with our mission and the object of our report, that we are bound to bring it forward. In answer to the second question as to recommending immigrants to go to the Maritime Provinces; until there is unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, so that the farmers would have a better market, and be able to command higher prices for their produce. I must decidedly say, "No."

"In coming to this conclusion, I may say that I went to the provinces unbiased and unprejudiced, and have endeavoured to give an honest and just report.

"JOHN McQUEEN.

"OAKLAND, SELKIRK, SCOTLAND, 18th Jan., 1892."

I would say that this is one of the best lessons the Government have ever received as to their policy in view of bringing immigrants to this country. This gentleman, as he says, came here unprejudiced and unbiased to investigate the capabilities of some sections of this country as to immigration, and he gives his opinion in a very straightforward manner, and he would have been untrue to his duties if he had not given a proper opinion as to the condition of the country with regard to its trade relations as well as in regard to its conditions for

settlement. I am about to read a letter addressed by Mr. McQueen to the *North British Agriculturist*, a paper published in Edinburgh. It seems that the editor published an article on the suppression of Mr. McQueen's report, and he sends this letter :

"CANADA AS A FIELD FOR INTENDING EMIGRANTS.

"SIR,—With reference to the article in your last issue, entitled 'Suppressing the Report of the Delegates,' I beg leave to make the following explanation.

"My reason for not being able to recommend the Maritime Provinces to intending emigrants, is not the heavy tariffs on imported goods altogether, but that the farmers of those provinces, as well as Ontario and Quebec, are cut out of their natural market—the United States—by the national policy and the high tariffs between the two countries. Canada, but most particularly the eastern provinces, is sadly wanting better trade relations, or unrestricted reciprocity with the States.

"Land in the Maritime Provinces has fallen from 70 to 35 per cent in ten years, and nearly all the young men are leaving the old folks on the farms, and going mostly to the States or the North-West of Canada. Consequently, land is getting run down, and into poor order. Hundreds of farms are offered for sale at less than the houses and buildings on them cost. Altogether, farming in the Maritime Provinces is in a wretchedly depressed state. A great deal of the land is poor, wet and miserable. I could not, therefore, with any consistency or honesty report favourably on the Maritime Provinces. I feel I am placed in a very invidious and unpleasant position as I have done, but I would belie the characteristics of a Scotchman had I done otherwise.

"The McKinley Bill, or the want of better trade relations with the United States, don't affect agriculturists in Manitoba and the North-West, which the farmer delegates mostly visited, to the same extent as the eastern provinces, Britain being the natural market for wheat, their principal product.

"My opinion is that the present policy will very soon drive the Canadians to annexation. I believe Canada has a great future before her. Though I cannot report favourably on the Maritime Provinces, I think so highly of Manitoba that I have taken up some land in one of the best wheat-producing districts, and intend leaving Scotland in another year to go out there to settle.

"I am, &c.,

"JOHN McQUEEN.

"OAKLAND, SELKIRK, 20th April, 1892."

Here is a letter which shows conclusively that a very deep interest was taken in the work of the delegates who came out to visit the Maritime Provinces and to see whether or not they were a desirable field for immigration purposes. A good deal of excitement must have spread through that country when the editor of one of the most widely circulated agricultural papers in Great Britain felt it necessary to call for the publication of this suppressed report of Mr. McQueen. It is evident that the Government, in order to undo the mischief which has been done, will have to adopt a trade policy which will show to that country that their markets have been restored to the people of the Lower Provinces, not only reducing the price of what they purchase and giving them the full value of their money, but also opening out the market with the United States, which, he truly states, is the natural market of those people. We have often heard it stated in this House that the United States is not the natural market for the people of the Maritime Provinces, but here is the opinion of a gentleman who came out here unbiased, and that opinion, based on his experience and on the information he was able to collect, is that the United States is the natural market. It must be remembered that at the time that he was going through the provinces he was under the care of the Dominion Government and under the control of individuals sent by them, so that the information which he received was as favourable as could be given to him so far as the Government could control such information. I believe that Canada has a great future, and I believe many people would come to this country if it were not for the tariff wall which exists between this country and the United States. For a certain time we heard that the Government of the United States were not willing to enter into trade relations with us, but statements have been made by Mr. Secretary Blaine and Mr. Foster of the United States, which show that they were willing to enter into trade relations with us, if a certain number of manufactured articles were included in any treaty which was entered into. We have always contended that that was the case, and now it is shown to be correct. I hope the Government will take this into their serious consideration, and as far as possible give every opportunity for unrestricted trade relations in as many articles as possible, in the interest of Canada, between the United States and this country. I believe myself that our interest lies in the United States market as well as in that of Great Britain. It is true that for our beef cattle and for our cheese, England is our principal market. Let me say that Mr. McQueen gives a very good account of the cattle trade, because he says in one instance that a farmer bought a good stock of steers, paying from $25 to $40 per head, and he was able to sell those steers for from $60 to $75 per head in the Lower Provinces. That is doing as well as we can do in Ontario. He shows that the system of agriculture is in a pretty advanced condition there, because they have gone into the silo, the most important and cheapest system of feeding, and in some localities they have been very successful. I hope the Government will take this into their serious consideration, and that before we meet again they will be prepared to offer for our consideration a proposition for such trade relations with the United States as that country may agree to. I think myself that if we can obtain reciprocal trade relations with that country it will be one of the greatest blessings that can be conferred, not only upon the agriculturists of the Lower Provinces, but upon those of Ontario and Quebec, yes, and of the North-West provinces also. I am convinced that it is the trade policy adopted by this Government that has kept back our North-West from prospering as it ought to have done.

Mr. COLTER. Coming from the Province of New Brunswick, one of the provinces visited by these farmers' delegates, I claim the privilege of saying a few words. I did not have the pleasure of accompanying these delegates when they visited the county I have the honour to represent ; my predecessor in this Parliament, and my opponent at the last two general elections, accompanied these gentlemen in their visit. But I did see them when they returned to the town of Woodstock, and I was very much impressed with their ability to do the work which had been assigned to them. But whilst they were very enthusiastic over the capabilities of that section of the Province of New Brunswick, yet during the short conversation I had with them I found that they could not recommend their fellow countrymen to emigrate to the Maritime Provinces for the reason, chiefly, of the want of a better market. This question of a market was one intimately connected with the object of their visit. Whilst the country might be all that could be desired so

far as soil, climate and farming capabilities are concerned, yet if the farmers have not a paying market in which to dispose of their produce, the fact constitutes a great drawback to that country, and one that these gentlemen, if true to themselves and the object of their mission, could not overlook in making a report to their fellow countrymen. I have looked over the reports of these delegates, and I find that Mr. Davey, after being at Sackville and speaking in high terms of the farming capabilities of that district, goes down to Sussex and St. John, and speaks highly of the farms in that neighbourhood. On page 28 I find that he says:

"In putting facts and figures together at this point of our journey, we could not see how the farmers in this locality could do any more than secure a bare subsistence."

On the same page he says again:

"On our way we met a dealer with a nice lot of lambs (about 30 lbs. each, dead weight), which had just been purchased at 10 shillings each. The present owner intended sending them to the States, but would (thanks to the McKinley tariff) have to pay a duty of 75 cents each before crossing the dividing line."

Now, Sir, it would be only facts and figures of this kind that could lead this gentleman to write as he did of that locality; for I well remember driving through it a few years ago, and it is one of the most flourishing farming regions in the County of York. On page 88, Mr. Davey, speaking of the Province of New Brunswick, says:

"New Brunswick produces every kind of grain and root crops that is produced in England, as well as some which will not come to maturity in the climate of the latter country."

Again he says:

"All who have given the subject proper attention agree in stating that New Brunswick is particularly well adapted for a system of varied husbandry, combined with cattle raising and feeding. The pastures are excellent, and the abundant crops of roots afford the means of preparing beef and mutton for the English and provincial market. That this can be done with profit has been demonstrated beyond a doubt. * * * * *

"The position of the Maritime Provinces on the Atlantic sea-board, and their proximity to Great Britain, give them special advantages for the transport of their products to that market."

Then, on page 89, he concludes by saying:

"That the introduction of improved breeds has led to the raising of large numbers of cattle for the English market, a business which is now conducted on an extensive scale by the farmers of Albert and Westmoreland. Some of these establishments in those counties stall-feed as many as 200 or 300 heads in the winter, and large aggregate numbers are exported."

Now, Sir, in this report of Mr. Davey I find several statements that I am sorry to say are incorrect. True it is that the farmers of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia did attempt a few years ago to sell live cattle to the English market, but I am sorry to say their effort was not a financial success; I believe it nearly ruined every man who had anything to do with it. But I hope that with a proper system of silo, and with a rapid and easy communication between St. John and Liverpool, in the near future we will be able to do something in that line. I also find in Mr. Davey's report a statement of the exports of the Province of New Brunswick, and as he makes this statement immediately after the extract I have quoted, I will read it:

"Of the product of the mines, New Brunswick exported $109,839, nearly all of which went to the United States. Of the products of the fisheries, New Brunswick exported $588,564, of which $27,000 worth, in round numbers, went to England, and $476,000 went to the United States."

We exported of animals and their products the value of $253,449, of which $3,959 went to Great Britain and $247,638 to the United States. Of the value that went to Great Britain $3,914 was in the shape of undressed furs, which cannot be considered a true farm product, leaving $45 as representing beef sent to the British market, of which we have heard so much of late. Of manufactures, the total amount exported was the value of $495,607, of which $83,440 went to Great Britain and $316,472 to the United States. I think these figures show that the conclusions read by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) from the farm delegates' report, were correct to the letter as regards New Brunswick. I find from the returns for 1891 that the trade of New Brunswick with Great Britain declined by a little over $500,000, while the trade with the United States increased by about the same amount. Of the export trade of forest produce, $2,904,711 to the English market, we find that spruce deals and deal ends amount to $2,866,678, leaving as the value of all other kinds of lumber sent there, $38,033; while of all other kinds of lumber sent to the American market were of the value of $2,133,008. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that in the American market we are met by very high duties, while in the English market our lumber is admitted free. I desire to read the conclusion arrived at by Mr. McQueen, one of the farmers' delegates from New Brunswick, as follows:—

"I must now give the conclusions I have formed, from an immigration point of view, of the capabilities and resources of the Maritime Provinces. Any one reading my report will have some idea of what they are. I may say my co-delegate and I hold exactly the same views and came to the same conclusions regarding the state of the country. As many former delegates to Canada and the Maritime Provinces have given such glowing, and I think rather misleading and overdrawn reports of the country, it places me in a delicate and unenviable position to be compelled to do the reverse. I cannot say anything derogatory of the resources and capabilities of the provinces; they are great and capable of great development, particularly the mineral. But facts prove that agriculture and farming has for a number of years, but more clearly since the McKinley Bill came into operation, been on the down grade, and in a very depressed state. Nearly all the young people are leaving the old folks on their farms and going to the United States. Land, consequently, is badly farmed and getting run down; houses and buildings in many instances falling out of repair. Any number of farms can be purchased at very low figures, often at less than the houses and buildings on them cost. A large number of farms are heavily mortgaged. The output of coal is increasing very slowly, and the iron industry is not developing as it ought to do. The census returns issued some months ago showed that the increase of population in the Maritime Provinces during the last ten years was very small, not at all commensurate with the natural increase of the population and the number of immigrants coming into the provinces. The questions naturally arise: What is the cause of this depression? and can I recommend farmers, labourers or artisans to immigrate to the Maritime Provinces? In answer to the first question, from my own observations and from all I could hear and learn, it is the want of better trade relations with the United States, the natural market for the surplus produce. Some may say, 'you have nothing to do with the question, it is out of your province and touches on politics,' but I hold it is so closely associated with our mission and the object of our report, that we are bound to bring it forward. In answer to the second question, as to recommending immigrants to go to the Maritime Provinces: until there is unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, so that farmers would have a better market, and be able to command higher prices for their produce, I must decidedly say, 'No.'"

Let us see for a moment if we can bring forward

anything to corroborate Mr. McQueen's report. I do not know any better way of doing so than by instituting a comparison between Aroostook in Maine and the County of Carleton in New Brunswick. These two counties lie side by side for a distance of 60 or 70 miles, they are inhabited by the same class of people, and in many other respects they are similar, but Aroostook has an advantage in having a market of 65,000,000 of people while Carleton has only the National Policy. Aroostook has no railway of her own. The New Brunswick system enters that county in two places. Aroostook has no great river running through it from one end to the other as is the case with Carleton. The lumber of the Aroostook region is directed into the small streams that flow into the St. John River, and it is manufactured in New Brunswick and shipped by our railways and our vessels. Yet what do we find in regard to the population of these two counties? Aroostook during the last ten years has increased 9,000 souls, while Carleton has lost 900. I believe if we had a proper return of the immigrants to Aroostook it would be found that they included most of the 900 people who went from Carleton, and people from other parts of New Brunswick and the other Maritime Provinces. Let us now look at the census, and see if the returns for New Brunswick will corroborate this report made by Mr. McQueen. I find that in the ten years from 1851 to 1861 the total increase of population in New Brunswick was 58,247, and I call attention to the fact that nearly eight years of that decade was covered by the old reciprocity treaty. That number, 58,247, was nearly one-quarter of the whole population at that time. In the next ten years, from 1861 to 1871, during the first four years of which we were under the treaty and the last four years under Confederation and a revenue tariff, the province gained 33,548 people. Between 1871 and 1881, during eight years of which we were under a revenue tariff, the province gained 35,639 people. But during the last ten years, from 1881 to 1891, while we have been under the National Policy, the province has gained only 61 people. It has lost the natural increase, which would amount to something like 38,000, besides 12,000 immigrants, brought into the province during the last decade; so that we have the fact that 50,000 people have been lost to the province during the last ten years, and if we had retained that number of people in the province this Parliament would not during the present session have deprived New Brunswick of one-eighth of its representation in this House. Now, Sir, I think this shows that if we had reciprocity with our neighbours to the south, or had simply a revenue tariff, we would not require, as was suggested by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) the other night, to ask for Imperial legislation with a view to secure for the smaller provinces the same number of representatives they had when they entered Confederation.

N. W. SETTLER'S GRIEVANCE.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a complaint which I have received in regard to a settler in Manitoba. He went to that province years ago, and, being anxious to have his son located near him, he took advantage of the two-mile limit to take up two sections that had been abandoned. He broke and cropped 10 acres the first year, 13 acres the second year, and 17 acres the third year, in accordance with what he understood to be the regulations whereby he would be permitted to make a homestead and get a grant. He made application for the purpose of getting his patent, but, not having measured the ground, he declared that he had broken 10 acres the first year, 13 the second and 17 the third, and that he had the whole 40 acres broken and cropped as provided by the law regulating the taking up of abandoned sections. It appears the Commissioner refused the application for the patent on account of his not having broken sufficient ground the second year, during which I fancy 13 acres had been broken instead of 15. The man had to borrow $400 and pay it in order to save the homestead that had been taken by his son, although he had broken and cropped the 40 acres in three years. This appears to be very harsh treatment. I do not know whether it is customary to compel settlers to break the exact number of acres each year, but it seems to me that when the required number was broken in three years the man should have his patent. I think it a pity that settlers going in there should be treated apparently harshly, as this man appears to have been in connection with this matter. I mention this to the hon. Minister of the Interior, trusting that he may see his way to consider the matter and do justice to this man.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know whether the matter has been brought to my attention or not, but if the hon. gentleman sends me the name of the settler I will enquire into the circumstances. I know that the law has been very strictly adhered to with reference to all applications, but I was under the impression that last year, certainly with regard to the five years' clause, the Act was amended so that if the quantity of land at the end of the five years was cultivated, any little irregularity with regard to not having done sufficiently in previous years was overlooked, and the patent issued. I think the case the hon. gentleman mentions refers to the two-mile radius clause, and if that is the case, the settler might not probably have carried out the conditions strictly in accordance with the Act. If I understand the hon. gentleman's remarks correctly, I am afraid there is no discretion on my part. However, I will enquire into it, and if there is any possibility of correcting it, I will be glad to do so.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Chairman, before you call the first item I wish to bring under the attention of the committee the general policy connected with the management of Indian affairs, and I think this is the most favourable opportunity of doing so. I suppose, if we were to follow the English practice, the Minister would make to the committee a statement of the general policy of his department; and as some years have gone by since we have minutely considered the management of Indian affairs, I desire to bring the matter under the attention of the committee very briefly. If it were earlier in the session I would go into details for the purpose of showing what I consider the abuses and extravagances which have grown up in

connection with the management of this particular department. The committee will, perhaps, be surprised when I say that the hon. gentleman in his department pays out for salaries a sum of upwards of $560,000 a year. $231,000 is paid out in connection with the Department of the Interior proper; $273,318 for salaries in connection with the Indian Branch; $49,450 for the Geological Branch, and $9,550 in connection with the management of the Mounted Police at the central office.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is not in my department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Excluding that there is something over $550,000 paid out in salaries in connection with the Department of the Interior and Indian Affairs. I am not going to discuss the Lands management to-day at all, but I give the hon. gentleman notice that if we both should have the good fortune to meet here next session of Parliament, I purpose entering into a detailed discussion, which I feel I would not be warranted in doing at this late period of the session, in connection with that branch of the department. Let me call attention to some facts. The head office at Ottawa in connection with Indian matters is represented, as appears in the estimate of appropriations taken, as paying out last year about $50,000. The head office at Regina, in the North-West Territories, employs 25 persons and costs the country $31,150. The head office in British Columbia employs 23 persons and costs $30,860, and the Manitoba agency costs $5,740. For these four central offices, including the department here, the salaries to 101 persons amount to $116,125. The outside service in Ontario employs 34 persons, at salaries amounting to $16,656, and in Quebec 12 persons are employed in the outside service at a cost of $3,000. The medical branch disbursements for Ontario and Quebec amount to $5,930. In this department 63 persons were employed at a cost of $23,586. In Nova Scotia 18 persons are employed at a cost of $1,203, in New Brunswick eight persons at a cost of $1,240, and in Prince Edward Island one person at a cost of $300; the total number of persons employed in the Maritime Provinces being 27, at an aggregate cost of $2,743. In the Province of Manitoba, the officials and expenses are divided as follows:—

Agency.	No. of Officials.	Cost.	No. of Indians.
Central Office	5	$ 5,740	.....
Treaty No. 1	2	1,950	2,413
do 2	1	1,000	760
do 3	5	4,150	3,002
do 5	2	2,000	3,701
Totals	15	$ 15,840	9,876

This is equal to about $1.40 paid to the officials for every Indian in Manitoba. I am not complaining that this is an inordinately large expense. On the whole it seems to be about the same as the cost of the Indian management in Ontario and Quebec. It is when we come to the North-West Territories proper that we find an extremely large expenditure for the management of Indian affairs. The head office in the North-West Territories employs 25 persons at salaries amounting in all to $31,150. Let me speak of the various agencies under each of the three treaties. In Treaty No. 4 the number of officials, the cost and the number of Indians at the different agencies are as follows:—

Agency.	No. of Officials.	Cost.	No. of Indians.
Birtle	3	$ 2,340	524
Fort Pelly	2	1,540	650
Moose Mountain	5	2,880	250
Crooked Lake	10	4,880	752
File Hills	3	2,320	276
Muscowpetung	9	5,220	552
Touchwood Hills	10	5,000	828
Assiniboine	2	1,680	211
Totals	44	$ 25,860	4,043

So that, to take charge of the 4,043 Indians within Treaty No. 4, there are 44 agents, not including those in the Regina office, employed at a cost of $25,860, which is equal to $6.39 for every Indian within the limits of the treaty. As the treaty provides for the distribution of $5 a head amongst the Indians, leaving out the extra sum paid to chiefs and headmen, it costs $1.29 more to pay the agents employed in the distribution of the fund than the amount of the fund itself. The figures in Treaty No. 6 are as follows:—

Agency.	No. of Officials.	Cost.	No. of Indians.
Duck Lake	7	$ 3,730	663
Carleton	4	2,080	1,239
Non-Treaty Sioux	.	624	953
Battleford	14	8,150	1,018
Onion Lake	2	1,620	660
Saddle Lake	3	2,200	711
Edmonton	5	3,000	716
Peace Hills	5	2,400	554
Totals	40	$23,804	5,561

In Treaty No. 7 the figures are as follows:—

Agency.	No. of Officials.	Cost.	No. of Indians.
Sarcee	4	$ 2,760	846
Blackfoot	5	3,300	1,479
Blood Reservation	10	6,100	1,736
Piegan Reservation	5	2,940	974
Totals	24	$15,100	4,947

Taking together the Regina office and the various agencies, we find that to take charge of 13,885 Indians, leaving out the non-treaty Indians and the extra amounts paid to chiefs and headmen, costs $95,914, or $6.91 for every Indian—considerably more than the Indians receive. I will first take the cost for a single year,

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is for the management, not including food.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes; I am just taking the salaries alone which those officers receive. Really the officers cost us more than the Indians. If we go to British Columbia, we find that the cost of the Indian management there is often even more extravagant than it is in the North-West Territories. I have looked over the number of cattle and sheep, the quantity of grain, the amount of wood and hay and furs, the amount received for labour and freight amongst the Indian population of that district, and I find the total in the year is but $40,875, or far less than we pay the parties who take charge of these Indians to enable them to produce this amount of crop for the market. I do not wish to do more than briefly sketch what I think is the ex-

travagance indicated in the management of the Indians of the North-West Territories. In my opinion, looking over the expense of the department, its efficiency could be increased and $100,000 annually wiped off, I would not say from the amount the Indians receive, but from the salaries of those employed to make the distribution and to take charge of Indian affairs. I think it would be altogether within the mark to say that $100,000 in salaries alone could be saved without at all interfering with the efficiency of the Department of Indian Affairs. When I look at British Columbia, it seems to me that the management there is even less efficient and more costly than it is in the North-West Territories. In British Columbia the several officers in the Indian Department cost $30,860. I do not think there is any warrant for such a cost. If any hon. gentleman will take the trouble of looking into the report on Indian Affairs, he will find that the commission which was established about 1874 or 1875 for setting out the Indian reserves, and which it was then thought would come to an end about 1881 or 1882, as all the reserves, it was thought, would then be set out, is existing to-day; and that the Indian Department has little or nothing to do at present. Let us look at the cost of the commission. Mr. O'Reilly receives a salary of $3,500 a year. I have looked at the services done and at the work undertaken by the head office; and taking the salaries of the chainmen who were employed, you can tell nearly how many days they were at work by seeing how much each of them received. The full amount that all this cost is $3,026, and the parties in the offices were evidently employed less than five days during the year. Any hon. gentleman who will analyse the report will see that that is the case. Take the number of chainmen and divide the amount paid them by the ordinary wages of each man per day, and you will find that less than five days' employment were given those men, and there is, therefore, no necessity for keeping up that commission at present. Let me call attention to some of the agencies. Take the Kootenay agency. You pay the agent a salary of $1,225, besides $420 travelling expenses and $248 office expenses, making the total cost of the agency in salaries, travelling, and office expenses $2,893. What did that Kootenay agency do in return for this expenditure? Let any hon. gentleman turn up part second of the Indian Report, and he will see for himself. It provided nothing for supplies, and distributed implements to the value of $130.68.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The industrial school.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am leaving out the school altogether, because the schools are not under the control of the agents but of their principals. The agricultural implements distributed cost $130.68, the seed grain distributed among the destitute Indians cost $166.65, and medicine was given to the amount of $65.80, so that there were distributed among the Indians $296.73 worth of seed grain and ploughs and $65 worth of medicine, for the work of distributing which we pay in salaries to the agents $2,893. Let any hon. gentleman say whether there is any justification for such an expenditure, and whether such an organization has any other object for its existence than simply to pension certain parties upon the public treasury. I do not think it has. I think it is perfectly clear that all this expenditure is simply a charge upon the public treasury which might, without detriment to the public service, be nearly if not altogether dispensed with. Take the North-West Coast agency. There was paid in salaries to agents, $2,975.21; travelling expenses, $650.65; and office expenses, $429.98, or in all $4,045.84. What was done for this money? What services did these men perform in the public interest to whom this money was paid? They distributed $193.50 among the destitute Indians. They distributed implements and seed grain, $148.95, and they dosed the Indians with $2,114 worth of medicine. I am not going into details to see where these medicines were purchased and from whom, but every one will see at once how preposterous such a bill is. It would be of some use, possibly, to have given to these Indians $2,000 worth of food or provisions, but to have given them instead pills and powders and cataplasms and plasters to the value of $2,114 seems preposterous, and I think the hon. gentleman himself must feel that it is an unwarrantable charge on the public treasury. Then, if you take the Kwahkewlth agency, I find we pay to the agent there $1,200, besides $353.76 travelling expenses and $46 office expenses, or in all $1,600. What did he do for that? He paid out to the school $55.63, to destitute Indians $202.21, and for medicine $98.78; so that for the payment of a little more than $300 you are charging for salaries $1,600. Then, when we come to the Fraser agency, there is an agent at $1,200 and assistance at $47.50, travelling expenses $137.50, office expenses $27.75, making a total of $1,412.75. The school there costs $1,651.55, the provision for the destitute Indians is $777.49, for seed grain $332.65, and for medicines $1,941.17. In British Columbia the largest item, next to the salaries of the officers of the Indian Branch, is the charge for medicines supplied for these Indians. In the Cowichan agency, the salary is $1,200, the wages of men employed in the agency $261, the travelling expenses $400, the office expenses $213, or a total of $2,074. The school there receives $68.94, the destitute Indians $555.90, for implements and seed grain the amount is $106.35, and for medicines $491.81. So that there the amount distributed amongst the Indians is less than half the amount distributed amongst the white men for salaries, &c. In the West Coast agency, salaries, office expenses and travelling expenses foot up to $1,754. The school there receives $74, destitute Indians $216, and for medicines $230; so, if you add the medicines and schools and destitute Indian funds together, that will amount to about $500, and to distribute that $500 to the Indians you pay $1,754 in salaries and so on, or three times the amount is paid to the white men in the form of salaries than you give to the Indians in the way of necessities and benevolences. Then, in the Babine agency, the salary, wages, travelling expenses and office expenses amount to $2,386.52, the school there costs $23.28, for seed grain and implements there is paid $30.75, for medicine $259, and for the relief of destitute Indians $723, so that you have still less than half the amount distributed and paid over for the benefit of the Indians than the amount which is paid in the form of salaries to white men in the public service. In the Williams' Lake agency, the salaries, wages, travelling expenses and office expenses amount to $1,806, the seed grain and implements cost $318.60, to destitute Indians $333,

and the medicines $492. If the hon. gentleman were to get rid of physic, if he were to throw that to the dogs, and were to discharge his officials, the public treasury would be relieved of more than $70,000 in British Columbia alone. I might refer to the other agencies. In the Kamloops agency, the salaries, travelling and office expenses amount to $2,165, the charges for destitute Indians are $13.35, for seed grain and implements $217.39, and for medicines $1,230.33 If you were to leave out the medicines, the Indians receive about one-tenth of the amount received by the officials.

[At one o'clock the committee adjourned, and at three o'clock resumed.]

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I had one more agency to refer to in British Columbia when you left the Chair at one o'clock, and that is the Okanagan agency. The salary there is $400, and is paid to Mr. McKay, who is also the agent at Kamloops; so that he receives $2,200 as salary for his services at these two agencies. The sum paid there for the relief of destitute Indians was $12.37; for seed grain and implements, $38.83; medicine, $135.19; so that even there the amount received by the agent was three times as great as the amount distributed amongst the Indians for the various purposes. Now, there are several industrial schools in British Columbia; I do not propose to find any fault with the expenditure for that purpose. I do not know how far these schools are efficient, or how much the attendance is. I find the industrial school at Metlakahtla costs $5,711; at Kamloops, $5,302; at Kuper, $5,237; at Kootenay, $7,000; and at Cocqua Leetza Home, $2,300. They all may be necessary; what the attendance is I cannot, at this moment, say; but, if the schools are efficient, I have no fault to find with that expenditure. I now wish to call the attention of the committee for a moment to the expenditure on surveys. I pointed out to the committee that about 1875 a dispute arose between the Government of British Columbia and the Department of Indian Affairs here with regard to the expenditure on the Indian reserves that should be set apart to the Indians under the term of union between British Columbia and Canada. In order to set apart what was regarded as adequate and fair reserves in the interest of the Indians, showing that no Indian title was recognized in the soil, two commissioners were appointed, one by each Government, and a third was agreed upon, and they proceeded to set apart reservations in various parts of British Columbia. After two or three years it was agreed that the party who was acting as umpire in the case should be sole commissioner for this purpose. At a still later period, some time about 1880 or 1881, a surveying party was established in which Mr. O'Reilly was named as chief commissioner. Four surveyors were named, I think, at $1,800 each, whose names are mentioned here in the report of the Minister of the Interior, and they have continued in existence ever since. Now, at page 43 of Part II, will be found an expenditure under Mr. Green for Indian surveys, mentioned on the top of the page as $401. So far as one can judge, about ten days were occupied by that party. Then there was an expenditure under Mr. Skinner, another surveyor, who received nine months' salary, $1,350. It will be seen by the wages of the axemen and other expenses that probably fifteen days were occupied by that party. Then there is an expenditure under Mr. Devereux, another surveyor, who received eleven months' salary, $1,669.35. That party seems to have been occupied about four months, or four and a half. Then there is an expenditure under Mr. Fletcher, who received two months' salary, $300, and it will be seen from the wages of the chainmen, axemen and others, that the whole expenditure of this survey was $1,821, and perhaps a month and a half or two months were taken in that survey. Then the Indian commission, as I have mentioned, at a cost of $6,326, seems to have devoted about five days to surveying operations. There is the salary of Mr. O'Reilly, $3,500; the salary of a surveyor, $1,800; wages of a chainman, $10. I do not know whether he was paid $2 or $3 a day; certainly he was not paid less than $2, and that would imply five days' service. Then there is the wages of the various axemen, board allowance, provisions, packing, transportation, and so on, making a total cost of $6,326. Well, probably part of the expense was salary of the commissioner, the surveyor for the year, and the cost of transportation. Whether the survey was made at a great distance from Victoria, I cannot say, but it is pretty clear, from the wages to the parties of chainmen, that not more than five days could have been occupied in the surveys. Now, I bring these matters under the attention of the committee, and I specially direct the attention of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of the Interior to these charges. I know that there could be an enormous saving in this department. I am satisfied that a hundred thousand dollars, as I have already said, could be saved in salaries alone without in the smallest degree interfering with the efficiency of the department; on the contrary, I believe that efficiency would be increased if the organization in the outlying districts were simplified, and responsibility increased by being fixed upon some definite party, and a small allowance in the way of salary for payment of actual services given. It seems to me preposterous, where a man is occupied for two or three days in the year visiting the Indian reserves, looking after some Indian matters, that he should be paid a salary of $1,500 a year when he has really nothing to do. I make no objection to the department having in its mind some person to whom it may refer to undertake the responsibilities for the two or three days, or a week, that his services may be required; but I see the greatest objection to such a man being a permanent officer of the department with a fixed annual salary, when he can have no services to perform on behalf of the public for the moneys which he receives. I am not further going to trespass upon the indulgence of the committee; I know that the committee is becoming impatient, and that hon. gentlemen are anxious to attend to their own private affairs. But I notify the Minister of the Interior that if we meet again next session I will ask for a very full consideration, a minute consideration of these various branches of the public service under his control, which I am sure may be greatly reformed in the way of diminishing the expense without in the slightest degree impairing the efficiency, and this especially in the case of British Columbia and of the North-West Territories.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am always glad to listen to the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), especially when they are made in connec-

tion with the department which I have the honour to administer. He has taken advantage every session to address observations on this head, and I have on some occasions obtained from the hon. gentleman valuable information, on which I have been able to act to the advantage of the department. But I never listened to the hon. gentleman when I was so disappointed as I was to-day. The hon. gentleman has confined himself almost entirely to the financial aspect of the Indian question; he has not referred to the general Indian question, he has not touched upon a circumstance which he must have found apparent if he had carefully read the report, the very great advancement made by the Indians during the last few years. If the hon. gentleman had gone into the figures, he would also have found that a very great reduction had taken place during the last few years in regard to an item to which we looked forward hopefully as being reduced in the future to a very great extent, that is the Indian destitute vote. The question of management is, of course, the one to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and the one item for which we have to find money for many years to come out in that western country, if we hope our Indians will continue in the same frame of mind they are to-day, anxious to progress and advance. The hon. gentleman, who knows the country pretty well, must be aware that if we were to withdraw the close supervision we have to-day on the Indians, especially in the west, they would retrograde and become as ignorant, as indolent and incapable of providing for themselves, as they were before we took charge of them. The hon. gentleman has referred especially to the cost of the Indians in the North-West and Manitoba, and he has also devoted considerable time to those of British Columbia. In regard to Manitoba, the hon. gentleman made the remark that he could not so much complain of the cost of administration in that province as in the North-West. It must, however, be remembered that the Indians in Manitoba are much less in number, and they are to a great extent in the same position as our eastern Indians. They are able to provide their own living, almost entirely, by fishing and hunting, and, consequently, we are relieved from the expense of exercising a close supervision over their reserves, and especially watching their farming operations. The only way we shall be able to reduce the expense is by keeping a sufficient number of employés at the elbows of the Indians in order to keep up their courage and assist and advise them in working their farms and gardens. Any one who will carefully peruse the report must see that the Indians of the western country are making great progress. In Manitoba we have eight agencies, where the agents draw salaries varying from $900 to $1,000. They have their medical officers. There is no reason why we should have a large staff in that province, because the agents are able to give the supervision necessary to the Indians in regard to their farming operations. In the North-West Territories we have 18 agencies, the average salary paid to an agent being $1,200, and clerks are also provided, as they are absolutely necessary in order to keep correct returns of the issues made and the different operations on the reserves. The agents have to closely supervise the farm operations, and assist the Indians in selling their products, and advise them as to what should be sold and what retained for their own use, and for seed. If these matters are not attended to, the Indians will become as wild as formerly. The question might be asked why we have so many of the agencies? It must be remembered that they are scattered over a very large territory, and the number of Indians in the agencies varies from a few hundred to 2,000 odd. Of course, in order to make a calculation as to the cost of the management of Indians, it must be remembered that it will vary in accordance with the number of Indians. On the Assiniboia reserve, which the hon. gentleman cited, the average cost was a little over $6; while on the Blood reserve, where the Indians are more numerous, the average was brought down to $1.25. But even if the average cost is $6 in the case of the Assiniboia reserve, that is one of those bodies of Indians that is practically off our hands. Last year and for several years previously they have progressed so rapidly until this year they have raised almost sufficient for their own use. This shows the necessity of having officers to supervise the Indians in order to keep down the very large expenditure we must be called upon to make, unless the Indians are able to provide food for themselves. In 1879 there was scarcely a house for an Indian to live in, now there are 5,000 houses, many of which are furnished comfortably. At that time they had virtually no stock; now they have over 16,000 head of cattle and horses, cows 3,000, 70 bulls, 2,000 oxen, 5,900 horses, 200 pigs. 13,500 acres are under cultivation this year, and they have also broken an additional 2,000 acres. Next year they will have between 15,000 and 16,000 acres under crop. Every acre to-day is broken by the Indians themselves; we have no white farm hands now, they have all disappeared. If we have to employ any labour on the reserves, we employ Indian labour, and they get the advantage of that employment, and all white labour is dispensed with except on a few reserves, where we have farm instructors proper who supervise the whole work on the reserve. In 1879 there were only 16 schools, with an attendance of 500 children; now there are 150 schools, with nearly 4,000 children in attendance, this return including the North-West and Manitoba. It is impossible to curtail the salaries of the agents in the North-West, for you must pay them sufficient to cause them to feel they are making a fair living for themselves. With respect to British Columbia, it is impossible to send men into the wilds of that country and pay them $500 or $400 when they will be called upon to live away from civilization. It is necessary to have an agent there, and we should pay him at least a fair salary. The hon. gentleman, in speaking of the cost of administering agencies in British Columbia, based his argument on the fact that there was a very small amount spent for relief, and that the largest items were for medical attendance. That has also been the case in the Maritime Provinces for years, but I think we ought to consider ourselves fortunate that that is the state of affairs, and that the Indians we are supervising in these provinces are really making their own living. Of course, they have difficulties to contend with and they want some one within easy reach to whom they can appeal in case of trouble, so that it is absolutely necessary we should have agents to attend to their business. In British Columbia, as the hon. gentleman knows,

the country is broken and of vast extent and the agencies extend over a territory of 385,000 square miles, larger, I think, than the Province of Ontario. I do not mean to say that the whole of this country is covered by the agencies, but all that portion of it is in which the whites are likely to be brought into contact with the Indians. I have myself made calculations with regard to some of the agencies in the North-West in order to discover how much it does really cost per diem to feed and manage our Indians. I have not done as the hon. gentleman has, discarded the items for food; but, adding all the costs together, I find that in the Assiniboia agency, including food, clothing, tools, schools on the reserve and everything else, with the exception of the annuity money which has to be paid under the treaty, the cost per head on the Assiniboia reserve is 6 cents per diem. Making a calculation on the same basis, I find that the average per head at the Birtle agency in Manitoba is 3 cents per day. On the Blackfoot reserve, where we have to feed every one of the Indians, men, women and children, with fair rations, except a few who are able to gain a livelihood by labour, the expenditure is 9 cents per day. At the Crooked Lake reserve the average was 6 cents per diem. This is based on the report of the Auditor General, and that report next year will show that that average will be reduced, because the Crooked Lake reserve and Assiniboia reserve and one or two others are virtually self-supporting; several of them in regard to their flour, and some with regard to their beef, which they raise themselves. I do not think the hon. gentleman can complain of the expenditure incurred at the head office at Victoria, B.C. The staff there is composed of a superintendent, his assistant and two clerks. The different agencies, 12 or 14 in number, extend over the entire province from north to south, and from the coast quite a distance into the interior. The hon. gentleman mentioned Kwakewlth agency, which was represented by Mr. R. H. Pidcock. He receives a salary of $1,200, and from my own knowledge of British Columbia, I can say that these Indians were the most warlike and caused the most trouble in British Columbia in the early days. That gentleman has been among them and they are just as good Indians now as any others in British Columbia. The lower Fraser agency is the most important agency there. Mr. McTiernan, the agent, has no one to assist him. He does the whole work himself and while supervising the small expenditure he attends to the business of the Indians, and, as my hon. friends from British Columbia will admit, it is absolutely necessary that we should have an agency there. It does appear from the remarks of the hon. gentleman that the surveys did cost a great deal of money for the work done, but the hon. gentleman must take into consideration the nature of the work in the Province of British Columbia and the time it takes for a person to travel from one portion to the other. The custom has been for the reserve commissioner to first visit the Indians in the different localities of British Columbia and to arrange with them what portions of territories shall be given as reserves. These have been kept down in area as small as possible, and although their numbers have been necessarily large for the reason that the fishing stations and favourite locations have been reserved for them, the arrangements are made by which the boundaries are determined on, and rough sketches taken by the surveyor who accompanies the Reserve Commissioner. When this district has been dealt with, the surveyor then instructs one of his deputies to go into the district and to make the surveys agreed upon by the Indians. Very often a steamer has to be chartered for the purpose of taking the party along the coast. It may take them but a very few days to make a survey of the reserve, but they may be kept waiting there idle until they are taken off to another part of the country to complete their work. I am sure that if the hon. gentleman understood the circumstances of British Columbia he would see the peculiarities of the province which necessitate what appears to be a large expenditure in the survey branch. The gentleman who is in charge is a most careful, competent and worthy officer who has the confidence of the Provincial Government and of our Government, and who was appointed specially on account of his high qualifications for the office. Since he has acted, there has been very little difficulty with the Indians and we have been able to get the reserves into a more satisfactory position than they were before. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for his remarks and I do wish that not only he himself, but his friend, the leader of the Opposition, would travel more through our western country and through the Province of British Columbia. The hon. gentleman, I know, has not visited our western country now for some years. I should like to take him through as my guest, and show him the advancement that has been made by the Indians. I should like to take him to the offices of our Indian agencies and show him the work that has been done. I should like to show him the fields which have been cultivated by the Indians, the way they fence their lands, and the houses they have built; and the next year, when we came to talk over the matter again, I have no doubt that we should be able to agree as to some means of reducing the expense. I have not said anything about the Regina office, which is to-day in a very different condition from what it was some ten years ago, when it was started. The work of that office can now be done more expeditiously than it could when it was established. Transport is easier and means of communication are better, and I have reports from my department and also from the commissioner as to the ways in which savings can be made. In that office we have two inspectors of agencies, a caretaker and two school inspectors. We established there two or three years ago a warehouse which has been the means of saving a large amount of money. The bulk of our supplies are now distributed from there instead of from the agencies. When the supplies were under the control of the agencies, the Indians were continually begging for them; but now the supplies are not sent to the agencies until the head office is satisfied that there is real need for them. There are also at that office two surveyors, who are absolutely necessary. Therefore, when we come to details, we find that the only clerks whom we might dispense with in the immediate future are those doing duplicate work, which I admit does now exist between the Regina office and the head office. I have a report from my officers in that regard, and there is no doubt that we can make a saving there. I have no doubt, also, that we may be able in the near future to dispense with the services of one of the

inspectors in the west, whose time is not fully occupied. I hope to be able to make arrangements with the Local Government for utilizing the public school inspectors of the province for the inspection of our Indian schools, as is done in the Province of Ontario. To-day we have two inspectors, one for the Protestant schools and the other for the Roman Catholic schools, and their travelling expenses are necessarily heavy. I have endeavoured to answer in as few words as I could the remarks of the hon. gentleman, which I have received in the spirit in which I am sure they have been given.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Just one word further, and I shall have nothing more to say on the Indian estimates; that is, with regard to the Indian land management fund, the Indian fund of the Province of Quebec, and the Indian school fund. These accounts have been largely overdrawn—the Indian land management fund to the extent of $76,400, the Indian fund of the Province of Quebec to the extent of $28,000, and the Indian school fund to the extent of $26,000, making in all $133,400. Now, I am not aware that the department has any authority for expending for Indian purposes more than the amount of the interest on these funds as it accrues, and I would like to know under what authority the hon. Minister has overdrawn these funds, the purposes for which the money has been applied, and how he proposes to recoup the funds which have been so overdrawn?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I had hoped that in dealing with this matter I should have received the assistance of the hon. gentleman himself, who, I think, during some portions of the years when these funds were withdrawn, had charge of the department. A short time ago, in examining the accounts published in the Indian report, and comparing them with those of the Auditor General, I found that the two did not agree, and I set about making enquiries with regard to the discrepancy. A memorandum was prepared for me by officers of the department, giving the particulars. I then referred the question, which I thought a serious one, to my colleagues, and a committee has been appointed from my department and the Finance Department to look into it and to endeavour to bring about an adjustment of the funds. I asked my deputy to report as to the authority on which those expenditures have been made. He sent me a report stating that it had been going on for years, his report beginning with the year 1870-71, and showing the state of the accounts at the end of each year. In some years certain amounts were taken from the main fund and added to the school fund, but I can find no record in the department showing why that was done. However, I am quite sure that before next session we shall make a rearrangement on a financial basis which will be satisfactory to the country.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior to a matter which I have already had occasion more than once to bring to the notice of the House. There is a band of Chippewa Indians located on the Indian reservation of Georgina Island and a few on Snake Island. The fund at the disposal of the band amounted to $24,674.57 at the commencement of the fiscal year ending to-day, and the interest arising from that fund amounted to $1,232.48. The total number in the band, according to the last report of the agent at Sutton West is 125, an increase of two since the last annual report. The band in question is a very advanced one. The Indians are devoted largely to agriculture, their lands have been all divided among them by the Government under the system of location tickets and separation of property, each having a separate holding, and I can only refer the Minister, for corroboration of my remarks, to the figures in possession of the department showing the amount they raise annually in farm products. The Minister will see from the report of the Indian agent that the band in question is possessed of a considerable quantity of live stock, that there are many agricultural implements in use among them, and that the output would be creditable to an agricultural community of white people. Now they are under the management of an Indian agent, a very estimable man, Mr. Stevenson, who resides in the village of Sutton West, six or eight miles from Georgina Island. The Indian agent, I am free to admit, takes a deep interest in the welfare of the band, and I would not like anything I am about to say to be regarded as involving the slightest reflection on him. Nevertheless, I must call the attention of the Minister to this fact, that the gross receipts from the fund is $1,232.48, and that of this amount the Indians received $970.05 last year, or at the rate of $7.76 per head. Now, when we look at the Auditor General's Report, we find that the Indian agent receives per annum $500 in connection with this reserve, or at the rate of $4 per head for every man, woman and child in the band, and this he receives for the distribution of this fund of $970.05. I think that his salary is out of all proportion to what it ought to be. If the Government have any money to spare, it would be better applied in increasing the annuity than in paying an unnecessary amount to the agent. It should be our duty to offer every reasonable inducement to the Indians to make progress, and if it is possible for us to offer prizes to them which would lead to this desirable result, we should do so. If there be found in the band a man quite capable of discharging the duties of Indian agent, why should he not be given that office and receive the emolument instead of having it vested in some one at a distance? He would be on the spot, and would have more influence in the band, with whom he would be always present, and the fact that the Government did that simple act of justice to the Indians would be an inducement to others to aim to attain that degree of advancement which perhaps would bring them within the reach of the prize as well. So that my remarks are twofold: first, to suggest to the Minister to look into the matter, and see whether he is not paying the Indian agent more than his services are worth, and, if so, whether the excess could not be properly used to increase the annuities; and, secondly, whether, with regard to this and all other bands as well, there could not be a policy adopted by which these services now performed by white men might not be entrusted to those advanced progressive Indians for whose benefit after all the whole fund is set apart, and for whose advancement we ought to endeavour in every reasonable way to use the public service. You will understand, Sir, that in alluding to the Indian agent, I desire to do so in the kindest spirit, for I believe he is doing his duty. At the same time, I feel it my duty to make this suggestion, believing that it will

be for the ultimate advantage of the Indians themselves.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Of course the hon. gentleman knows that I am not as familiar with the Indians of Ontario as with our western Indians. With regard to the policy the hon. gentleman has suggested to be followed in the reserve of Georgina, it is the policy I have followed as far as possible in our western country, that is, if we can find an Indian who can do the work as well as a white man we give him the preference in connection with the expenditure for the benefit of the Indians. The hon. gentleman's suggestion with reference to the appointment of Indians as agents in supervision of Indian bands requires a good deal of consideration and a perfect knowledge of the band in which such a policy might be adopted. If the Indians are so advanced as the hon. gentleman indicates, in the band he has mentioned, no doubt one of themselves could be selected to do the duties of the agent; but as a rule, we do find that it does not do to place an Indian over his band. That is my experience. Therefore, I am unable to express an opinion very decidedly with regard to the agency to which the hon. gentleman has referred. With regard to the funds, I may say that the amount divided among the Indians, as interest money, was a portion of the total, $1,232. The balance was for the salary of the chief, who is appointed by themselves, and other charges. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman speak so well of the Indian agent, whom I do not know personally, but who, so far as I know, has conducted the affairs of the band very satisfactorily. Is the hon. gentleman aware whether he does anything else besides this agency business?

Mr. MULOCK. He is a very substantial man there.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If it is necessary to have an agent, it does not appear to me that $500 is very excessive, although, if he is a gentleman of independent means, no doubt he might do the work for less money. I cannot believe that the duties are very onerous as the band is a very small one.

Mr. MULOCK. At one time this band occupied principally Snake Island, which is in the southerly part of Lake Simcoe, and it was subsequently transferred to Georgina Island in the north. I think a few families are still on Snake Island, and it is probable that the agent has occasionally to pay a visit to Snake Island. Mr. Stevenson is, I think, a man of means.

Schools..... $27,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Can the hon. gentleman give any information as to how the schools in Ontario are progressing?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think, generally, the schools, especially the industrial schools, are progressing very favourably. The report which came down, which perhaps the hon. gentleman has not been able to peruse, shows that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How many are in Ontario, how many in Quebec, and how many in the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We have 42 schools in Quebec and Ontario, 8 of which are in Quebec. In Nova Scotia there are 6; in New Brunswick, 5; and in Prince Edward Island, 1.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see it is reported that several additional schools have been brought into operation during the year. Have you a list of the reserves they are on?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot pick out the additional schools that we have established this year. In Ontario we are assisting in the same way as last year the industrial school near Brantford.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You do not do much for that except in the way of prizes?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Assistance is given for 90 pupils at $60 a head.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Where they have trust funds in the reserves, do they themselves aid the maintenance of the school, or is that altogether defrayed by public grants?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Nearly all the salaries are paid by the denominations to which they belong. The Methodists, for example, pay half the salaries. In the industrial school, it was only last year that we gave assistance. The New England Company were doing that before, and, when I was in England, I attended one of their meetings, and they called my attention to it, and I asked the Government to undertake that, and last year was the first that it was done.

Survey of Indian Reserves..... $500

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Where does the Minister intend to make surveys this year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think the department has made up its mind on that subject. This is for the purpose of rectifying disputed boundaries when trespasses occur and applications are made.

Indians of Manitoba, North-West Territories and Keewatin..... $768,920

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see there are considerable decreases here; for instance, for farm wages, seed grain, live stock and supplies for destitute Indians. I suppose this is to be taken as an indication of the more prosperous condition of the Indians, and that they are more self-supporting than they were. I do not suppose that the Minister is cutting down supplies.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is the fact. The Indians now are raising so much produce of their own that they are able to sell considerable quantities, and to provide themselves to a large extent with farming implements, with which we had previously supplied them. Now they are buying their own waggons, to a great extent, and self-binders. I think last year, on three or four reserves, they bought their own self-binders. One progressive man would be able to obtain his self-binder from the agricultural implement manufacturers, who would give the Indians just as good terms as the white man, and he would cut for his neighbours and be paid, receiving a percentage of the crop; this he would sell, the agent managing the business for him. In that way they are able to secure their own implements to a great extent.

Reserve Commission..... $8,000

Mr. LAURIER. Before we leave these items for Indian Affairs, I would like to call the attention of the Minister to a complaint which has been made to me by the Saulteaux Indians of the St. Peter's reserve in Manitoba. Perhaps the hon. gentleman

has heard of that case, but as he may not recollect it at the moment, I may say that the St. Peter's reserve, as I understand it, is the joint reserve for two bands of Indians, the Saulteaux band and the Swamp Indians. I understand that the Saulteaux complain that they are not getting along well with their neighbours, the Swamp Indians, and they desire that the reserve should be divided into two portions, one for them and one for the Swamp Indians, the two divisions to extend to the boundary line on each side of the river. For some reason with which I am not familiar, these Saulteaux Indians are not able to agree with their neighbours; one band seems to be more disposed to farming and the other to hunting. I would like to know from the Minister if there is any objection to this change being carried out?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is the first time I have heard of an application being made for that purpose by the band of Indians on the St. Peter Reserve near Winnipeg. I know they have been occupying it ever since the reserve was established. I think some of them are pagans and others are christianized, and I think the pagans do a great deal of hunting and keep a great deal off the reserves. I cannot at this moment say, without consulting the officers of the department, what objection there may be to a division of that kind, but I fancy that there would be some objection, because the reserve has been so much cut up and located on different portions by Indians scattered from one end of the reserve to the other, that there may be some difficulty. If there is a large portion of the reserve on which there is no settlement, perhaps some arrangement may be come to. I would like to know further particulars with regard to it before I express an opinion.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman give me his official answer upon Concurrence?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will.

North-West Mounted Police—Pay of Force.....$310,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any considerable reduction to be made in the number of this force, or is there any reasonable ground for supposing, as has been promised, that this reduction will be carried out in reality, and be something more than a mere paper reduction?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I may state that the total authorized strength of the force, by statute, is 1,123. In November last the total force consisted of 1,016 men, and in June, this present month, the force is 970 strong, so that we are gradually making a slight decrease. In November last the number of horses was 861, and the number now is 857. So we are keeping down the force as much as we possibly can.

Subsistence..... $85,000

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a reduction here. For the four years from 30th June, 1878, the average cost per man and horse was $1,149, and it gradually decreased from year to year, except in the year 1885-86, when there was an extra expenditure averaging for each man and horse $1,354. For the three years 1886, '87, '88 and '89 the cost was $825; in 1889-90, $753; 1890-91, $741; 1891-92, $701. It is estimated that the average for 1892-93 will be $675, and we hope, next year, to be able to bring down to $650 the average cost per man and horse. The cost of transportation and the improved facilities for moving cheapen the price of supplies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman tell us the amount paid to the railway companies for the transportation of this force from place to place last year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I fancy it was about $15,000 or $13,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not more than that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No, I think not, according to the informatian I have got. I think last year it was $13,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought on looking over the Auditor General's Report, it was considerably in excess. But I suppose the hon. gentleman is speaking from detailed information supplied to him.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is the information supplied to me. Perhaps the hon. gentleman may be thinking of some arrears that stood over for sometime.

Mr. Fabre's salary and contingencies of office.....$3,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We should have the long promised report, showing what services have inured to the Dominion of Canada from the employment of this officer during the past year. Where is the report to be found?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think this matter is under supervision of the Secretary of State or the Finance Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have paid during the past ten years about $40,000 to this official, and I want to know what he has done.

Mr. FOSTER. This is the usual vote to Mr. Fabre.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am quite aware of that.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had his case pretty well discussed in former years. Last year we had a discussion with respect to it, and the vote was passed on the understanding that in the meantime the Government would consider the matter, come to a conclusion with respect to that agency, and announce its policy. The Government have considered it and come to the conclusion that the agency ought not to be dispensed with at the present time. I have been making arrangements with respect to commercial agencies, and by Order in Council I have made Mr. Fabre a commercial agent, and have placed certain duties upon him in the way of making researches and reports to me in the matter of tariffs and commercial relations in France and Belgium, which will occupy a good deal of his time. These duties will be added to the duties formerly performed by Mr. Fabre, those of immigration proper, in which he has been moderately successful, considering the difficulty of inducing immigration from France, which all admit. It was stated last year that no immigrants from France had come here, or not more than three. That is quite a mistake, as the record shows a large number of immigrants have come here as the result of Mr. Fabre's efforts. The sum is not a

large one, and, looking at the importance of keeping up our connection for immigration and commercial purposes with so great a country as France, the Government do not think this is too large a sum to be voted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We want the report and details.

Mr. FOSTER. I will place Mr. Fabre's report on the Table, for I think I have it here. Last year the question of the report of Mr. Fabre came up, and it was stated that it had not been sent. That was not fair to Mr. Fabre, because it had been sent. It had been sent to the Secretary of State, and ordered by him to be sent to my department, but the order had been mislaid, so that the report was not sent to my department until later. I lay the report of Mr. Fabre on the Table of the House, and also his report of last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is the report of his immigration performances? I do not see anything about that here.

Mr. FOSTER. That report has not come to hand. It is made to Sir Charles Tupper, and the department has not yet received it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We shall have an opportunity of ascertaining what has been done when we get the details of the census, and I shall be very curious to see how many natives of old France have been induced to settle in Canada during the last ten years as the result of this gentleman's exertions. I observe there is very little of this report devoted to immigration.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the report he made to me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have the two reports, one under date of September 3, 1891, in which he refers to his exertions in the matter of immigration.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman might take a little time to read the reports, and again refer to the matter on Concurrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Concurrence is not a desirable time, and I do not think that the House is in a temper to devote a good deal of time to any items in Concurrence. I perceive that this gentleman dwells somewhat more on our emigration than on our immigration, for he congratulates us on the fact that there is annually a large number of students and artists of Canadian birth in Paris, which is very satisfactory no doubt. This report really appears to be devoted to his consideration of the commercial relations.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, he deals with the tariff legislation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And not very particularly with the immigration. What total number of immigrants does the hon. gentleman suppose that we have got from old France within the last ten years, to settle in Canada?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can only speak for one district, and I know that there is a large settlement at Whitewood, N.W.T., composed entirely of old country Frenchmen, who are interested largely in raising beets and chicory, and also sheep and horses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman give us some idea of the total number?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not the remotest idea.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know something of the Whitewood settlement myself, and unless they came there very recently I do not think there is a very great number.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is sometimes said in the House that only three or four French immigrants have come annually to this country, and that is a mistake. There is a large settlement at Whitewood, and within the last two or three years several hundred have emigrated to the North-West, bringing as a rule their families and some capital besides. If my hon. friend will look at the report of Mr. Foursin, one of the farmer delegates, he will find a good deal of information about Whitewood and a couple of other settlements in the North-West published there. I may mention for the information of the House that within the last seven or eight years a large number of immigrants from old France have settled in the region of Lake St. John, and the upper part of the constituency that I represent. Of course immigration is encouraged by this Government to the immense territories which we possess in the North-West, but surely immigrants which come to the other provinces are not to be left out of consideration when we are discussing the small sum of money for our agent in France, which is all that has been spent in favour of immigration from that part of the world to this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Could the hon. gentleman state approximately how many he supposes have come?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said that more than five or six hundred at least have come within the last three years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To the hon. gentleman's district?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, I am referring now to the North-West Territories. I cannot say exactly the number in the Province of Quebec. I saw at one time that 25 families were established in the Lake St. John district. Mr. Lesage, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture at Quebec, and the late Monsignor Labelle, have been instrumental in bringing out a certain number of them

Cost of litigated matters..... $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is that?

Mr. FOSTER. These are general matters of litigation which may occur in the course of the year. I do not think they are intended to cover cases in which the actual costs are known, but it would be impossible to give details. This is put into one vote, but formerly we used to give a portion to the different departments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can you tell us how you spent the $15,000 you got last year?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell that.

Commercial Agencies..... .....$5,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I brought this matter of commercial agencies before the Minister last year, and I understood from the remarks he then made that he would have succeeded in doing something with this fund in the direction indicated at that time, and which seems to me is the object for which the money is voted. This amount has

been granted for many years now, and I believe that the object it was intended for, and to which it should be legitimately applied, has never been accomplished yet. For instance, it was expended last year for the following purposes :—

"Information *re* Newfoundland, $300; poultry and egg trade: John Sanders, $350; ocean fares, $120; fare and pullman to New York, $28; expenses in Ottawa preparing report, $20; West India trade negotiations, J. & A. McMillan, St. John, $35; freight and expenses of books, $21.33; Washington trade negotiations, Sir Charles Tupper's expenses: 78 days at $10 a day, $780; fare Liverpool to New York, $243.83; New York to London, $250; other expenses, $266.65."

Then, there is the travel for Ottawa officials which you find at page B-87 of the Auditor General's Report and which amounts to $105.97, having something to do, I suppose with Sir John Thompson's visit to Washington or London, and then there is charged to this item, for unforeseen expenses, $1,400. These are all the items apparently for which this vote was expended last year, and not saying that the information was not necessary with reference to Newfoundland, and the egg trade, and Sir Charles Tupper's and the other Ministers' negotiations at Washington. I hold that is not the purpose for which this grant was instituted, and I think the Minister should either drop this vote, or charge these expenditures to a more legitimate vote. I understood from the Minister last year that he was devising a plan which he expected would be carried out this year, for establishing resident agents in foreign countries to promote foreign trade and commerce, to be ready to give information to Canadian exporters, and to aid them in every way they could in effecting sales in those countries; in short, to help Canadian exporters to open up trade with those countries. I am not objecting to the expenditure, but I hold that that is not the object of the grant, and it would be interesting to the House if the Minister were in a position to state at what points he thought foreign trade could be profitably done and where resident agents are to be located.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that a vote for commercial agencies should be used for commercial agencies in the proper sense of that term. I do not suppose that he wishes me to go into an explanation of the items for the current year which he has read. Having this vote, and not having utilized it for commercial agents resident in foreign countries, we have used it for the purpose of defraying expenses in connection with commercial negotiations. I have, however, been at work in connection with the establishment of agencies proper, and we have now in operation some eight agencies in the West Indies, Great Britain and France. In France Mr. Fabre, who is our resident agent there, has also been made our commercial agent; and under instructions from the department here, he is engaged in making whatever researches are thought necessary and beneficial, and in keeping me informed, especially as to the trend of tariffs and the like; and his suggestions and reports to me are of very great benefit in keeping me *au courant* with the legislation in that country in regard to commercial matters. In Great Britain I have taken authority, by an Order in Council, to select certain immigration agents and make them also commercial agents. They are under instructions to report with reference to certain phases of our trade in those countries; and those reports are also being sent to me. In the West Indies I have established five agencies—two in the Leeward Islands, one in the Windward Islands, one in Jamaica, and one on the coast of British Guiana. These gentlemen are now at work, and their first report is expected by the next mail from the West India Islands. I suppose my hon. friend made a slip of the tongue in speaking, for they are not actually to buy and sell.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Oh, no; I did not mean that.

Mr. FOSTER. I have furnished them thoroughly with all papers and documents from this country that I thought would be useful to them for supplying information to the merchants and traders of the countries in which they live. Then, I have asked them to make reports to me on special subjects which I have designated; and I have put them in communication with all the boards of trade in Canada, and have notified those bodies of the appointment of those gentlemen, so as to encourage the different commercial bodies in Canada to correspond directly with them. Suppose information is required at Toronto or Guelph with reference to the probability of opening up trade at a particular point; the manufacturers or merchants there may write to these agents and obtain information direct from them. They will make reports to me, quarterly at any rate, and these reports will be embodied in a report at the end of the year, and laid on the Table of Parliament, and printed and distributed among the different commercial bodies of the country—if not in full, the essence of them. Although these agencies have been in operation only three months, I have myself heard of benefits which have resulted from them in the way of opening up trade. I am also in correspondence with the view of opening a similar agency at Yokohama for our Japan trade, which is opening up well, and one at Shanghai for our China trade. I am quite convinced that this is a good policy for us to pursue on a fairly extensive scale. I believe that this vote will be largely used up this year for this service, and if it works well, as I am sure it will, I shall ask Parliament next year for a somewhat larger vote,—not intending to be extravagant, however, for these gentlemen are not extravagantly paid. In fact, they are experimenting with me in the matter, and are not at all greedy in their demands on the public treasury.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think we are moving in the direction for which this vote is intended, and I hope that benefits will result from the expenditure. There has been nothing done in Australia?

Mr. FOSTER. Not yet.

Survey, construction of roads, bridges, and other necessary works in connection with the Hot Springs Reservation, near Banff Station, North-West Territories.....	$8,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see that last year we took a vote of $10,000 for this, and expended within 16 cents of $17,000.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The revenue for 1890-91 was $2,347.25. The revenue for the eight months ending 29th of February this year was $2,889.76. These are the two last years, so that the revenue is increasing, and I suppose at the end of

this month another quarter will be added, bringing it up to $3,400.

Classification of old records of the late Province of Canada in Department of Secretary of State..... $1,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is entrusted with this duty?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Colonel Audette. These records comprise documents dating from the year 1866, and have been classified up to 1870. There is a great mass of important matter, instructions to governors, orders to generals of forces in time of war and other documents, which will be of great historic interest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do they cover Upper Canada as well as Quebec?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I presume they do, because they were handed over from the old Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of antiquarian interest, I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would have a search made in his department to ascertain whether we are in possession of the record showing the names of the first Parliament of the Province of Ontario which sat at Niagara a hundred years ago and also whether we have a record of their proceedings.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will do so, and I propose having a special report made on this branch to be placed in the Secretary's report next year.

Classification of old records of Canada in Office of the Privy Council..... $1,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is the work which Mr. McGee has been carrying on for three years, a small sum being voted each year. It comprises old parliamentary records which he is bringing into order and arranging under cover so that they may be easy for reference. I happened the other day to be in his office, and went up to where he is keeping his records, and found they are being very nicely and conveniently arranged.

Further amount required for plant for Printing Bureau $6,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That bureau has cost us a good deal already and is yet not able to keep up with the work. If the Minister wants this plant to expedite the work we will have to give it, as it is desirable the work should be done expeditiously. The printing of voters' list was very much behind, and this year I know that one report of a department was prepared for a long time and yet we only got it into our hands last week, and I understand that the delay was in the Printing Bureau. The Minister will perhaps see, if we give him this additionnal plant, that the work is kept up better in the future.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). This is required to pay for the linotype machines which were ordered last year and not yet delivered, and which are required to keep up to the work. With regard to printing the voters' lists, the delay did not occur in the Printing Bureau but on the part of the revising officers who did not send in their lists in time. In nineteen out of twenty cases, the lists were not received until the 1st of January, and the superintendent of the department had to give preference to the lists of counties in which contests were pending. I would remind the House that the delay in the first instance was due to the solicitations of hon. gentlemen opposite for an extension of some sixteen or seventeen days in the time for receiving the preliminary lists, and this put the machinery of the revising officers to some extent out of gear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The voters' list for the County of Kent has never been published, although the revising barrister sent it in some months ago in due time. When is it likely to be printed?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I brought down the list to that date, and will bring down a list again Monday next.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Have the revising officers been instructed not to proceed with their business this year?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Yes, at the beginning of June.

To meet cost of arbitration respecting the accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. (Payments on account of services rendered may be made to members of the Civil Service notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act).... $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. A year and a half ago, just before the session, an agreement was come to between the Dominion and Provincial Governments to provide for a Board of Arbitration to settle the long-pending disputed points in the Public Accounts, and both the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec adopted legislation to carry out the arbitration. By some means or other, the Province of Quebec failed to appoint its arbitrator, and the matter has hung over until this time. Now, I hope this year the arbitrators will meet and the points will be determined, so that this long-standing matter may be closed out.

Excise..... $394,588 75

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would ask the Minister of Customs if the vacancy in the town of Chatham recently caused by the death of Mr. McGregor has been filled. I think it was filled by the promotion of Mr. Eberts, but I should like to know if the Minister intends to fill his position.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is no other officer to replace Mr. Eberts.

Adulteration of Food..... $25,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What amount was actually required for this service last year?

Mr. FOSTER. $24,725.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is that chiefly expended?

Mr. FOSTER. On inspectors and analysts, and chemical apparatus, and samples, and travelling expenses, and the salaries of the staff at Ottawa.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whereabout are these analysts stationed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Besides the staff at Ottawa, we have an analyst at Toronto, London, Winnipeg, St. John, N.B., Halifax, Quebec and Montreal.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They are all salaried officers?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not one. They are paid according to the number of samples they analyse.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How is this amount that we are taking now, $25,000, to be expended?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That covers the whole expenditure, here and outside, throughout the Dominion, salaries, fees and other expenditure.

Dominion Land Agents' salaries..... $20,195

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is an increase here of $900. Have you appointed another agent?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is for Mr. Jessup, a clerk. The salary was estimated for in 1891-92, at $800, and this year $900 are asked for. He is appointed at Red Deer River, half way between Calgary and Edmonton. It is a sub-office of the Calgary office. He has to be there during the summer months to keep it open. He works during the winter at the head office.

To pay salaries of extra clerks at Head Office, Ottawa, advertising, copying, etc $6,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is a decrease here of $7,000; how is that accounted for?

Mr. FOSTER. Economy.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is a transfer, is there not, in some way?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No, we have dispensed with 17 extra clerks last year at the head office.

To provide for the amount required for surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, &c..... $100,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is this sum expended? Where are the surveys being carried on?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The surveys we propose to carry on during the year 1892, consist of 10 parties, estimated to cost $42,600. Seven of these are located between Calgary and Edmonton on the new line of railway. A large number of settlers are going in there. There is also one at Prince Albert, one at the head of St. Mary's River, one south of Qu'Appelle, and one at Lake Otter. We have to send strong parties both on the line between Calgary and Edmonton and between Regina and Prince Albert. The bulk of the immigration appears to be going in there, and, as is usual, it appears that settlers prefer to go on land unsurveyed rather than settle on surveyed land. That is our experience, and we have had several applications for survey of sections where no subdivision has taken place. We also find that a good many of the survey marks, more particularly in Prince Albert, which were made in 1882-83, have virtually disappeared, and we have had to appoint some of our surveyors to do the work with the settlers as they come in, in order to relieve the latter of the difficulty and delay of running the lines themselves. The chief of the survey, Mr. Dennis, is in the Edmonton district, and Mr. Ogilvie is at Prince Albert. A portion of the land in the New Westminster district is being subdivided, the land in the railway belt; and we have also a party working along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, by which means we are able to connect any portion of the territory which is wanted for settlement or for mines or any other purpose, and we thus obviate the necessity of surveying large portions of land for which there would be no application for settlement. This work is being carried on by some of our most experienced surveyors. Triangulations are being made through the mountains and points astronomically fixed by which we can connect portions of the country for which applications are made, both for settlement and mining purposes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why should the cost of relaying out old lines be charged to capital account?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have more than once called the attention of the department to the impropriety of pushing on surveys years in advance of settlement, the tendency of which is to scatter population over an immense territory. The surveys should never proceed more than about one year in advance of settlement. The business of the Government is to observe the direction in which settlers are moving and the districts which they regard as desirable, and carry out the surveys accordingly. This would reduce the expenditure.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is exactly what the Government have been doing the last few years. But in 1881-82-83 almost every surveyor who could run a compass was sent out, in anticipation of a very large immigration. The result has been that in some portions of the surveyed lands the wooden posts have been burned and the marks have disappeared.

Department of the Interior—salary of a chief clerk..... $2,800

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the Minister will explain this item?

Mr. FOSTER. It is to provide a salary for the position of a chief clerk, at present occupied by the late deputy head, Mr. Burgess.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is the Government yet able to state whether they are going to reinstate Mr. Burgess?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not in a position to give that information to-day.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—salaries of two draughtsmen for hydrographic survey..... $1,200

Mr. LAURIER. Will the Minister explain this item?

Mr. FOSTER. This amount is to provide for the salaries of two draughtsmen for the hydrographic survey in connection with the Georgian Bay, a survey which is at present going on, or for any hydrographic surveys that may be conducted in future. They are to be taken from the graduates of the Royal Military College and to be placed under Commander Boulton, who is in charge of the Georgian Bay survey, with the idea of training them, as others have been trained under him, to conduct hydrographic surveys. The head hydrographic surveyor, who was taken from the Military College some four or five years ago, first entered the service of the Minister of Marine and afterwards became an adept in hydrographic survey work, and this year has conducted an independent survey of Burrard Inlet, to the complete satisfaction of the home authorities. The time will come when Commander Boulton's services will not be any longer at our disposal, and then we shall have these younger men who are able to do our hydrographic surveys themselves.

To pay clerks, Privy Council Department..$307

Mr. LAURIER. What is the explanation of this?

Mr. FOSTER. These gentlemen were temporary clerks, and, under the law, the Auditor General held that they could not be continuously employed but that they should be put off for a month and then taken back again if necessary. They performed the service during the time mentioned, and although temporary clerks, they are regularly employed in the Privy Council Office.

To increase salary of Mr. E. L. Sanders, Customs Department.....$212 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is Mr. Sanders's present salary?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. $1,400, less $212.50. Mr. Sanders, who was appointed 13 years ago, is one of the most deserving officers, and who, outside of his particular duties as general correspondent of the department, was the private secretary of the late Minister of Customs. He is now no more private secretary, and he loses $600 a year, and I give him the full amount of his class as compensation.

Machinery, Kingston Penitentiary.....$20,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What machinery was required?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is the intention of the Minister of Justice to put in machinery for the manufacture of binding twine to be used for the purposes of the farm.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a very large increase in this vote for the isolation of prisoners, what is that for?

Mr. FOSTER. It is for keeping the sexes apart, and the more dangerous criminals by themselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was under the impression that the sexes were kept apart in the Kingston Penitentiary.

Mr. FOSTER. We are going to isolate them still more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a very unsatisfactory explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. We will let the item stand until I see the Deputy Minister.

World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago.. $100,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister ought to explain what is to be done with this vote?

Mr. CARLING. At the exhibition to be held at Chicago, which commences on the 1st of May, 1893, it is the desire of the Government that Canada should make a good exhibit. Our exhibit at Philadelphia cost a trifle under $100,000. At Chicago we have asked for nearly double the space we had at Philadelphia, and we expect that our exhibit there will be the best that has ever taken place at any world's fair. The different provinces will actively co-operate. The Government of Ontario has voted a sum of money for the purpose, and the Government of Quebec has done the same and both are preparing exhibits of minerals and timber; in fact, all the Provincial Governments are preparing for the exhibition in unison with the Dominion Government.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Have they all made grants?

Mr. CARLING. Not all; but those that have not yet done so, have, I believe, intimated their intention of doing so. It is intended to have a building erected in Chicago as a rendezvous for Canadian visitors and containing offices for the commissioners. This, it is expected, can be completed for $15,000 or $20,000. Of course, it is impossible to give details of the expenditure. From all that I can learn of the interest being taken in the exhibition by the Provincial Governments, and by manufacturers, agriculturists, and in fact by every class, I am satisfied that Canada will make a first-class exhibit, and it is the intention and hope of the Government that it will be a credit to the Dominion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Individually, I am in favour of this vote. If we make an exhibition at all we want to make a good one, and I trust that will be done. Is this our first vote?

Mr. CARLING. We have already taken a small vote of $5,000 for preliminary expenses.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Minister expect that this grant, with the grants of the Provincial Governments, will defray the whole expense, or is it thought that another grant will be necessary?

Mr. CARLING. I am inclined to think we will be able, possibly, to do all the work with that amount of money. It may take more, but I do not think a great deal. I do not think it will exceed over and above the amount I have named, $20,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the American Government charge duty on the goods exhibited?

Mr. CARLING. No; not unless the goods are sold.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the Minister decided whom he will appoint, as far as the Dominion is concerned?

Mr. CARLING. The commissioner appointed some time ago by the Government is Professor Saunders, who is chief director of the Experimental Farm.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who will be under him?

Mr. CARLING. No assistant commissioners have yet been appointed, but in time, as circumstances require, additional assistance will be provided.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think Mr. Larke was engaged in connection with this?

Mr. CARLING. He has been for the last month or two employed in soliciting exhibits in the west, with the view of ascertaining the wishes of our manufacturers regarding exhibits of their products.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister has stated that he has had correspondence with the Local Governments. Does he anticipate that everything will work harmoniously between the provinces and the Dominion, and that there will be no conflict of authority or any unpleasantness of that kind?

Mr. CARLING. I do not anticipate anything of that kind, because the Provincial Governments have not only been corresponded with, but Prof. Saunders has had personal interviews with most

of the Local Governments, and everything appears to be working very satisfactorily and harmoniously.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the date of Mr. Larke's appointment?

Mr. CARLING. Some time in May; I think the 1st May.

Mr. McMULLEN. What pay is he getting?

Mr. CARLING. He is being paid the same as was paid by the Government in similar cases at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition—$5 a day and travelling expenses.

Mr. McMULLEN. And his services commenced the 1st of May?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. gentleman know that he has been attending public meetings in the North-West and stumping in several ridings?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, but he was not paid by the Government during that time. I think he was so engaged once or twice, but he got leave of absence and was not paid during his absence. In fact he is very particular about that.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then, when he is stumping some constituency in the interests of the Government, he does not draw pay from the moment he leaves on that mission until his return?

Mr. CARLING. He is paid so much a day, and when not doing this work he is not paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who keeps count of his absences?

Mr. CARLING. The account is kept in the office. He has been away only once or twice. He gives notice when he wants to go away for a day or two.

Mr. McMULLEN. He keeps his own account?

Mr. CARLING. No, it is kept in the office. When absent from work he is not paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that before Mr. Larke went on any of his stumping tours he returned to the office and gave formal notice, and gave similar notice when he came back?

Mr. CARLING. When he goes out to give an address, he does not remain until the election is over. Mr. Larke attended one or two meetings, and then came back and attended to his work.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the nature of his engagement?

Mr. CARLING. To visit the different factories in Ontario, and ascertain what exhibits they are prepared to send to Chicago and to what extent, just as was done in the case of every other exhibition. Mr. Larke is a very intelligent gentleman who has been engaged in manufacturing and understands thoroughly what he is about.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He failed in his business.

Mr. LISTER. The National Policy killed him.

Mr. CARLING. If he failed, I am very sorry for it. He is a very good and clever man and is paid only during the time he is employed.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who pays him for the political work done in the interests of hon. gentlemen opposite? Mr. Webster, immigration agent, also goes around stumping constituencies, perhaps carrying the boodle, while presumably in discharge of his duty as immigration agent. Mr. Larke is a very convenient man: evidently he is quite larky. He crops up very conveniently in different constituencies at election time, and I will not deny that he is a valuable man to hon. gentlemen opposite. But he gets paid a nice little political commission, and I do not think the people should be called on to support him besides with $5 a day and travelling expenses for the purpose of defending the Government.

Mr. CARLING. I have told the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know, but we had the same thing told us with regard to Mr. Webster, whose accounts I took the opportunity last year of going over. He did electioneering work in North Victoria.

Mr. HUGHES. He was not in North Victoria.

Mr. McMULLEN. And while helping the Government in North Victoria, he was drawing pay as an immigration agent, and this Mr. Larke is filling the same dual position. The hon. gentleman should be ashamed to ask the committee to consent to this.

Mr. CARLING. It is unfair to say Mr. Larke is travelling around the country at the public expense attending to public meetings. I have said most positively that is not so. Mr. Larke said he would not receive any pay whatever while attending political meetings. He is a very conscientious, straightforward man, and only gets paid the days he works for the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would it not be convenient if the hon. gentleman were also to stipulate with him that he should not engage in these political enterprises while in the service of the Government?

Mr. TISDALE. The Ontario Government at present have an agent, and a very able one, I am glad to say, though he is also one of the strongest political stumpers in the Province of Ontario. I allude to Mr. Awrey, M.P.P. He is employed by the Ontario Government to do the same work as Mr. Larke is doing for the Dominion. I may say the Ontario Government could not have a more competent gentleman. I do not think that we should, over a matter like the Columbian Exhibition, indulge in any political acrimony whatever. Each of the Governments has taken a gentleman who has rendered it political service, and both gentlemen are political speakers of considerable ability. I am glad to be able to say that the gentleman the Ontario Government has employed is an able speaker and a competent man for the position. No better representative could have been chosen from either side of politics. I believe Mr. Larke is also a good man. Unfortunately, according to the views of the hon. member for Wellington, he is able to make strong speeches, but, no doubt, that will make him all the better representative. He and Mr. Awrey will do good work together to the credit of the Province of Ontario and of the Dominion, as in this matter men can be united in feeling and sympathy. I am glad to hear the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) say that he is prepared to vote more money, if necessary, as I think we are all desirous that there should be no stint in this

matter, while not spending more than is necessary, in order to make our representation a success.

Mr. HUGHES. I just rise to correct the statement of the hon. member for North Wellington that Mr. Webster was in North Victoria during the campaign. He was certainly not there, to my knowledge, and never took any part directly or indirectly in the election.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was in North Victoria and saw him at work. I was there when he was there. With regard to Mr. Awrey, I challenge the hon. member for South Norfolk to point out a single place where he made speeches since he was appointed.

Mr. TISDALE. I met him in two or three places.

Mr. McMULLEN. Not since his appointment.

Mr. TISDALE. I think so; at any rate, I know he would take part if he got the opportunity, and I know he would not deny it either.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has spoken in very complimentary terms of Mr. Awrey and the efforts the Government of Ontario have made for the purpose of aiding the steps taken by the Dominion Government. I would say to the Minister of Agriculture that the Ontario Government appointed a gentleman from both sides of politics for the purpose of making our share in the exhibition a success and I hope he will follow the precedent.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Additional amount required for Census.. $12,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I would ask the Minister if J. P. Payne is employed in the census just now?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that he has drawn a large amount in the Agriculture Department during the last year, and that he was engaged in this office.

Mr. CARLING. He is not employed in the census at the present time, and has not been.

Further amount required for Militia drill pay..... $6,000

Mr. HUGHES. Is this amount for drill pay for the current year or for the next year?

Mr. FOSTER. For this year.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I would ask why the militia in the County of Annapolis were not called out this year?

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Militia is not here now, but I will bring the matter to his attention.

Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, Construction..... $5,000

Mr. LAURIER. What is this for?

Mr. HAGGART. It is a sum required to complete the water service, the tanks and so on.

Canadian Pacific Railway..... $590,000

Mr. LAURIER. What is the meaning of this vote?

Mr. HAGGART. It is to pay the award of the arbitrators in reference to the line between Port Moody and Savona's Ferry, and $10,745 to pay legal and other expenses, as well as the salary of the engineer superintending the work.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the total amount of the award?

Mr. HAGGART. $579,255.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And the expenses of the arbitration?

Mr. HAGGART. That is included in this $10,745. I think there is a sum in the estimate of the Minister of Justice, or the cost of the arbitration was paid out of the construction vote last year.

Trent Valley Canal, swing bridge at Fenelon Falls..... $10,000

Mr. HUGHES. In my opinion and in that of many others, that sum will not be nearly sufficient. At present there is no swing in the bridge. The bridge has been built for a number of years, and the canal is useless because the bridge crosses the river without a swing. The Grand Trunk Railway has proposed to change the route from above the village and go below the falls, thus obviating the necessity of a swing. The swing would make it very difficult for navigation. When the bridge was built, it was not expected that there would be a canal there, and now, if the swing be placed in the present bridge, the barges and other boats will find it difficult to make the passage when there is any wind. There is quite a strong current, and the boatmen have petitioned the Government to change the site to below the falls. They maintain that, if there is a wind, their barges will be driven against the piers. If the bridge were removed below the falls, it would be different, and the railway company say it would be altogether in the interests of the Government to do that, and the owners of boats there also say it would be much better. The fact that the road is going to be extended to Mattawa in a few years would be an argument in favour of the Government considering the feasibility of changing the route. The Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway also touches this road, and is being pushed on to the eastward very rapidly, and thus increases the travel over that road. While the company is desirous of avoiding as far as possible all swing bridges, still if the sum of $10,000 only is voted in this connection, the bridge will stay where it is now. That will certainly be a drawback to navigation, but will be to the interest of the company. The company, I presume, would prefer, so far as they are concerned, to have it where it is now, unless they are more largely assisted. I would respectfully draw the attention of the Government to that phase of the case, and I would be much pleased if this item could be held over and a larger amount given to meet the proposed change. If it is left in its present condition I am satisfied this is not sufficient to complete the work, and the result will be the postponement of its completion for another year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman with regard to deviating the

line of railway if it possibly could be done, but I am afraid that the expense of running the road through the centre of the town on the east side of the canal, would be very large. If the deviation could be made and the swing bridge could be dispensed with above the falls, it would be much better. That bridge is now within three or four feet of the water, and you cannot possibly utilize the stream for a row boat when the swing bridge is there.

To provide for salaries of extra clerks and copyists, Railways and Canals... $17,000

Mr. LAURIER. That is a very large item for extra clerks.

Mr. HAGGART. It is simply an alteration in the manner of book-keeping. The practice hitherto has been to charge the salaries of engineers, draughtsmen and extra clerks at Ottawa, to the various appropriations for the works. The Auditor General objects to that system, and it is now proposed to obtain this special vote. It is for those that I have now in the employment of the department.

Ship Channel between Quebec and Montreal..... $30,000

Mr. LAURIER. How is that to be expended?

Mr. FOSTER. This is to complete the work. It has been going on for some time, and was contemplated under a former arrangement.

Esquimalt Graving Dock, balance due contractors for stop-gate, with hoisting-frame and winches complete..... $4,827

Mr. LAURIER. Who are those contractors?

Mr. OUIMET. The Albion Iron Company of Victoria.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have learned that the graving-dock has been very largely used by the British Government during the last season. I would like to know if that is the case? If it is, it would be much better to take that dock entirely into the hands of this Dominion, as we have been deprived of a considerable amount of revenue.

Mr. OUIMET. Originally, as the hon. gentleman knows, the graving dock was undertaken by the British Columbia Government, and they had made an arrangement with the British Government, who had aided it to the extent of $250,000. In consequence, arrangements were made in order to accommodate the ships of the Admiralty. When this Government took hold of the work they had to accept it on the same terms as regards the Admiralty. I think that for the last few years the dock was monopolized to a certain extent by the Admiralty, but that will not be the case this year, and the revenue will be considerably decreased. The dock has not been very much used this year because so few wrecks have taken place. This year the dock will certainly accommodate every ship that will demand to be received there. The revenue last year was $29,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. There are no dock dues paid by any British ships when they come in for repair?

Mr. OUIMET. They pay all expenses. They have a reduced rate, but all they have to pay they have paid.

Railways and Canals—To provide for the salary of a second-class clerk..... $1,100

Mr. HAGGART. This is to make provision for a party who has been a clerk of records for a vast number of years, a very deserving officer in the Department of Railways.

Privy Council Office—To provide for one third class clerkship..... $800

Mr. FOSTER. It was put in there "notwithstanding anything contrary to the Civil Service Act" for this reason: This is for a clerk who has been transferred from the Auditor General's department, a clerk of superior training and grade, who is needed in the Privy Council Office for special work, and he is to get $150 in increased salary.

Kingston Penitentiary—Prison of Isolation..... $18,150

Mr. FOSTER. This is for officering the prison of isolation, which is almost completed. This prison is for the more hardened criminals, who are being separated from the general prisoners and placed by themselves, with their special officers and their own industries and trade instructors. Houses are to be built for officers at Kingston Penitentiary, which will be done by prison labour, at an estimated cost of $1,000 each.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand the Government contemplate manufacturing binding twine in the prison?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Ontario Government have established a similar manufactory in the Central Prison in Toronto, and it will be a great mistake to establish another industry of exactly the same sort at Kingston Penitentiary, because the probability is that one industry will manufacture all the binding twine for which we can find a market in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). More especially is this the case when already a large number of private establishments are in existence. Although the money has been voted, the Government are not bound to establish such an industry if they should find these facts to be the case, and the vote might be diverted to establishing some other manufacture. It would be a great mistake to undertake to manufacture binding twine beyond the requirements of the country, and simply follow in the track of another institution that has already established an industry of this kind.

Mr. FOSTER. This was decided on by the Government before we knew that the Ontario Government had engaged in this industry. The Government will carefully consider the matter and invest the amount in what is considered to be most advisable. The hon. gentleman will not ask for a monopoly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My remarks were made in order to prevent waste of energy and labour.

Mr. McMULLEN. An enormous quantity of binding twine is required in the country. If the result of the establishment of this industry would be to increase the competition so as to give the farmers binding twine at a very much cheaper price, I would not object to this vote. I should regret if the money invested in machinery should be lost

on account of more twine being produced than could be used in the country; but at the same time if this expenditure would tend to reduce the price to a very low one, I would rather see the money invested in this industry than in other industries.

Mr. FLINT. What is the explanation of $175 royalty for use of seat in refectory?

Mr. FOSTER. The steward has invented a particularly convenient seat for the dining room and this is a small royalty given him as a reward for his inventive genius.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Has a patent been taken out for the seat?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Is this an annual payment or a lump sum?

Mr. FOSTER. A lump sum.

Halifax Drill Hall..... .....$40,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is this for a new work?

Mr. OUIMET. The Halifax drill hall was destroyed by fire, and this vote is for a new drill hall for the use of the volunteers.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is being done about the Brantford drill shed?

Mr. OUIMET. The amount has been revoted. It is at the disposal of the corporation or the military authorities of that city whenever they see fit to take it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What has been done about repairs to the present shed? The roof has been on the ground for almost a year, the building is open to the weather, and one of the best regiments in the country is entirely without any place in which to store their arms.

Mr. OUIMET. None of these complaints have reached me.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, they will have been submitted to the Minister of Militia.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will bring the matter up on Concurrence.

St. John Custom House..... $50,000

Mr. BOWERS. There seems to have been carelessness in regard to this building, as I understand it was not insured, and no night watchman was there.

Mr. OUIMET. I have every reason to believe there was a night watchman there. The building was not insured, as none of the Government buildings are insured.

Mr. FLINT. Has the report of the investigation committee, in regard to the late fire, been laid before the Government yet?

Mr. OUIMET. The committee who made the investigation were not able to ascertain the cause of the fire.

Mr. BOWERS. I was in St. John a few days after the fire, and I was informed that if a watchman had been there, the fire would not have obtained such headway, and could have been extinguished in a short time. I was told there was no watchman in the building.

Mr. McLEOD. There was a watchman in the building. I was not in St. John at the time the fire occurred, but I was there shortly afterwards, and I was told the watchman had gone all through the building shortly before the fire took place, and he saw no signs of fire. It is difficult to tell how it occurred. It was simply an accident. There happened to be a high wind blowing at the time, and when once the fire had got under way inside it was practically impossible for the firemen to prevent the destruction of the building. This amount will not be sufficient to complete the work, but I trust the Government will subsequently take another vote.

Mr. BOWERS. I understand a watchman had been engaged but had not yet taken his position, and was not expected to do so for about a week.

Mr. McLEOD. He was there.

Mr. BOWERS. In such a building a time clock should be used.

Vancouver Post Office, &c., additional amount required..... $9,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How is that?

Mr. OUIMET. That is to complete the post office at Vancouver.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What are you asking the extra amount for now?

Mr. OUIMET. This is to complete it. We did not expect to complete it this year, but now we see that it will probably be built during the course of the fall, and we want to have the additional amount in order to pay the contractors.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is not that I object to this vote, but I just wanted to know what principle the department worked on. I see in half a dozen items that there were sums taken to commence the work, and additional amounts asked for after they are commenced. As the works proceeded and according as additional sums are required the Government asks the House for them. I want to know why the Minister of Public Works cannot commence the Brantford drill shed with the money at his disposal, and then if he finds he has not enough to go on, come to Parliament and ask for more. There should be some straight line of working on in the department. That drill shed is badly needed. The work is urgently required. We have here instance upon instance in which the Government do not take the ground that because they have not got enough money they will not commence the work, but they begin on whatever they have and ask the House to supplement it afterwards. Now why is not that done in the case of the Brantford drill shed?

Mr. OUIMET. I am sorry the Minister of Militia is not here because this matter is in his department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is in the Department of Public Works.

Mr. OUIMET. We only make the plans and erect the buildings with the money that is asked as being necessary to complete the work. In the case of Vancouver public building a certain amount is estimated as the probable cost. A part of it was voted, and now there is a demand for the balance because the works are being completed a little earlier than we expected. If I understand aright, in the Brantford case a certain amount is

voted to assist the city of Brantford to erect a drill shed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Oh, no.

Mr. OUIMET. The department has never undertaken to build that drill shed; at least I do not understand so. If the hon. gentleman will leave the matter until Concurrence when the Minister of Militia is here, I am sure he will be glad to hear the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Apparently I have done all that I can with the Minister of Militia, and now I want to try the Minister of Public Works. If it were attempted to repair the drill shed I understand that it would be under the Minister of Militia, but, in my opinion, it would be money wasted to do so because the old building is a perfect wreck. Moreover, it is standing on ground on which it has no right to stand, as the lease has expired long ago. It is for the Militia Department, of course, to say what they are going to do with reference to accommodation for one of their own regiments. The regiment does not belong specially to the city of Brantford. It was not enlisted for the defence of the city; it is an honour to the militia force of Canada and its purpose is for the defence of the whole Dominion. It is quartered in a building part of the roof of which has been lying on the ground, and in which the arms are getting destroyed, and where there is no accommodation for officers or privates. This matter has been two or three years before the department now, and the statement is made that the vote granted is not sufficient, according to the plans, to complete the work. I ask why does the Minister not go on and commence the work as he does in other cases, and then come here again and ask for more money if he wants it? This is not a personal matter with me. It is a matter in which the militia force of the whole country is concerned. The hon. Minister stated that the money was voted for the city of Brantford to build a drill shed. The city of Brantford is not building drill sheds; it is no part of the work of this Government to throw the building of armouries and drill sheds upon the people of a city, who are not more interested in it than the people of any other portion of Canada. That battalion is for the defence of this Dominion in any part, to go anywhere. There must be some solution found for this matter. This regiment cannot be expected to go on labouring under their present difficulties. It is utterly discouraging and dispiriting; and now that we have a new Minister of Public Works, I hope he will find a solution, either by reducing the plans or otherwise. He must not throw the responsibility on the city of Brantford. The people of that city honour the regiment, and have voluntarily granted $10,000, but it is not their duty to provide a drill shed. Let the Government commence the work with what they have, and if they find that they have not enough, let them take an additional vote. I trust that the Minister will go into this matter thoroughly and find some solution for the difficulty that exists. It is not for the representative of the riding, nor for the officers of the battalion, nor for the municipality of the city of Brantford to find the solution. The citizens granted $10,000 simply to show their appreciation of their volunteer force, and their desire to have the regiment properly provided for. It was a very handsome grant, and the Government have only given $10,000. In many other cases drill sheds have been built in cities which have not contributed nearly one-half of the amount of the building; and why should a distinction be made? It cannot be because the riding in which the city is situated sends to Parliament a representative who is opposed to the Government. That cannot enter into consideration when you are talking about providing for the militia force of the country. It is not a local force, but it is a part of the Dominion force, and must be looked upon in that light. I press upon the Minister that there ought to be and must be a solution found for the difficulty. I am sure that the Minister of Militia would not like to see a regiment like this disbanded for want of accommodation. These men were so enthusiastic that they lent their influence to carry the bonus of $10,000, and did carry it; and while that has been done and the site has been bought and deeded to the Government, they find that they cannot get enough money to put up a building; and there the whole matter stands, while the present drill shed is a ruin, a large part of the roof lying on the ground, and the new site lying idle. I do not think the matter ought to be trifled with any further. The duty devolves on the Government, and the Government ought not to shirk that duty or throw the responsibility of erecting a public building for the accommodation of Dominion troops upon the municipality. I have spoken on this matter before; I speak now in good nature, but I speak earnestly. It is not only a matter of justice but it is the imperative duty of the department to see that this thing is done.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we have had this question debated on several occasions, and nobody knows better than the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat the conditions on which that $10,000 was granted. The fact that we have a new Minister of Public Works does not alter the old conditions; I suppose they remain and will remain. The grant of $10,000 for Brantford was given on a parity with that for Belleville. The people of Belleville built a drill shed, and we promised $10,000 as a subsidy. We promised in the same way to contribute $10,000 for a drill shed in Brantford, whether it should be built by the military, the friends of the military, or the city; and when the drill shed is built the $10,000 will be paid. But it was not the intention of the Government to build a drill hall at Brantford. Their liability commenced and ended with giving the $10,000 as subsidy towards one.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I notice that $25,000 is granted for military buildings at Winnipeg without any conditions at all being attached. I suppose that in all these cases the jurisdiction over military matters rests with this Parliament, and not with any municipality. While the people of any district in the country may voluntarily contribute, I am not aware that there is any legal obligation whatever resting upon them to raise a dollar for a work of this sort, and I never learned that the city of Brantford entered into a contract with the Government to erect a drill shed. It may be that the Government offered $10,000 to any parties who would contribute the money; but that is merely an offer on the part of the Administration that binds nobody else. If the Government can do without buildings of this sort all over the country,

I suppose the rest of the inhabitants will be able to stand it; and those who think as I do, that we ought to direct our expenditures to providing for the civil necessities of the country, will perhaps, after all, not be dissatisfied if that is made a rule of universal application. But they would not like to see one rule adopted towards a constituency represented by a member on this side of the House, and a different rule adopted towards another constituency represented by a member on the opposite side.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not mean to be understood that the city of Belleville entered into an arrangement with the Government. The building was erected by the military themselves or by their friends, the Government contributing $10,000 towards it. The grant for the Brantford drill shed was made on precisely the same conditions. I do not say that the city of Brantford entered into a contract to erect a building, but the Government agreed to contribute $10,000 for the erection of the building at that place.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister of Finance has spoken very positively about what the Government will do and will not do. He need not have spoken so positively. I suppose the Government were ready to receive suggestions. Will he tell me on what grounds $40,000 is voted to erect a drill shed at Halifax without any contribution being asked from that city, while, at the same time, he says the Government will not do any more for Brantford than they have done? What greater claim has Halifax than Brantford? It has a claim; its drill shed ought to be built; but the Government have no more right to provide suitable accommodation for one regiment than they have for another regiment.

Mr. FOSTER. The same thing might be said about Belleville.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The same thing might be said about any place; but why is it done?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I may be permitted to say a word, as the vote now under discussion originated while I had the honour of being Minister of Militia. I see a great deal of difference between the cases the hon. gentleman has been referring to. The vote for Halifax is to rebuild a building which has been burned down. At the time of the vote for the erection of the drill shed at Brantford, two applications were submitted at the same time—one by the city of Belleville and the other by the city of Brantford. It was agreed, and nothing more was asked from the Department of Militia, that $10,000 should cover the amount to be provided by the Government for the purpose of giving to the militia force at Belleville and to the militia force at Brantford the accommodation which was considered by the department to be necessary. Belleville accepted the $10,000 and built a drill shed, which to my mind is equal to any in the Dominion, in so far as accommodating the force in that place is concerned; and I thought that Brantford would have followed in the wake of Belleville and taken advantage of the liberality of Parliament in voting the $10,000, and have put up a drill shed quite sufficient for the requirements of the force there. Several applications were made to me while I still held the portfolio of Minister of Militia to depart from the conditions which had been accepted by the city of Brantford, but I always refused, as my successor equally has refused. I know that the present drill shed is in such a condition that it is unfit for the storage of the arms held there, and I think we are losing precious moments through the city of Brantford not making use of the $10,000 voted by Parliament to put up a drill shed. I would advise the people there to go to work and follow the example of the people of Belleville; and by so doing, they would do much more to benefit the force than by discussing year after year whether Parliament is going to give in to Brantford or whether Brantford is going to condescend to accept the vote of Parliament.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I like the tone of the Minister's last remarks better than that of his previous remarks. The people of Brantford would be satisfied with a drill shed similar to that of Belleville.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We gave Belleville only $10,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Exactly, and the Belleville officers did not give another $10,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They gave more than that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not think they gave nearly as much. I do not think the drill shed cost $20,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think not. But here is the trouble. Would the Public Works Department accept a building if the Brantford people would put up one as up to their standard? If Brantford would put up a drill shed the same as the one in Belleville, the department might not accept it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Why not?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The officers of the department say they will not. If the Minister will say now that the Government will accept a drill shed built the same as the Belleville one, we will have something to go on.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. And pay $10,000 for it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is their business to build a drill shed. Will the department go on and build a drill shed the same as the Belleville shed, which was built with that money and for a less amount?

Mr. OUIMET. It was not the department built it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, but they accepted it. Will the department say now that if a shed is built the same as that of Belleville, they will accept it? The officers of the department say they will not.

Mr. OUIMET. It is for the Minister of Militia to say whether he will be satisfied with the kind of building that will be given by the military of Brantford.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the hon. gentleman's own architects must be satisfied. The Public Works Department will not be responsible for any building unless it conforms to their ideas and plans.

Mr. OUIMET. Will the military of Brantford be satisfied with a drill shed costing $20,000 including the site?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If built on the same plans and having the same accommodation as the Belleville drill shed, I think it will be satisfactory. Will the Minister say that he will accept a drill shed no more substantial than that of Belleville?

Mr. OUIMET. For my part I have no objection to tell the hon. gentleman that I will examine into the matter and confer with the Minister of Militia about it, but he has already been told that the military of Brantford ought to go to work and build a drill shed similar to that of Belleville; and I do not see why there should be any objection on the part of the Minister of Militia to accept such a building. The Militia Department accepted the drill shed at Belleville, and I do not see why they should not accept a similar one.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will the hon. gentleman's own department accept it?

Mr. OUIMET. I have nothing to accept. When a drill shed is demanded by the Militia Department, they state what they want. My officers then go to work and make plans and estimate the cost. The whole thing is then referred back to the Department of Militia, and submitted to Council for approval. It is, therefore, for the Department of Militia to say whether they will be satisfied with the plans prepared by the military of Brantford, and if they are, it is for the Brantford prople to go on and build it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The erection of new public buildings, I understand, comes under the hon. gentleman's department, and the repairing of old drill sheds under the Department of Militia. The Public Works Department must express themselves as satisfied with the building.

Mr. OUIMET. The Department of Militia want a drill shed. They tell us what kind of building they want, and we instruct our architects to make out the plans and estimates. These are sent to the Militia Department for approval. If they are satisfactory, the plans are returned to my department, and the department asks for a vote. When the building is completed, it is transferred to the Department of Militia, and the Department of Public Works has nothing more to do with it. I understand that it was in this case decided, instead of asking the Department of Public Works to build a drill shed, that the Government should give $10,000 towards the construction. I understand that plans were demanded from my department, I do not know why, but of course when plans are demanded by the Minister of Militia for his own use, we supply them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will the department have any objection to have plans made by their own officers on the same lines as those for the Belleville drill shed? A municipality is not likely to be involved in putting up a building unless it is sure that it will pass muster.

Mr. OUIMET. I see no objection to my officer going to Belleville to have plans made according to what has been built there, and then refer them to the Department of Militia to see what that department wants to have done. The arrangement was that $10,000 was to be given by Parliament, and then the people of Brantford were to give a similar sum, so that it would cost $20,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand that the Minister will have no objection to have plans prepared according to the plan of the Belleville drill shed. I will rely on the Minister doing that.

Experimental Farms—Improvements, renewals, &c..... ..... $6,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I would like to know what this is for. This is a new farm and should not require many repairs.

Mr. CARLING. This is for some new works on the different farms. One amount is for fencing and poultry buildings at Agassiz in British Columbia, and also for lumber and supplies and fittings in the museum-room in the central farm, with other amounts coming to a total of $6,000.

Harbours and rivers in Nova Scotia—
Meteghan Cove, repairs to pier..... $300

Mr. BOWERS. Have not the Government made a mistake of a cipher here? Should it not be $3,000 instead of $300. Even $1,000 would scarcely repair one end of the wharf, and $300 is of no use, but, if you could give a little more out of the fund for repairs to piers and breakwaters, you might be able to do something with one end of the wharf this year.

Mr. OUIMET. I think we could expend usefully a larger amount on the work in question, but I believe $300 will do what is necessary for this summer.

Mr. BOWERS. At the end of the wharf, the tide has washed through, and washed out a great deal of the ballast, while the sides are rotting away.

Maitland, repairs to wharf..... $300

Mr. FLINT. This amount is small, but I suppose it is the result of careful calculations by the proper officers. I want to ask if the department has decided to do anything in repairing the Sandford breakwater.

Mr. OUIMET. An examination has been made of the work and a report has been made, but the amount necessary has been considered too large to put in the Estimates this year.

Mr. FLINT. Then, as the department has a report, and is thoroughly aware of the circumstances of the case, it will not be necessary for me just now to make any remarks as to the importance of making these repairs. I hope next year the Government will see its way clear to do something for this important work.

Prince Edward Island—Bay Fortune—
Additional amount required to complete extension of breakwater.. .....$700

Mr. McLEAN (King's, P.E.I.) I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works whether it is his intention, during the present session, to have the breakwater at Souris, P.E.I., repaired? I may say that I accompanied the engineer when he went down there after the breakwater had been partly destroyed by a storm last fall, and he made a survey, and, as I understand, reported to the department. In my estimation, it will take from $10,000 to $15,000 to make these repairs. I would like the Minister of Public Works to understand that this is a place of great importance to the people of Prince Edward Island. This breakwater was built some years ago at an expense of something like $120,000. During the storms of last season 300 feet in the centre of the breakwater was carried

away. The outer wall was carried away and allowed the ballast to fall out of that portion of the work. If this is not repaired during the present season before the fall storms come on, I have no hesitation in predicting that it will cost $25,000 or $30,000 to repair it. It is a work of great importance. Souris is the only harbour of refuge for all that part of the coast, it and Georgetown being the two nearest ports to the vessels on the fishing grounds. Besides, we have three steamers a week calling at that place, and that breakwater is the only protection they have. Not only that, but the Government themselves have a railway wharf that was built at a cost of $35,000, and the only protection to it is the breakwater. I was under the impression the Government would see the necessity of having this repaired during the present season. The time of the year when most of the vessels frequent that place as a harbour of refuge, is the very time the breakwater is most liable to be carried away, and it will then be in a very dangerous condition, both for the work inside and for the vessels frequenting it. I hope the Minister will see his way clear to put in an amount sufficient to make the repairs, whatever may be required. I do not know what it will cost.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I was going to call attention to what my hon. colleague said, and I would add to that, that so important is that work for that section of the country that it would be better to forego many of the votes that we are passing for other public works, in order to do the repairs of which my hon. colleague has spoken. It is the only place for shipping for the eastern portion of King's County for a distance of 60 or 70 miles of coast, except St. Peter's harbour on the north side. All that large portion of country from East Point to Souris, and up the north side, is dependent on the shipping at Souris. It will be a great loss to the people of that country as well as a loss to the Government, because, as my colleague has said, the railway wharf is altogether dependent on that breakwater for protection. It is not built to stand the heavy seas of the gulf that it would have to encounter if the breakwater is further carried away, and it will certainly entail a very large additional cost on the country if the present repairs are not attended to. I would earnestly press upon the Government to take some means of doing the necessary work. I very much regret to see that there is no amount in the Estimates for it, as I certainly expected there would be. I wish to impress upon the Government the very great importance of attending to this matter as early as possible before the fall storms come on, else the whole structure will be carried away.

Public Works, Quebec—River Nicolet—additional amount required.....$1,000

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister told us some time ago in voting the main estimates, that that sum would complete the work.

Mr. OUIMET. That sum in the main estimates was to rebuild one or two ice-breakers that had been carried away by the ice. This amount will suffice to put the works in complete order.

Mr. LAURIER. Are we commencing to repair these works before they are completed ?

Mr. OUIMET. The result of the carrying away of these ice-breakers was to impair the works themselves.

River Ottawa—Compensation to Mrs. N. Guindon for land taken at Papineauville in 1888..... $500

Mr. LAURIER. What is the explanation of this item ?

Mr. OUIMET. In 1888 a special appropriation was voted by Parliament with a view to dredge a channel for the steamboat to call at Papineauville, which is situated on the north side of the River Ottawa in a bay. The officers of the department thought it would be cheaper to make the channel through the presqu'isle forming the bay in order to get by a short cut to the pier, and this was made through the property of Mrs. Guindon. Since then negotiations have taken place as to the amount of damages which should be paid, and the department considered that $500 would be a satisfactory sum, and that it would do better to pay that amount rather than have the matter sent to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. LAURIER. I desire to draw the attention of the Minister to a matter that has been placed in my hands by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette). My hon. friend has been long complaining of certain damages done on the Rivière du Sud to property adjacent to the Intercolonial Railway bridge. A pier has been built in the centre of the river, the effect of which is to divert the channel and cause the damages complained of. I understand the matter has been investigated by the department, and that an engineer has reported favourably on the claim of the riparian owners. I call the attention of the Minister to a letter addressed to my hon. friend by the Hon. Frank Smith, then acting Minister of Public Works, dated 28th October, 1891, in which he said :

"I am in receipt of your letter of the 26th instant, and in accordance with your request will ask in the next estimates for $3,500, for the works mentioned."

I understand no amount has been placed in the Estimates, notwithstanding the promise contained in this letter.

Mr. OUIMET. I am sorry to say that certain difficulties have presented themselves which have prevented this amount being at present granted. A question of jurisdiction has arisen between the Department of Railways and Canals and the Department of Public Works. The damage, if damage has been caused, has been caused by the piers of the bridge, and piers that have been placed above the bridge in order to protect it. This work comes under the jurisdiction of the Department of Railways, and I have not had time to adjudicate the matter with that department, and so it had to be left over. It will be duly considered.

Mr. LAURIER. This answer is hardly satisfactory. I have nothing to say with respect to the question of jurisdiction between the two departments, but as they are within the same Government, it should be a very easy matter to settle that question.

Mr. OUIMET. The difficulty is that the officers of the Department of Railways maintain that the damage done is not due to the piers.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand it, the officers of the Department of Public Works say the reverse. The matter has been investigated and a claim for damage admitted, and under the circumstances, whatever may be the dispute between the departments, the fact remains that the public still suffer.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Is any portion of the $7,500 for general repairs to be expended on Bayfield Harbour, Lake Huron?

Mr. OUIMET. Half of this sum will be expended in Ontario and the other half in Quebec. I do not think there will be sufficient to do anything at Bayfield, as a large amount will be required to place the harbour in a state of repair. I believe it is not precisely a Government harbour. My attention having been drawn to it, if any expenditure can be made, it will be made.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I think it is a Government harbour, for the people subscribed $30,000, and the Government then proceeded and completed the building. The Government repaired the pier. They did not take advantage of the cribwork, but they used piles, and owing to the nature of the bottom of the river they would not hold, and accordingly they were carried away by the first storm. I have received a letter from the fishermen asking me to bring this matter up with a view to have such repairs made as would enable them to enter the harbour. Unless the necessary repairs are carried out, very great injustice will be done to the people, because this is an incorporated village and the people have strongly supported the Government up to the present time. Indeed, they have never given a Reform majority, but they have been "hived," and that no doubt was one of the reasons why this case has not been taken into consideration. I observe that both Goderich and Port Albert harbours are to be repaired, and Bayfield is as important as Port Albert. I hope the Government will take this matter into consideration, because something should be done in order to enable the fishermen to enter the harbour.

Mr. OUIMET. I understand the dredge will pass at that point and will remain there to do the dredging that is necessary. As to the repairs to the works constructed by the municipality as well as by the Government, these will cost a very large amount, which the department does not think it advisable to expend this year. The dredging, however, will be done so as to afford relief to the fishermen.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In looking over the Estimates I see no special provision made for the cleansing of the River Sydenham, which I brought before the attention of the Government at the beginning of the session. I pointed out to the Minister of Public Works that the dredge engaged at the mouth of the River Thames would be only two hours' sail from the River Sydenham, where it could be well utilized in removing the obstructions to navigation which exist there. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that the tonnage entering Sydenham harbour is larger than the tonnage entering any other port in Ontario, except Toronto. An immense trade is done on the river. There are large mills engaged in manufacturing elm into barrel staves and heads, and from the village of Wallaceburg, which has 3,000 inhabitants, there is shipped every day a train load of this material for the Canadian and American markets. There are immense quantities of timber taken down the river every year to the city of Detroit. The river is usually navigable, but serious obstructions now exist in navigation. I received a letter from there to-day from which it appears that recently property has been damaged, and loss to the extent of upwards of $100,000, on account of the want of care on the part of the department with respect to the navigation of that river. I can point out in these Estimates $200,000 that might stand over without any serious detriment to the public service, and yet the hon. gentleman has not inserted an appropriation for the removing of these obstructions in the River Sydenham. I told the hon. gentleman, when I addressed the House before, that steamboats ran daily from the town of Dresden on one branch of the Sydenham to the city of Detroit and to Sarnia, but recently there have been such serious obstructions to navigation on account of the logs that have been floated down the river that it is impossible that a vessel can pass either to Dresden or up the North Sydenham to Wilkesport. The hon. gentleman has had the courtesy to send me a report made by an officer of his department who says that it will take something like $2,000 to remove the obstructions to navigation in the one branch of the river, and about the same amount in the other. These are certainly not large sums of money when you consider the immense amount of traffic on the river. I say there is not another river of equal extent in all this Dominion upon which there is one-half the traffic, and there is no place in Canada where obstructions to navigation, at the present time, can do as much detriment to the public interest as there. Between 25,000 and 30,000 people reside on these two branches of the Sydenham, and for forty years an immense trade has been carried on there. Unless the Government do take some action serious difficulties will arise. I hold in my hand a letter in which it is said that, in consequence of the obstructions in the river, the embankments of a large extent of territory, which has recently been brought into cultivation and where steam pumps are employed to keep the land perfectly dry, have been broken down by the water rising on account of these obstructions.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the nature of these obstructions?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They are sunken logs which can easily be removed by a dredge. Twice within twenty years these two branches of the river have had these obstructions removed. On account of the immense quantity of timber carried down the river some of the logs sink, and these accumulate bars. The statement made to me is that some 5,000 acres of crops have been destroyed by these floods, that about fifty families, as I judge from the account, have been obliged to leave their houses in boats, that their cattle had to be driven on the land of their neigbours, and notwithstanding that the water has been pumped out by these steam pumps, four or five thousand acres of crops are absolutely destroyed. Mr. Clancy, the local member who is a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, has had 500 acres of wheat destroyed by these inundations. If the department could have taken action earlier in the season and given author-

ity to the customs officer at Wallaceburg to see that the lumbermen in bringing down their logs did not wholly impede navigation, these damages could have been prevented. I ask the hon. gentleman that immediate action should be taken, because if not the injury which the country will sustain will be out of all proportion to the cost of the necesary work. I say that it is not overestimating the injury to state that $100,000 worth of property has been destroyed within the last week, and a far larger amount may be destroyed if the Minister of Public Works does not take immediate action.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman has only notified me of these damages to-day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course it was only to-day I received notice of the damages.

Mr. OUIMET. The matter has not been brought to my attention before, and I never did understand that the work asked for by the hon. gentleman was so necessary or so urgent as he now states. The matter will be attended to at once.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I corroborate all that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) states in reference to this matter. I know that the obstructions in the river are doing a great deal of damage to that part of the country, and the difficulty can be removed at a very small expense. There are two dredges now in the town of Chatham which are doing nothing and could be obtained at a very low rate per day by the Government, and a few days' work would be all that is required. I called the Minister's attention to the fact that the River Thames was in a similar position. These two rivers are almost together and arrangements could be made with one of the dredging companies in the town of Chatham to do all this work at a small expense. I hope that the Minister will take immediate steps to have the obstructions removed in both these rivers.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before voting the present item, I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Minister of Public Works to cause certain improvements to be made on the shore, in the parish of St. Jean des Chaillons, in the County of Lotbinière? I had occasion to call the attention of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) when he was Minister of Public Works, during the session of 1890, to the importance of the improvements in question. For some years there have been brickyards on the shore at St. Jean des Chaillons. When these brickyards were established, boats could land easily there; but, since then, the deepening of the river in front of these brickyards has resulted in lowering the water to a great extent, and the consequence is that, during a great part of the summer, it is now impossible for boats to land there. In the course of last session I called the attention of the hon. Minister to that state of things. He promised that he would attend to the matter. The improvements I wish for would really cost very little. Every spring a number of dredging machines are sent to that point to dredge the river. Moreover, stone-lifters are also there to remove the stones. For the first week after their arrival in the spring the dredges cannot do anything owing to the height of the water. It would be easy, then, to employ them at removing the stones from the shore, instead of keeping them idle. Should a stone-lifter be employed there two or three days, it could free the shore of all the stones which now prevent the landing of vessels. I would like to learn from the Minister of Public Works whether it is his intention to do anything in answer to the request of the people interested?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) All I can say to the hon. member is that I will examine the reports which must have been made on the subject, since the question has already occupied the attention of the department. It would take $5,000 or $6,000 to make the improvements suggested by the hon. member. However, the matter will be examined again.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) I will point out that the first request which was made was to have some dredging done opposite the brickyards. If the hon. Minister thought this would be too expensive, he could at any rate cause the removal of the stones which obstruct the river and prevent the boats from landing. I am told that if the stones were removed, it would be an immense improvement. Instead of being kept idle, the men could be employed on the shore for a few days, and the work could be done without costing a cent to the Department of Public Works.

Dredging in the Maritime Provinces—
additional amount required..... $3,700

Mr. GILLIES. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works how many dredges are available for operations in the Maritime Provinces? I may say that down there we are an essentially maritime people, with the homes of many upon the deep, and this is a very deserving service. I had occasion myself last year to draw the attention of the Department of Public Works, then presided over by the Hon. Mr. Smith, to the very inadequate manner in which dredging was carried on in the Island of Cape Breton. Some years ago one of the dredges assigned to the Maritime Provinces was destroyed or lost at sea, and has not since been replaced. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if it is the intention of the department to have that loss supplied, and the number of dredges available increased. From St. Peter's Bay to Louisbourg, for some 60 or 70 miles, there is an iron bound wild coast, which has not been protected. I urged the claims of the harbour of Fourchu for some attention at the hands of the department. Last year the department was kind enough to send one of the dredges to the harbour of Descousse, and I had great difficulty in keeping it at work long enough to accomplish anything. The inspector did all he could to have the dredge taken away before any work could be done, and only for the kindness of the then Minister of Public Works it would have been taken away before anything of service to the place was accomplished. The harbour of Descousse is one owning some 35 vessels, which aggregating a value of some $200,000, shows the Government the great enterprise of the people of that large and deserving community, and until last year vessels could not enter that harbour except at high tide. This will show the Minister the desirability, if not the absolute necessity, of having the work completed at that portion of the Island of Cape Breton, and I wish particularly to impress my desire upon him to

have this work done. Then there is the Bras d'Or end of the canal. The accumulation of debris there has caused the water to become two feet shallower than in the canal itself. This requires attention. The mouth of the Grand River has been brought by me to the notice of the hon. Minister. Work at this point is necessary in the interests of the fishermen and of the people of that locality. I would like to ask these three questions: First, if it is the intention of the Minister to have a greater number of dredges made available for the Maritime Provinces; secondly, if it is his intention to have the loss of the dredge *George Mackenzie* supplied; and, thirdly, if it is his intention to have some dredging done at the points mentioned on the southern coast of Cape Breton at an early day? The importance of the places I have mentioned cannot be over-estimated, and the necessity of the dredging I ask for now is strongly demanded and ardently desired.

Mr. OUIMET. The department is very anxious to increase the dredging accommodation in the Maritime Provinces; but although we have a Maritime Finance Minister we cannot get all the money we require. In fact, the department has not yet been in a position to obtain the necessary money for all the dredging that the hon. gentleman from the Maritime Provinces require. It is the intention of the department to replace the dredge *George Mackenzie* as soon as the finances of the Government will enable it to do so. As to the dredging of Cape Breton, the dredge *St. Laurence* is going to do the work asked for by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FORBES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if any appropriations are to be made for the purchase of a new dredge for the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. OUIMET. I have said that there is no such intention this year, but that it is the intention as soon as the resources of the Government will permit.

Mr. FORBES. Last year the very same answer was made to me by the Minister of Public Works. He said it would be done as soon as the finances of the country, not the Government, would permit.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman must come to the conclusion that we have not yet reached that period.

Mr. FORBES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, since he has told me that the *St. Laurence* dredge is going to Cape Breton, whether it is not possible that that dredge can at the same time accommodate the people on the south side of the province. There are several localities along there absolutely in need of dredging.

Mr. OUIMET. I understand that that dredge cannot do the work along the south shore of Nova Scotia because she draws too much water.

Mr. FORBES. We have just as deep water as they have on the Island of Cape Breton, and I fail to understand how that explanation will work. A few years ago the dredge which was used for that purpose on the shores of Nova Scotia was lost. The year subsequent to that a large boat was made for dredging in the waters of the lakes in Ontario, and the Minister then said that very shortly afterwards a grant would be asked for to replace the lost dredge to the Maritime Provinces. I would very strenuously urge upon the Minister that it is necessary we should have several of our ports looked after. Fishermen are bitterly complaining that harbours where they could formerly anchor their boats with safety are now gradually filling up.

Dredging, Quebec and Ontario—additional amount required..... $6,300

Mr. BRODEUR. Does the Government intend this year making any further dredging on the Richelieu?

Mr. OUIMET. There is something to be done by the Department of Railways near the entrance of the Chambly Canal, but nothing by my department.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would call the attention of the Government to the fact that some years ago dredging was begun opposite St. Hilaire near a wharf, and the work was left unfinished. It is now impossible for large boats to reach the wharf, and I would ask the Government to complete their work. It would not cost very much, as they could use the dredge which is near the entrance of the Chambly Canal, about 10 or 15 miles distant, and it would be of great advantage to the shipping.

Mr. OUIMET. I will mention the matter to the Minister of Railways, who will no doubt attend to it.

Dredging, B.C.—additional amount required.....$5,000

Mr. GORDON. I would like to enquire of the Minister whether any portion of this sum, or of the $15,000 in the main estimates, is intended for dredging in Nanaimo Harbour?

Mr. OUIMET. I am sorry to say there is not, as we have no dredge that can dredge to the depth necessary there.

Mr. GORDON. I was in hopes the department would engage the dredge belonging to Mr. Rithet, of Victoria, which is capable of dredging to any depth required. The number of large ships which sailed from Nanaimo Harbour last year was 553, and they carried away to foreign countries 640,000 tons of the products of that district. Through want of dredging several ships have grounded, and the rates of insurance are likely to be raised in consequence. Every cent of advance on freight is so much taken out of the pockets of the men who work in the mines, who scatter the money they earn in the maintenance of themselves and families. I hope the Minister will arrange to employ Mr. Rithet's dredge for a portion of the summer at least.

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Rithet is very exacting in his terms, and we have not been able to come to any arrangement.

Mr. GORDON. Where is it intended to expend this?

Mr. OUIMET. In British Columbia generally.

Mr. GORDON. With that broad assurance we may expect some consideration.

Saguenay District—To effect a settlement with William Larouche and Gagné and Rochette, in full of all demands for damages caused to their mills by the breaking away of the Government works on the "Petite Décharge" outlet from Lake St. John.....$1,500

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman explain this?

Mr. OUIMET. This vote is to pay damages to the parties mentioned. These damages were caused by the breaking of booms belonging to the Government, on account of which a quantity of logs were let loose and caused damages to these different parties. We sent an engineer up there who reported that the accident was due to the fault of the officers employed at the boom. We thought it better to make this very reasonable arrangement with the parties, who agreed to accept the amount, rather than have the matter brought up in the Exchequer Court.

Mr. LAURIER. Of course, if the Government caused damage to the mill-owners, it is only fair they should make compensation. Will the hon. gentleman bring down the report of the engineer?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. OUIMET. I must ask you to go back to the Goderich item and add "extension to piers."

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I thank the Government for having voted this money for the town of Goderich and for having kept their promises made at the last election, in consequence of which the present member for West Huron was elected and my friend Mr. Cameron was left at home. Now they feel that they have redeemed the promises they made.

Temporary clerical and other assistance, Department of Public Works..... $36,000

Mr. OUIMET. I have already explained that this amount was intended to pay clerks who were formerly paid in a different manner. Before this year these temporary clerks were paid out of the amounts appropriated on the different works. This was considered by the Auditor General and by the Minister of the department, a better manner to deal with it in regard to book-keeping. It does not increase the amount, but, on the contrary, I have showed that the amount paid in 1890-91 will be reduced this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask if this includes any payment to Mr. J. L. Payne. I find that Mr. Payne was paid by the Department of Agriculture $1,031.12; for extra work for 116½ hours at 50 cents; he was paid travelling expenses to London, 22nd June to 5th July, 1890, $55.50, and 10th to 16th August, $46.25; to Toronto 8th to 18th Sept., $57; to Sherbrooke, 18th and 19th Sept., $18.40; to London, 25th to 28th Sept., $38; to Toronto, 13th to 18th Nov., $11.50; Montreal to Toronto, 14th to 19th Dec., $42.55; London, Toronto and London, 3rd Feb. to 7th March, 1891—this is during the election—$148.90. Then I find also cab-hire at Ottawa, $12.25, and also that he is paid for reporting for a committee, 13,379 folios at 30 cents, $4,013.90, besides 117 sittings of the committee at $5, $585. In all he has drawn during the last year $6,060.17. I think this is undoubtedly an extraordinary amount for one man to draw for services during one year, and I think it is a ridiculous amount for one man to be allowed to draw during one year. I understand this man is the private secretary of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that $6,000 was drawn by Mr. Payne for his own services?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, I have quoted from the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is dealing with the Department of Agriculture and the Minister is not here now.

Monument to the late Sir John A. Macdonald..... $10,000

Mr. LAURIER. How is that to be expended?

Mr. FOSTER. The amount will be expended in the way the vote implies. I think the monument will be something in the style of that which was erected to the late Sir George Cartier.

Mr. LAURIER. While I am very much in favour of preserving the memory of the public men of Canada by monuments and works of that kind, I believe it would be better to leave that for private initiative instead of to pay for it out of the public treasury. However, if this principle is admitted, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that we have lately lost a statesman of as high a rank as the late Sir John Macdonald, and that, if the hon. gentleman wants to be generous and patriotic, he should remember those statesmen on one side of politics as well as those on the other.

Mr. FOSTER. I agree with the hon. gentleman's estimate of the late leader of the Opposition, and of the Government from 1873 to 1878. The Government have given some consideration to that matter and we will give more consideration to it, but we have not felt justified in bringing any further proposition before the House at the present time.

Mr. LAURIER. Will this cover the total amount required?

Mr. FOSTER. It is expected that it will.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think it is right that the whole country should be asked to pay for a monument to the deceased leader of half the people of this Dominion, and I am sure that the other half are of the opinion that it was to their misfortune that he should have governed the country so long. While I have no objection that a certain portion of the people should contribute to the erection of this monument, I do not think that the other half should be compelled to contribute towards it. As to the late Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, his followers are willing to contribute to the erection of a monument to him out of their own pockets. Now, I believe that the admirers of any public man in this country are quite at liberty, if they choose, to contribute their money to the erection of a monument to his memory; but I do not think it is right that you should, by numerical force, compel the Reformers of this country, who are not disposed to recognize the long reign of Sir John A. Macdonald as having been a blessing to this country, to contribute their money to the erection of his monument.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not rise to answer the rather ungenerous allusion the hon. gentleman has made with reference to the late Sir John A. Macdonald. But there may be gentlemen just as conscientious as some Reformers, who may believe that the rule and reign of the late Mr. Mackenzie was not for the benefit of this country; but I should hope there is no Conservative from one end of this country to the other, who would be ungenerous enough to say of him after his death what the hon. gentleman has said of Sir John Macdonald. With reference to the vote that was taken for Mr. Payne's services, that sum represents the cheques that were given to

Mr. Payne for distribution amongst the stenographic reporters who took part in reporting the investigation before the Privileges and Elections Committee—Mr. Taylor, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Cook, Mr. Dickson, Mr. Payne and Mr. Marceau, himself being one.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the explanation given by the Minister of Finance is correct, the accounts of the department are kept in an imprudent way. These cheques should go before the Public Accounts Committee and be audited by the Auditor General.

Mr. FOSTER. Undoubtedly they did go before the committee, and undoubtedly they were audited by the Auditor General; but my hon. friend had better be sure and see where to distribute the blame. It may be a mistake in the Audit Office.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the accounts that were sent in by Mr. Payne were paid to any other parties, undoubtedly the Auditor General would take notice of it. Now, I have made a statement to the committee, and am prepared to stand by it. The pages of the Auditor General's Report clearly show that this money was paid to Mr. Payne, and if Mr. Payne paid it out to other people he should have furnished vouchers to the Auditor General, and if the Auditor General audited the accounts it would undoubtedly appear in his report. There is no such account, and the attempt to evade the charge I made in the statement I presented to the House, by saying that he paid the money out to other people, has not been successful.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman persists in representing to the country that the statement I have made is not true, and that the $6,000 was given to Mr. Payne for his own services. If he chooses to do that I cannot quarrel with him.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It would be well to put on record what sums are given to each one.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not got that here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think Mr. Payne employed the parties who assisted him in taking evidence before the Committee on Privileges and Elections last year, and in all probability a considerable proportion of that money that was paid to Mr. Payne for reporting, was paid over by him to those men who assisted him. What amount was paid to Mr. Payne, and what amount went to other parties, of course does not appear. I think, however, that Mr. Cook's name is one of the other reporters whose name appears in the Auditor General's Report, not for a portion of the money that Mr. Payne received, but for a sum paid to himself, and I think the sum paid to Mr. Payne does not represent the whole amount paid for reporting. What the whole amount is, I cannot at this moment say. It would have been more satisfactory, both for Mr. Payne and for each of the other parties, if each party had drawn a cheque for his own amount, and then there would have been no misapprehension in the minds of the members. But I understand some time ago that this large amount charged to Mr. Payne was not all received by him for himself, but was distributed amongst the other reporters.

Mr. FOSTER. The memorandum I have says it was distributed equally amongst the six reporters.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask if this Mr. Payne is the same gentleman who writes for the London *Free Press* and edits that paper?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will have to refer to better sources of information than myself.

To pay Macdonald Brothers for their services in saving the boiler and engine of the Dominion steamer *Napoleon III.* wrecked at Little Glace Bay, Cape Breton, N.S., November, 1890. . $4,000

Mr. FORBES. Was that done under contract?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say how it was done, but I will find out and let the hon. gentleman know.

Expenses in connection with Behring Sea matters..... $60,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is a vote towards meeting the expenses incurred in the Behring Sea matters andfor the commission. The commissioners are appointed by the Governments of Great Britain and the United States, and large expenses are involved of which Canada has to bear a certain share.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What share will we bear?

Mr. FOSTER. We are in communication now with the British Government, and have not settled exactly how the expense will be apportioned.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This amount will be subject to final decision?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it will take all this, and probaby more, as our share.

To provide for the payment of the first of twelve years' arrears of annuity to Montreal Lake and Lac la Rouge bands..... $900

Mr. DEWDNEY. When this treaty was made with the Indians of Montreal Lake some three years ago, it was not decided whether they would be entitled to arrears of annuities between the date of Treaty 6, which was made some nine years previous, and that treaty. It has since been decided by the department that they are entitled to these arrears. Our practice has been not to pay the whole arrears at one time, but to spread the payments over a number of years.

To provide for payment to wives of instructors for services in teaching Indian women the domestic arts..... $700

Mr. DEWDNEY. Last year there was an item of $1,900 in the Estimates for this purpose. On enquiry I came to the conclusion that a number of the women instructors were doing nothing towards assisting the Indians, and the item was struck out of the Estimates. On considering the subject further, I learned that 5 or 6 of them have given great attention to teaching Indian women cooking, knitting and so forth, and so I propose to retain 5 altogether.

Hospital on the Blood Reserve..... $2,500

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is a new departure, and it has been entered upon at the earnest request of Father Lacombe, who has impressed its advisability on the department during the last two or three years. He is of the opinion, as I am, that

in many cases it is impossible to successfully treat sick Indians in their houses or tents, and that many lives are lost in consequence. The father's idea is, if this hospital is established, to take personal supervision of it, to put some of his people in charge of it, the Government supplying the medicine, and not only to take sick Indians into the hospital but to train Indian women to nurse them.

Expenses *re* enquiry made by Justice Kingsmill into Dr. Spohn's charges in connection with supplies for steamer *Bayfield*..... $250

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has there been a report of this enquiry made?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; and the charges were not sustained.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the report been printed?

Mr. FOSTER. No. The charges were not sustained, except with respect to the steward in one or two very slight cases. The whole tenor of the evidence showed that these irregularities were not wilfully committed, but the steward thought they were part of his perquisites. He has, however, paid back all the money—it was not a large amount—and been dismissed from the service.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Can the report be brought down before Concurrence?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there is any objection to bring it down.

Expenses of litigation, Bulmer *vs.* the Queen..... $1,500

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is this case?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In 1883 and 1884 the authority of Council was obtained to issue licenses to Mr. Henry Bulmer and seven other persons to cut timber on ten berths in what was known as the disputed territory, and these persons subsequently assigned to Mr. Bulmer. Licenses were issued for the year 1884 to cut timber on three of the berths. Licenses for the year 1885 were issued to cut timber on the three berths in question and also on three other berths, but no licenses were issued for the four remaining berths. No licenses to cut timber on any of these berths were issued for 1886, the Minister of the Interior having decided not to renew any licenses pending the settlement of the question as to the Indian title to the lands in the disputed territory. Mr. Bulmer has filed with the Department of the Interior a claim for $200,000 damages, or in the event of his not being able to recover damages, for payment of $65,575, which amount he alleges he expended in surveys, erection of sawmill, &c., and in payment of bonuses and rent in connection with the said berths. The claim was submitted to the Minister of Justice, who advised that it be referred to the Exchequer Court for adjudication. This has been done, and the estimate of $1,500 now submitted is to cover the litigation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is not for the purpose of meeting the payment of Mr. Bulmer but simply for the purpose of the expenses of litigation?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

To refund amount received from sundry persons by the Department of the Interior as bonus and rents for licenses to cut timber on, and for their actual outlay for surveys (under instructions from the Department of the Interior) of certain timber berths in the late disputed territories, as after the award of Boundary Commission, no timber has been cut..... $34,225.53

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This requires some explanation.

Mr. DEWDNEY. On the 9th January, 1883, an Order in Council was passed acquiescing in the action of the Government of Ontario in abrogating the conventional arrangement between that Government and the Dominion Government with respect to the lands in the disputed territories which was ratified by Order in Council of the 8th of July, 1884. The Minister of the Interior was authorized to issue licenses to cut timber on certain berths in the disputed territories to the persons mentioned in the annexed schedule and these persons filed the returns of the survey of their berths in the Department of the Interior. These surveys were made under instructions from the Department of the Interior, but the cost thereof was defrayed by the persons whose names are mentioned in the schedule. The information derived from these surveys has been of great service to the Department of the Interior in the preparation of plans of the country in which the berths are situated and the returns thereof are still in the possession of the Department of the Interior. The persons mentioned in the schedule have not cut any timber upon the berths accorded to them and were unable pending the decision of the courts as to the ownership of the territory in which the berths were situated, to carry out the provisions of the regulations. It is considered right and equitable that they should be recompensed for their actual outlay in making these surveys, provided the items of outlay can be substituted by such vouchers and evidence as the Surveyor General usually requires in respect of similar surveys executed under his instructions, and it is for this purpose that the vote of $15,372.77 is asked.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Can you give us the names of these parties?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; they are the following: John Macdonald, L. Oliver, Hugh Macdonald, Thomas Shortiss, C. J. Campbell, C. C. Small, W. B. Scarth, H. L. St. George, F. Arnoldi, J. S. Aikins, David Blain, F. C. Campbell, H. O'Brien, L. R. O'Brien, John Gunty, A. Moffatt, Smith & Muir, R. Longtin, E. Lecourt, F. J. Bulmer, R. T. Sutton, James McKnight, H. Bulmer, jun., T. G. Blackstock, N. J. Paterson, John Bain, Bain & Paterson, Ilover, Isbester & Gibbons, Wm. Mc Carthy, St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company, Thomas Birkett, D. E. Sprague, J. B. Sprague, E. W. Nesbitt, H. Bulmer, jun., A. C. Williamson Thomas Marks, John Ross, J. D. Foreman, Frank Thompson, H. M. Stanton, J. J. Foster, McArthur, Boyle & Campbell, P. McRae, N. Treateau, F. F. Bulmer, A. J. Parsons, Jos. McCoy, A. J. Lefaivre, Nicol Kingsmill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is the claim of the St. Catharines Milling Company settled?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What was the amount?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I don't think they got anything at all.

Proportion of Expenditure — International Customs Bureau, Brussels..... $600

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is this?

Mr. FOSTER. This is the International Bureau which, as the result of a conference, has been established at Brussels. The object is to collate all the tariffs of the countries that belong to the union, and to furnish them to each country. This is done under the auspices of the King of the Belgians. Every change made in the tariff is reported and furnished to each nation in its own language.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does it include many countries?

Mr. FOSTER. It includes all of the principal countries now.

Amount required to meet expenses of the North-West Mounted Police Commission..... $3,300

Mr. LAURIER. Has this commission reported yet?

Mr. FOSTER. The evidence has been taken, but the report is not in yet.

To provide for expense of survey of bed of Straits between Capes Tormentine and Traverse..... $12,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is that the commencement of the tunnel?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say that it is the commencement of the tunnel, but it is in order to carry out the work which the Government promised should go on until it was proved what the condition of the bottom of the straits was, and whether the strata were such that a tunnel would be feasible. In order to find that out, it is necessary for borings to be made at certain intervals in the bed of the channel, and about 30 borings will be made to various depths from 60 to 200 or 300 feet. A record of these borings is to be taken and kept. This vote will overtake that work, and the information will furnish any parties, who may wish to pursue the matter further, with all the data necessary in order to decide as to the feasibility of a tunnel and as to its probable cost. In providing the money necessary to make that preliminary investigation, the Government does not pledge itself at all in any way to the building of the tunnel. I may say also, in connection with this, that the Government is making some investigations with reference to another passage over these straits, that is, from Richibucto or near thereon the main land to Point Wolfe on the Prince Edward Island side. It has been contended, and is contended, that there is a portion of the straits there which is open nearly every day in the year, year in and year out. This is vouched for by old residents in the vicinity, notably by some priests who have been there for a number of years; and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has for the last two or three years had observations taken by his officers, lighthouse keepers and others in the vicinity, every day in the year as to the state of the ice, the winds, the currents and the like. These observations will be carried on for another year, and in this way some reliable data will be gained as to the open stretches there. There is a company which has in mind, if the thing is feasible, to carry the railway, by the addition of a few miles, to the straits, and to build staunch ice vessels to carry the trains across every day in the year, which they think can be done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the distance?

Mr. FOSTER. I think about 13 miles; I am not quite sure. Then a short spur will provide a connection on the other side with the Island railway. Both of these preliminary investigations are being carried on by the Government, and the results will be given to the House next session.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose the hon. gentleman would have no objection to leaving it to the representatives from the Island to say whether this money should be devoted to this experimental investigation, or whether it should be applied to the improvement of the breakwaters and the harbours of the Island. I think it would be of more service to the public if it were applied in the latter way, and I should be quite ready to vote that it should be so applied if the members from the Island should prefer that application of the money.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I might leave it to the members from the Island, for I am certain, from the heat of the discussions which we had on the subject, that the members from the Island would not agree with my hon. friend. They have urged the matter very strongly upon the Government, and they have had a lurking suspicion that the Government did not intend to carry out its promises in regard to making these investigations; and it is to lull that suspicion that this vote is taken. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman will get himself into hot water for making that suggestion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would submit whether the members from the Island would prefer to have the money expended on the bed of the straits or on the breakwaters, because the Minister says he will abide by their decision. They have the opportunity of saying which they prefer.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Minister think the members for the Island would be willing to take both?

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps they might.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

RIVER SYDENHAM FLOODS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I call the attention of the Government to the serious damage private parties have sustained and to the considerable distress a large number will be in for some time owing to the losses occasioned by the floods on the Lower Sydenham. I take this occasion to bring the matter before the House as the session must soon come to a close. There is in that district a very considerable tract of land, some thousands of acres, which is frequently scarcely above water. That land has been dyked and ditched, steam pumps have been used for the purpose of draining it, and it has been cultivated during the four or five years since the embankment was made with a considerable degree of success. I have a letter written by one of the parties who says: "The drainage works here have worked admirably, even better than the artificial drainage, and notwithstanding the wet season, has kept our land within the embankment in really better con-

dition than the lands in the surrounding district, and the whole area was under crop." He further says that the rising in the water inundated the embankments and destroyed them, and that the whole 5,000 acres are, to the depth of two feet, under water. The season being warm, the crops were totally destroyed. There was a large portion of the land covered by a magnificent wheat crop which is completely destroyed, and the writer says nothing can be more sickening to the proprietors than to see, since the pumps have removed the water from the surface, the absolute desolation which exists over this entire area. He cannot say how many families occupied those lands, but there must be a considerable number, and the writer asks me to bring this matter to the attention of the Government. He says: "I have given you a true statement of the facts, and some of the proprietors are so much disheartened that they speak of abandoning the district;" and he asks me to mention the matter to the Minister. I do so. This is perhaps of all seasons of the year the one in which the greatest injury can be done the farmer. I know the district well. The harvest there is within a week or ten days of being ripe, and all this wheat, barley and oats harvest and the hay ready for cutting is absolutely destroyed. The writer speaks of the stock of the farmers having to be driven away in order to prevent their starving or drowning, so that these people are left with nothing. They do not differ very much from a population who would be entirely burned out, and we have sometimes come to the rescue of parties who have had all their property destroyed by fire. I think that was done in this district. It was done in the city of St. John at the time of the very serious fire that occurred there. I understand from the Minister that the last appropriation has been made for the season, but I thought that this would be a fair subject for warranting the Government in giving some moderate gratuity to these parties who have so seriously suffered. I have no doubt that the county will consider the matter, but I apprehend that there is perhaps more involved than they would care to deal with.

Mr. FOSTER. The story that the hon. gentleman has told of the suffering and loss that has come in that district is certainly one to evoke sympathy from members on both sides of the House. It is a question how far the Federal Government can alleviate local losses incurred in this way. It is true that, in the St. John fire, action was taken, but that was a tremendous calamity. There have been great losses incurred in the Eastern Townships by the recent cyclone, and I can only say that the Government will take this into consideration, but it will be well for the parties to apply to the Local Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No doubt that will be done. I have only received the information to-day, and I purpose to make further enquiry and communicate the results to the Government.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it the intention of the Government to submit any further estimates?

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid I cannot answer that, but I can promise the hon. gentleman that there will be nothing further for the Brantford drill hall.

SCHOOL SAVINGS BANK BILL

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland) moved:

That owing to the advanced period of the session, Bill (No. 36) to amend the Act to incorporate the School Savings' Bank be placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration in Committee of the Whole immediately after routine proceedings on Saturday next.

Motion agreed to.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Several days ago we were promised that a communication would be made to the House in regard to the late negotiations at Washington. I suppose that that communication will be made at an early day.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I can promise it on Monday.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 2nd July, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the House, on Monday next, resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:—

To the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding, with the amount already paid, $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $114,125.

To the St. Catharines and Central Railway Company, for 14 miles of their railway, from the end of the 20 miles subsidized by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, to Hamilton, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $44,800.

2. *Resolved*, That the subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose shall be granted to such companies respectively; all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council; and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, and which the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location, also, of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and all the said subsidies respectively shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister, or upon the completion of the work subsidized.

3. *Resolved*, That the granting of such subsidies respectively shall be subject to such conditions for securing such running powers or traffic arrangements and other rights as will afford all reasonable facilities and equal

mileage rates to all railways connecting with those so subsidized, as the Governor in Council determines.

4. *Resolved*, That notwithstanding the expiration of the time limited by the Act 47 Victoria, chapter 8, and by the contract entered into with the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, the Governor in Council may pay the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the said Act to the said company, according as it becomes due and payable in accordance with the said contract and subject to the terms and conditions applicable to the Act.

5. *Resolved*, That notwithstanding the expiration of the time limited by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, and by the contract entered into with the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, the Governor in Council may pay the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the said Act to the said company, according as it becomes due and payable in accordance with the said contract, and subject to the terms and conditions applicable to the said subsidy under the terms of the said Act.

Mr. LAURIER. I think that the House will be hardly in a position to take up these resolutions on Monday. We have not yet had laid on the Table of the House any correspondence with reference to them, and certainly we shall not engage in a discussion of them unless we have the correspondence some time beforehand.

Mr. HAGGART. I am trying very hard to get all the correspondence down this evening. Of course, if it is not down in time for Monday, we will not take the resolutions up on Monday.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To meet cost of litigated matters..... $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. This item was held over for explanations. I gave the explanations on the vote in the Supplementary Estimates which was taken to supplement this sum. Both votes will be necessary for the cases we are carrying on.

Committee rose and reported resolution.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply:

Immigration Agent,	Ottawa.....	$1,300 00
do	Kingston.....	1,300 00
do	Toronto.....	1,650 00
do	Hamilton.....	1,250 00
do	London.....	1,000 00
do	Winnipeg.....	1,400 00
Assistant Agent,	Winnipeg	1,000 00
Immigration Agent,	Brandon	1,400 00
do	Calgary.....	1,200 00
do	Port Arthur....	1,000 00
do	Victoria	1,200 00
do	Vancouver.....	1,200 00

Mr. FOSTER moved that the above items be disagreed to. It was the policy of the Government to do away with the useless Canadian agencies.

Motion agreed to.

Edmonton Crown lands and timber agent's office..... $10,000

Mr. LAURIER. I would again call the attention of the Minister to the land office at Edmonton. I put a question some time ago to the Government as to whether it was their intention to remove the

office to the south side of the Saskatchewan River? I was glad to hear from the hon. gentleman at that time that there was no such intention on the part of the Government, but there must be a misapprehension there, or the hon. gentleman's agents have not rightly understood the intention of the Government, because I find that the local agent has published the following advertisement:—

"NOTICE.—The timber and land office has been removed over to South Edmonton, immediately opposite the depot built for the immigration.

"THOS. ANDERSON,
"*D.L.A. & C.T.A.*"

Has this order been cancelled?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; he had no authority whatever to do that. The intention was to remove temporarily to the south side and not to close the office on the north side. I was surprised to hear that this notice had been issued, and the interpretation the agent has put upon his instructions is wrong.

Mr. LAURIER. I have received numerous complaints about this, but I suppose the answer will go that there is no intention of making any change?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is no intention of making any change.

Major's Hill Park, Ottawa..... $4,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the expenses connected with Major's Hill Park? It seems to me to be almost set aside for the benefit of the citizens of Ottawa who monopolize not only that park but the walks and seats around the Parliament buildings and the walk below. If they are to enjoy the advantages of that park, the city should be prepared to contribute to the cost. It has cost the country a great deal of money, and if it is a compliment to the city of Ottawa, we should know it. I think it is unfair that the country should be asked to contribute $4,000 or $5,000 a year to keep up Major's Hill Park in its present condition. It is a lovely spot, but it is almost entirely devoted to the pleasure of citizens of Ottawa. I would like to know if it is the intention of the Government to continue to support the park at the Dominion expense?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say to my hon. friend that there are mutual considerations in respect to these grounds and to certain streets in Ottawa which the Government have to take into account and upon which they have been proceeding for a number of years, and it is the intention of the Government to take care of Major's Hill Park until some other arrangements are made. It will be done with the utmost economy. It will be seen that the vote has been appreciably lessened from what it was three or four years ago. Nothing will have to be done except simply to take care of the grounds and keep them in order. It is true, they are for the use of the city of Ottawa to a certain extent, but the same may be said of these grounds. If my hon. friend wishes, he can take a constitutional over there every morning and enjoy the beauties of the park.

Mr. LANDERKIN. While the Government are beautifying the public buildings and preserving this park, right across the principal street in Ottawa,

on the Ordnance land that belongs to the Government, they allow a space to be crowded with wood, slabs and all that sort of thing. Why should we repair the park on the other side and let this unsightly yard remain right in the centre of the city? I think it is about time that it should be renovated and made to look as it should look in the centre of the city of Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. At the request of my hon. friend, supported, I suppose, by his colleagues on that side of the House, I will bring this matter before the attention of my colleagues. As it will involve some expense, to which the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is much averse, I am afraid he will have to have a private conference with the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to see whether it would be wise to support that expenditure.

Mr. LAURIER. We have discussed this item year after year, and I have never yet heard a good reason why the Government should continue the maintenance of this park. There is every reason why it should be given over to the care of the municipal authorities of the city of Ottawa, like every other park in other cities in the Dominion. It seems a misappropriation of public money to apply it in this way. I hope that the hon. gentleman's intention of making an arrangement with the municipal authorities will be carried into effect, otherwise we shall take strong exception to this vote in the future.

For three lines of steamers between Halifax and St. John, N.B., or either, and the West Indies and South America..... $103,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to know if the Minister of Finance has thought over the remarks offered by hon. members on this side of the House with respect to this line of steamers to the West Indies, and whether the hon. gentleman proposes to continue the expenditure in face of the prospective limited trade with those islands? This appears to be a proposal to throw away $103,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I have tried to think over the remarks that were made, but this is a matter of contract as well as a matter of policy. There is no prospect of dropping the vote during the continuation of the contract, and I hope not after that time.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not propose that we should dispute the voting of the money this year, as we are bound by contract, but it is well to discuss this matter often so as to impress upon the hon. gentleman that all the reasons on which he demanded this money a few years ago have not been realized. The views he enunciated and the expectations he held out led to the belief that we would be able to build up a large trade with the West Indies. The hon. gentleman has shown that there has been an increase in the imports to the West Indies, but he has not been able to show that there has been a return trade from the West Indies to Canada. Unless this trade is developed much more in the future than in the past, I think this contract will have to be dropped.

Mr. FOSTER. When the contract period runs out, of course it will be for the House to consider whether it will continue the same policy. I understand the hon. gentleman does not intend to challenge the vote now?

Mr. LAURIER. No, because it is now under contract; but I desire the hon. gentleman to understand that it will be challenged whenever the occasion arises.

Mr. FOSTER. In the meantime I must enter a gentle protest against the statement that the trade has not increased. It has increased largely. The import trade is not very large and was not expected to be, but one item alone, within the past three months, 12,000 barrels of flour, have been shipped from Canada to the West Indies.

To meet cost of arbitration respecting the Accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec..... $10,000

Mr. LAURIER. Can the hon. Minister of Finance inform the House how these accounts stand now?

Mr. FOSTER. Without going into the earlier history of the matter, I may say that after repeated conferences between the Dominion Government and the representatives of the two Provincial Governments, most of the items have been agreed to. But there are certain items on which we do not agree, and there is also a question in dispute as to the rate of interest. These we have agreed to refer to arbitration, and this vote is to pay the expenses of that arbitration. In the last two years legislation has been had by both Provincial Governments with reference to the arbitrators; Ontario has, I think, appointed hers, but up to a late date the Quebec Government had not made any move in the matter. I think, however, that they will immediately do so, when the arbitration will proceed, and the whole matter will be adjusted.

On account of expenses in connection with the Survey of Georgian Bay..... $18,000

Mr. O'BRIEN. Before this resolution is adopted, I would like to ask the Government seriously to consider before they make any change in the conduct of that survey. I understand it is in contemplation not to employ any further on that survey the gentleman who has hitherto directed it, Capt, Boulton, R.N. His survey has been most satisfactory and has been most economically conducted, and has given the greatest possible satisfaction to all interested in the navigation and geography of the lakes. It has the sanction and stamp of the Admiralty, and to make a change now, before the work is completed, will degrade the character of the work. Therefore, the work should be completed as begun. No one has found the slightest fault with it so far, but, on the contrary, it has gained the approval of all; and I trust the Government will make no change in the hydrographic survey until that particular piece of work is completed. It is reasonable to establish a hydrographic board of service of our own, but to make a change before Capt. Boulton's survey is completed, no matter how well qualified his assistants may be, would be a great misfortune.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know what the intentions of the Minister of Marine are with reference to this matter, but my hon. friend may rest assured that nothing will be done which will militate at all against the efficiency of the survey.

Post Office Mail Service..... $2,046,846

Mr. HUGHES. I take this opportunity of drawing attention to the fact that members of this House

have been franking the private correspondence and private business cards of a gentleman who is not a member of this House. These cards and circulars have been extensively circulated throughout North Victoria. They are the business cards and private circulars of Mr. John A. Barron. I have letters here bearing the frank of Mr. J. Sutherland, a member of this House, and Mr. Bowers, also a member of this House, who have violated their franking privilege and defrauded the revenue of some money in this matter.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman were to be consistent, he would move to abolish the franking system. I do not think it is fair for him to select one or two members in particular, because I am afraid there are few not open to the charge the hon. gentleman has made.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will the hon. gentleman mention the names again ?

Mr. HUGHES. I can mention more names, but those I have already mentioned are the names of Mr. Sutherland and Mr. Bowers.

Mr. FORBES. Did the hon. gentleman notify Mr. Sutherland that he intended to make this statement ?

Mr. HUGHES. He has not been here.

Mr. FORBES. He has been absent some days, and I presume, if present, could give proper explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. Since this question has come up, I would like to call the attention of members to the fact that a rather wide interpretation of the franking system seems to prevail. I have had one or two circulars and business cards brought to my attention, which are circulated through the country under frank, and bear the names of persons belonging to the House, but who have had them circulated under the franking privilege and thus avoided postage. There is no reason why the whole country should not have its correspondence franked as well as these persons. It is defrauding the revenue to a large extent, although it may not be looked upon in that light by those who thoughtlessly do it. It is an abuse of the franking privilege, and I hope it will not occur again.

Mr. LAURIER. It is hardly fair for the hon. gentleman to select one or two members as having abused their franking privilege, without having given them notice, more especially as it is within the knowledge of everybody that almost every one does this. The proper reform to make would be to abolish the franking system altogether.

Mr. BOWERS. An hon. member of this House has handed me on two or three occasions a number of envelopes and asked me to put my initials on them, which I did without asking him what they were.

Mr. FRASER. I agree with what the leader of the Opposition has said, that none of us can cast a stone against the other, and I do not know that the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) has been so pure himself in this matter. I can understand that, when a friend comes to a member, he thinks it is a small matter, but still this does strike an important question. I do not believe in the franking privilege at all. It is all wrong. There are members in the House who do much more writing than others, and, if you state a certain sum to be given instead of the franking privilege, perhaps one would make more than another. If the Government would ascertain what a member's correspondence is and would pay him the sum, that would be a fair way of dealing with it. Suppose an extra clerk were to count the number of letters of all the members, and divide it by the number of members, you might get at it. This is a bad system. It is a temptation to every member to frank a letter when he ought not. However, it is so widespread that we cannot afford to strike at one man more than another. In the Local Legislatures, they have not the power to send the letters free, but the Government give each member his stationery and a sum in lieu of postage. I think the Government should do the same thing here. I would recommend that before next session, the Government should enquire into that matter and find out what would pay each member to buy his own stamps.

Mr. HUGHES. This is not a solitary instance, but these letters have been franked to every elector in North Victoria. As to the statement of the last speaker (Mr. Fraser) that I have not been purer than any other member in this matter, I assert that I have never abused the franking privilege, and I have never travelled on a railway pass after the period for that pass has expired.

Mr. FRASER. Neither did I. I had the pass in my pocket and it was not called in by the Government. If the hon. gentleman thinks it is wrong to use a pass which is granted for a year and is not called in by the Government, I tell him I will do it every time. If he brings a criterion to his moral conduct that he cannot apply,——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FRASER—I only desire to ask how we can prove whether the hon. gentleman has done it or not ?

Department of the Interior—salary of a Chief Clerk $2,800

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would ask the Minister of the Interior if any steps have been taken to reorganize the department as promised to the House ? When the item was up for discussion in the early part of the session, we were told the department would be reorganized, and so far we have had no information on that point. Has the deputy been reinstated, or is it the intention of the Government to reinstate him or to appoint another ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not recollect having stated to reorganize the department.

Mr. LAURIER. What about Mr. Burgess ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We had that matter up a day or two ago, when I said I did not propose to make any recommendation to Council until after the session.

Mr. LAURIER. Then what is the reason for this item ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is for the purpose of paying Mr. Burgess the salary of a chief clerk.

Mr. LAURIER. These reasons are not satisfactory. Mr. Burgess was suspended almost a year ago for a grave dereliction of duty, but, though twelve months have elapsed, the hon. gentleman is not prepared to state what is to be done. If he would say that Mr. Burgess is to be

the deputy head, the creation of this office would not be necessary, and, as the hon. gentleman has not been able to state what he is going to do, I beg to move that all the words after "That" be left out, and the following substituted:—

This House refuses to concur in this item until the Government informs the House of the reasons which in its opinion necessitate the appointment of a chief clerk in the Department of the Interior.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Leduc,
Beith,	Lister,
Bowers,	Lowell,
Bowman,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brodeur,	McMillan (Huron),
Campbell,	McMullen,
Casey,	Mignault,
Christie,	Mills (Bothwell),
Fauvel,	Paterson (Brant),
Fraser,	Perry,
Geoffrion,	Proulx,
Gibson,	Rinfret,
Godbout,	Rowand,
Grieve,	Sanborn,
Guay,	Somerville,
Landerkin,	Vaillancourt,
Laurier,	Yeo.—34.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bain (Soulanges),	Lippé,
Bowell,	Macdonald (King's),
Boyle,	McAlister,
Cameron,	McDougald (Pictou),
Carling,	McLeod,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Masson,
Chapleau,	Mills (Annapolis),
Cockburn,	Monerieff,
Costigan,	O'Brien,
Curran,	Ouimet,
Davin,	Patterson (Colchester),
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Pridham,
Dewdney,	Roome,
Dickey,	Rosamond,
Dupont,	Ross (Lisgar),
Earle,	Skinner,
Fairbairn,	Temple,
Foster,	Turcotte,
Gillies,	Wallace,
Haggart,	Weldon,
Henderson,	White (Cardwell),
Hughes,	Wilson.—47.
Kenny,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Fréchette,	Mr. Lavergne,
Sir John Thompson,	Mr. Forbes,
Mr. Corbould,	Mr. Davies,
Mr. Taylor,	Mr. Sutherland,
Mr. Macdonald (Winnipeg).	Mr. Choquette.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) and the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Forbes) have not voted.

Mr. FORBES. I paired with Sir John Thompson.

Mr. DEVLIN. I paired with the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin).

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has not voted.

Mr. TAYLOR. I paired with the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland).

Motion negatived, and resolution concurred in.

THE SPANISH TREATY.

Mr. FOSTER. Before you leave the Chair, I wish to make an announcement with reference to the Spanish Treaty, and at the earliest opportunity in order that the country may have the information. I am able to announce that pending the negotiations we get the benefit of the minimum tariff in Spain, which puts us upon equal terms in the matter of fish and lumber, with Norway and other competitors, and we get the minimum tariff also in the West Indies.

Mr. FORBES. Will the Minister tell us whether the tariff on lumber and fish accorded to us by the Spanish West Indies, is higher than that on exports of the same kind from the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. I just stated that we get the minimum tariff.

Mr. FORBES. The Minister mentioned Norway.

Mr. FOSTER. I stated that we get the minimum tariff in Spain with reference to fish and lumber, and that puts us on the same terms as other competitors: also, the minimum tariff with the Spanish West Indies.

[At one o'clock the Committee adjourned, and at three o'clock resumed.]

World's Columbian Exhibition in Chicago..... $100,000

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the adoption of this item, I wish to ask the Government if it is their intention to appoint a French-Canadian to represent Canada at the Chicago exhibition? From the statements made the other day by the Minister of Agriculture, I understood that Mr. Saunders has been appointed chief commissioner for Canada, but the hon. Minister said also that other persons would be appointed to assist him. I believe that it would be but an act of justice for the Government to appoint a French-Canadian as deputy commissioner. It was astonishing enough for the Government of the Province of Quebec to appoint an Englishman to represent French Canada. I hope that the Dominion Government at least will do their duty in this connection, and will appoint some of my countrymen to represent us there. We have now more than a million French-Canadians in the United States, and I think they must expect that on an occasion like this they will find some one of their nationality representing Canada in Chicago. In my opinion, it would be an ignominy if the deputy commissioner was not selected among the French-Canadians. I dare say that it will be enough to call the attention of the Government to this matter, and that they will accede to the wishes of my countrymen.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister who has charge of this vote is not at present in his seat, but I will bring to his attention the remarks which have been made by the hon. gentleman. I understand that no person has been appointed as yet besides Prof. Saunders, who will be the chief director. Whatever other appointments may be necessary hereafter—I dare say there will be some—will be carefully considered by the Government in the light of the remarks my hon. friend has made.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to make an explanation with reference to the remarks I made about a large sum of money which was drawn last session by a certain Mr. Payne for shorthand reporting. I have received an explanation of that matter, and I understand that he acted as chief of the staff who took charge of the reporting of the proceedings before the Public Accounts Committee and before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that the money he received was divided among those who were associated with him in the discharge of that duty. I am quite willing to make the matter right so far as Mr. Payne is concerned. What I specially drew the attention of the committee to was that Mr. Payne had received money otherwise, as to which I think a full explanation has not been given. But I am quite willing to make the explanation that he acted as chief of the staff of reporters.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear. That has always been the custom.

Train Ferry between Mulgrave and Point Tupper $21,700

Mr. FRASER. Do the Government intend to have a larger boat on that service?

Mr. FOSTER. This vote I understand is for that purpose.

Mr. HAGGART. It is to carry out the arrangement made by the department for a ferry. It is at present in contemplation to have a vessel which will carry a train and be towed over by another vessel.

Oxford and New Glasgow Railway—Construction $5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. When this item was before the committee, I asked what amount was paid for the construction of this railway. The hon. Minister could not give me the information then, but he said he would give it on Concurrence.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not say I would give it on Concurrence. I told the hon. gentleman that he would find it in the Railway Report. The statement there includes all the cost except a few thousand dollars.

Trent Valley Canal—Towards building and maintaining a swing bridge at Fenelon Falls $10,000

Mr. HUGHES. I would like again to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that this sum is considered too small for any purpose, either for constructing a swing bridge or for diverting the route. When the matter was before the committee the other day I intended to have it explained, but the item was passed over so rapidly that it could not be done. Now, this bridge crosses the river between Cameron Lake and Sturgeon Lake, above Fenelon Falls proper. There are several spans in the bridge, and it is built just where the current becomes rapid, after leaving the lake. The falls are below the bridge about a quarter of a mile. It is maintained on the one hand by the railway company, that they are not called on to place this swing bridge in position, and as a consequence, ever since the completion of these canal works at Fenelon Falls, they have been completely useless, owing to the existence of this bridge over the stream above the falls, thus preventing vessels going from Cameron Lake to Sturgeon Lake, or *vice versa*. The railway company contend that it is the duty of the Government to make a swing bridge, inasmuch as the bridge was there before the canal was constructed. On the other hand, the Government, I understand, maintain that they can oblige the Grand Trunk Railway Company to place a swing bridge there, inasmuch as the stream below the bridge and down to the falls was navigable before the bridge was constructed. At all events, the discussion has been going on and nothing has been done, and the people of the locality who wish to obtain the advantage of this canal in order to get their freight and products to market on favourable conditions have been debarred from the use of that canal. Now, I think a good solution of the difficulty would be to take the money that is to be spent in law—the lawyers get enough of this kind of business without our throwing any more in their way—and spend it in completing the work. Let the Government and the railway company come to terms, and let the work be completed. I see here the item of $3,000, and an additional item of $1,000, for a simple waggon bridge across a feeder in the Welland Canal. I am satisfied, from the information obtained from the Grand Trunk engineers and other engineers who are acquainted with these matters, that $10,000 will not complete the work proposed, and the effect will be that the work will stand over for another year, and the people of that locality will be debarred from having the advantage of communication through that canal. I would suggest that this matter be considered again, and that, as $10,000 is not enough, some assurance shall be given that whatever sum is required shall be provided.

Mr. HAGGART. I may state that this question came up before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and on a report of the committee, which was adopted, this item was put in the Estimates. If I remember rightly, it was to this effect: That as the Victoria Railway, a branch of the Midland Railway, which is at present possessed by the Grand Trunk Railway, had a bridge over the Trent River, the committee arrived at the conclusion that it was but right that the Government, when they made the stream navigable, should contribute towards the swing bridge; and in their report to the Council they recommended the payment to the Grand Trunk Railway of the amount that would be required to make the swing and keep it up. Upon the report of the engineer who was ordered to enquire into the matter, I find that the cost of a swing steel span there would be $11,400. The engineer reported that the trestle work over that particular portion of the road is in bad condition and will have to be rebuilt, and therefore the Grand Trunk Railway would be obliged to make the pier. The total cost of the steel span would be $11,400, and if there was no span it would cost to the railway $5,900. The difference in cost would be $5,500, and to that is to be added the cost of maintenance, semaphores, &c., which capitalized would amount to about $8,000, or a total of $13,500. The Government thought that $10,000 was enough to contribute for their share towards having a swing span in that particular section, and I have no doubt we will be able to have it done for that sum.

Heating Public Buildings, Ottawa, additional amount.....$15,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With reference to this item, I would again press on the Minister of Public Works what I think is very desirable, namely, that if it is possible he should make a change in the fuel that is used. I am sure that it would be greatly in the interest of economy if this were done. I feel satisfied that using mixed wood at $4.75 a cord for the heating of these buildings is most injudicious from an economical point of view, and I think the sooner the Minister will make arrangements to change the grates so that coal can be used, the more it will be in the interests of economy. In addition to the economy of the thing, it is anything but sightly to have great piles of wood lying about public buildings such as these. The construction of cellars for coal may involve an outlay at first, but I feel sure that it would be amply compensated for in a short time. I again impress on the Minister that he should consider this matter before next session. Could the Minister state whether the contract for wood is a yearly contract or whether it runs over a number of years?

Mr. OUIMET. The last contract was made for three years, and I think there is another year to run.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the ventilation of this Chamber, which is an important question to the members. A number of members on this side of the House, who sit beyond the second row, have been unable to stay in the Chamber when important public questions were being discussed and have had to retire to other rooms. It appears to be impossible to heat the back portion of this House so as to prevent cold air rushing in, and unless some provision is made to put the Chamber into a better condition before next session we will have to complain more than we do now. On the opposite side of the Chamber there are no windows to let in the cold air, but on this side we suffer a very great inconvenience. I have consulted the engineer in charge and he appears to be unable to find out how it is that there is such a rush of cold air on this side of the House. I am sure that the members will feel deeply grateful to the Minister of Public Works if he would make a thorough investigation to see if the evil could not be remedied.

Mr. OUIMET. The question of ventilation has been a vexed one for the last 25 years, and numerous examinations have been held without satisfying everybody. Enquiries have been made during this session, and we will utilize the result of the experiments made by our chief architect to try and improve matters. The question will receive my attention during the recess.

Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia.....$40,740

Mr. FRASER. Will it be possible for the department to send an officer to New Harbour and Beckerton, County of Guysborough, to make enquiry?

Mr. OUIMET. These two places have not been brought under my notice.

Mr. FRASER. I have been bringing them under the notice of Parliament for the last two years until I am almost ashamed of the matter. Last year there was a petition presented, which is now on file in the department, relating to New Harbour. It was numerously signed by electors on both sides, and I have the sympathy of the Minister of Militia just now who said that, in a matter of pressing importance, something might be done after making enquiries. It is absolutely necessary that something should be done in those two places in order that fishing may be carried on. During the recess, an officer should be sent to enquire into the matter, and if he be, I guarantee the friends of the Government will impress upon him the necessity for having something done.

Mr. OUIMET. I will be very glad to send an officer there who will make a report.

Mail Service between Canada and Liverpool..... $126,533

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask my hon. friend what has become of the grand proposal which was launched two years ago with a great flourish of trumpets, as to obtaining a mail service across the Atlantic equal to any on the ocean?

Mr. FOSTER. The matter has not been lost sight of. Attempts have been made on three different occasions by calling for tenders and by negotiations to carry this out, but untoward circumstances have each time prevented our obtaining this service. The Government has not abandoned its policy in regard to getting a fast and adequate service, and hopes to attain that object in a reasonable time.

Mr. LAURIER. I remember that a former member for Halifax said it was not practicable, and it looks very much like that now.

Expenses in connection with Behring Sea matters..... $60,000

Mr. LAURIER. I will take this opportunity to enquire of the Government if they have any information that the steamer *Coquitlam* which some time ago sailed from Victoria with supplies to the sealers, and was returning with some seals on board, was seized by the American authorities?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not heard of it, but the news may be in the department.

Further amount for Fish-breeding.....$1,000

Mr. GILLIES. I should like to ask the Minister in charge of this department whether it is the intention of the Government, as has been for some time contemplated, to remove the obstructions on the Grand River which runs from the Loch Lomond Lakes into the ocean in Richmond County? Some years ago a considerable amount of money was expended in removing those obstructions, but that money was improperly or irregularly or unscientifically expended, and consequently the obstructions remain. Last year the Minister of Marine caused a survey to be made of the obstructions on that river. The survey was made by a competent engineer and estimates were sent in to the department by him and tenders were called for, but there was no money available then to carry out the intentions of the department. The Minister, however, informed me that he was strongly disposed to carry out the objects of the investigation, and assured me that provision would be made this year. The chain of lakes that are to be connected with the ocean by this river, I am told by experts in fish-breeding, form

possibly the best fish-breeding grounds in the world. I will, therefore, ask if the Government intend to have these obstructions removed ?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot give the hon. gentleman any definite information, but I remember having some conversation with the Minister on this question, because it was brought up when I was Minister of Marine. I see that the Minister has a new item in the main Estimates of $5,000 for clearing rivers and building fishways, and it is possible that this is one of the works contemplated.

Damages to Duncan Chisholm's lands in Antigonish, N.S., through Indian depredations upon the timber, &c..... $473

Mr. LAURIER. No explanation whatever has been given as to this vote, and it is somewhat extraordinary in its character.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think no questions were asked about it. My recollection is that an Indian reserve adjoins the property of Mr. Chisholm, and the Indians have been destroying his wood for some years past. Complaint was made to the department, an investigation took place, and an estimate was made of the amount of the depredations committed, which was valued by the appraiser at $400. There was, also, a proposition made that the wood that remained might be reserved for the use of the Indians for ten years, which accounts for $60 of the amount last year, and the balance is $13 for the cost of the appraisement.

Mr. FRASER. Although this seems a small matter, it is one that the Government should be fully informed upon before they deal with it. We have in Nova Scotia very few Indian reserves, and the consequence is that the Indians roam at large and cut down wood everywhere. As they owned the land at first, nobody says anything about it. I venture to say there are 5,000 cases in Nova Scotia similar to this. The Indians go everywhere, and they cut down trees. If we begin to acknowledge that the Government has to pay for every stick they cut upon every man's property, we have a big contract on hand. This may be a special case ; but I know that in the county from which I come, everybody expects that an Indian may cut down any tree that suits him. Of course, we took the land from them, and we feel that is part of the contribution that we ought to make to them. I venture to say there will be a number of cases like this before next year. At Merigomish, in Nova Scotia, there is an Indian settlement, and they take wood where they like, and there are many farmers who ought to be paid for this wood if the Government admit the principle that we are to pay for any wood that an Indian takes.

Indians—British Columbia..... $3,100

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. leader of the Opposition spoke the other night about an application that had been made by the Indians on the St. Peter Reserve in Manitoba, and I promised to give him the information he asked for. I find that a little over a year ago the Indians made an application that their treaty payments might be made at different points, the Saulteaux Indians to be paid where they reside, and Swampies where they reside. That matter was looked into by the agent, and we left him to follow his own judgment as to making the payments at the most convenient places. Subsequently correspondence has been going on in the direction indicated by the hon. gentleman, and they made an application that the reserve be divided In looking over the correspondence I find that the superintendent in Manitoba, about a month or two ago, reported very strongly against the application for the reasons that, in the first place, it would be very difficult to divide the reserve on account of settlement, and, in the next place, they have been inter-marrying for the last fifty years, and consequently it would be impossible to make a division so as to do them all justice. However, he is on his way down here from the west, and I will confer with him personally about it. But from my own knowledge and information, I believe there will be great difficulty in acceding to their request.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman lay on the Table a copy of the correspondence, on Monday ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

VOTERS' LISTS, 1891.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 67) respecting the Voters' Lists of 1891.—(Mr. Patterson, Huron.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose this section is intended to cover some irregularities supposed to have taken place at the bye-elections. I notice that in Welland the seat of the present member is contested, and one of the allegations is as follows:—

"The voters' lists used by the said several deputy returning officers at the said election were not correct and authentic copies of the original lists of voters entitled to vote at the said election within the several polling subdivisions or polling districts of the said electoral district, nor were such voters' lists duly certified according to the statute in that behalf, but the names of divers persons not properly entitled to vote at the said election, and whose names did not appear upon the original voters' lists of the said electoral district, and who voted for the said James A. Lowell, were improperly inserted in such voters' lists; and the names of divers or other persons who were properly entitled to vote thereat, and whose names appeared upon the said original lists as finally revised, were omitted from the said voters' lists ; and by reason thereof the result of the said election was materially affected, and the election of the said James A. Lowell should be declared null and void."

This section is intended to correct the irregularities. I do not know whether it is broad enough to cover the irregularities mentioned in this petition ; but if it is not broad enough, it should be so amended, because really it is most unfair to the sitting member that he should be made responsible for irregularities for which the officers of the Government were altogether to blame.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and if the hon. gentleman can suggest any words to give additional strength to this section, I shall be very glad to insert them.

Mr. LAURIER. I am much gratified to hear the remark of the hon. member, and I shall be glad to suggest some words before the third reading.

Bill reported.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 84) to amend the Railway Act, was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 8,

Section two hundred and forty-six of the said Act is hereby amended by adding thereto the following subsection:—

"4. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the company from making such conditions, with respect to the receiving, forwarding and delivering of any animals, articles, goods or things, as are adjudged by the court or judge before whom any question relating thereto is tried, to be just and reasonable; and nothing herein contained shall render invalid any special contract made for the carriage of property of any kind such as is above mentioned, by the car load, where such contract is entered into in consideration of the company receiving and carrying such property at a reduced rate: Provided always, that no special contract between such company and any other parties, respecting the receiving, forwarding or delivery of any animals, articles, goods, property or things as aforesaid, shall be binding unless signed by the shipper or by the person delivering such animals, articles, property, goods or things, respectively, for carriage."

Mr. HAGGART. The object of this is to allow the company to make any special contract for dangerous classes of goods, such as plate glass. It is a copy of the English Act. Under the old Act the company could not make any special contract.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a wide departure from the policy we have hitherto pursued. The hon. gentleman must recollect that some years ago, and during several successive sessions of Parliament, complaints were made of invidious discrimination between trader and trader by the railway companies. I remember remonstrances being made more than once against the companies being allowed to make any special contracts. I do not know at present whether the amendment is a good one; but I think it is rather late to introduce such a wide departure at this stage of the session.

Mr. MASSON. If it is advisable to permit these special contracts, the contract should be signed by the shipper or by some one properly authorized by him to sign. Under this provision, a shipper might make a special bargain with the company for a reduced rate and nothing be said about the special terms as to liability. He might then send his carter or agent with the goods, who would make delivery, and who would naturally sign without considering what he was doing, knowing nothing about the agreement. I think if special privileges releasing from liability are to be embodied in the contract and we allow it to be signed by persons not authorized, we are placing the power entirely in the hands of the railway company. I think the latter part of the clause should be struck out, or worded so that the signature must be that of the shipper himself or some person duly authorized.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think it is intended at all to apply to any special contract in the direction the hon. gentleman states.

Mr. TISDALE. To pass the first part of the clause without the last would interfere with what is very largely in the interest of shippers. It applies to what is called car load transportation and has no reference to the first part. Its object is to prevent any interference with special arrangements, and is, therefore, in the interest of shippers. If my hon. friend will read the latter part of the clause carefully, he will see that it relates to car load lots, and to carry out his proposition would injuriously interfere with present facilities for shipping such lots. It reads:

"Contracts made for the carriage of property of any kind such as is above mentioned, by the car load, where such contract is entered into in consideration of the company receiving and carrying such property at a reduced rate, are to be valid and binding on the parties notwithstanding anything herein contained.

Mr. HAGGART. The clause does not apply to rates whatever.

Mr. TISDALE. No.

Mr. HAGGART. It is only in reference to negligence. They may make such a contract with individuals that they may not be held for negligence, provided the court holds it just and reasonable. I have no object in pressing the clause, and if the committee objects let it be thrown out.

Mr. LAURIER. It is an important one, and comes up very late, and I do not think can be given the consideration it demands.

Mr. TISDALE. Better drop the whole section.

Section dropped.

Amendments concurred in and Bill reported.

QUEBEC HARBOUR AND RIVER POLICE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that Order for second reading of Bill (No. 66) to repeal the Act of the Harbour and River Police of the Province of Quebec, be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 95) further to amend the General Inspection Act.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COSTIGAN. I wish to add cheese to the articles to be inspected.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the reason for that?

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is in compliance with the very general request which has been made to have an inspection of cheese exported from this country. During the last two or three sessions the question has been brought prominently before the House, and there has been a difference of opinion as to the standard to be established. Personally, I would prefer to leave this until next year, but the pressure has been so strong that we propose to add cheese to the list of articles to be inspected, and the Governor in Council may make regulations as to the standard and system of inspection, not in the same way as in regard to apples, because there we define the grades. There will be a subsequent clause providing that the Governor in Council may make regulations for the inspection of cheese and the branding of packages. When the Bill was before the House some time ago I find that some difficulty arose in regard to dimensions of the barrel of apples. Every one seemed to agree that

the inspection of apples was desirable. Some members did not seem to be aware that the present law regulates the size of the barrel. I have been asked to alter that, but it would involve the amendment of another Act, and I object to doing that at this stage of the session. No great difficulty can arise until next session. The inspection of apples will involve the inspection of the barrels. Some hon. gentlemen thought that, because only the length of the stave and the diameter at the end of the barrel were mentioned, without naming any diameter for the centre, therefore the Bill is imperfect. It does not make much difference because, if you define the length of the stave and the diameter of the head, if then you increase the bilge, you shorten the length of the barrel, and the capacity is not materially altered.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not if you increase the width of the stave.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If you increase the width of the stave at the middle you shorten the length of the barrel.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not to the same extent.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think nearly to the same extent. The other change in this Bill is in reference to selecting standards of wheat. In future, these samples will be selected under the supervision of the Government who will be responsible for them, and they have taken power to reject standards if they are badly selected and substitute others. It is found at present that the system of bringing together the boards of trade is very unwieldy and adds materially to the expense.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Has the inspection of cheese been asked for by the Dairymen's Association ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know, but we have had strong representation from prominent persons engaged in the manufacture of cheese, including members of this House.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The dairymen meet annually, and all these matters are discussed by them, and no action should be taken in this matter unless they have requested it. The system of buying cheese in the Province of Ontario has been very satisfactiory without any inspection. The buyers inspect the cheese at the different factories, and, unless the cheese is all inspected in the factory, I do not think the inspection should take place unless it is asked for by the dairymen in their associations. I am convinced that if there was any great necessity for the inspection of cheese, it would have been asked for by the Dairymen's Association. I would, therefore, ask the Minister to allow the clause to stand over, unless the Dairymen's Association ask that it be passed. I am aware that it might be in the interest of some buyers if they could get cheese inspected without going to the country, while agreeing to the settlement of any dispute that might arise between the buyers and sellers. The system that has been followed for years past of sending people to the factory to weigh the cheese and see it all before it is put into boxes, does away with any trouble between the buyers and sellers. That system has been very satisfactory, and I do not think it would be satisfactory to establish any other system that would take cheese from the factory until it was inspected and full arrangements were entered into.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) I, also, am interested in the cheese industry, and I know pretty well how things go in that trade. I am in favour of the suggestion made by the Minister of Inland Revenue, and, before him, by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I am in favour of the appointment of such an inspector, provided his duties be so determined that he may only have to interfere in cases of dispute between buyers and vendors. It is known how the difficulties arise. The cheese at the time of the transaction seems acceptable to the buyer, and may be really so; but here is what frequently happens. If there is a rise in the price of cheese, nothing is said, but if there be a drop in the market, the buyer finds objections in order to avoid having to take the cheese purchased, and he complains of a lack of uniformity in the article sold. Often it is quite hard to settle such disputes, as it is a question of degrees. It is easy to understand that in the case of a drop in the prices, the buyer is interested in depreciating the article, hence endless contentions which turn to the detriment of the producer. If an inspector was appointed, he could be called as an arbitrator in cases like this. I share the opinion of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) as to the services which such an officer would render. But I believe that his interposition should not be forced upon the trade. The interested parties should have the right to refuse his services as an arbitrator, for we can foresee what could happen. Should they be obliged in all cases to resort to the services of this inspector, it is quite possible that this office be held by a dishonest individual, or a man accessible to corruption, and the shipper could then make a friend of him by means that are known. I therefore favour the appointment of such an inspector, provided the contending parties are not obliged by law to take him as an arbitrator, that his salary be not too high, and that it should at all events be borne by the Government.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am glad the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) takes that view of it. He may remember that some years ago I introduced an amendment to the Inspection Act by which inspection was made voluntary instead of compulsory in all cases. We propose to remedy the complaint the hon. gentleman has alluded to, by providing some means of settling disputes between the buyer and seller. We provide that the inspection law shall be a machine to be used by those who desire that inspection should be had of leather, hides and several other articles, and of butter, as it is under the present law; but the inspection is not compulsory for any of these articles. The inspection of fish, for instance, is not compulsory, but we afford machinery for those who would like to have it inspected. I am sorry to hear my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Mc Millan) take such strong ground against the proposition. I understood him the other day to say that he was well satisfied with the amendment, and the only point upon which he differed was that he thought the inspection should take place at the factory and not at the port. That is a matter of detail. To-day he seems to think that we should not move at all unless the Dairymen's

Association think it advisable. I think this amendment will afford relief to those who want something to be done. I would be very glad to be assisted by the hon. member for Lotbinière and others who take an interest in this matter, in framing such regulations as will meet the case.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman at the present time only proposes to include the word cheese. If we are to come under the regulations which the Governor in Council propose to make, I suppose he has a plan ready, and if he would lay this plan before the House probably that would facilitate business. I see there is a wish for an inspection of some kind; the only question is whether it should be compulsory.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I would not make it compulsory.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. McMillan) raises the point that it should take place at the factory and not at the port of shipping. If the hon. gentleman would make known the plan which he intends to follow, it would facilitate business.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I explained at the outset that the reason I did not introduce legislation myself was that I did not see my way to frame such regulations as would meet the case, and satisfy the different views of the buyers and sellers of cheese. But if these gentlemen are anxious for inspection, then this Bill will give the Governor in Council power to make regulations. I cannot lay down regulations, I can do no more than to say that we shall exercise that power in the interest of the parties to be affected by it, and we shall be guided by the advice of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who are known to take an interest in this industry.

Mr. TAYLOR. I regret very much that I was unable to understand the remarks of my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Rinfret), who is a manufacturer of cheese in the Province of Quebec. I understood that my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) used the same argument the other day, when this question was discussed before. As I understand, the inspection is to be permissive, and it will not interfere with the producers of cheese in any part of the Dominion who wish to sell their cheese at the factory. Suppose the inspection takes place at the factory. The buyer offers so much for the output of a factory, say, for the month of May. At the end of the month when the cheese is fit for shipment, he goes there and weighs it, inspects it and pays for it. Now, the Inspection Act will not at all interfere with that. But we want to provide for these cheese boards, as we have them established in our county at Brockville. Last week there were over 8,000 boxes offered on the board in one day. Each dairyman comes forward and marks on the board the number of boxes that the factory has for sale, white or coloured. The cheese is subject to inspection when it arrives at Montreal. That inspection, however, is made simply in the interest of the purchaser. I may say that I have over 100 factories in my constituency, and I have received letters from the owners of these establishments, urging the Government to take some action, and a deputation has waited on me likewise, urging the Government to take action, and to-day I handed to the Minister of Inland Revenue a letter from the secretary of the county agricultural society, stating that the association hopes this Bill will pass, as it meets with the approval of every cheese-producer in the county, and the secretary of this association is a very good Liberal. When this cheese, having been sold, arrives at Montreal, it is declared to be of fine quality provided the market advances, in which event, a complaint is never made; but if the market declines, 20, 30, or 50 boxes are declared to be ill-flavoured, and a certain reduced price is offered. What the producers ask is that at the export point, Montreal, there should be an officer who is a competent authority on cheese to decide such questions as arise, and who will be able to decide whether the cheese on its arrival is of fine quality or not. If we introduce this provision, it may be well after a year or two to make compulsory the inspection of every box of cheese that leaves Canada, and that it shall be branded with the Government inspection mark. This would be one of the first steps taken to raise the standard of Canadian cheese. We do not, however, ask for that regulation to be enforced at present, but we ask that some form of inspection be adopted to meet this difficulty experienced by cheese producers in regard to their sales to buyers. As the representatives of buyers will not go to the factories, the cheese should be inspected at Montreal. I do not say the buyers are to blame in all cases, but the producers affirm that they are to blame, that their cheese is all good quality, and it is simply because a fall occurs in the market that complaints are made by the buyers. In view of these statements I think there should be an authority appointed who can declare whether the cheese is of prime quality or not, and by whose means the purchasers will be compelled to carry out their bargains. There will be no difficulty, as suggested by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. McMullen), in the case of cheese sold at the factories, because it will not necessarily be inspected.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). At one time I was manager of a cheese factory, and I generally sold our products at the Board of Trade in Stratford, and sometimes in Listowel. We put up our cheese as stated. I object to any system of inspection after the cheese leaves the factory. I have had difficulty with buyers of cheese. My difficulty has been in regard to weight. I have found that cheese would be weighed, and one or two pounds given in favour of the buyers. Cheese should be inspected in the factory, and any system which institutes a system of inspection outside of the factory is detrimental to the interests of the farmers of Ontario. The hon. gentleman says that after this permissive system has been in force a year or two it will be proposed to make it imperative. I do not think this will be in the interests of our farmers. The hon. gentleman has spoken about raising the quality of Canadian cheese in the English market. He should be aware that Canadian cheese at the present time holds a higher position in the English market than the cheese of any country sending cheese there. It stands as high as a good deal of the English cheddar, and I have seen comparisons made between Canadian and Scotch cheese, in which our cheese compared favourably. In regard to the butter industry, the Provincial Dairy Commissioner went round the Ontario factories and did good work

among them. Any one who is acquainted with the butter export trade is aware that when butter is once packed for shipment the packages should not be disturbed, as, after the air has been readmitted, the condition of the article is deteriorated. In this case also an inspection should not be had after it is in the factory. Our butter is one of the dairy products which it is necessary to ship in excellent condition for the British market, and I am, therefore, convinced that no inspection should be made after it has left the factory.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. I have listened with much pleasure to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), and the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), and I approve very heartily of the remarks made by the hon. Minister and the member for South Leeds. I have been salesman, as well as the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Mc Millan, for a cheese factory, and I can assure hon. members that I have experienced great difficulty after our cheese has been sold. I could enumerate several cases in which, after our cheese was sold, there was a decline in the market, and accordingly the price fell. Then we received complaints as to the quality of the cheese; but if the market advanced, our cheese was right in every case. The farmers should have some protection, for it must be remembered that the cheese industry has become one of the most important industries of the farm. The butter industry is properly protected under the present law, but I am satisfied there should be some different provisions applied to the cheese industry. Anything that is in the interest of the farmers and of the cheese industry should be adopted. The farmers of Ontario can no longer look for extensive wheat crops as a means of living, but they must look to the dairy as their great source of revenue, and it will be well to adopt measures to develop and promote this important industry in our province. I heartily approve of the remarks of the hon. Minister, and I regret that the hon. member for West Huron, being a farmer, should object to the adoption of measures for the protection of farmers in regard to this particular branch of industry.

Mr. McMULLEN. The cheese industry has become a very important one in this Dominion, and it is well that very great care should be taken in regard to any legislation that could possibly affect that industry. The cheese industry has been growing very rapidly and has been progressing very satisfactorily. I am rather surprised that no application has been made by the Dairymen's Association for this proposed change in the law. I think that, if the Dairymen's Associations have not urged this legislation upon the Government, it is imprudent for the Minister to press the change. They have handled the cheese industry very creditably. I am glad to learn that the inspection is to be made permissive, but I see a difficulty in that. Suppose a cheese factory sells a good portion of its cheese to a buyer who does not take the care of it he should, and keeps it for some time, and then when it reaches the port of Montreal it is inspected and is branded as second or third class, the factory which produced it will be seriously affected. The object of the Government should be to help the cheese-producing institutions in this country, and, if this Bill is going to cripple or injure those factories, the Government should hesitate in proceeding with it. My hon. friend to my left (Mr. McMillan) speaks by the book, and I have some experience in this matter, as I hold an interest in two cheese factories, one of which took the first prize in Ontario last year. I do not see how this matter can be regulated without running serious risks, and, unless there is an almost unanimous demand by the cheese producers throughout the Dominion, I think the Government are assuming a very serious responsibility in legislating in this way.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The cheese is frequently taken away from the factory and kept for a time before it is shipped to Montreal, so that, if any inspection is to take place, which I hope will not be the case at present, there should be a clause providing that it should be inspected within a certain time after it leaves the factory, or rather it should be in the factory itself.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The factory can sell the cheese without inspection or subject to inspection, or subject to inspection within ten days, or can make any bargain it likes. If the cheese has deteriorated before being exported, it should be branded with a lower number. The manufacturer can protect himself.

Mr. McMULLEN. I agree with the Minister that the producer can sell the cheese without inspection, or subject to inspection, but, if the buyer holds it for a month or six weeks and it deteriorates before it is inspected in Montreal, and is branded No. 2 or No. 3, that report goes back to the cheese factory, and that will injuriously affect the sale of their cheese the following year.

Mr. TAYLOR. The argument of the last speaker (Mr. McMullen) should have no weight, from the fact that the maker in nearly every factory is changed nearly every year. Because a factory makes bad cheese one year, it is no reason why it should make bad cheese the next year. I think that in a few years every cheese that leaves Canada should bear the Government brand. Then it will raise Canadian cheese in the market, and a bad box of cheese will not be sent over to the old country. If it is branded No. 1, the box need not be opened, it will be known that it has been inspected and that it is not United States cheese, and I think that will make producers careful to send only good cheese. I do not know whether the Dairymen's Association have made reports or not, but I know that every producer in my county has asked for this. The Dairymen's Association is chiefly made up of the buyers of cheese, but the producer is the man in whose interest we should legislate. When the Inspection Act was first passed, we had no inspection of dairy articles. Since then butter has been added, and cheese is the only important item of produce which is left out of the Act. Cheese is the only important product of this country which does not come within the operations of that Act, and the cheese industry has grown to such proportions and the producers have suffered so much in the past that they now ask the Government to come to their relief, and appoint an inspector to decide in case of a dispute arising between the buyer and the seller. That is all that we are asking, and I do not see how any member representing an agricultural district, and considering the question on its merits, can ask the Govern-

ment to withhold this relief. Mr. Robertson, the Dairy Commissioner, who has travelled all over the country, states that a grievance does exist in this respect, both in the Province of Quebec and in the Province of Ontario, and he asks the Government to pass this legislation. The Government, I believe, will not take action without asking our Dairy Commissioner what is the best course to pursue in order to remedy this grievance, and I am sure that the Government will deal with it in a way not only to meet the views of the producers, but to do no injustice to the purchasers.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not see how there can be any force in the objection taken by the hon. member for South Huron, that the course proposed would injure the reputation of any factory. We all know that each box of cheese bears the name of the factory where it was manufactured. If it be of an inferior quality when it reaches England, the factory will stand in just as much disrepute, and more so, if such cheese is sold as "A" No. 1. If the package contains the inspector's mark attesting its actual quality when it left the country, how could that do the factory any more harm? When I was in England a few years ago, I took some pains to visit the markets at Preston and Liverpool, and I heard a general complaint that the marks on the packages were not sufficiently distinct. I saw thousands of boxes containing the abbreviated word "Ont.," and Mr. Dyke, the Government agent there, pointed out to me that there was scarcely a man who knew what "Ont." meant. At that time Canadian cheese did not stand as well in the English market as it does to-day, and I pointed out the necessity of putting the word "Canada" on the package, so that the purchaser would know where the cheese came from. Now, I do not see how a factory can be injured by the proposed inspection. We can only have one object in view, that is to have Canadian cheese occupy in the markets of Europe the position which we believe its quality justifies; and it must have been a matter of congratulation to every man who has given any attention to that subject, to know that Canadian cheese is now worth more in the English market than that produced by our neighbours. Three years ago when I was in Europe, I found, not only in London, but in Paris, Germany and Switzerland, that Canadian cheese had a place on the bills of fare at the hotels. That could only be for the reason that Canadian cheese was found to be superior to the product of other countries. Now, if my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) will point out how any injury can be done to the factories by having the article inspected and branded, when we remember that the name of the factory is stamped on each box, it would assist my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue in amending the Bill, if necessary, in the interest of the producer, while doing no injustice to the purchaser.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to see the Bill provide for the inspection of cheese, not only at the ports of shipment to the old country, but also at the place of delivery, that is, in addition to the steamship ports in this country. In Victoria County the cheese-makers meet together on what we call cheese boards on a couple of days in each month. They there meet the buyers who come to purchase. These buyers inspect the cheese for themselves at certain localities, and enter into contracts for its purchase at certain prices, to be delivered on certain days; but it very frequently occurs between the time of purchase and the time of the delivery of the cheese that prices fall, and the buyer then has the seller at an advantage. He says to the cheese-maker: Your cheese is scarcely up to the standard, and I can only allow you so much for it. I know that the producers of cheese in the Victoria district would be glad to have the cheese inspected by Government inspectors, so that when it reaches a certain standard they can claim the price agreed upon. But I would like to see the Act so framed that it will be optional to have the cheese inspected anywhere.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is gratifying to know that our cheese industry has made such rapid strides as it has. This it has done without restriction or limitation or Government interference; and when we find this industry increasing so rapidly, while other branches of trade are not increasing as rapidly as we would like, would it not be good policy to leave well enough alone? In my experience buyers always pay for the cheese when it is delivered at the railway station, and I do not see how under that method any one is placed at a disadvantage. I have heard farmers say that the best paying branches of farming to-day are the cheese and butter branches; and if that is so, would it not be as well to refrain from placing any imposts upon these articles that might be prejudicial to the interests of the producers? I would like to ask the Minister what staff will be required to carry on this service?

Mr. COSTIGAN. As I stated before, this is simply putting cheese on the list of articles subject to the General Inspection Act. The number of officers to be appointed will depend upon the applications of those who wish to take advantage of the Act. We do not appoint salaried officers, but place the machinery before the public; and the farmers and producers and others may then utilize the machinery to any extent. They may use the system of inspection or not use it as they please; and as regards the export of cheese, an inspector paid by fees will be appointed at Montreal, and also one perhaps at some point in the Maritime Provinces and another at some point in Quebec. Three at the outside will be appointed. If the inspection is wanted at the factory, the machinery will be there, and we will apply it.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. It is evident the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) scarcely knows what he is talking about when he takes up this question of cheese. On that question I would back my judgment against his, but would be quite willing to yield to him the preference in matters of medicine. I can give one case as an instance of the necessity of this inspection. A factory in South Victoria last year sold a quantity of cheese and delivered it, but after delivery the price went down, and the buyers refused to take it unless at a reduced price. The consequence was that a meeting of the patrons of the factory was held, and the salesman said to them: If you will bear with me and do without your money for a while, I will ship the cheese myself and run the risk of having a good result. The consequence was the farmers were kept out of their money for three or four months until returns were had from the old country, to which the cheese was shipped, and they

then received a good deal more money than was offered by the men who bought it in the first instance. If we had had a Government inspector to call on, in cases of disputes of that kind, that difficulty would have been got rid of, and the farmers would have had their money three or four months earlier. It is in very bad taste for hon. gentlemen opposite to do anything against the interests of the farmers, whose hard lot they have been deploring all session. Now, however, when they have an opportunity of defending the farmer against monopolies, they refuse to help him. I will just say to my hon. friend that while I am quite willing to bow to his opinion in matters of medicine, I must insist on preferring my own in a matter of this kind and what is of interest to the farmer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what difference it would have made whether that cheese had been inspected by the Government inspector or by the business inspector who did inspect it. If, after the price had gone down, the firm refused to pay the full price, what remedy would a Government inspection have given which the sellers have not now. Does the hon. gentleman know what he is talking about? I think he has not looked at this Bill, or he would say that, in dealing with men of the character of the buyers he referred to, the difficulty would still remain, whether you had inspection by a Government inspector or not. I would like the hon. gentleman to look better after the interests of farmers in matters of this kind, because if the factories will sell to men who are not honourable, they will find that they will require to have recourse to law to make these men act up to their contract, if they are worth suing. This business has been doing very well, and I do not see why we should not let well enough alone. There may be difficulties in the way without the Bill, but there may perhaps be greater difficulties with it.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. These sales are all made subject to inspection by the very men who buy them, and what we require is a Government inspection to prove that the cheese sold was up to the mark.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). In answer to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who has said that the Dairymen's Associations were largely composed of cheese buyers, I admit that there are a great many buyers in them, but there is hardly a cheese-maker in Ontario who is not a member of these associations, and a very large number of the farmers are directors of the joint-stock factories and members of the associations also, so that these associations are not in the hands of the cheese buyers. I wish to reply to the hon. Minister with respect to his astonishment at what I said. I am astonished at his action, because he said he would not take action in the matter, when he and I had a conversation about it, but that he would allow it to stand over for another year. Not only that, but I said I would bring the matter up at every Farmers' Institute I attended, and the Minister replied he would be happy to get from me what information I could collect. I am, therefore, astonished at his action now, after that conversation. If we are to have an inspection, it should take place at the factory, before the cheese goes into the hands of the buyer. As I said before, there is just as much advantage in keeping the cheese in good condition and curing it properly, after it is manufactured, as in manufacturing it properly; and when it is taken away from the factory and not sent direct to Montreal, but put into a cold cellar in the fall, and not in a spot where it can cure properly, it is often injured. If inspection is to take place, let it take place at the factory where it is made. It is not in the interest of the farmer or cheese-maker to let the cheese go from the factory and be inspected either at Montreal or other port of shipping, because as long as it is in the factory and inspected there, if any dispute arises, the manufacturers can hold the cheese and resell it, but once out of their hands they can have no control. I am not opposed so much to inspection as to the inspection of the cheese after it leaves the hands of the seller or the farmer.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman does not seem to have understood me. He made the bald statement that I promised him that this would lie over until next session, and that I would wait until I had received from him communication of his interviews with the different associations in Ontario, before bringing down the Bill next session.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). You did not say you would wait on me, but that you wanted to collect all the information you could, and would be happy to receive information from me.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No doubt I said so to the hon. gentleman, and my sense of courtesy in dealing with him would naturally prompt me to say so. That is exactly what I did tell him, and that is consistent with my opening remarks. I said, when this matter was first brought under my notice, that I would prefer letting it stand over and not dealing with it this session. It was then that the hon. gentleman had a conversation with me, and it was then I told him I did not see my way clear to provide regulations and lay down a standard and so forth, but would prefer letting the matter stand over. I said also that I would be very glad to avail myself of any information he could give me, knowing that he was thoroughly conversant with that business. But, as I have said, since then the pressure has been so strong that I thought fit to yield to the general demand of the country for a measure of this kind. The hon. gentleman has said that the only objection had was that the inpection was not to be at the factories. Well, the Bill does not prevent inspection at the factories. It is at the option of the manufacturers themselves to have the inspection there or in Montreal or elsewhere. The Bill does not make inspection compulsory at Montreal or anywhere else, but provides machinery for the trade to take advantage of when and where they will; and in bringing down this Bill I yielded to the strong pressure brought upon me from all sections of the country, since I had the conversation the hon. gentleman referred to. While I did tell the hon. gentleman that I concurred in letting the matter stand till another session, the hon. gentleman knows that was my wish, but I yielded to the pressure that was brought from all quarters for a measure of this kind, and then I told my hon. friend I was going to introduce this, and I understood that his only objection was that the inspection should be at the factory instead of at the point of export.

Mr. SPEAKER. Under what mode are the samples now supplied to the inspectors? Is it by the boards of trade?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope this amendment will remove a cause of complaint which is very prevalent in the section of the country from which I come. The millers there complain that the wheat sent from Manitoba and the North-West under the Winnipeg inspection is, in a majority of cases, not up to the standard. I hope the proposal in this Bill will remove that cause of complaint.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is the object.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Mr. COSTIGAN. I propose to add as section 111:

The Governor in Council may make regulations for the inspection of cheese, or branding the packages thereof, and may make a tariff of fees and charges to be allowed to inspectors for such inspection.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Making a tariff,—is that tariff to be submitted to the House for approval?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am afraid you will have to trust to the Governor in Council to make the tariff. Of course, we will make the tariff as light as possible. The Government will endeavour to keep the revenue self-sustaining, and at the lowest figure possible.

Amendment concurred in and Bill reported.

ST. JOHN HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain resolution (June 30) to authorize the raising by the issue of debentures of the sum of $250,000 to be advanced to the Harbour Commissioners at St. John, N.B.

He said: The resolution explains itself. It is to give authority to advance $250,000 to the Harbour Commissioners of St. John. There was an Act passed in 1882 constituting a Board of Harbour Commissioners in the city of St. John, and giving authority to the Government to advance $750,000. That Act has never been taken advantage of by the city of St. John, and one of the reasons, amongst others, is that $750,000 is not sufficient to acquire the property and make the improvements that are necessary; so that if the harbour had been put into commission with that amount, the work would have been stopped, and the harbour would have remained incomplete. It is calculated that $1,000,000 will be sufficient for this purpose, and this proposition to increase the amount by $250,000 is made on the same terms and for the like purposes as are set forth in the Act of 1882. If any hon. gentleman has looked up that Act he will see that it is well and strictly drawn in every respect to safeguard the interests of the Government. I need not take up the time of the committee in saying anything with reference to the commerce, shipping and enterprise of the city of St. John. It is, however, a point of some interest to know whether there are sufficient revenues to ensure the Government a return of the interest on the investment, for it is an investment. I have a statement here of the revenues of the harbour of the city of St. John since 1882, which show that the revenue has largely increased since that year; and during the last series, say, six years, has kept remarkably steady. The tonnage has increased outwards and inwards and runs up to a little over half a million tons each way for sea-going vessels. In 1882 the income of the port, over which the city has exercised control and which the harbour-master has under his charge, was $27,166. In 1891 the revenue was $34,647, and for the last six years the revenue has been remarkably even, being in 1885 $30,476, in 1887 $31,779, in 1891, $34,647. That, however, does not take in all the revenues. The private wharves which will be acquired by the commission yield a revenue of more than $15,000. So that, taking last year as an example, the revenue of the wharves of the city of St. John was in round numbers $50,000. The interest which will be paid is at the rate of 4 per cent, so that when the whole $1,000,000 will be used, which will not be the case for a certain number of years, the amount paid will be $40,000. The revenue will, without doubt, largely increase, because for lack of facilities in the harbour, the properties are not as productive and the revenues are not as great as they will be when improvements are made and facilities offered, and consequently the attractiveness of the property increased.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What contract is there between the city of St. John and the Dominion as to payment of interest?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no contract. The interest on the investment is the first lien on the income of the harbour. It is enacted by the Act of 1882 that there shall be five commissioners, three appointed by the Government—which gives the Government a majority—one by the board of trade of the city and one by the city council; and it is also enacted by the same statute that from the revenues shall be first paid the interest on the investment and the money advanced by the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that $500,000 have been advanced already?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing has been advanced. The Act of 1882 authorized an advance of that amount of money, but it has never been taken advantage of, owing to the fact that it was not sufficient to acquire the necessary property and place the harbour in a proper state, and ensure facilities for the large trade of St. John.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is there no sinking fund or special obligation?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no sinking fund.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not intend, at all events at this stage, to oppose the resolution, but the hon. gentleman will fully understand that the information which he has given to the House should have

been placed before the House some time ago. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will lay all the papers on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. Everything that is necessary in the way of information will be cheerfully given. With respect to a port so well known as St. John, the record of which is embodied in the public documents issued every year, I did not think it necessary, so far as the trade is concerned, that information should be laid before the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Are these facts from the public documents?

Mr. FOSTER. They are semi-public. They are contained in petitions asking for the increase.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose there is an application on the part of the harbour commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. The harbour commission is not formed. The Act of 1882 gives authority to form a harbour commission, but the city has first to take advantage of that Act.

Mr. LAURIER. Then there is an application on the part of the city.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. LAURIER. On whose behalf is the application made?

Mr. FOSTER. By the members for the city and county of St. John, who are the representatives of the people.

Mr. LAURIER. I want to see the application.

Mr. McLEOD. An Act was passed in 1882 providing for the placing of the harbour of St. John in commission. The improvement of the harbour is a matter that has interested the citizens of St. John for some time, and after giving the subject a great deal of attention, both in the council and in the board of trade, the Harbour Act of 1882 was passed. It provides for the appointment of a commission of five members, three to be appointed by the Government, including the chairman, and one by the board of trade, and one by the common council. There was also local legislation obtained, authorizing St. John city to sell the harbour to the commission when it was formed, and providing that this could only be done by a two-thirds vote of the common council. One of the difficulties with respect to our harbour is the number of owners. The city alone has control of the harbour and owns many of the wharves. Then there are private wharf-owners. So a difficulty exists in regard to adopting and carrying out any general scheme of improvement, because some parties who own wharves do not desire any improvement, while others desire improvement. The object of appointing a general harbour commission has, therefore, been to secure the carrying out of a general scheme of improvement. In connection with this Act authorizing the appointment of a commission, authority was given the Government to advance to the commission, when formed, $750,000, $500,000 of which was to be paid to the city of St. John for its interest in the harbour, the city controlling the harbour and owning a large portion of the wharves. The balance was to be used in making improvements and in buying from time to time private wharves. The private wharf-owners objected to the scheme, urging that it was scarcely fair to put them in competition with the commission, and that their wharves should be acquired as well as the city wharves. That was a fair proposition. It was ascertained, however, that $750,000 would not enable the commission to obtain control of the entire harbour and make the necessary improvements, and so the city has not taken advantage of the Act. The expenditure necessary will cover improvements to wharves and considerable dredging, which is necessary on account of the high tides, and the ebb and flow causing filling-in at some of the wharves. Some other improvements are required, one of which is to provide better facilities for the shipment of grain. These are the objects we have in view, and we have asked the Government to increase the loan from $750,000 to $1,000,000. The Minister of Finance has been furnished with an official statement of the collections from the city wharves during the last 10 years. These are matters of public record. He has also a statement of the average incomes from the private wharves. The actual revenue from all the wharves to-day is about $50,000. Of course, with the improvements that are contemplated, we expect to increase the revenue very largely, and the Act provides that the interest on this money so advanced shall be the first charge on the revenues of the wharves, so that the Government run no risk. There is this further provision, that the commission have not absolute power to make the expenditure, but are still controlled by the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the House has reason to complain of the period of the session at which the Minister of Finance has brought this matter under its attention. It is very well to refer to an Act of ten years ago, passed before two-thirds of the present members had seats in the House. This measure has only been before us since the 30th June, and we are just at the close of the session. It seems to me, if the Government contemplated anything of the sort, it ought to have been brought under the attention of Parliament at a very early period of the session. I understand from the statement of the Minister that the city of St. John, as a municipal body, has not made any application in this matter. The hon. members for St. John are here as any other members of the House. They are here as members of the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. McLEOD. While the council have not made any application as a council, the members of the common council of St. John have been in communication with my colleagues and myself in regard to this matter. In fact, some of the information was furnished by the mayor himself.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is easy to be seen that these gentlemen spoke not in their official but in their private capacity. They cannot speak to the hon. gentleman in their official capacity. They have not taken any steps in council, yet you propose to impose obligations upon them to which they are not in any way parties.

Mr. SKINNER. This cannot impose anything upon the council, because the council cannot put the harbour in commission unless they pass that by a two-thirds vote, so under the proposed legislation t is left to the council.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not know how that may be nor is it of great consequence. What is important to this House is that obligations of this sort ought to be incurred in the interest of

commerce when they are incurred at all, and, as the city has a special interest in the matter there ought to have been some understanding between the city and the Government before the Government proposed this scheme. This is partly in the interest of the Dominion as affecting the commerce of the country, and it is specially in the interest of the city of St. John, and the city ought to have spoken before the hon. gentleman came here to Parliament. We do not know yet what the city will be prepared to assent to, and the Government and the city ought to have agreed to a scheme or plan before the Government proposed to take a million of dollars from the Treasury of Canada or loan it upon the credit of Canada to St. John at 4 per cent interest. I think it would be of considerable importance if, before this matter comes before us again, the Minister could state to the House what is the relation of the Government to each of the other large centres of commerce in the Dominion, such as Toronto, Halifax, Montreal and Quebec, and I believe Three Rivers, which had an advance from the Dominion, and we ought to have some general scheme or plan on which the Government propose to proceed so that we may know whether we are making an appropriation absolutely at the expense of the whole people of Canada or an appropriation to be borne by the trade and commerce of the harbour of the city of St. John. I would be very far from saying that we should deal less favourably with the city of St. John than we do with the other cities of the Dominion, but some plan or scheme, properly considered and worked out, should be placed before Parliament so that it may know precisely what it is doing. That has not been done, and is not being done, and there is no opportunity of considering this subsidy as its importance requires at this period of the session. I do not suppose the city of St. John will be disposed to take any action now. In fact it is scarcely possible that it can do so before Parliament meets again. We are now at midsummer and the whole scheme should be placed before Parliament at an early day, and it should be well considered both by the city of St. John and the Government, and Parliament should have an opportunity, with full information as to what has been done elsewhere, and the conditions and circumstances, to consider a general plan under which all the large commercial ports of the Dominion may be placed on a footing of equality. The present method is treating the House of Commons, which should be the body exercising paramount authority in regard to all matters of expenditure, as a mere registering body in regard to matters which the Government may have hurriedly determined upon and which up to this moment, as the Minister states, appear not to have been even cursorily considered.

Mr. FOSTER. There might be a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says if this Bill was new legislation, but in 1882 the House, which was then the result of the people's wishes as the present Parliament is, went through all the clauses of a long Bill and settled the whole plan on which this advance was to be made. The powers the city should have and the powers the Government should have were then considered.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That was ten years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but what we propose now is not to begin new legislation, but to advance $250,000 more than the power then given authorized us to do. I will get all the information I possibly can as to some of the other principal ports before the reading of the Bill, but it is impossible to adopt a uniform system for all our ports or even for all our maritime ports. They differ as to the dispositions of the people as to how a harbour should be carried on. Some will not put it under a commission, and others think that is the better plan. We have to study the feelings and views of the people, and no uniform scheme would be adaptable to all the harbours. As my hon. friend from St. John stated, this is no compulsion. The city of St. John, represented by its council, is not compelled to take advantage of this Act. They know in advance what amount they can expect, and they will consider whether it will be sufficient or not. If they consider the Act beneficial, they will adopt it of their own free will. It is a matter entirely at their option.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is a very important matter. The experience of old Canada in lending money to the municipalities for harbour improvements proved to be very unsatisfactory in the end. In a great many cases the moneys so lent were never returned. Now, we have already lent some money in the Maritime Provinces, and I do not think we have received very much in return. I would like to know if the interest on the $300,000 which was lent to build a bridge across the St. John River, has been regularly and annually paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, the interest has been regularly paid on that investment.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. Can any of the hon. members from the city of St. John explain why no action has been taken under this Act for the last ten years?

Mr. McLEOD. As I have stated, the $750,000 has been available, but it was not sufficient to enable the commission to acquire all the private wharves necessary to make the improvements. The private wharf-owners naturally said: It is not fair to us that the city shall sell its wharves and place the whole harbour under the control of the commission, without our wharves being transferred to the commission at the same time; and the $750,000 was not sufficient for that purpose.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the present liability of the city?

Mr. McLEOD. The city has no liability on the wharves beyond the city bonds which have been issued, and which are to be retired out of this money. The amount is under $50,000, though I do not know exactly how much it is. The revenues obtained by the city from the wharves in 1891 amounted to something over $30,000.

Mr. LAURIER. Are the Government in possession of an estimate of the private property which is to be purchased?

Mr. McLEOD. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose that will be brought down also.

Resolution reported.

HARBOUR OF THREE RIVERS.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers was read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 9 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 4th July, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHARGES AGAINST A MEMBER.

Mr. LANDERKIN proceeded to ask a question respecting certain charges published in a newspaper reflecting on a member of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the rule with regard to questions. It is this:

"It is not proper to put a question on the Paper affecting the character or the conduct of a member."

In my opinion, it is just as improper to quote a letter from a newspaper and base a question upon that letter, which affects the character of a member, as it is to put a question directly affecting his character.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was about finishing the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. My opinion is the question is improper. Of course it is for the House to say whether my ruling is correct or otherwise. I had not looked at the question until the hon. gentleman began to put it; but looking at it and reading the statements it contains, one of which is that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Dewdney) procured the telling of a lie by his groom, it appears to me that that is a reflection on the conduct of a member which ought not to be put in the form of a question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am not responsible for the question.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, you are, if you put it on paper and ask it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The criminal code is not adopted yet, so I suppose it is not a crime.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is a violation of the practice of the House, and is not decent.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Was it indecent for me to read that he told the lie or for him to tell the lie?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman is out of order, but he may appeal from my ruling.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is your ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER. I ruled that the question is improper.

SPANISH WEST INDIES—EXPORTS.

Mr. FORBES asked, Will imports into the Spanish West India ports from Canada be there received on equally favourable terms with similar imports from the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. I have nothing further to add to the information I gave the House on Saturday.

69th BATTALION OF ANNAPOLIS.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) asked, Why it was the 69th Battalion, of Annapolis, N.S., was not called out to Camp Aldershot this year?

Mr. BOWELL. The reason was the same that existed in regard to a large number of other battalions, that there was not enough money to drill the whole force, and this battalion had to remain at home like many others. There were no other reasons, and the probabilities are that this battalion may be called out next year.

RIVER SYDENHAM FLOODS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would refer to a matter I brought under the attention of the Committee of Supply, on Saturday evening, in reference to the disasters produced by floods on the River Sydenham, and I have also privately called the attention of the Minister of Finance to the damages that parties in that locality have sustained. My information is that these damages considerably exceed $100,000, and that the actual damage to the crops amounts to something like $70,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That is included in the $100,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes. Of course that affects a considerable extent of farming territory, and while, if it affected only a few individuals, others in the locality would have come to their assistance, where it affects perhaps one hundred families in all, it is quite out of the power of those in the immediate locality to give that relief. I again ask the Government if they are disposed to ask Parliament to contribute something towards the present relief of this population. There is no doubt the county would be disposed to do something, but at the same time I do not think it would be improper, looking at what was done in the case of the Hull fire, that some contribution should be made out of the public treasury. Of course the hon. gentleman will understand that, happening as this does, on the eve of the harvest, it is a loss which these people cannot repair in the present season.

Mr. FOSTER. I have nothing further to say in addition to what I said on Saturday, except that the Government have had no opportunity since of considering the matter. Of course it is difficult for the Dominion Government to undertake to alleviate these local distresses which arise from wind, or fire, or storm, or the like of that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We did in the case of Hull.

Mr. FOSTER. Our rule has been very general, and exception has only been made in one or two extreme cases such as the St. John fire and the Hull fire. However, the Government have not had time to consider the matter yet.

VOTERS' LISTS, 1891.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved third reading of Bill (No. 67) respecting the voters' lists of 1891.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The House is aware that there has been a great deal of dispute in reference to the voters' list in the city of London. As it now stands, it contains over 230 bogus names, declared to be bogus, declared that the men represented by these names have no right to the franchise in the city of London, and so declared by the Conservative revising officer who revised the list. It is an intolerable hardship that such a state of things should continue. It might be that an election might take place, as human life is mutable, or there might be a general election before the list is revised again. I move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time but be referred back to Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend the same by adding the words "except in the city of London" to the second clause.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think the hon. gentleman has given sufficient reason for the House to refer the Bill back to committee in order to adopt this amendment. I understand his argument to be that the revising officer decided that there were names on the list which ought not to be there, and in consequence of that the hon. gentlemen is of opinion that there should be a revision in the city of London. I do not know that the same state of affairs exists in other constituencies, but I suppose in every constituency there has been more or less contest as to the revision, and that in most constituencies there are some parties dissatisfied with the revision who would like to have it made over again. These matters have been left for adjudication by the proper authorities and the proper legal course has been pursued, I presume in every case, to test whether the revision should be disturbed or not. The usual legal remedies having been exhausted, the only question is whether the lists made last year should stand good for another year without any further revision or not. If the House should make an exception in one case, I do not see why the same reasons should not apply to a general revision. When the Bill was introduced, it was the understanding that no revision would take place this year, and the revising officers were instructed not to proceed with the revision this year, which it would otherwise have been their duty to do about the 1st of June. Notwithstanding the time has elapsed, if it is considered necessary to have a revision, we are prepared to go on with it and to have it made in every part of the country, but, in view of the indications which were given to the House by the Minister who introduces this Bill, it is considered advisable to avoid having a revision this year in order to save expense and also in view of some amendments which it is intended to propose to the Bill. There is no reason why London should be made an exception or why this expense should be incurred there, if it is unnecessary elsewhere. The contingency of a bye-election in the city of London is very remote and hardly sufficient to make it necessary, I suppose, to call for a special revision there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think the case of London stands in the same position as any other electoral district as far as I know. I think I have in my desk a copy of the evidence taken before the revising officer. I understand the position to be this: There were 230 names that the revising officer struck off the list on the ground that they were not possessed of the necessary qualifications; these 230 names are still left upon the list. Application was made to the county judge—the Minister knows well, and the House knows wells the controversy that took place and the decision incidentally given by the Court of Queen's Bench and the Court of Appeals with regard to that matter—and the county judge decided that these names should be allowed to remain on the list, not because the parties had any claim to be there on the ground of qualification, but on the ground that the notice for the removal was not such a notice as the law requires. It was upon that ground alone that the county judge allowed these names to remain. Now, it seems to me that when the fact is shown that the revising officer decided that these names should go off on the ground that the parties had no qualification, and that they were retained simply on the ground that the notice had not been adequate, it is certainly an abuse of power to put the names upon the list, and I think that these names, under the circumstances, should not be allowed to remain. I am not awere of any other case——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was going to ask my hon. friend if he was not aware that that is the case in a great many constituencies, perhaps not to the same extent; but the ruling sometimes has been against one party and sometimes against another. But in a great many constituencies, I think fully one-half, the applications have been ruled out on the ground of insufficient notice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will find that there are not many such: I do not believe he will find two per cent. In almost every case the revising officer is himself a county judge, and therefore his decision, where he held that the notice was not adequate, would also fail to establish the absence of any qualification. The Minister will see that in this case the evidence was taken before the revising officer, and the fact that they did not possess the qualification was established, which makes this case differ from any others, so far as I know.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman has not been fully informed of the facts. I am in a position to assert positively that a large number of these gentlemen declined to appear, because they relied on the advice of their counsel that they had no business to appear, and if they did, they would waive the legal right they at first had, to avail themselves of appeal, and a large number did not appeal. These things are well known; the proceedings were published in the London papers at the time the dispute arose about the action of Judge Elliott. Certainly 40 or 50 declined to appear who resided in the neighbourhood of London. Another thing the hon. gentleman forgets. Even where the evidence was taken, the other parties did not appear, and only *ex parte* evidence was given. But apart from all that, surely the hon. gentleman will not seriously argue that it is not a good answer, on a contest whether a name should be on the voters' list, to object to the notice, and if the notice is held to be bad, that ends the dispute. That proposition holds good, not only in these courts, but in all others; if a party who seeks to attack another does not make out a legal case against him, he has no right to complain afterwards of an unjust decision. In my own experience, limited to my own county, I have seen but very few revisions in which one party or the other did not succeed in preventing an enquiry by showing insufficiency of notice. I have seen cases stated in the press, notably in the city

of Hamilton, and nobody complained of there being any injustice because the decisions of the courts were upheld. If it were a bye-election, it would be a different proposition altogether; it would be quite proper that protection should be given, and that a mistake should be remedied. I will venture to say that in 20 per cent of the ridings of Ontario such things have happened, and people have been shut out because the notices were held to be insufficient.

Mr. LAURIER. It is quite possible there was no complaint in any of these cases the hon. gentleman alludes to, but here there was a complaint that an injustice had been done, and that is the reason why there should be a revision. In the other cases, if there was no complaint, that was a reason why there should be no other revision.

Mr. TISDALE. There was a good deal of complaint from one side or the other. Your case is where there is dissatisfaction. What I am arguing is that in the other cases they submitted to the decision; here they do not want to submit to the decision.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that in justice to the electors of the city of London the Minister of Justice should consent to a revision of that particular list during this year. Now, the facts of the case, so far as I understand them, are these: In preparing the preliminary list the judge gave notice that he intended to add a number of names in the city of London. Then we objected to these names being added to the list, giving notice that they were not qualified, without stating specifically in what the disqualification consisted. The result was that when the case came before the judge the Conservative party held that the notice was not sufficient, that in the notice the grounds on which they were qualified should be set out. The revising officer accepted the objection, but decided to give them three days longer to put in the necessary notices of qualification. On the expiration of the three days the Conservatives raised the objection that the judge had no right to extend the time, and they entered an appeal against his decision. That appeal was carried to the Supreme Court of Ontario and argued before the court. The judges at that time declined to make an order declaring that the judge should pursue a certain course, and as the time for the election was approaching the result was that before a decision could be reached a proper revision of the lists was not completed before the election took place, this being due to one movement and another made on behalf of the Conservative party. These men were thus permitted to vote. I do not think the Minister of Justice, or any one who understands the facts connected with the revision of the London lists, will decline to admit that there are very many names there that should under the last revision be struck off, the names of men whose right to vote should have been tested in accordance with the appeal made by the party which objected to these names being on the list. The application of the provisions of the Franchise Act to this voters' list failed to reach these people owing to the technical objections raised from time to time by the Conservative party, and by these means the names still remain on the list. I contend there is no other constituency where the same irregularities in regard to revision have occurred as in London. Why should we continue to put on the voters' list a number of names which represent simply bogus votes; and we have a right to say they are bogus votes because the justice of their retention on the voters' list has never been shown, and although their right to be on the list has been contested, the question has never been decided. We should give those who object to these names being on the list an opportunity of deciding whether they should be retained on the list or not. There is not another case where there is such evidence of flagrant irregularities as in London, where the law has completely failed to purge the list of objectionable votes. The Minister of Justice has said there is not a constituency which has not names on its voters' list which should be removed. But the provisions of the Franchise Act have been applied fully and fairly in every division except London, and why should we decline to make full application of the Franchise Act to London and allow the provisions of the statute to be defeated by technical objections? There must be an object in allowing these names to improperly remain on the list. We do not know how long any hon. member may be entitled to a seat in the House, for death may occur and London may be opened, and in such an event these names would still appear on the list and the men would be again allowed to vote. There is not another constituency in the Dominion where there has been such evidence of the failure of the present Act, and that is the strongest argument that can be advanced why we should apply without delay the provisions of the Franchise Act and have a revision of the voters' lists of that city and purge the list of those names which have no right to appear there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was sorry to hear the Minister of Justice state that there were many constituencies in which the same state of things prevailed in regard to the voters' lists as existed in London. It is a lamentable state of affairs, if such is the case, and the Minister of Justice should at once take steps to remove such great defects as are found to exist in the voters' list of London. It is reasonable that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) should be adopted, and that delay should take place in order to have a proper revision carried out and these wrongs remedied. There is no one who understands the matter who will not be prepared to admit that there are complaints of a very serious character in regard to the voters' list in London, which it is desirable this House should remedy and remove. It is a reflection on the character of the Government and those who support them to allow such a system to continue, without urging the advisability of a new revision taking place. If names improperly appear on the voters' list, they should be struck off, and the adoption of the amendment would give the Government an opportunity to have this list revised, and if the names of parties had been excluded by reason of insufficient evidence, they should have an opportunity of having their names inserted, and if names had been placed on the list improperly, they should be removed. Such would be the proper course to take in order that justice might be done to all parties.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I desire to offer a word of explanation. I did not say that the exact state of affairs stated to have prevailed in London

exists in many constituencies, but I said that in a great many constituencies applications have failed from technical defects.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Armstrong:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Lister,
Armstrong,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bain (Wentworth),	McMillan (Huron),
Bowers,	McMullen,
Bowman,	Mignault,
Campbell,	Mills (Bothwell),
Edgar,	Paterson (Brant),
Forbes,	Perry,
Fraser,	Rowand,
Geoffrion,	Sanborn,
Gibson,	Semple,
Godbout,	Somerville,
Grieve,	Sutherland,
Landerkin,	Vaillancourt,
Laurier,	Yeo.—30.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	McAlister,
Baker,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bowell,	McDougald (Pictou),
Boyle,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Carling,	McLeod,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Mara,
Cockburn,	Masson,
Costigan,	Mills (Annapolis),
Daly,	Moncrieff,
Davin,	Montague,
Denison,	O'Brien,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Patterson (Colchester),
Dewdney,	Pridham,
Dickey,	Putnam,
Dugas,	Robillard,
Dupont,	Roome,
Earle,	Ross (Lisgar),
Fairbairn,	Simard,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Skinner,
Foster,	Stairs,
Gordon,	Taylor,
Grandbois,	Temple,
Guillet,	Thompson (Sir John),
Haggart,	Tisdale,
Henderson,	Turcotte,
Hodgins,	Tyrwhitt,
Hughes,	Wallace,
Kenny,	Weldon,
Langevin (Sir Hector),	White (Cardwell),
LaRivière,	Wilson,
Lippé,	Wood (Brockville).—63.
Macdonald (King's),	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Corbould,	Mr. Davies (P.E.I.),
Mr. Macdonald (Winnipeg),	Mr. Choquette,
Mr. Fréchette,	Mr. Lavergne,
Mr. Chapleau,	Mr. Guay,
Mr. Ouimet,	Mr. Rinfret,
Mr. Wood (Westmoreland),	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. Tupper.	Mr. Flint.

Mr. TAYLOR. I call attention to the fact that the hon. member for St. John has not voted.

Mr. HAZEN. I am paired with the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor).

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member from Lotbinière has not voted.

Mr. RINFRET. I am paired with the hon. Minister of Public Works. I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. FORBES. The member for Lévis has not voted.

Mr. GUAY. I am paired with the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Chapleau).

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 95) further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)

SECOND AND THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 97) further to amend the Winding-up Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1893, the sum of $23,586,398.23 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution reported.

ST. JOHN HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Resolution (July 2) to authorize the raising of a sum to be advanced to the Harbour Commissioners at St. John, N. B., was read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 99) to amend the Act relating to the Harbour of St. John, in the Province of New Brunswick.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House again resolved itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions on the subject of subsidies to be granted to the railway companies therein mentioned.

(In the Committee.)

To the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company, for 55 miles of their railway from Barry's Bay towards the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, a subsidy not exceeding $6,400 per mile on the first 27½ miles out from Barry's Bay, and not exceeding $3,200 per mile on the second 27½ miles, nor exceeding in the whole $264,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. How is it that $6,400 per mile is granted?

Mr. HAGGART. This is a very important road, running from the city of Ottawa and connecting with that portion which is subsidized and now nearly complete between Parry Sound and the Northern Railway. There is no subsidy for the portion from Ottawa to Renfrew. The first portion subsidized runs from Renfrew to Barry's Bay. Of the remaining portion of 55 miles, there are 27½ miles through a very difficult country, and on this account the Government recommend for it a subsidy to the extent of $6,400 a mile. Some large mills are to be built along the line of railway.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can well understand no subsidy being given to the line between Ottawa and Renfrew. I think the leader of the Government, two or three years ago, stated that the Government intended to adopt the principle followed by the Ontario Government of granting no subsidies to competing lines. I think that is a very proper course if subsidies are to be granted at all. Is the country rocky?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, it is a very rocky and unsettled section.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose the Government have taken care to ascertain that the subsidies to be

given for the construction of this road will secure its construction.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; the contracts are to be let to-day for a considerable portion of it, and the assurance is given to the Government that the whole road from Ottawa to the point to which it is subsidized will be finished within two years.

Mr. EDGAR. A great many assurances have been given to the Government in regard to other roads which have not been substantiated. When they are giving double the usual subsidy for 27 miles, I think they should know what the road is going to cost.

Mr. HAGGART. The road is located and the location plan is filed with the department, and I think the tenders for a good portion of the road will be opened to-day or to-morrow. The length of road to be built is about 200 miles, of which 52 miles are already subsidized, and these, with the 55 covered by this resolution, will make 107 miles; and the cost of this is estimated by the department to be $23,000 per mile.

Mr. EDGAR. That is only an estimate. I remember a railway which was very largely assisted by this Government, and which the Minister stated was estimated to cost $32,000 a mile. I know that since then it has turned out to cost quite double that. I refer to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not think there is any railway company in this list more deserving of consideration by the House than the one under discussion. The object of the line is to make a complete through line from Georgian Bay through to the eastern ports; and any one who looks at the map will see that it is the shortest route that can be devised between these two points. This much also can be said in its favour, that I do not think there is any one connected with railways in this country whose name will command more respect for business enterprise and integrity than the gentleman at the head of this company, Mr. J. R. Booth, of Ottawa. If there is any one company which is free from any taint of corruption or any taint which should at all disqualify it from receiving the attention of the House, it is the Canada Atlantic Company, with which this line is intimately connected, and all those connected with it, both on this and the other side of the line, are men of the greatest integrity and enterprise, and of considerable financial success. I would like to suggest this consideration. There are a number of railways desirous of obtaining access to the mineral regions above Sudbury and the Georgian Bay as well as Sault Ste. Marie. There are five or six lines all competing for this traffic, and I would like to ask the Minister whether he could not consider a proposal by which some point could be fixed to which a line common to all might be constructed over a very considerable portion of the route. It is no slight enterprise to build a line of this sort running through an unsettled country, the resources of which must largely depend on the timber trade, so far as local traffic is concerned; but all those interested have a common object in reaching a point which would be to a great extent common to them all. It would develop a considerable portion of eastern Ontario, it would add largely to the resources of the province, and would probably bring in a very large population who would contribute to the resources of the Dominion. It would be very desirable to adopt a plan by which the Government should give reasonable and immediate assistance to a line which would accomplish all these objects. The American companies are desirous of obtaining connection with Georgian Bay, the lakes and Chicago. The western trade of that country are all willing to assist in the building of this line, but until it is completed any expenditure made by them or by any one on their behalf will be unremunerative. The mere subsidizing of 40 or 50 miles will be of no advantage whatever to these people, because until they get a through route they will derive no benefit. Of course the local traffic will benefit to some extent by the development of the mineral and lumber resources of the country, but the great object of the through route cannot be obtained until the whole line is completed. I understand the policy of the Government to be only to subsidize a certain portion of the line. That will not at all answer the object these people have in view. In order to concentrate the resources which might be brought to bear on such an undertaking, it would be a reasonable proposal of the Government to suggest that if all these lines should unite, the Government might aid in building 150 or 200 miles which should be common to them all. That would immediately develop the country and attain the object desired and be the means of bringing outside capital into the undertaking. Something of the same sort was done in the building of the Northern Pacific Junction, and it seems to me a similar course might be taken with regard to the proposal now before us. It seems to me that the Government could build a common line, of common benefits to all the companies which have sought incorporation, instead of asking us every year for subsidies to enable them to move in the direction of the subsidy now given. Instead of this, the Government should give substantial assistance so as to enable the whole line to be put under construction from end to end. If that were done, a great deal of foreign capital would be brought into the enterprise which is now not available, because until the whole line is constructed the subsidizing of portions here and there will be of no advantage whatever.

Mr. HAGGART. I might state that assurance has been given the Government that this road will be completed all through in about two years. The road is nearly completed to the Northern Railway. The proprietor or promoter of this scheme has made arrangements, I think within these few days, or will within a few days, to get the control of that portion of the road between Parry Sound and the Northern Extension, which goes up to North Bay. He has also assured me that he has made arrangements to have the line completed to the extent of these 50 miles within a couple of years, and has every prospect of the whole road being completed and under one management and one company within a couple of years.

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to what the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has said with reference to connecting Sudbury and that region by another railway, I think there is a great deal, but I do not see that this line proposes to go to Sudbury at all.

Mr. O'BRIEN. No; what I meant was that there is a very considerable portion of this line which might be given to all the lines as a connecting point with Sudbury or Georgian Bay.

Mr. EDGAR. That would be only run east and west.

Mr. McMULLEN. I might say, in addition, that, in my opinion, it is highly desirable, if any money be granted to this line at all, that the Government should urge on the proprietors to rush it through to completion, because it is quite evident, from the remarks of the Minister of Railways, that this country is a wilderness and its resources almost entirely lumber. It is not fit at all for agriculture. If the country is to reap any advantages at all from the construction of a road it will only be by having a through line from Parry Sound connecting down here with the other lines; and, to reap that advantage, the country would have a right to expect, from the grant of this large subsidy, that the Government should engage that the road would be completed within two years or as short a period as possible. The proprietor of the road being a lumber merchant, in granting this money we are enabling him to remove the enormous wealth which he has there in the shape of timber, and consequently the road will be of no real provincial or Dominion value until there is a through line to Georgian Bay. When it reaches there it may possibly form one of the arteries through which a very large percentage of our north-western wheat trade will flow. Parry Sound is, I understand, a very good harbour; and, should the North-West develop, as we all earnestly desire it will, the outflow of grain through Lake Superior and Georgian Bay may be very large, and it may take more than the port of Owen Sound, and even of the port of Parry Sound, to handle the export trade. I readily understand that the remarks of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) are pertinent to the question, and I think the Government should urge on the construction of the entire line within the shortest period possible.

Mr. EDGAR. It is no doubt the fact that the head of this concern is a very substantial man, and that it is in good hands, but we know that people interested in railways raise the money to build them by the issue of bonds and stock on the road, and do not put their hands into their own pockets to build them. Now, the Government, I suppose, will tell us what is the financial basis on which it is proposed to build this road, and on the strength of which we are giving a Dominion subsidy. How is the balance of the money required proposed to be raised? Is it by bonds or stock, and in what proportion of each? No doubt the Minister of Railways has ascertained that, because he would not think of proposing to the House to give this subsidy merely on the credit of the parties interested.

Mr. HAGGART. It is a very unusual course for a Minister to take to ask this question of a company, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that I have made enquiries on that subject. Mr. Booth affirms that he has capital sufficient of his own to build the road right up to Renfrew, and that he intends to build to that point out of his own resources and have it completed this summer. He has also made arrangements with the parties who have purchased the limits, consisting of large quantities of lands, and who are Michigan people, to build mills where he intends to have the road finished in a couple of years. He has made a contract with them to have the road finished up to that particular section, and they intend to build several mills on the faith of that. He has made no arrangement that I know of for the present to float bonds or any other securities, but he assured me he was in possession of sufficient capital himself and had such faith in the enterprise, that he intended to put his own money into it and build the section to Renfrew this summer. I believe the contracts are to be opened to-day.

Mr. LAURIER. What is to be the total length of this road?

Mr. HAGGART. Up to the junction with the Northern road, it is about 200 miles. Then there is the distance from Ottawa up to Rainy River, which is about 43 miles, a total distance from here to the Northern Railway of about 243 miles.

Mr. EDGAR. What is the distance from the Northern Railway up to Parry Sound?

Mr. HAGGART. 49 miles.

Mr. LAURIER. There are two other resolutions in favour of this road further on.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, they are simply renewals of subsidies already granted.

For a railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, at or near Revelstoke, to the head of Arrow Lake for 25 miles of such railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $80,000.

Mr. HAGGART. This is to build a road from Revelstoke on the Canadian Pacific Railway, alongside that portion of the river which is at portions of the year not navigable, to Arrow Lake. Then it is the intention to connect that with the road which we have already subsidized and is at present being built, called the Columbia and Kootenay River Road.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself?

Mr. HAGGART. It is an application made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but I think it is another company independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. LAURIER. Then the resolution should show to whom the grant is to be made, as it is too vague at present. I would object to any money being given unless we adopt the policy that the subsidy is to be given to some one company or individual who is named. This does not say to whom the money is to be paid. The application laid before us by the Minister is not for any other company but for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself. It is dated in their office, speaks in their name, and is signed by their president.

Mr. HAGGART. There was an application made by a separate company for a charter from the Local Legislature of British Columbia, but I understand it was too late to pass it this session.

Mr. LAURIER. In former years we have given subsidies for intending companies which were not yet formed, but provision was always made in the resolution for that purpose. No such provision occurs here, and I think it is a vicious principle to vote money without having the name of the persons to whom the money is to be given stated. To me it is a matter of no consequence whether this money is to be given to the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way Company or any other company or individual, but I strongly object to giving this to anybody unless the name is mentioned.

Mr. MARA. I think this will be called a part of the Columbia and Kootenay Railway, which is built from Robinson to Nelson, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company can negotiate the bonds better if that is done in the name of that company, and guaranteed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Columbia and Kootenay line is virtually owned and run by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. LAURIER. We should say to whom we are giving the money. I have no objection whether we pay the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or the Kootenay and Columbia Company, but some name should be put in.

Mr. EDGAR. The second resolution here provides "that the subsidies hereinbefore mentioned to be granted to companies named for that purpose shall be granted to such companies respectively." It does not say that it will be granted to individuals.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know whether the leader of the Opposition desired to express a general principle in regard to this matter or whether his observations are confined to this particular grant.

Mr. LAURIER. I spoke on general principles.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the House should pause before adopting a general rule that the company should be named in the resolution. There are often companies which are ready to undertake the enterprise, but, if we confine it to them, we are practically in their hands though we may have little faith in their ability to carry out their intention. I think in most cases our hands should be free to give the subsidy to them or to any other company which may be formed. Of course there are cases in which the company has given assurances of its ability to carry on the work, and in those cases we mention the name of the company. I have in view certain cases named in these resolutions, and I think, in regard to any company now in existence and where the *bonâ fides* of the comany or its financial ability is not very well established, we should be in a position to go past that company and seek other organizations.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. member will agree with me that the principle he lays down is a very unsafe one. When the Government ask for an appropriation for a certain work, I suppose they have confidence in the stability and feasibility and prospects of the work which it wants subsidized. Now, if the work is feasible and one that is to the general advantage of the public, there ought to be no difficulty in forming a company to operate the work when substantial help is given. It may be that at this moment there is no company in existence, or no individuals ready to take the subsidy; but in such case let such a provision be made as I have pointed out in former years, that so soon as a company is organized under general powers, the aid may be given with the sanction of the Governor in Council. But here you say that a sum of $80,000 be granted for a railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Revelstoke to the head of Arrow lake. To whom is this money to be paid? There is nothing whatever in the resolution to show that the money is to be paid to this party or to the other party. There is not a syllable in this resolution which gives authority to the Government to pay the money to anybody whatever. Now, this is what I object to. I say that Parliament should know to whom the Government is to pay that money, if it is voted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand that to meet the hon. gentleman's view, if these resolutions are adopted, a general resolution will be added, stating that where a company is incorporated for this purpose, and that company gives evidence to the Minister of Railways of their ability to carry on the work——

Mr. LAURIER. That has been done in former years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no objection to that. But I think there are some of these railway companies to whom it would be very unwise to give a subsidy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In this case, the application is from the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is very likely that the Canadian Pacific Railway will undertake this.

Mr. LAURIER. The application is made by the president of the company himself.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was not speaking of this particular case. I quite agree that it would be well to add a resolution to the other resolutions governing the other cases that I have mentioned.

Mr. LAURIER. Apart from the general principle, in this case the money is to be given to the company who applies for it, and who says that it is ready to undertake the work, and in this case it is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I see no reason why you should not give it to the company applying for it, but you are reserving the right to give it to some other party who has not applied for it.

Mr. HAGGART. In a similar manner they have applied for subsidies to other lines of road, as the South-Western and the Souris Branch Railway in Manitoba. It is an entirely different company that subscribes the funds necessary to build the road. It is true that it is in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway to have these connections, but they may find it difficult to get stockholders to embark in an undertaking of this kind, but they might get individual members of the company to risk an investment in this particular enterprise.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). All these statements go to show that the Government are moving faster than the country requires with regard to these appropriations. Now, when a company is organized and submits plans and shows that the road is feasible, then it may come to the Government for aid, and we know with whom we are dealing. But when you say that we will grant $3,200 or $6,400 a mile to a railway company to build a road from one point to another, and you make that announcement without knowing with whom you are dealing, you are merely advertising what you are willing to do if a company can be found to undertake such work. Then you will have such scandals as occurred here three or four years ago, when parties obtained charters and went to New York or London or elsewhere, and undertook to

sell them, or to see how much of the bonus they would be allowed for the charter for the company that was about to be organized. I do not think that is a desirable thing, it is not in the public interest it should be done. It seems to me that wherever you think a railway can be built with a view to promoting settlement or to the public advantage, and no company is yet organized, it would be just as well to let it alone until an application is made. In this case I understand the Minister to say that while the application is made by the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the company in itself is in no sense a party, so that really there is no person or body of persons who are organized or prepared to organize themselves into a company, that are ready to undertake the construction of the road. If I understand the Minister rightly, it would be to the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway to have these tributary branches, but the stockholders may not be ready to embark in the enterprise, and may think that on the whole it would diminish the value of the stock in the end. It seems to me that is a reason for delay. If the Canadian Pacific Railway has an interest and does not wish to undertake the responsibility, it no doubt will see that a company is organized, and if they are here next year, then would that not be a more proper time to make the appropriation than the present time?

Mr. MARA. In this case I am glad to be able to inform the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that the Government are not going too fast, but on the contrary they are about two years too slow. This subsidy ought to have been granted two years ago.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). To whom?

Mr. MARA. Either to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or to the Columbia and Kootenay Railway Company.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They are not applying.

Mr. MARA. The Columbia and Kootenay Railway is practically owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway have leased the line for 99 years, and are running it, and part of this subsidy is to extend their main line to deep water which will give the Kootenay country communication with other parts of Canada during nine or ten months in the year. The point to which it is proposed to extend the line is at the head of Arrow Lake, and except in the narrows between the two lakes, there is navigable water except for a month or two in the year when the ice forms near the shore. I may also state that the Canadian Pacific Railway contemplate building a line from Nakusp on Arrow Lake *via* Slocan Lake and Slocan River to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway at the mouth of the Slocan, that would give almost uninterrupted railway communication with the railway system of Canada. But, instead of the Government being too fast in this matter, they are too slow, and the subsidy should have been granted two years ago.

Mr. LAURIER. That may be; I do not object to granting this subsidy, I agree with the Government that the subsidy is necessary; but I submit that, in these matters, the Government ought to deal with Parliament fairly and openly. The Government in this case are not acting on their own motion, but they are acting on the motion of somebody else who comes to them and says: Here is a work in the public interest, and we want a subsidy to help build this railway. The party who does this is the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it is upon the application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that the Government asks Parliament to vote this money. Now, the public are entitled to know the reason for which the Government asks to vote this $80,000, and the only reason the Government give is this: It is represented to us that if we give the Canadian Pacific Railway that sum of money they will build the railway and will give to the locality in question the railway benefit which they must have. But, strange to say, although they act upon the application of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when they go before the Council and represent to His Excellency that Parliament should be asked to vote that appropriation they do not give the appropriation to the company which asked for it. The hon. gentleman gives us a narration of facts which I submit have no relation at all to the present case. We are not interested whether this railway is to be operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or by the Columbia and Kootenay Company. The only thing which I submit Parliament has to deal with is the reasons which are given to them for the voting of the money. In looking through these reasons I find that the money is asked by the Canadian Pacific Railway themselves. They represent to the Government that if they are given the subsidy of $80,000 they will give that section of the country the railway facilities needed. Under the circumstances, I am at a loss to understand why the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot have the appropriation if they ask for it, and since they are prepared to carry out the contract. It is stated in this resolution that the Government will enter into a contract with the company, but with which company will they enter into a contract? Manifestly with the company which shall receive the subsidy, and I presume the hon. gentleman will move to amend the resolution and to give the money to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. MARA. I suggest that the resolution should read: "the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or the Columbia and Kootenay Railway Company."

Mr. HAGGART. There is no objection to that, and I move that the resolution be amended in that way.

Motion agreed to.

For a railway from the north end of the 11 miles for which a subsidy was granted by the 53 Victoria, chapter 2, to Plaister Rock Island, for three miles of such railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $9,600.

Mr. McMULLEN. Where is this road?

Mr. HAGGART. It is the Tobique Valley Railway. It is to enable a road which we have subsidized already to accomplish its mission. That is, to get to the plaister beds on the river.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why was not the full length of the road included in the first application for the subsidy?

Mr. FOSTER. This is for a road running from the mouth of the Tobique River along the valley of the Tobique; the design being to get to Plaister Rock, and ultimately to go up the valley, which is fine agricultural land and thickly settled. The

road, as subsidized at present, comes within three miles of the Plaister Rock, which contains a large deposit of valuable plaister, used for fertilizing and building purposes. It has always been the intention to subsidize the road up to that point.

Mr. LAURIER. I have always understood that there was more plaster already in New Brunswick than you can find a market for?

Mr. FOSTER. Plaster and "Plaister Rock" are quite different.

Mr. LAURIER. The subsidy would be a good one if you had reciprocity.

Mr. EDGAR. What company does this subsidy go to?

Mr. FOSTER. The company which has built the rest of the line.

Mr. LAURIER. The Tobique Valley Railway Company should be mentioned. Let the resolution be amended in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has this plaister been thoroughly tested both as regards extent and quality for fertilizing purposes?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it in the hands of a private company?

Mr. FOSTER. Some of the plaister rock deposits belong to the Provincial Government and some to private parties, and the Provincial Government have subsidized this road with a view of developing that deposit, as well as helping the agriculturists who live there. The great trouble that has been met heretofore is the lack of facility in getting the plaister away.

[At one o'clock the Committee adjourned, and at three o'clock resumed.]

To the Monfort Colonization Railway Company, for 21 miles of their railway from Lachute or St. Jérôme westward, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $67,200.

Mr. HAGGART. I want this resolution amended by adding to it "or from a point at or near St. Sauveur."

Mr. LAURIER. What is the reason of that?

Mr. HAGGART. The road is finished from St. Sauveur and it is in reality the starting point.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand there is a conflict of opinion as to whether the road should start from St. Sauveur or St. Jérôme, and that Lachute is out of the question because there are practical engineering difficulties in the way.

Mr. HAGGART. Lachute is at the other end. The road is finished from Lachute to near Grenville. The road is being built from St. Sauveur in the direction of Lachute, and it is built from Lachute to St. Andrews.

Mr. LAURIER. According to the resolution, you have the option of spending the money on 25 miles of road either from Lachute or St. Jérôme. In the application of the company signed by the president, E. Senécal, and dated Montreal, 13th May, 1892, I find the following:—

"After examination the Lachute line had to be abandoned, and a choice had to be made between St. Jérôme and St. Sauveur, and the company had commenced their work at St. Sauveur."

The company seemed to prefer St. Sauveur, but I understand there is a dispute among the public as to whether it should be St. Sauveur or St. Jérôme. For what reason does the Minister now propose a change?

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). The company has actually started from St. Sauveur, and of course they want to apply the subsidy from that point.

Mr. LAURIER, There is something which I do not understand in all this. On the 13th May, 1892, the company made application for a subsidy to start from St. Sauveur, but the Government, apparently for reasons of their own, did not comply with that request and asked Parliament to bonus a road to start from St. Jérôme. Now the Government for some reason complies with the request of the company, and I want to know what is the reason for that change of opinion?

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps you had better let this resolution stand until my colleagues from Quebec come into the House.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). My information is that it was a clerical error, and that the works are actually commenced at St. Sauveur.

Mr. LAURIER. Let it stand.

To the Ontario, Belmont and Northern Railway Company, for 10 miles of their railway from the Belmont Iron Mines to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Central Ontario Railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $32,000.

Mr. EDGAR. Has the railway been constructed up to this point?

Mr. HAGGART. No, that is the commencing point; they have partially graded the road.

Mr. EDGAR. What kind of a standard does the Government require for a road of this kind?

Mr. HAGGART. The same as the others; all companies make the same contract.

Mr. EDGAR. You mean the agreement with the Government?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. The company is building it themselves.

To the Buctouche and Moncton Railway Company, for 32 miles of their railway from Moncton to Buctouche, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, granted by the Acts 43 Victoria, chapter 10, and 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, nor exceeding in the whole $35,480.

Mr. LAURIER. This is the balance of their subsidy?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; the road is built and running, but some of the road was not up to the requirement of the contract and this is simply to continue the subsidy.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is no increased sum?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not object to the subsidy, but I wish to ensure that the payment shall be made under the same conditions that the money was originally voted on.

Mr. HAGGART. That is what is intended. It must be up to the contract.

To the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company, for 19 miles of their railway from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway (in addition to the sub-

sidy granted by the Act 53 Victoria, chapter 2), a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $60,800.

Mr. EDGAR. This seems to be in addition to the subsidy. Does that make it more than $3,200 a mile or an additional length ?

Mr. HAGGART. It is for an additional length of 19 miles. The road is 49 miles and the former subsidy was for 30 miles. This is to make connection between Cobourg and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the original section for which a subsidy was granted completed ?

Mr. HAGGART. It is not commenced yet.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do the company anticipate being able to complete this entire section this year ?

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that they feel very certain of having the road built within a couple of years.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is no portion of it let yet ?

Mr. HAGGART. There is no portion of it built yet.

Mr. McMULLEN. I believe that the electors were told that if they returned a supporter of the Government they would get this bonus. I understand that when Mr. Hargraft was defeated, strong representations were made to the electors that if they wanted a grant for the harbour, or if they wanted the railway, they would have to return a supporter of the Government. The hon. gentleman shakes his head.

Mr. HAGGART. I never heard it before.

Mr. McMULLEN. It was stated in the public press.

Mr. FOSTER. That was a yarn.

Mr. McMULLEN. There have been a good many such yarns during the elections. This is the first fulfilment of the promise made with a wink to the electors of the County of Northumberland that if they defeated Mr. Hargraft and elected his opponent they would no doubt get the subsidy and a grant for their harbour. Yet hon. gentlemen have the hardihood of taunting us with losing the bye-elections, and twitting us when we say that the constituencies have been bought.

Mr. GUILLET. I would like to say a word in regard to the assertions which have been made on the floor of this House and in the press of the country on this subject. I say that no such promise was made either by me or any of the speakers who addressed the electors at the recent bye-election. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) will bear me out in this. He was present at a meeting where I told the electors that I wanted them to vote on the issues before the country, and not to consider the railway—that that was a matter of very little importance, compared with the issues before the country. I say, fearless of contradiction, that the proposition to build that railway was really an injury to me, because it was the means of turning against me the influence of a great corporation, and it also turned against me the votes of a good many electors who were told that if they defeated me they would not have a dollar to pay off the bonus which they had granted to the railway. My gains were made in the central and western portions of Hamilton, remote from the railway, and in the township of Alnwick, which is not interested in the railway to any extent ; whereas in the northern part of Haldimand, where the line is projected, I lost ground, not receiving as large a majority as I did in the previous election. It is not the case that any promise was held out to the people that they would or would not have this railway, according to the result of the election. The Government were committed to the railway, as everybody knew, by the previous vote. But what influences were exercised in favour of my opponent? It is well known in Ontario that what is called the educational federation policy of the Ontario Government caused the removal of Victoria College from Cobourg, and efforts were made to induce that Government to buy the university buildings at Cobourg and locate a public institution there ; and deputations from Cobourg interviewed the Government on that subject. During the election a prominent architect and a prison inspector were sent to Cobourg to inspect the buildings, and the idea was spread abroad that the Local Government would have a large amount of patronage there and would provide a great deal of employment. That was a direct interference in the election. In a similar way the license commissioners there held a rod over the holders of licenses to induce them to vote against us. We had the power of the Local Government and of every local official against us, as well as the opposition of a powerful corporation, and the proposition to build the railway, instead of being an advantage to me, was a disadvantage. If there was any direct interference in the election to intimidate the electors, it was on the part of our opponents, and it has always been so. Why, Sir, when the municipal loan fund indebtedness was settled, we had a Conservative representative ; and we were told that if we had elected a supporter of the Government, that indebtedness would have been wiped out ; but as we had a Conservative representative it was saddled upon us. It was finally compromised at a reduced amount ; but we were told on the public platform by the ex-mayor of Cobourg that if we returned Mr. Field as a supporter of the Government, we would not have a dollar of that indebtedness to pay. Yet we are told that we are the corrupt party, and that we buy up the constituencies. We are not in the habit of posing as purists in the country ; but the disguise of hon. gentlemen opposite is too thin. The school boys all know as well as the intelligent electors and the judges on the bench, that these men are masquerading in a false cloak of purity ; but behind it we can see all their dirty linen and their political deformity.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is pretty obvious that this is a very unpopular proposition. It has nearly killed the hon. gentleman. He only got here by the narrowest escape possible from defeat ; and now the Government, seeing what very serious mischief they are doing to a friend, ought not to persist in this proposition.

Mr. GUILLET. They are doing their duty to the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has shown that the further away from the railway the better the vote he polled, and that this was such

a very unpopular project that he dare not even mention it. After a statement of that kind, I think the Government should not persist in their proposition——

Mr. BOWELL. The public good must always be paramount in cases of this kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell)—greatly against the will and greatly to the detriment of the hon. gentleman's friends.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It does appear that the hon. gentleman is also opposed to the Local Government establishing a public work at the old university building. As the hon. gentleman has appealed to me, I might say that I was in Northumberland at the time of the elections, and remember that at a meeting held there they had a motto on the wall:

"If you want the railway, vote for George Guillet."

It looked to me very significant, but I believe they did not say anything about it, because in that part of the riding, I understand, the railway was unpopular, but in the north part of the riding they had that motto not only at the public meetings, but on the fences and everywhere around. I am willing to bear testimony to this when called upon.

To the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company (or any other company undertaking the work), for 25 miles of their railway from a point on the Cape Breton Railway, at or near Orangedale, to Broad Cove, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, in lieu of the subsidy of $50,000 granted for the said railway company by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, and on the same conditions, nor exceeding in the whole $80,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the proposal to build this branch, the applications have been very numerous on behalf of the people there to have the Cape Breton Railway connected with Broad Cove, where there are valuable deposits of coal only partly developed. There is reason to believe that the road possesses resources which will justify the expenditure of capital necessary to build this branch, and likewise justify the extension of the road northward to Cheticamp and southward to Port Hood. Two or three years ago this same company undertook, in advance altogether of any subsidy, to build their line of railway, not, however, upon this branch, but along the northern shore of Cape Breton in the direction of Port Hood. A small subsidy was given them, $1,000 a mile, for a railway from Point Tupper or Port Hastings, I forget which, to Port Hood, it being understood to be a very easy portion of road to grade, and that very great progress had been made with the work. Some hopes were likewise held out on behalf of the Provincial Government of a further subsidy, but the company abandoned that piece of work. I am not aware what the reason was, but they never complied with the conditions under which they would be entitled to a subsidy, and the subsidy has therefore lapsed. In view of the expected development of the Broad Cove mines, we thought it better that the subsidy should be transferred, with such additional aid as we can give, to a branch line connecting with the Cape Breton Railway, which would be a feeder to the Intercolonial Railway. I have reason to believe that if the company named in the resolution will not undertake the work another company is prepared to offer for the construction of that piece of road.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. McMULLEN. In granting subsidies to railway companies the Government should confine their grants to those which intend to develop the country generally. Where you grant subsidies for the purpose of developing mines already in the hands of private parties you are simply assisting private enterprise. I would like to know whether there is an agricultural district along this road of sufficient importance to warrant its construction. If it is to be built only for the purpose of opening mines now in the hands of private individuals or corporations, I say that is an unjustifiable use of public money. When these parties secured the mines they knew they were considerably distant from any railway, and must have calculated on building a railway themselves to carry their coal.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would ask my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) to reply as to the agricultural character of the district; but I do not understand it to be a disadvantage that there should be mineral deposits at any railway point. On the contrary, I consider that the development of such deposits will be of great advantage to the community at large, and a great source of profit both to this railway and the Cape Breton line. At present there is no railway in that section whatever, and the mines are consequently only developed to a very limited extent. As they are developed, the farming community will likewise be benefited.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What are the shipping facilities at these mines, what distance are they from the sea-board, and what is the population to be benefited?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are right on the sea-board.

Mr. CAMERON. I would like to inform my hon. friend from Wellington that this road will pass through one of the best agricultural districts in the County of Inverness, which is unquestionably the best agricultural county in the Province of Nova Scotia. I would also inform him that the Broad Cove coal district is one of the best coal areas in the whole province. There are no harbour facilities there for export, and, therefore, it is essential for the development of that coal district that it should have a branch line to the Intercolonial Railway. My only regret is that the subsidy will not extend further into the interior of the county. The people have been applying year after year, for subsidies to aid in the construction of that road in Inverness, but up to the present we have been left without any railway, and I have no doubt but that this branch will be the best paying one in the whole province.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is to be earnestly hoped that it will be a paying branch and give the country something for the money invested. We have invested a large amount of money in Cape Breton on the construction of a road, and we had my hon. friend's assurance that it would at least pay running expenses.

Mr. CAMERON. So it does.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not know that it does; I think not. Hon. members from the Maritime Provinces appear to be the most fortunate and successful members of this House in securing bonuses, either for roads, or harbours, or anything else, and seem to have most powerful influence to

obtain aid for any undertaking they press upon the attention of the Government. They have secured railways at an enormous expense to the country, on which the people will have to pay the interest as long as they live, and never see a farthing in return; but they got the road through their influence with the Government, and I suppose this is the second addition of it. I must take exception to what the Minister of Justice says. We do not for a moment deny that it is an advantage to have mineral facilities, and I, presume this road to be constructed will connect with the Intercolonial Railway or the Cape Breton line, and will be a benefit in the sense of securing traffic to these lines from the development of these mines. At the same time, if these mines are held by private individuals or corporations, and this road is going to add very materially to the value of their property, I think it is they who should build it and not we. If the mines were in the hands of the Government or in any way controlled by the Dominion, or if we had a royalty out of them, it might be wise to develop them, but I question whether we have any such interest.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It would not make any difference if they were public property, because the provisions of the Act require that they shall be given to the first applicant on the payment of a very small sum. There is a royalty reserved to the Provincial Government.

To the Nicola Valley Railway Company, for 25 miles of their railway, from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, at or near Spence's Bridge, towards Nicola Lake, $80,000.

Mr. HAGGART. This is a very important road and is to connect the Canadian Pacific Railway with one of the finest agricultural regions in British Columbia. The total length of the road is 50 miles, but this vote is for 25 miles. It is a well settled district.

Mr. MARA. This is an agricultural and stock-raising country, but there are valuable coal deposits which can only be developed by a railway being built to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the interior of British Columbia, from $8 to $10 a ton is paid for coal. This is the largest and richest coal deposit in the interior of the province. There is coal at Kamloops, a few miles from the railway, but not sufficient to warrant a large expenditure in sinking shafts.

Mr. LAURIER. Is this company ready to undertake the work?

Mr. MARA. Yes, two companies were chartered, and they have been amalgamated.

For a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway, through the Stewiacke Valley, on a line which will afford facilities of communication with the iron mines at Springside, Upper Stewiacke and Musquodoboit settlements, 25 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $80,000.

Mr. HAGGART. This is merely a revote of a subsidy. No ten-mile section has been completed, but a great deal of work has been done, and this is to allow the Government to pay for the work which has been done.

Mr. EDGAR. What railway company is doing this? There is none mentioned.

Mr. HAGGART. I think it is the Stewiacke and Lansdowne Railway Company.

Mr. FRASER. Of course the Government are aware that the company have issued bonds, and floated quite a large loan in London a year or two ago on the strength of the subsidy.

Mr. PUTNAM. I would call the attention of the Minister of Railways to this vote. The line is from Brookfield on the Intercolonial, to Newton Mills and Stewiacke. There is another line by Maitland to Newport or Windsor, a distance of 49 miles. There is a link which is not yet subsidized of 15 miles, and in order to allow the company to complete their financial arrangements, I would call the attention of the Government to that fact.

Mr. KENNY. I am glad to see that the name of Musquodoboit has been introduced in this resolution, and I suppose it is intended ultimately to extend this line to that settlement which is one of the best farming settlements in Nova Scotia, and I say this with all respect to my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron). A few years ago I called the attention of the Government to the fact that in this section of the County of Halifax there was no railway connection, and I am glad to see that the name has been introduced now, because I take it that it is understood that something will be done to aid railway development in that district.

Mr. FRASER. What is the intention of the Government in regard to this vote? Is the line to be built from Truro directly, or is it to be joined at Brookfield with the Stewiacke and Lansdowne Railway? There is a distance of eight miles left there. There was a question whether the company would build through the County of Hants or directly from Truro. I would like to know whether it is the intention to join the line from Brookfield, or to have an independent road from Windsor?

Mr. PUTNAM. The contract for this line has been signed from Newton Mills to Brookfield, and then down to Shubenacadie, and down through the County of Hants to Windsor or Newport. That is subsidized by the Local as well as by the Dominion Government; and I now ask whether the line from Newton Mills to Lansdowne, on the Pictou branch, a distance of 15 miles, is to be subsidized?

Mr. FRASER. A great deal was said about this in the County of Colchester during the last election, and I should like to know if the road is to be continuous with the Stewiacke and Lansdowne road through Brookfield, or if a road is to be built from Truro?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand it is a continuous road, and goes by Brookfield, and not from Truro. As I understand it, there are practically two lines, one from Newport or Windsor, and the other the Stewiacke line.

To the Philipsburg Junction Railway and Quarry Company, for 6 75-100 miles of their railway from Stanbridge Station to Philipsburg, in the County of Missisquoi, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $21,690.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has brought down no papers whatever in regard to this railway.

Mr. HAGGART. It is for the purpose of building a railway to a very valuable stone quarry at Philipsburg.

Mr. BAKER. This subsidy is to secure the completion of a line of railway which will connect the

old Philipsburg, Farnham and Yamaska Railway with Missisquoi Bay. This company was chartered as long ago as 1871. This line runs right through the heart of the fertile counties lying on the south side of the Richelieu River, including Rouville, St. Hyacinthe and Bagot, down to the St. Lawrence. The northern portion of the road has been constructed, but it stops at Stanbridge station. Recently a new company has been incorporated by the Quebec Legislature, authorizing the construction of the southern extremity of this old railway, which is necessary in order to complete the general communication between the northern counties and Missisquoi Bay. There are valuable quarries of stone and marble there. It will enable the northern section of that country to get communication with navigable waters, and it will give an outlet to the products of these fertile farming countries with which my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, is acquainted, and it will also give an outlet for the large production of lumber that is produced in Nicolet. Without disparaging other railway enterprises, this is one of the most important in the Province of Quebec, and this subsidy can be abundantly justified.

Mr. LAURIER. And these wealthy people are not able to build six miles of railway without public aid.

Mr. BAKER. My hon. friend must be aware that railway enterprises in the Province of Quebec have been in times past considerably crippled. That company passed into the hands of the South-Eastern Company, and circumstances over which the company had no control compelled them to abandon the construction of that part of the railway.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does this run to a saw mill?

Mr. BAKER. It runs from Stanbridge station, the present terminus of the railway, to Missisquoi Bay, that is, to navigable water. Missisquoi Bay is a part of Lake Champlain, and it gives direct communication with the United States, to which my hon. friend looks with yearning eyes.

Mr. LAURIER. But you should give us an entrance to the United States.

To the Kingston, Napanee and Tamworth Railway Company, for 3 miles of their railway from a point at or near Harrowsmith to a point at or near Sydenham, in lieu of the subsidy granted for this section of road by 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $9,600.

Mr. HAGGART. The name of the railway should be the Kingston, Napanee and Western. There was a mistake in drawing the resolution.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why is Tamworth left out?

Mr. HAGGART. It is the same railway as the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec, which was changed by Act of Parliament. This is merely a revote of a subsidy that was voted two years ago. It was given for the purpose of getting from the present end of the line to Harrowsmith or Sydenham down to the lake. The point it is intended to reach is on the lake shore. The object was to get wood for the extensive charcoal manufactory that those gentlemen have at Deseronto. They are going into the manufacture of charcoal and pig iron.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand that in some cases subsidies have been granted to lines before they are located, or even before a survey of any kind has been made. Now, in order to obviate the granting of small subsidies to build these small ends of lines, the Government in every case should insist upon the survey and location of the line, and then they would know the exact length of the road.

For a railway from Cape Tormenti towards Murray Bay, 20 miles, in the Province of Quebec, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is a mistake in the name that is given to this road. It is Cape Tourmente, and is an extension of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway.

Mr. LAURIER. This road, I understand, is subsidized from Quebec to Murray Bay.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. The road is completed to Ste. Anne, and there will be a gap, according to this subsidy.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The extension is not proposed to go beyond Cape Tourmente; the extension down to Murray Bay is not contemplated in this resolution.

Mr. LAURIER. Then I do not understand the language of the resolution. The hon. gentleman says it is not intended to go on with the railway.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is a revote.

Mr. LAURIER. If it is a revote, we must understand what we are voting. The hon. gentleman tells us that it is not intended to carry on the railway any further than Cape Tourmente, the appropriation that is now asked for is to build a road from Cape Tourmente to Murray Bay.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The last subsidy which was given to this road was for a line going to Cape Tourmente; it was given only for a time, which will have elapsed when the present resolutions come into force. It is contemplated now to renew that subsidy, and this is a revote to continue the road, in so far as the present extension is concerned, as far as Cape Tourmente.

Mr. EDGAR. This resolution states that it is in lieu of the subsidy granted by 52 Victoria, chapter 3, but that Act only grants a subsidy from the bank of the St. Charles River to or near Cape Tourmente, and does not go beyond it at all.

Mr. HAGGART. I think there are two subsidies, and it is intended to renew one of them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman will look at the statute it will be found that the subsidy is given just exactly as I have stated. The first subsidy was given to Cape Tourmente, and the second subsidy is given from Cape Tourmente down to Murray Bay. It is that subsidy we are revoting now to prevent it lapsing.

Mr. EDGAR. If so, this resolution is wrongly drawn, because it is stated that this resolution is granted in lieu of the subsidy granted by 52 Victoria, chapter 3, and that is only from St. Charles to Cape Tourmente.

Mr. HAGGART. There were two subsidies granted in the same year. One is described as being for a road from the east branch of the St. Charles towards Cape Tourmente. That road is under contract, and is nearly finished. The other subsidy

was granted for a line from Cape Tourmente towards Murray Bay.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The construction was to be completed within two years, and two years have elapsed. There were two subsidies granted in that year.

Mr. LAURIER. Then this resolution should be amended so that the subsidy will be granted to the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlebois Railway Company.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

For a railway from Truro, or a point between Truro and Stewiacke, to Newport or to Windsor, in the Province of Nova Scotia, for 49 miles of such railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $158,800.

Mr. LAURIER. To what company is this subsidy to be given?

Mr. HAGGART. To the same company.

To the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway from Campbellton towards Grand Falls, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. Where will this road run?

Mr. HAGGART. This is a road which has been agitated in New Brunswick for a number of years. A few years ago it was surveyed by the Government, and the cost of construction was approximately estimated at $20,000 per mile. It will pass through a very fair farming country and also an extensive lumbering region.

Mr. EDGAR. With what railway will it connect?

Mr. HAGGART. It will connect with the New Brunswick Railway that runs north to Temiscouata and also with the Intercolonial.

For a railway from St. John's to Ste. Rosalie, 32 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $102,400.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This road will run between St. John's, Que., and St. Hyacinthe, and will connect with the Drummond County Railway at Ste. Rosalie. The name of the company was the United Counties Railway Company. As the company has not been in very active existence lately, the subsidy is to be given to a company established by new arrangements entered into, I understand, between the late shareholders and other persons who have joined them.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the subsidy not given to the United Counties Company?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is given to the railway which was proposed to be built by the United Counties Railway Company.

Mr. McMULLEN. What railway facilities are there in that section now?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Between those towns, which are progressive communities, there are only two ways of communication. One is by going from St. John's to St. Lambert and back to St. Hyacinthe by the Grand Trunk Railway; and the other is by going round by the South-Eastern, which will be two or three times as long a journey. I might add that these people, who are very active, intelligent and progressive, have so far received no railway subsidy from this Government. They have received railway subsidies from the Quebec Government, and they now ask a small subsidy from the Dominion Government, which is equivalent to the usual subsidies granted to these enterprises. The valley between the Richelieu and Yamaska Rivers is one of the richest valleys in the whole Province of Quebec.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do I understand that this section has already railway accommodation at two points, and this line is to make direct connection across the intervening country?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Across the country between those two towns which have railway communication, one from Montreal to Portland by the Grand Trunk Railway, and one from Montreal to the international boundary.

Mr. EDGAR. What reason is there why the name of the company to which the subsidy is to be given should not appear?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said the affairs of the company were rather in an unsettled state when the Government intended to grant a subsidy.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I had in 1884 the honour to address the House and ask the Minister of Railways and Canals to grant subsidies to railways, in order to relieve the Provincial Governments from the burden of subventions to commercial roads. I then represented to the Government that the subsidies granted by the Local Governments must necessarily involve expenditures which should not be incumbent on them, and which sooner or later create difficulties which will be more or less hard to face. Since 1884 the Dominion Government undertook the subsidizing of those roads, and declared that it was their intention to adopt a policy calculated to insure the building of railways in the different provinces. The road now subsidized by the present resolutions, from St. John's to Ste. Rosalie, obtained under Mr. Mercier's regime a land grant equivalent to the subvention now given by this Government. I have no objection to see the Government insure the building of a railway between St. John's and St. Hyacinthe, but I wish that a restriction be added to the resolutions, to the effect that this company, as well as all others receiving subsidies from the Dominion Government, shall have no right to receive grants of a Provincial Government. These railways are commercial enterprises, which must be under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament and not under that of the provinces. Now, the provinces should not grant subsidies to the same companies: for if these are allowed to get money from both Dominion and Provincial Governments, we will necessarily find speculations taking place at the expense either of the federal or of the provincial treasury.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Two instead of one.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) As to such subsidies, I consider that there is generally much danger of boodlers fattening their wallets with them; but when they are too large the danger is really too apparent. Now, the last dodge in boodling is to form companies of political friends of the Government and to cause some political opponents of the Administration to join in, so as to insure impunity to the raids made on the public treasury. I will tell my hon. friend that I believe

that a subsidy of $6,400 per mile for a road from St. Hyacinthe to St. John's, in a country which offers no obstacle to such a construction, is too much. I know what is the cost of a railway per mile on such a surface: and if such an enterprise has any commercial value at all, it can be carried out with a subvention of $3,200 per mile. Consequently, it is undesirable to force the Quebec treasury to yield another $3,200 per mile, so as to bring the total to $6,400 per mile. I consider that this provincial subsidy was granted at a time when politics in Quebec were in the hands of extravagant men. If the grant now given by the Dominion Government is not sufficient, I have no objection—since this Government is to have the control of the road—that it be increased; but I object to see the Provincial Government obliged to pay an equal sum. for the provincial grant of 10,000 acres, converted into money, will give a sum equal to the Dominion subsidy. Now, the building of a railway, in a region like that through which this road is to run, will cost less than $6,000 per mile.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Does my hon. friend know that the economical men who to day govern the Province of Quebec have given a subvention to the Lake St. John Railway Company.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I know that and I do not approve that subvention. I will give here, Mr. Chairman, the cost of building such a road per mile:

Cost of a Mile of Railway on Level Ground.

Purchase of land, 9 arpents and 20 perches, at $80 per arpent	$ 720 00
Wire fencing	400 00
Earthwork	700 00
Steel rails, 88 tons at $21 per ton	1,848 00
Spikes, nuts, bolts, 4 30-100 tons at $50 per ton.	215 00
Ties, 2,300 at 22 cts. each	506 00
Distributing the ties, 2,300 at 3 cts. each	69 00
Laying down the rails	70 00
Ballast, 2,000 cubic yards at 20 cts. per yard	400 00
Telegraph	75 00
Public and farm road crossings, and cattle guards	150 00
Station buildings, engine houses, sheds, turn-plates, engineering	400 00
Total	$5,553 00

According to these figures the total cost per mile is about $5,500. Therefore, the subsidy from the Local Government is an abuse, when such companies are equally subsidized by the Dominion Government. When such roads are to run through regions like that where the railway of the united counties is to be built, and where the work can be done for at most $6,000 per mile, the House will agree with me that the companies which undertake them should contribute something to the cost of their construction. The contractors must not expect that the Dominion and Local Governments will grant them such subsidies that when the road is built, they will still have on hand, over and above its cost, a bonus for its construction.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) As was stated by the Minister of Customs, Mr. Chairman, the railway now subsidized had for its promoters Mr. Morrison, of St. Hyacinthe, the late Mr. Massue, of Varennes, formerly member for Richelieu, and the late Mr. Labelle, member for the same county, and two or three other prominent Conservatives, and myself. The first charter we obtained was in 1883, but owing to certain difficulties resulting from an amendment passed by the Legislative Council we were obliged to have this charter renewed in 1885. Finally, in 1888, we obtained a charter allowing to build a road from St. John to Sorel. In 1890, the Quebec Government granted this company a land subsidy, as they had done to many others. This subsidy consisted of 10,000 acres per mile, which were to be converted in money at the rate of 70 cents per acre, 35 cents of which would be payable in money after the construction of every ten-mile section, and the balance after the sale of the lands. As was mentined by the Minister of Customs, Mr. Morrison and myself assigned to other persons all the rights we had in the charter. I am happy to say that the person at the head of the enterprise is an able and experienced engineer, who has already built railways, and if this subsidy is granted I am satisfied that the building of the road will be assured. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) objects to the granting of the proposed subsidy to this road, and he came before the committee to give estimates of the probable cost of the work. He told us that the rails would cost $21 per ton; the grading $700 per mile, and so on. I have known the hon. member for a long while, and I know that when it is a question of St. Hyacinthe, he must not be excepted to show sympathies for that. But, seeing that the road passes by the parish of Ste. Rosalie, a parish in his own county and which is as interested as is St. Hyacinthe in the success of the enterprise, I thought at least that he would do nothing to prevent the granting of this subsidy. The hon. member brought out an altogether new theory. He did not want the Dominion Government to give any aid to a railway enterprise already subsidized by the Provincial Government. This is the first time I hear a member raise such an objection, and ask the Government to grant no subsidy to a road, on the ground that it has already received some help from a Provincial Government. He added that his object was to prevent the promoters of this road from making money at the expense of the public treasury and to prevent boodlers from speculating with that money. I do not think there are any boodlers in that company, and I do not believe the hon. member could name a single man in it deserving that name. For the first time perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I approve the Government, as they show their willingness of facilitating the building of that road. It is true that the town of St. Hyacinthe has means of communication with the city of Montreal by the Grand Trunk and the Pacific, but the latter route is much too long to offer very great advantages. With the proposed road not only shall we have easy and direct communication with the different localities which it is to cross, but we will all be put in connection with an important Eastern Township road, the Drummond Railway, which will pass by St. Hyacinthe, St. Damase, the Counties of Rouville and Iberville, and will connect us with the American railroads. We can, therefore, in the future expect to be able to trade with the Eastern Townships and the United States, as well as Montreal. The farmers will take the shortest line, which will be that one now contemplated. If my information is correct it will be the shortest route from Quebec to New York, and the distance so saved will not be less than 50 miles. I hope now that the hon.

member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) has expounded his theory on Dominion and provincial subsidies, and shown his knowledge as an engineer as to the cost of railway construction, he will be satisfied and will not carry his opposition any further. I hope also that the Government will not withdraw from its position in consequence of this manifestation of opposition by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont). The new company in whose favour this subsidy is to be voted is composed of men perfectly qualified to carry the enterprise to completion. If the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) thinks that my presence in this company is sufficient in his opinion to be an obstacle to granting this subsidy, I will tell him that neither Mr. Morrison nor myself, nor any of the original members of the company, have any other interest in it now than that of seeing St. Hyacinthe and the counties which this road is to cross benefit by its construction.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) If the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) understands that I am opposed to this subsidy he is greatly mistaken. What I said and what I repeat, is that I object to seeing commercial lines subsidized by the Quebec Provincial Government. It is not reasonable that such enterprises be a burden on the provincial treasury when they are to bring no revenue to that treasury, and that all the benefit is to accrue to the Dominion Government. I also added—and this will prove that I am not opposed to the subsidy—that I would be glad to see a larger subsidy granted, if that which is now provided for is not sufficient to insure the building of the road. But what I want is that the Quebec Government be not forced to pay a sum of two or three hundred thousand dollars for an enterprise which will only benefit the Dominion Government, in the matter of revenue, and for the building of a purely commercial railway. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) seems to have taken for himself what I said about boodlers. I will assure the hon. member that I in no way referred to him or any of the members of the company; I only spoke in a general way of much-to-be-regretted speculations carried on by the class of men known as boodlers. It is well known that the speculators of this type are not very particular when an occasion comes of easily making money at the expense of the public treasury. It seems to me that the hon. member should be of my opinion, when I say that a railway company should not be at the same time under the control of two governments, and that people should not be allowed to draw money from two governments, and even make profits on the construction cost of a railway out of the subsidies granted to the enterprise. The hon. member gave to understand that I have the pretension to pose as an engineer, because I gave figures as to the cost of building the railway. I will point out to my hon. friend that these figures are not mine, but those of the engineers who built railways on similar ground. They must know as much as the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) about such questions. The figures I read were put before the committee, and any one can see if they are true or false. If the railway is to benefit the town of St. Hyacinthe, I will be glad for that, but since it is such an important enterprise, and since it will afford direct communication with Montreal and even the United States, I see in that an additional ground for my position, when I contend that the enterprise falls within the immediate province of the Dominion Government, and that the Quebec Government who is to derive no benefit from this road, should not be called upon to subsidize it. Moreover, since this railway is to run through a valley where there is much made, which will make it profitable to its owners; if, as is said, the city of St. Hyacinthe is to derive so great advantages from this road, I do not see why the promoters of the enterprise should want to have, by way of subsidies, enough money to build the road, and still have, after its completion, a balance on hand applicable to its equipment. I am not hostile to the interest of the city of St. Hyacinthe; on the contrary, the policy which I always supported has caused the prosperity of that city, while the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) voted against subsidies to railways, and opposed with all his strength a policy so favourable to the industrial and commercial interests of St. Hyacinthe.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I wish to correct some of the figures of my hon. friend. If the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) can give the secret to an engineer or capitalist to build a railway through a well settled and rich farming country where the cost of expropriation is very heavy, for $6,000 a mile, I am sure that without boodling he could make a good deal of money out of his patent.

Mr. DUPONT. I have given the figures to the Minister.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Figures are very deceiving things, especially in building a railway.

Mr. FORBES. Not in a railway subsidy.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, in the building of a railway like this. This railway implies the construction of a bridge over the Richelieu River at St. John's, and of another over the River Yamaska at St. Hyacinthe; and although I am not an engineer every one who knows that place will see it is an expensive undertaking.

Mr. DUPONT. They will run over the same bridge.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They will not and cannot, and the cost of that bridge will be over $70,000.

Mr. BERNIER. $75,000.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I repeat that even if these two bridges were not there, that if the hon. gentleman can build a railway through a country such as this for less than $12,000 a mile, with the equipment of the road, he has a secret that engineers do not possess.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) When we made the surveys we had an engineer who, after having made the plans, stated to us that the road would not cost less than $9,000 or $10,000 a mile. That is the estimation of a competent engineer who had the supervision of the works on the Drummond Railway from beginning to end.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) With the bridges.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) Without the bridges. The bridges are to be added to that. I am not only referring to the bridges on the Yamaska or the Richelieu. At that time there was no intention of crossing the County of Bagot in order to please the hon. member as is the case to-day. The road was to cross the Counties of Iberville, Rouville, St. Hyacinthe and Richelieu. Now, according to the present location, the road will reach beyond Drummondville and Nicolet in the Eastern Town-

ships. It will connect with the Drummond Railway. My hon. friend must know that there is a bridge to be constructed on the Yamaska, at a distance of some ten arpents below the Grand Trunk bridge. This structure will cost about $75,000. I could not say how much the bridge at St. John's would cost; but I will say, as did the Minister of Customs, that if the hon. member for Bagot has a secret for building railways for $6,000 a mile, he ought to give it to us.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I have given you my secret.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) That was purely theoretical, and I do not believe that the hon. member would like to undertake the construction of a railway for the sum he mentioned notwithstanding his ability and his brilliant faculties as an engineer. I will now come to his theory that the Dominion Government should not subsidize railways which receive help from Provincial Governments. This has often been done, and the hon. member never objected. I find with regret that the hon. member chooses an occasion when the interests of St. Hyacinthe are at stake to come and unfold a new theory, the result of which, should it be adopted, would be detrimental to St. Hyacinthe and to a large number of electors of his county, the prosperity of whom depends on the prosperity of St. Hyacinthe to a certain extent. As the leader of the Opposition has pointed out, the hon. member has just voted a resolution for a subsidy to a New Brunswick Railway which also receives a grant from the Local Government. It is possible that he has not paid as much attention to the resolutions concerning New Brunswick as to those which refer to the Province of Quebec, for he seems to have concentrated his mind on the St. John's and Ste. Rosalie Railway. I hope that before the debate is over, the hon. member will admit that he was wrong in offering this opposition; he will admit that he had forgotten the parish of Ste. Rosalie, where he took his first education as a notary. I hope that he will apologize for having attempted to deprive it of a railway which is to be shorter and more rapid than those now in existence.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I will tell my hon. friend for St. Hyacinthe that the electors of Ste. Rosalie agree with me as to the subvention which was granted by the Provincial Government. No more than those of St. Hyacinthe will the electors of Ste. Rosalie feel like standing direct taxation to favour the building of a railway, when this railway, as I said before, can be subsidized by the Dominion Government. While the building of this road can be insured by the Dominion subvention, it is useless for the Quebec Government to pay $150,000 towards it, when the latter Government has no interest in it. The Minister of Customs turned into ridicule the figures which I put before the House. Before ridiculing my figures he should be able, as well as the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, to furnish the figures given by the engineers of the enterprise. Can the Minister of Customs say that steel rails to-day cost any more than $21 per ton? About 80 tons are necessary to lay down a mile of track. The hon. Minister knows also the cost of sleepers or ties. The engineers say that it takes 2,300 ties to the mile. Now, they cost $22 a hundred. And so on with the different items which I enumerated. When the cost of the material and that of labour are given, I think the whole is covered. If the hon. members treat this as a secret they simply close their eyes to the light in order not to see the truth, because they are bent upon granting large subsidies that may allow the contractors to enrich themselves.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) I will ask the hon. member if he is not forgetting a rather important item. I mean the ballast. Could he tell me whether the necessary ballast will be found along the road?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I will tell the hon. member that there is no ballast on this line, because there are no natural obstacles to overcome; and if the road is to connect with the Drummond County Railway, it will be easy to get the necessary ballast on the latter. Consequently, the matter of ballast cannot be considered in advance as an obstacle. The number of cubic yards per mile is about 2,000, and will cost about $400.

Mr. BECHARD. (Translation.) If I am not mistaken, the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) stated that he only objected to this subsidy for the reason that this company is already receiving a grant from the Quebec Provincial Government, and that he is opposed to a railway company receiving subsidies, both from Provincial and Federal Governments. It seems that the answer to this is very simple. He ought to have opposed all the subsidies that were under the same circumstances; and that is what he did not do. He never cared as long as those double subsidies were for other roads, but he brought his opposition to bear on this one alone. The hon. member seems opposed to the Quebec Government paying subventions to railways that are subsidized by the Dominion Government. I will point out to the hon. member that this is not the place for him to urge this objection. Let him have some of his friends urge it in the Quebec Legislature. The hon. member says that the Quebec provincial treasury is not in a condition to subsidize such enterprises, which are in the interest of the Dominion treasury; but this is not a reason which should deter the Dominion Government from favouring this railway, as it did others under the same circumstances, that is to say, other railways receiving subsidies from both Governments. He seems to fear the boodlers. On that point we all agree; the boodlers are the worst plagues for all governments; but I don't know that there are boodlers to be feared in connection with this road. I have not the practical knowledge of an engineer, and I do not know the history of this enterprise; all I know is that this road will cross a territory where land will cost a considerable sum. It crosses one of the finest regions of the Province of Quebec, and consequently the right of way must cost very much. The hon. Minister of Customs told us that the company will have to build a bridge at St. Hyacinthe, and another one on the Richelieu River. These two bridges will cost much money, for one of them is to be no less than a half mile long, which means that it must be an expensive structure. I hope that the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) will not continue his opposition to the subsidy, and that he will approve the policy which favours this enterprise. He contends that the Quebec Provin-

cial Government has not the means to subsidize railways. He may be right; let him then take measures for remedying that with the Provincial Government, but in the meanwhile let him accept the resolution for this subsidy.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I am happy, Mr. Chairman, to see the Government pursue a policy calculated to develop the resources of the province and encourage particularly the railway enterprises of the district of Montreal. I understand that the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) does not oppose that policy which he finds excellent, since he is ready to vote for an increase of the subsidy by the Dominion Government if necessary, so that the Quebec Provincial Government be not called upon to pay for the carrying out of that enterprise. The hon. member deserves the approbation of the Province of Quebec, for it is time that we should know whether the Provincial Government should subsidize railways that are to be put under the control of the Dominion Government as soon as they are built. But this is not the point to which I wish to call the attention of the committee. It seems to be forgotten that there is in the district of Quebec a large territory which has no railway to help its development. It seems to be forgotten that there is, behind the Alleghanies, a region which deserves that some help be given by the Government towards the construction of a railway within its area. I notice on the map now on the Table of the House, the indication of a railway starting from St. Anselme, and going through the Counties of Bellechasse, Montmagny, l'Islet, Kamouraska and Témiscouata. I wish to draw the attention of the Government to that proposed railway. The public have long asked for the realization of this project, which is calculated to develop that important part of the province. I do not accuse the Government of negligence, but I urge them not to forget that there is behind the Alleghanies a vast territory deprived of means of communication. This railway would be the shortest route from the Province of Quebec to the Maritime Provinces. We would have there a railway whose whole length would be on Canadian territory, and which would favour the development of the agricultural, lumbering and mining interests of this large region. I hope that next session the Government will ask us to vote a sum towards the construction of that railway. The idea expressed by my hon. friend the member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) deserves the most serious attention, if we want to consolidate the work of confederation. We must give it all our solicitude, for it is well known that the Provincial Legislatures have not resources enough to subsidize railway enterprises.

For a railway from St. Placide to St. Andrews, 8 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200, per mile nor exceeding in the whole $25,600.

Mr. OUIMET. The ground covered by this subsidy forms part of a line of railway which is intended to be built from a point in the County of Laval, near Bord à Plouffe, passing St. Martin, Ste. Dorothée, St. Eustache, St. Joseph, St. Benoit, St. Placide, to St. Andrew's, in the County of Argenteuil, and thence by a line already built to Lachute, on the Canadian Pacific Railway. In 1887 a subsidy was granted covering the ground between St. Placide and St. Eustache, and the following year another subsidy covered the ground from St. Eustache to Sault au Recollet, the starting point in that line which I have just described. These two subsidies are revoted this year. One of the subsidies that was first voted was voted to the Grenville and Carillon Railway Company, which owns the road from Carillon to Grenville, and forms part of the Ottawa River Navigation Company's line of communication. That company has done nothing, and this year the grant has been revoted simply for a railway from St. Eustache to St. Placide, and to continue that line from St. Eustache to Sault au Recollet, which is to form a line traversing a valuable farming country, and a country of great value also as having some splendid places for summer resorts. This is to encourage the formation of a new company, and if a company can be formed to build that road it will be a great benefit to the locality. Of course, if that company cannot be formed the scheme will have to be abandoned, I suppose, but I hope a company will be formed that will build the line with the subsidy that is now granted.

For a railway to complete the connection between Sydney and Louisbourg, in the County of Cape Breton, for 28 miles of such railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $89,600.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is a projected railway from the terminus of the Cape Breton Railway, at Sydney, connecting with the shipping port of Louisbourg. There are two or three applications for the subsidy, two I believe filed by incorporated companies. It has been considered better not to name any particular company in the subsidy, because we wish first to see which company will give us the best terms and have the best prospects of success.

Mr. LAURIER. I see no application except from the Louisbourg Railway Company.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. One company is the company that owns the mine, and an abandoned narrow gauge railway running towards Louisbourg, but not through from Sydney. The other application was made by persons interested in the International Coal Company. I am not aware whether it was intended that the International Coal Company should take up the subsidy and construct a railway, or whether it would be done by shareholders in that enterprise.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How many miles of railway would the hon. gentleman say had been subsidized, including what is now proposed to be granted?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government work consists of 80 miles, and this mileage of 28 miles and the Orangedale branch is all there is in the Island. As regards the International Coal Company, I have received to-day a letter from one of the principal shareholders in that company—in fact, I think the manager, who states:—

"I have a telegram from Mr. McDougall advising me that the subsidy has been voted to the Lunenburg line, $3,200 per mile for a distance of 28 miles. In this form I assume no company is mentioned, but I take it our many times renewed applications cover it, not only as regards route, but also priority. The amount is less than we had counted on, and under previously existing circumstances would have been insufficient to secure the prompt building of the road; but negotiations have been going on with some parties for a larger enterprise than the railway to Lunenburg, which will form part of this scheme, and it looks now as if these would come to a practical issue immediately. Will you kindly advise me if any further application is necessary from us?"

This is from Mr. J. S. McLennan, who is the manager of the International Coal Company. We will ascertain which company is the best to deal with, without committing ourselves to any.

Mr. LAURIER. The same gentleman is one of the incorporators of the Louisbourg Company. I find his name among those in the application.

To the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway, for 30 miles of their railway from Belleville to Tweed and thence to Bridgewater, in lieu of the subsidy granted, 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this a renewal of an old grant?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. EDGAR. Has any progress been made?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. EDGAR. Is there any prospect of any? I think when such a large grant is renewed we should be told by the Government what prospect there is of the railway being built within a reasonable time. Otherwise it is a farce to renew the grant.

Mr. BOWELL. I made a similar remark the other day, when in Belleville, to those interested in the railway. I pointed out that unless there was a prospect of the road being built, it was nonsense to go on voting the subsidy, and they assured me that there was every prospect of the work going on. I also told them that they need not expect another renewal of the subsidy.

To the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company, for 56 miles of their railway from the city of Kingston to Smith's Falls, in lieu of the subsidies not to exceed $179,200, granted by the Acts 53 Victoria, chapter 3, and 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy calculated on a basis of 3½ per cent on the amount of such subsidies so granted, to be paid in semi-annual instalments for such period not exceeding 21 years, as the company may elect, which represents a grant in cash of $179,200.

Provided that, upon the completion of 28 miles of the said railway, a semi-annual subsidy may be paid proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole 56 miles: Provided also, that the company may deposit with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General a sum not exceeding $1,170,000.

In consideration whereof there shall be paid to the company for such period not exceeding 20 years as the company may elect, a semi-annual annuity calculated on a basis of 3½ per cent on the amount so deposited: Provided further, that the Governor in Council may permit the company to assign the said subsidy and annuity to trustees by way of security for any bonds or securities which may be issued by the company in respect of their undertaking, and the subsidy to the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway shall be paid in instalments, the first semi-annual payment upon which shall be made at the end of the six months from the date of the Chief Engineer's certificate of the completion of the 28 miles of railway, and each subsequent payment at the end of six months thereafter, for the term of 20 years or less.

Mr. EDGAR. This is rather a new system of giving aid to railways. It may be a good one or it may not be; but I think we should have a pretty full consideration before we enter upon it. I suppose that when the Government guaranteed the Canadian Pacific Railway securities, they established something of a precedent; but if we assume that this grant of $179,200 is proper, then I suppose we can come to the question which the Minister of Finance has had to consider. It is proposed apparently, in the first part, that, instead of paying that subsidy in money when it is earned, the country shall borrow as it were that amount from the railway company and pay them back an equivalent in an annuity for 20 years, that annuity to be calculated at 3½ per cent. That is a sale of an annuity pure and simple for a subsidy which the railway shall earn. Then we come to the other provision, which is still more unusual, that the Government shall borrow from the railway company $1,170,000, and pay them that also by an annuity calculated at 3½ per cent. Now, I can understand that that would be an excellent plan for a railway to raise money from supplementing the assistance which they get from municipalities, and it would of course stiffen their bonds and enable them to borrow the money. It is a question, however, for the Minister of Finance. If 3½ per cent be the present rate at which we can borrow money at par, and this annuity has to run for 20 years, the question is whether it is a profitable investment for Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. The question, as my hon. friend has stated, is not a new one. It was introduced the year before last when we voted the subsidies. When we give $3,200 a mile for a certain length of railway, the money is paid over when the work is completed and the money is earned; instead of having the whole sum given to them at that time, they preferred, what was an exact equivalent, that they should receive the payment over a certain number of years. That is, the capital amount was turned into an annuity on a 3½ per cent basis. The first thing to be considered is the fact that the cost to the Government is exactly the same; and, in the second place, the putting of a certain amount on deposit is really a loan to the Government. We take that much money from the company and keep it in trust, and pay it in the form of an annuity costing us 3½ per cent per annum. The whole question is whether we calculate the annuity at too high a rate of interest or not. I have never undertaken to take from railway companies whatever they may choose to offer. This is the sole instance in this system of railway subsidies, outside the Canadian Pacific Railway of course, in which this has been done; and I would not like to go into it as a policy, because if we did it, it would place moneys in our hands which we might not need. At the time I made this arrangement, we were in need of money, at least we expected to be within a year, and if I could have got it in that way within the year, it would have been better for us than to raise a loan on the market. The company were not able to raise it in that time, but we had put ourselves under the obligation to agree to this, and as I shall have to raise money from time to time that money will come in very well. The percentage is not very high, it is exactly what we pay in the savings banks but more advantageous, as it has this advantage, that we do not incur the same charges in paying it out. We will not have to pay the charges which the management of the savings banks entails, though these charges are small, of course, distributed over the whole amount. Comparing it with loans we raise at home, where we have to pay when the rates of exchange may be against us in transmitting money between Great Britain and this country, it is to our advantage. We have also to take into account, with regard to loans in the old country, the cost of putting the loan on the market. We have also to take into

account our own costs which are slight, and the charges and fees of our agents, besides the payment of a percentage on every half year's interest. In this transaction there will be none of these costs, so that altogether I think it is fully as favourable as, perhaps a little more than, any loan we can make on the British market. There is this other circumstance if that be an advantage, that the interest is paid in our own country, the money being kept here.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the explanation given by the Minister of Finance is very clear and explicit with regard to this particular transaction, but I am glad to hear him intimate that it is not the policy of the Government to adopt this mode of aiding railway lines to any very considerable extent because circumstances might arise under which the Government would be paying interest when they did not require the money. There cannot be any doubt at all that the rate of three and a-half paid here, without any of the incidental charges that are attached to loans in the old country, is an advantage to the people of Canada; and I can only say I wish that the rate of interest fixed in the post office savings banks were such that a larger amount of money would be deposited by the people in those banks than is deposited at present, but circumstances might arise when moneys would be deposited, if this principle were adopted, to a very considerable extent, and interest be paid upon it when the requirements of the Government did not necessitate a loan.

Mr. EDGAR. Under the Act, there seems to be a possibility of the railway company paying in this money at any time and in separate amounts. There is no time fixed in the law. It says: "Provided also that the company may deposit with the Finance Minister or Receiver General a sum not exceeding so much." Within what time is it to be deposited and in what manner?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no provision as to time. It is to be deposited when they can raise the money in a lump sum. It is not understood that I am to take it in small amounts. If that were so, it would be stipulated so. At any time when this amount is paid in to me, I can stop just so much at 5 per cent interest, so that the country will be the gainer of 1½ per cent.

To the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company, for 34 miles of their railway, from the city of St. Catharines to the city of Hamilton, in lieu of subsidies not to exceed $108,000, granted by the Acts 52 Vic., cap. 3, and 53 Vic., cap. 2, a subsidy equal, on the basis of 3½ per cent on the amount of the said subsidies, to be paid in semi-annual instalments, in such period, not exceeding twenty years, as the company may elect, representing a grant in cash of $108,000. Provided that, upon completion of 10 miles of said railway, the semi-annual subsidy may be paid proportionately on the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole 34 miles; provided always, that the company may deposit with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General a sum not exceeding $400,000; in consideration whereof there shall be paid by the Government to the company for such period, not exceeding twenty years, as the company may elect, the same annual annuity, calculated on the basis of 3½ per cent on the amount so deposited, on a guarantee of a like sum as interest on the bonds of the company; provided further, that the company, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may assign the said subsidy and annuity to proceeds, by way of security for principal or interest of any bonds or securities which may be issued by the company in respect of their undertaking; and the subsidy last above mentioned, to the St. Catharines and Niagara Railway Company, shall be paid in instalments, the first semi-annual payment upon which shall be made at the end of six months from the date of the Chief Engineer's certificate of the completion of the first ten miles of railway, and each subsequent payment at the end of six months thereafter, for a term of twenty years or less. It is a condition of this resolution that the sum not exceeding $400,000 above mentioned, shall be deposited with the Minister of Finance before 1st January, 1893.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to enquire where the road runs in respect of the Grand Trunk Railway from St. Catharines to Hamilton?

Mr. HAGGART. It runs very close to it.

Mr. FRASER. I know nothing about the previous one, but I take it for granted it was through the country where a road should go, but if we are to have another road from St. Catharines to Hamilton where we have already one of the best roads anywhere, while large portions of the Dominion have no road at all, it seems to me to be voting money for an almost useless purpose. In addition to this, there is the fact that the road already completed by the same company is a disgrace to the country. Has the Minister seen the road the company has completed already?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. FRASER. If he had he would not have brought down this subsidy. It is a road away up 12 or 15 feet on trestle work, running along mile after mile through the country; a wooden railway that cannot stand for the 20 years that this money is to be paid back. When I passed up there I felt that I would be afraid to travel on the road. I think that this should be enquired into. I have been in the country lately, subsequent to these subsidies being brought down, and when I looked at the railway I was surprized that there should be a proposal to subsidize such a line as that. It is not an elevated railway such as they have in New York, built on iron trestles, but it is an elevated road built along the canal on wooden trestles. As everybody knows, from St. Catharines down to Hamilton, you can make as good a run as in any part of Canada. It is a beautiful country and should have a railway, but why we should subsidize this other line passes my comprehension. The hon. Minister has told us that this will run quite close to the existing line, and I believe that it is not a judicious expenditure of money when there are so many rich parts of this Dominion yet unopened by railways. I think that the Minister should enquire into this matter before he proposes to subsidize the line.

Mr. HAGGART. I know nothing about the railway that is built, but it must have been built according to contract. This is merely a renewal of subsidies that have been granted for a road on which work, I believe, has already been commenced.

Mr. FRASER. I am sure the Minister cannot have seen the work, and I believe that the Government should at once enquire into it. I do not know on what authority the road now built has been built, and I am not giving my opinion as an engineer, because I am not an engineer; but I do say that in this country, where we have such severe winters, an elevated railway on trestle work is not a proper railway to build. If the railway is going to be continued beyond St. Catharines to Hamilton, then I say before a dollar is paid, the Government should enquire as to the character of the road that is already built, and ensure that this road will

be built properly. I do not approve of the Government voting money to build a parallel line to one already existing, which I suppose is not a mile distant from it at any point, when there are other rich sections of the country which have yet no railway accommodation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is well that this matter should be investigated. It is quite clear as my hon. friend has stated that that section of the country has ample railway accommodation now. There is a road running along there, and there is no necessity for another line. The Minister says they have commenced work, and I dare say the company may have been led to understand that the previous grant would be renewed. If there was any distinct understanding of that kind, the country, I suppose, is bound to carry out its promise, but unless there is such a distinct understanding, I do not think it is wise that a subsidy should be given. If the Minister of Railways had been through that district he would know that it is a very narrow piece of land from the mountain to the lake, and that there is no room for more than one road. I think the road already built gives ample accommodation to that section, and I cannot see that there is any ground whatever for running another line side by side with it. You can almost step from one track to the other at some places.

Mr. EDGAR. I think the addition to the resolution made by the Minister of Finance seems to be a very prudent one. Is he going to allow the other railway to have unlimited time with the deposit?

Mr. FOSTER. The arrangement made with the other railway did not contemplate any particular time, and I do not care to put it in now. That, as I said before, I can do at any time. I should like to have this the present year.

To the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, for the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the 52 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and also for the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the 53 Victoria, chapter 2, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

Mr. EDGAR. I see the subsidy granted by 52 Victoria was $64,000.

Mr. HAGGART. There are two grants by the 52 and 53 Victoria, one for $128,000, and the other for $64,000. All has been paid except $96,800.

For a railway connecting the works of the New Glasgow Iron, Coal and Railway Company with the Intercolonial Railway at Eureka, for 12½ miles of such railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $40,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I want to amend that resolution so that it may read:

For a railway from Eureka Junction, on the Intercolonial Railway, to a point at or near Sunnybrae, including a branch line to the Charcoal Iron Furnace at Bridgeville, for 12½ miles of such railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $40,000.

Mr. FRASER. I am glad to see by the map that the Government propose to extend this line. I take it this map will receive the mark of the Government and remain the property of the House, so that every line the Government has seen fit to mark upon it shall receive a subsidy, and in this way a little measure of justice will be done to a very deserving county, and a very deserving people. I do not like the colour of the line indicated to the south, but I trust the fact that it is green will not interfere with the promise of the Government that they will build this road. There is a company that are investing about a million dollars. This subsidy was promised some time ago, and I think it is right. From Sunnybrae, 12 miles from the Intercolonial Railway, a company proposes to build a road down to County Harbour, in my county, and when that road is built it will be one of the most useful in Nova Scotia. It would be easy to continue it 40 miles longer to Canso, the principal fishing port of eastern Nova Scotia. I have no doubt that the trade in fresh fish from that point to the United States will be larger than from any other part of the world. I know that there are houses in Chicago already who have been making enquiries, and who will take a car load of fresh fish every day. This is the best fishing district in Nova Scotia. As the Minister has kindly indicated that this road is to be assisted down to County Harbour, if the company who are proposing to build it show themselves to be worthy, and have the funds, I am glad it is the intention of the Government to assist that road down to County Harbour. County Harbour is one of the best harbours in Nova Scotia, and that means one of the best harbours in the world. It is within some 40 miles from Sunnybrae. I think representations have been made by this company to the Government. I do not wish the Minister of Justice to commit the Government to any policy, but I should like to know his views of the line as marked out. I trust they will be favourable, especially if the company should prove itself able to build the road. They also propose to erect smelting works, but they wish to have a harbour where they can ship their products. In the district through which the line will run there is an unlimited supply of iron. According to experts, including men who are authorities in the United States, the best portion of the southern states do not furnish now favourable conditions for making iron, than does this portion of the Pictou district. There is, as I have said, an abundant supply of iron, there are five coal mines within three or four miles of the company's works and an unlimited supply of lime, which lies near the iron ore. A railroad running through a country like this will pay for itself within a very short time, and it was on the ground that they would derive from the company an adequate return the Local Government agreed to grant a subsidy to the company. I hold that the Dominion Government would make no mistake in voting a subsidy to any road first subsidized by a Local Government, because a Local Government cannot afford as well as the Dominion Government to grant subsidies, and in this way there is an assurance that only such roads will be bonused as are in the true interests of the country. I should like to know the views of the Government in regard to this matter, and if they have arrived at any policy on this undertaking which is of great importance to the county I represent.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course, it is premature to say what will be the policy of the Government next year--and perhaps that is what the hon. member for Guysborough desires me to state. But, speaking for myself, I may say that the road which the hon. gentleman advocates appears to

have a great deal of merit and to present pretty substantial guarantees, considering that the company offers to put up a smelting furnace at a cost of over $100,000. But the Government were unable to consider the merits of the road or to frame any policy in regard to it, from the fact that the small amount we propose this year to vote for new subsidies was consumed, so far as Nova Scotia was concerned, by lines of railway which had antecedent claims. For this reason the road to which the hon. gentleman has alluded is not one of those subsidized.

To the Thousand Islands Railway Company, for 13 miles of their railway from Gananoque Junction of the Grand Trunk Railway to a junction with the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway in the Province of Ontario, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 53 Victoria, chapter 3, for this section of road, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile; also the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the same Act for 4 miles of their railway from a point near the St. Lawrence River, in the Gananoque Village, to Gananoque Junction of the Grand Trunk Railway, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $44,000.

Mr. EDGAR. I see the grant in 1889 was $64,400. Has that been expended?

Mr. HAGGART. The work is divided into two sections, on one of which the company could obtain payment for every 10 miles, and on the other for every 14 miles. I understand one section has been completed.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

To the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway from Little Current to the Algoma Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

Mr. EDGAR. This is another case in which the House should know what progress is being made. I suppose it is a revote of the same amount.

Mr. HAGGART. That is all.

Mr. EDGAR. What work has been done?

Mr. HAGGART. I have the assurance that there is every prospect of the road being built. A further grant was asked for the completion of the road the whole length of Manitoulin Island, but the Government thought it would be well to wait and see the road finished to the present terminal point, Little Current.

Mr. EDGAR. Is it proposed to bridge the waters there?

Mr. HAGGART. I think that is their intention.

To the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company, for 16 miles of their railway from the end of subsidy granted by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, at junction of Midland Railway, to Pontypool, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $51,200.

Mr. LAURIER. No papers are filed in connection with this proposed vote.

Mr. HAGGART. Nearly every one in eastern Ontario knows the country from Bobcaygeon to Lindsay and from Lindsay to Pontypool. It is one of the finest sections of the province, and this vote is for the purpose of extending the railway communication to the thriving village of Bobcaygeon, where there are large milling establishments, so as to enable the people to have railway communication in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is a renewal.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, all but 16 miles.

For 75 miles of the railway from Sand Point, Shelburne Harbour, in Nova Scotia, to a junction at or near New Germany on the Nova Scotia Central Railway and to Annapolis, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, in lieu of the subsidy to the like amount granted by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, for the same length of railway from Shelburne and from Liverpool towards Annapolis, nor exceeding in the whole $240,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I propose to amend the resolution as follows:—

For 75 miles of the railway from Sand Point, Shelburne Harbour, in Nova Scotia, to Annapolis Royal, in the County of Annapolis, and to a junction at or near New Germany, on the Nova Scotia Central Railway, with a view to future construction to Liverpool, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, in lieu of the subsidy for the like amount granted by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, for the same length of railway from Shelburne and from Liverpool towards Annapolis, nor exceeding in the whole $240,000.

Mr. FORBES. Is that intended to pass through the town of Caledonia?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; I believe it is expected to pass through there.

Mr. FORBES. Will the hon. gentleman so amend the resolution as to make it sure that it will pass there?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is impossible to amend the resolution so as to say what way the road shall pass. It is fully expected that this line will pass through Caledonia, but we cannot say that until we make a contract. The great object is to secure a railway between the termini mentioned; and until we get a company willing to make a contract, we cannot lay down the route with precision. When it comes to make a proposal for a contract the company may have representations to make as regards the route which we may be bound to accept. In all probability this line will pass through Caledonia.

Mr. FORBES. Why is it that the link from Liverpool to Caledonia is dropped? In 1890 a resolution was passed in this House for 75 miles of road from Shelburne, in the County of Shelburne, and from Liverpool in the County of Queen's, to Annapolis, in the Province of Nova Scotia. The word "to" was changed to "towards." On the 30th March last, the Minister of Justice told me across the floor of the House that I was perfectly correct in stating that the subsidy then granted was only a part of the whole subsidy intended to be given for the purpose of constructing a road to Liverpool, as well as to Shelburne and Annapolis. I quote his words as follows:—

"The hon. gentleman is right in stating to the extent that *Hansard* supports him, that the Government were pledged to give a subsidy for the remainder of the line to Annapolis. That is to say, we indicated to this House clearly, in bringing down the subsidy for the line from Shelburne and Liverpool in the direction of Annapolis, that our intention was not to stop there, but to reach its terminal point on the Bay of Fundy which is Annapolis."

Now, the subsidy which is brought in to-day, is to build a line from Sand Point towards Annapolis, and not even binding the company to go through Caledonia. More than that, they go from a junction somewhere on the Annapolis line, east to New Germany to tap the line of the Nova Scotia Central, thereby deliberately providing that the town of Liverpool should not be touched by the line, and neglecting to subsidize the line from

Liverpool. I would like to get an explanation from the Minister as to why he has dropped that provision in last year's subsidy. I will further call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the line which he proposes to give a subsidy for now will be fully 98 miles in length, whereas the appropriation is only for 75 miles of road. I would suggest that he would amend the resolution so as to subsidize the entire mileage of that route, or else I would suggest that the Government should decide now where the eastern terminus of the line should be; whether at New Germany or Annapolis. I take it that this resolution is brought down for the purpose merely of pleasing the supporters of the Government in this House who are demanding the construction of railways in the Counties of Shelburne and Annapolis. If it were intended to accommodate the Counties of Queen's and Shelburne with railways the Government would feel bound, as I claim the Minister of Justice is personally bound, to provide that the line should run from Liverpool and Shelburne to Caledonia, and thence to Annapolis and New Germany. Neither the Counties of Queen's nor Shelburne have any railway accommodation whatever; Queen's is 30 miles from any railroad and the County of Shelburne is over 60 miles. I fail to understand how these counties are to get any railway accommodation by the present resolution, or how 98 miles of railway is going to be built on the subsidy for only 75 miles. There is another point which I trust the hon. gentleman has not overlooked. I hope that a request has been made for this subsidy, although I have no knowledge that it has. The only record I can find bearing on this resolution are two letters signed by hon. members of this House. One of them asked for the extension of the subsidy granted in 1890 for a line from Caledonia eastward to connect with the Nova Scotia Central; the other one is of a much later date and is as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 22nd March, 1892.

"The Hon. JOHN HAGGART, M.P.,
"Minister of Railways and Canals,
"Ottawa.

"SIR,—We the undersigned desire to renew our application of last year for a subsidy for a line of railway from the harbour of Shelburne, in the County of Shelburne, through or near Caledonia, in the County of Queen's, to New Germany or some convenient point on the Nova Scotia Central Railway in the County of Lunenburg.

"We have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servants,
(Signed) "N. W. WHITE.
"JOHN F. STAIRS.
"ALFRED PUTNAM.
"T. E. KENNY.
"C. EDW. KAULBACH."

I presume that it is on the strength of that request that the subsidy we are now discussnig has been brought down. If so, I would like the Minister to explain the following points:—First, why it is that two outlets are given to this proposed line, one to Annapolis and another to New Germany; second, why the Liverpool Branch is dropped; and third, how he proposes to make a subsidy for 75 miles complete a route which is estimated to be 98 miles in length?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My hon. friend is in error in supposing that this is an extension and completion of the subsidy which was granted two years ago. I think that that mistake has led him into the mystery which he says exists as to these three points. He is quite right in stating that I declared to the House that our intention was to complete the line to Annapolis, and he is also right in stating that this subsidy will not suffice for that purpose. The reason we have not done so is simply that we have not the money this year to do it, and that we have not been able to do what I expected two years ago we would have been able to do, namely, to subsidize the whole length of the road. The reason why the Liverpool part of it has been dropped is this: The subsidy was expressed to be, two years ago, from Shelburne and from Liverpool to Annapolis. These are the two principal ports on the south-western coast of Nova Scotia, and it was intended to go to the other side of the province and reach the harbour of Annapolis, on the Bay of Fundy. I think there was only one company that had a charter to build the line. At any rate there was only one company that had any negotiations with the Government, and I must repeat what I said on the occasion to which the hon. member (Mr. Forbes) refers: that I was very much disappointed indeed that no more active efforts were made by that company to take up the work. In expressing that remonstrance to them, during the present session, the answer which I was met with was, that we had altogether over-weighted the enterprise by insisting that they should at the same time construct the road to Liverpool, and that it would be an advantage to them to be permitted to build from Shelburne, and to connect with the Nova Scotia Central Railway, as proposed in this resolution, at or near New Germany. We have not abandoned the project of constructing the railway to Annapolis; but in the meantime all we can give towards the enterprise is a renewal of the subsidy that we gave two years ago. We are, therefore, simply holding the ground, and at the same time relieving the company of some conditions which they thought were onerous, as to completing the road both to Annapolis and Liverpool at the same time. We do expect that it will reach both places ultimately, but that must be by a further grant.

Mr. FORBES. I understand that the hon. gentleman is not granting the subsidy in the interest of the counties, but in the interest of the company.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am trying to get the subsidy in such a shape that some company will take up the undertaking. It is for the benefit of the counties. I do not care a straw about the company. I am rather disappointed at the little effort the company have made hitherto, and I have asked the Government not to stipulate that they will get the subsidy, and they will not get it unless they show more enterprise than they have shown within the last two years. At the same time we have tried to meet their views as far as possible, because there was apparently no other company to do the work.

Mr. FORBES. I presume it is the same company to which the last subsidy was granted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We did not grant the last subsidy to any company; but they were the only company on the ground.

Mr. FORBES. They are the same persons.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, the same persons who allege that they are ready to take up the work.

I do not know whether they are or not, and we do not intend to be bound to them in this vote.

Mr. FORBES. Is it intended to go on immediately?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, with the whole work if the company are prepared to sign the contract.

Mr. FORBES. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what objection he has to inserting a rider to the effect that before any of the subsidy is paid, the company must give a certain guarantee that they will subsequently construct the road to Liverpool?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Because I have told the hon. gentleman that we cannot expect that assurance now unless Parliament will vote a further subsidy, the subsidy we are now getting not being at all sufficient to construct the whole road.

Mr. FORBES. The railway is 98 miles in length, and after the 75 miles here provided for are constructed, 23 more miles will be required to complete the line. Will a subsidy for that be granted before the subsidy is granted for the line to Liverpool? I trust not. I trust that the Government will be prepared to grant the rest of the subsidy in the interest of the county, and not in the interest of the company.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Any further grant will be simply with the view of providing the two counties with railway accommodation. I am not prepared to say what we shall be able to recommend next year. I am very anxious to have these two counties united by railway communication.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

To the Kingston, Napanee and Western Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway, being extensions or branches in the Counties of Peterborough, Hastings, Addington, Frontenac or Leeds towards iron deposits, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, payable in instalments regulated by the length of each such extension, the subsidy not exceeding in the whole $64,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I may explain that the object of this is to build a little extension to meet one of the railways beyond Tweed, and to build two or three extensions in order to reach lakes or large bodies of navigable waters for the purpose of utilizing the iron deposits, and also the woods for making charcoal. The intention is to establish charcoal smelting furnaces at Deseronto, and to make use of these branches to obtain supplies for a number of years.

To the St. John Valley and Rivière du Loup Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway from the north end of the line subsidized by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, to the Town of Woodstock, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000

Mr. EDGAR. In what condition is the railway, and what are the subsidies?

Mr. FOSTER. It was subsidized on two occasions from Fredericton towards Woodstock. This is the third section, but it does not reach, I believe, the city of Woodstock, so I shall put in the word "towards" instead of "to." The road has been surveyed, and the company are preparing to go on with the work. It is entirely a new road.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the Minister may be able to tell us what is the financial position of the extension the Government are aiding? Is it contracted for, and what is the financial estimate?

Mr. HAGGART. Some of the work has been done on the road, but on account of financial difficulties the company were not able to complete the scheme. The first section was contracted for, but not having been completed in accordance with the contract, they have got none of their subsidy yet.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has this section any railway accommodation?

Mr. FOSTER. No, not within a long distance from the line along the River St. John where this will run. There is a railway, but it runs from Fredericton out in a direct line, and this goes by way of McAdam, being a long way distant from the bank of the river, and it provides the farming section along the whole river with railway accommodation. The river is navigable for only a short period of the year. When the water falls it is impassable for steamboats, so that the farmers are entirely dependent upon waggons to transport their produce.

To the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway, for 30 miles of their railway from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the committee again to this road. The hon. member who represents that constituency (Mr. Guillet) took the opportunity this afternoon of stating that the road was virtually an injury to him in his candidature instead of helping him. I hold in my hand the *Morning Sentinel-Star*, printed in Cobourg, and with the portrait of the hon. gentleman at the top. It is as follows:—

"But in view of the present strong position of the Government we are more concerned about the future of our own locality, and the effect which the result of the present contest will have upon our town in particular. This being the county town and the largest centre of population in the riding, it is but natural to assume that what will benefit the town will also prove beneficial to the whole riding. It is also the largest market for the farmers of this section of country, where the produce of the farm may always find ready sale at fair prices. The interests of the town and country are therefore identical, and we have never witnessed a more striking example of this than in the expressed sentiment of the people with regard to our new railway project at its first inception. But we have also witnessed with much regret the efforts of our political opponents to belittle the railway question in the present contest. Of course this is done for political effect, because when the railway question was uppermost, without attendant political excitement, none were more enthusiastically anxious for the new railway than were our Grit friends. But when the general election came on they threw their anxiety about the welfare of the town to the winds and worked to their utmost for the defeat of the Government. But the Government triumphed with a large majority, although unfortunately for the town our candidate in this riding was defeated and with him for the time being all hope of the new railway. The opportunity is again offered to the people, however, to secure the construction of the new railway, or otherwise as they may decide at the polls on Tuesday. Let them not be deceived, for upon their decision in this contest depends the fate of Cobourg for at least the present decade. We do not propose to deceive the people, nor to hold out to them false hope. Our success just now depends upon sending to Ottawa a representative friendly to the Government so that the charter for the new road may be extended and the additional subsidy granted, which will in all human probability secure its construction."

Further on the writer says :

" And we never had a representative in Parliament who obtained such solid benefits for our town. He secured the Government dredge and tug to clean out and deepen our harbour, which work if done by contract would have cost the ratepayers of Cobourg over twenty thousand dollars. He also secured an annual grant to keep the new pier in repair. And better still, in the hour of our need, when we appealed to the Provincial and Federal Governments for relief, owing principally to his influence and persistence with the Government, Sir John Macdonald returned us nearly twenty-five thousand dollars of our share of the cost of building the new pier, and also cancelled and returned our debentures held by the Government for the purchase of the Port Hope and Rice Lake gravel road, about twenty-five thousand more, thus assisting us to the amount of about fifty thousand dollars."

These are the arguments that were put forth by that paper which supports the hon. gentleman, and it publishes a full-sized picture of him at the head of the article. Yet the hon. gentleman told us this afternoon that this project virtually did him harm in his canvass. It is a very singular thing that this devoted sheet, published in Cobourg, should, the day before the vote was taken, on the 5th March, publish this article to persuade the voters of Cobourg and Northumberland that their best interests, their financial well-being, the future of their county and of their town, and of their railway and the construction of their line, all depended on whether the hon. gentleman was returned to Parliament or not ; and yet this afternoon he says that, instead of being a benefit, it was an injury to him and he lost votes by it. The editor of the paper says the well-being of Cobourg is tied up in the Government of the day being sustained. I believe the hon. gentleman is a resident of Cobourg, and the people there, like those in many other constituencies, have been bought with their own money. The editor of the paper must have known that they might count upon certain advantages if they returned the hon. gentleman. They had either received a wink directly or indirectly from the candidate or the Government, or from those who were sent to stump the county in the interest of the candidate, and the people were led to understand that they were to be benefited if they returned the hon. gentleman ; and now we find that 19 miles more are to be aided, and we are to renew and extend the bonus already granted to 30 miles. This is a clear case of buying out a constituency with promises of their own money.

Mr. GUILLET. What I stated this afternoon was not that this question of railway was not spoken of by anyone during the campaign. It would be impossible to muzzle people and to prevent them from talking or writing on such a subject. I suppose hon. gentlemen of the Opposition would be very sorry sometimes to be held responsible for some of the utterances of their local journal there during an election. What I said was that they were using every interest against us, and a powerful corporation was also against us. In the township of Haldimand, when the railway bonus by-law was submitted, the solid vote in the north of the township carried it against the majority of the south. The Opposition candidate appealed to these people in the south to vote against me, and thus by defeating me get rid of the bonus. Is it surprising, then, that some of our supporters, on patriotic grounds as well as in the interests of the community, appealed to the local interest in the railway against the powerful influences which were brought to bear against us? No matter what utterances may have been made on the streets, there was none of this kind made on the platform. We made none, and we were not authorized to make any promises. If there was any indirect advantage to be gained, there was a great indirect disadvantage, from the fact that the railway, promoted by a patriotic Government, was being used as a means of injuring their candidate and had provoked the hostility of a great rival institution. The Local Government sent down a prominent engineer and an inspector of public institutions, who inspected the college there, with the view, it was understood, to turn it into a public institution, which would employ labour ; and that was held up before the electors in order to induce them to vote for Mr. Hargraft instead of me. No such action was taken by this Government. There is no doubt the railway was mentioned, but it was unfair and unjust to accuse the Government, or to accuse me, in view of the fact that we had to meet the opposition of a powerful railway corporation. I did not say the railway had not been mentioned, but I said it was not mentioned with authority, or by me or my friends on the platform. We had to meet extensive bribery there on the Opposition side and a large amount of personation. We have now two of those who engaged in personation lodged in gaol, and there is no doubt that an organized gang of personators were brought down there by Mr. Preston, the organizer of the Reform party, in collusion with leading Reformers in my riding. While proclaiming purity of election they were at the same time bribing and paralyzing electors with whiskey. They spirited one man away to Port Hope and put him in a back shed, a man named Linton—and this conduct reminds me of the plan of a notorious horse thief. He took the expedient of becoming a revival preacher and he established a camp on the frontier of a western state, and, while he was working up the people to a high state of devotional fervour, and made them very anxious about their souls, his confederates were on the outskirts of the camp stealing the horses and carrying them off. These pretenses of political purity are a mere masquerading before the country, because the people know that it is pure hypocrisy, and I hope both sides of the House are convinced that it is time we were done with this, because, if the Opposition had not indulged so much in this, they would not have left their party in opposition so long.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not want the hon. gentleman, by drawing a herring across the trail, to take away the attention of the House from the question. This afternoon he said the railway cry was an injury to him.

Mr. GUILLET. I said it did me as much injury as good.

Mr. McMULLEN. He said it did him more harm than good. Now he says it did him as much harm as good. Perhaps a little further on he will say it did him a little more good than harm. It is quite clear from the statement made by the journal that has reported him, that it was a clear bargain and sale, so far as this journal was concerned. One of the leading papers in the town of Cobourg had the audacity, the brass, to publish the hon. gentleman's photograph at the top of the page, and put the items I have read under it. I should advise him hereafter, when he has another contest, to give his journal directions what to say, because

it is evident here that they intended to do him good, whether they did or not. It is clear that constituency was bought, not only with the promise of the revival of the grant that is now before us, but with the promise that an additional grant for 19 miles more would be made. That promise is now being carried out, and we are now called upon to give a grant for the other 30 miles in payment to that constituency for rejecting Mr. Hargraft, after his protest had been carried through and he had been unseated on a flimsy technicality. The hon. gentleman says that the Ontario Government and Mr. Preston had something to do with inciting personation, and two of the offenders are in gaol. I would recommend him to follow up Mr. Preston if there was any personation done at his instigation. We are now pledging the people's money in return for favours granted to the opposite party by rejecting a man who was the representative of the constituency and sending another man here to support the Government. We are called upon to vote an additional sum for 19 miles of railway in fulfilment of that contract, and to revive a grant that had lapsed for 30 miles more. That clearly shows the means by which the bye-elections have been carried, and I dare say if we could ferret out the secrets of all the rest, they would come in line with this one.

Mr. EDGAR. There is something about these two resolutions that require explanation, because as I read this one it is not only, as suggested by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. McMullen), a grant to revive the original grant for 30 miles, and an additional grant for 19 miles more, but it is a revival of the original grant for 30 miles, and a duplication of the first 19 miles from Cobourg by another $3,200 a mile. If it does not mean that, the language will have to be changed. As the resolution reads it distinctly means for the first 19 miles out of Cobourg, $6,400 per mile. The resolution we are considering now is a correct statement of the old vote, and if it is intended to be a revote of that old vote, it is right. But the resolution we passed in the afternoon says :

"To the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company, for 19 miles of their railway from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway (in addition to the subsidy granted by the Act 53 Vic. chap. 2), a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $60,800."

Now, if the English language means anything at all, this is duplicating the first 19 miles from Cobourg, $3,200 per mile. The Minister of Justice has come into his seat, and I will ask him whether it does not mean that in English ; and if it is not intended that it should be $6,400 per mile, we shall have to alter the language. I do not know whether it is more than 30 miles from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway, but the Minister can tell us how far it is.

Mr. TISDALE. The language seems to me plain enough. The first resolution does not give the points it merely mentions that the aid is given to a railway which is to run in its whole length from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway. I do not think there is any doubt of the intention. It says 19 miles of their railway from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. EDGAR. From Cobourg.

Mr. TISDALE. That is more than 19 miles, but that is a description of what the whole road covers ; 19 miles will not reach from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that if there is any doubt it ought to be amended. The resolution of this afternoon is clearly a description simply of the whole length of their road from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway ; that is 19 miles, and the 30 miles, and I do not know how much more.

Mr. EDGAR. What is wanted is to say that this is a grant from the end of the 30 miles running out from Cobourg towards the Ontario and Quebec Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. We can alter the original resolution so as to cover the point made by the hon. gentleman, although I do not think there is any doubt as to its meaning at present. We can state :

To the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway, for a further distance of 19 miles on the railway from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway, in extension of the subsidy granted by the Act 53 Vic., chap. 2.

That will remove all doubt. Before it comes to the third reading we will put some words in.

Mr. McMULLEN. The resolution now covers the line from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand the 19 miles are intended to be an extension of this 30 miles. Therefore, we can come back to that question.

To the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company for 32 miles of their railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the 51 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $70,400.

Mr. EDGAR. I understood from the Minister when he was discussing the previous vote that the money had been earned. Has it been earned ?

Mr. HAGGART. No ; none of it has been earned. The first section is from Renfrew to Eganville, and the second one from Eganville to Barry's Bay.

To the Lake Témiscamingue Colonization Railway Company, for 35 miles of their railway from Mattawa to the Long Sault, in lieu of the subsidies granted by the 52 Victoria, chapter 3, and 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $112,000.

Mr. HAGGART. This company was a narrow gauge company, and, as a colonization company, had constructed a short road. It is now proposed to widen the road to the broad gauge, and join the Canadian Pacific Railway at Mattawa. There is a provision for 15 per cent for the bridge.

Mr. LAURIER. The company is only asking for a subsidy of $2,000 per mile.

Mr. HAGGART. The company ask $2,000 a mile in excess of the subsidy of $3,200 per mile.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think so. This is what I read in the application of the company :

"The company was chartered by the Dominion Government in July, 1885, for the purpose of building a narrow gauge road between the foot of Lake Témiscamingue and a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway near Mattawa, with a branch to Lake Kippewa.

"It was granted Dominion subsidies as follows:—

Act of 1885	$25,000
do 1886	6,000
do 1887	12,400
do 1888	33,000
do 1889	48,000
do 1890	64,000

"Disconnected portions of the line have been completed and Dominion subsidies paid to the amount of about $75,000 and traffic is now being handled between Mattawa and the lower end of Lake Kippewa by a part rail and part water route, involving transfer from the rail to the water and *vice versa* at nine different points in 50 miles. This makes the expense of transportation practically prohibitory. With the completion of the narrow gauge line as proposed, the necessity for transfer would be removed, except at Mattawa, where transhipment to and from the narrow gauge cars, would, of course, be necessary.

"The territory in the vicinity of Lake Kippewa and north to the head of Lake Témiscamingue is rich in timber and minerals, and with a suitable means of connection enterprises of great advantage to the country would be quickly developped, but with a narrow gauge road the increased expense of transportation and transhipment would be a serious bar to the movement of coarse freight like lumber and minerals.

"With the subsidies already granted, the Témiscamingue Company would be unable to complete even a narrow gauge road, and the long bridge over the Ottawa, to a point of connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway near Mattawa and the subsidies already paid would be practically wasted.

"The Témiscamingue Company being unable to continue the work to completion have asked this company to take it over and finish it, and this company therefore desires to submit to your Government a proposition to take over the Témiscamingue road, complete it of standard gauge from Mattawa to Lake Kippewa, a distance of about fifty miles, provided that your Government will grant an additional subsidy of $2,000 per mile, not exceeding $100,000 in all, and a subsidy of 15 per cent of the cost of a wooden structure across the Ottawa River near Mattawa."

Mr. HAGGART. This is an additional subsidy.

Mr. LAURIER. Over and above what has been paid? The Government have already paid, I understand, $75,000.

Mr. HAGGART. $3,215 per mille. Other subsidies were paid by the Local Government. What the company really asked was $2,000 per mile over and above the subsidy already granted.

Mr. LAURIER. You simply propose to continue the same subsidy?

Mr. HAGGART. Under this resolution we propose to revote the same subsidy for 35 miles of the road, and revote $3,200 per mile for 15 miles, which was completed as a narrow gauge road. They state that they do not expect to be able to use the same line.

Mr. SPEAKER. No doubt the company will have to use a new line of railway all the way to the Mattawa. These short pieces of road with their light grades were simply constructed to get around the rapids connecting the navigation of the stretches of water between Mattawa and Lake Témiscamingue. It is now proposed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as I understand, to cross the Mattawa to the north side of the Ottawa, and construct the road continuously right up to the Long Sault, at the foot of Lake Témiscamingue; and, therefore, the company will be wholly unable to utilize any portion of the connecting links that constitute the work of the Témiscamingue Colonization Railway Company.

Mr. LAURIER. Then the Government simply continue the same subsidy, giving 15 per cent for the bridge.

Mr. LAURIER.

Mr. HAGGART. We continue the same subsidy for 35 miles and propose to vote $3,200 per mile for 15 miles. The vote for the 15 miles, and also the 15 per cent for the bridge, and $3,200 per mile for a couple of miles connecting with the bridge, comprise a new vote.

To the Témiscouata Railway Company, for 12 miles of their railway, from the north end of the section of St. François Branch subsidized by 51 Victoria, chapter 3, being the first 12 miles on the section subsidized by the 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $1,800 per mile, in addition to the subsidy already granted, not exceeding in the whole $21,600.

Mr. EDGAR. This proposal seems to be one for an additional $1,800 per mile for the first 12 miles of a portion of this line subsidized by 53 Victoria. The subsidy given to Témiscouata Railway Company in that year was for 16 miles at the rate of $3,200 per mile. Therefore it is proposed now by this grant, to make the subsidy $5,000 per mile for this portion of 12 miles. I fail to see what claim that railway can possibly have upon this country for an additional subsidy. I find in the Railway Statistics that this railway is 81 miles in length, that the company have been voted Dominion railway subsidies in one way and other of $649,000; that they have been voted a subsidy from the Quebec Government of $462,000 for that 81 miles; that they have received a subsidy from the New Brunswick Government of $36,000, and that they have received a municipal subsidy of $25,000, or altogether $1,172,200 of public moneys for that 81 miles of road, which would be equal to $14,471 per mile. It is proposed now to give them a further subsidy as if they had not received enough; but, Sir, we fortunately, from the Railway Statistics which have been published, have some idea of the financial position of that railway company. In addition to this subsidy of $14,471 per mile I find that they have issued their bonds to the extent of $1,574,640. Now, supposing you place that issue at 75 cents on the dollar which is a moderate figure for 6 per cent bonds, that would produce $1,180,000 or $14,580 and more, per mile for that railway. That railway appears to have received $29,051 per mile of public moneys from the Dominion and Local Governments and the municipalities. They fed upon this Government, they fed upon the Quebec Government, they fed upon the New Brunswick Government and they fed upon the municipalities, and then they issued their bonds properly enough, and got $15,000 more per mile for them.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know, but is it not very likely the bonds were issued on the guarantee of the subsidy from the Quebec Government, or perhaps the Quebec Government guarantees it.

Mr. EDGAR. If that is so the hon. gentleman should have stated it in the Railway Statistics which are furnished to the public. There is nothing of that kind shown and I do not think it is at all likely. I never heard of it, and I do not think it is so. At any rate there is the security of the road in the shape of bonds and the subsidy of the Government; and besides that, Sir, I do not know whether it amounts to anything or not, it seems they had $791,000 of paid-up stock which would represent $9,765 more per mile for this railway. Perhaps we will throw the stock in, and not consider that it was paid up at all, although it appears on the returns of the Govern-

ment as paid-up stock. Now, I would like to know why this House should be called upon to vote one single cent more to that railway. I looked this up and I saw in the *Hansard* that the present member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) who was then explaining the policy of the Government in describing the character of this road, said in 1885, "it is an easy road to build for a long distance," and then the Minister of Inland Revenue whom I see there also in his seat, on the same occasion said, that the New Brunswick Railway Company offered to build it for a subsidy of $6,000 per mile. The Minister of Inland Revenue will be very much surprised to learn that this railway has received over $14,000 per mile in subsidies from this Government, and other Governments, and the municipalities. I say, therefore, that it is preposterous to call upon this House to vote any additional sum to that pampered railway. If that were not enough, Sir, to cause this House to hesitate, I want to call attention to the fact that in my place in this House on the 6th of April last, I made certain charges in connection with that very Temiscouata Railway which have not been investigated yet, and I protest against one single cent of public money being voted by Parliament to that railway until these charges are investigated. I do not say whether the tribunal I asked for is granted or not. I will not discuss that, but the charges were made in this House, and they are not investigated in reference to the disposal of a portion of these subsidies that were granted to that railway. I protest on that ground also against this vote being carried by the House to-night.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman has covered a good deal of ground, but I do not think it was necessary for him to travel quite so far.

Mr. LAURIER. On the contrary he said a good deal.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think it was necessary to say quite as much as he did. The question before the House now is with regard to a subsidy payable on the construction of 12 miles of road which has no connection, and never had any connection, with the Témiscouata Railway proper. The Témiscouata Railway was the missing link necessary to connect the Intercolonial Railway with the New Brunswick Railway, starting from Rivière du Loup on the Intercolonial Railway and making a connection at Edmundston. The construction of that road was undertaken by the Témiscouata Railway Company for which they received subsidies to the extent of $9,000 per mile, and not $14,000 as stated by the hon. gentleman; $6,000 from the Dominion Government and $3,000 some odd from the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman says that they scooped up subsidies from Quebec, from the Dominion and from the New Brunswick. The 81 miles from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston passes mostly through the Province of Quebec and has a subsidy from the Dominion and from the Province of Quebec to the boundary line of that province. There were 11 miles of that 81 miles constructed in New Brunswick, and of course the New Brunswick Government paid a small subsidy for that 11 miles, and for that portion the Province of Quebec did not pay any subsidy. Afterwards the line of railway that was in contemplation as a rival line to this Témiscouata road—what is called the St. Francis route—was to be constructed. It is one of the most important lines in the whole of the Maritime Provinces, and one which will develop greater resources than any 30 miles of railway that has been constructed or could be constructed. It develops not only the local trade of the country, but if hon. gentlemen look at the map they will see that the great bulk of the future cut of lumber in the State of Maine has to be cut and brought down the river St. John, and that this line taps that very country. All supplies necessary to operate the cutting of that lumber which is manufactured in our own province, affording employment to our people, have to be carried there. I say that no railway of the same length promises to develop so much trade as that line now under consideration. I point out again that it is not the Témiscouata Railway and it has nothing to do with the charges which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edgar) has made in the House. This company after completing their contract with the Government for the construction of the Témiscouata Railway made an offer to build this branch up the St. Francis River from Edmundston, in another direction. The understanding was they were to get $5,000 a mile, and the hon. gentleman asks why was not the House required to give $5,000 towards that railway? The original understanding with this company was that they should construct 45 miles to reach the border of the Province of Quebec on the St. Francis River. After a meeting of the leading merchants and lumbermen interested, we found that we could get along without pressing for the construction of the road for the whole of that distance. A subsidy had been granted by this Parliament at the rate of $5,000 a mile for the first 20 miles. It was understood that that would bring the railway to one of the important points, and that after that portion was constructed an application would be made for a further subsidy for the balance of the road. But after the first twenty miles were constructed it was concluded that if the road were carried 12 miles further it would meet all the requirements of the country for a long time to come. Therefore the company applied for a subsidy for the 12 miles, at the same rate as the subsidy for the first 20 miles, the length of the whole road thus being reduced from 45 miles to 32 miles. Parliament granted a subsidy at the rate of $3,200 per mile in the usual way for 16 miles, and when the promoters came to make arrangements for the construction of that portion of the road, the contract was signed with the understanding that they would hold to the original arrangement for $5,000 a mile. They have gone on and constructed the other 12 miles, and they want to stop there so as to make the subsidy $5,000 a mile for the 12 miles instead of $3,200 a mile for 16 miles. The House will understand that this is an old line in connection with the Témiscouata Railway and now connected with the New Brunswick Railway. It has nothing to do with the construction of that missing link from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston. Although the Témiscouata Railway Company constructed the road, it was open to any other company to contract for the work.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman undertakes to say that the amount of the subsidy granted to this road amounts to only about $9,000 a mile in contradiction to the statement of my hon. friend

from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). Now, the statement which my hon. friend read shows that this company received Dominion subsidies to the extent of $649,000 for 81 miles, Quebec subsidies to the extent of $462,000, New Brunswick subsidies to the extent of $36,000, and municipal subventions to the extent of $25,000, or in all $1,172,000 or $14,471 per mile. Besides, it received whatever its bonds sold for, estimated by my hon. friend at 75 cents on the dollar, amounting to $1,180,980; or total subventions to the extent of $2,353,180, or $29,000 per mile. Now, when the Government of which the hon. gentleman is a member first introduced this system of subventions, it was done for the purpose of encouraging the construction of railways. It was supposed that gentlemen who embarked in this kind of enterprise would be prepared to put at all events a small portion of their own funds into them. But the system has gone on from year to year, and we know as a fact that few if any of the railways that have been constructed in recent years have had expended upon them any money belonging to the promoters at all. These people expect to have the railways built at the cost of the public, and to be the owners of the properties after they are completed. Let us advert for a moment to the case of the Northern Pacific Junction Railway. This Parliament voted to that road something like $12,500 per mile, and under their statute the company had the right to issue bonds to the extent of $20,000 per mile, making a total of $32,500 per mile available for building the railway. Yet we know as a fact that that road never cost at the outside more than $25,000 per mile, and it is well known that the promoters placed several hundred thousand dollars in their own pockets, besides becoming the owners of the road. Take the case of the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway. For that railway a subvention was granted by the Quebec Government to the extent of $6,600 a mile, and a subvention was granted by the Dominion Government to the extent of $3,200 per mile, or $9,200 per mile in all; and the company had bonding powers besides; yet any person who passes over that road will see that it traverses almost a dead level, that the bridges are of small consequence, that the culverts are built of wood, and that the rails are of a very light character. I venture to say that that road equipped—because it has no stations of any consequence—never cost $15,000 a mile; and it is manifest that the promoters of that road did not put one single dollar of their own money into it, while they have taken out of it hundreds of thousands of dollars. It is a question whether it is not time to put the brakes on, and stop this kind of thing. Here is a road for which the hon. gentleman defends a bonus to the enormous extent of $29,000 a mile, and hon. gentlemen have the effrontery to come before Parliament and ask for a further subsidy for it, and they are listened to by the Government. It is monstrous. If the Government are going to recognize the policy of building those roads and handing them over to companies, allowing private individuals to enrich themselves at the expense of the country at large, let us understand it; but if we are only going to encourage the construction of roads when the gentlemen promoting them will put their hands in their own pockets and contribute something towards their construction, there can be no objection to aiding portions of the country in obtaining the railway accommodation they require. But it is proposed here to grant a bonus to this company which is involved in the shocking scandals which have been brought before this House, for it is this company to which this road will belong, and which must undertake to run it. I say that in view of these circumstances and until these charges are fully investigated, this Parliament should not vote one dollar for the construction of this road. If it is true that the gentlemen engaged in this enterprise have taken from the Government a portion of the subsidies which have been granted by Parliament, and handed them back for the purpose of promoting the election of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, then they have forfeited all claim to the consideration of this House, and they are not entitled to receive any aid from the funds of the people of this country.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken would not, I think, willingly misrepresent the case. I stated that the subsidies paid by the Dominion and Local Government to the Témiscouata Railway Company did not amount to anything like $14,000 per mile. The subsidy paid to the company by the Dominion Government was at the rate of $6,000 per mile up to the boundary line, and the Provincial Government of Quebec gave a subsidy for about 69 miles of the road from Rivière du Loup through the Province of Quebec at $3,500 per mile, and no more; and for the fourteen miles from the boundary of the Province of Quebec to Edmundston, in New Brunswick, the company received the Dominion subsidy of $6,000 a mile and the New Brunswick provincial subsidy of $3,000 per mile, or $500 less. Therefore, for the 69 miles of the road——

Mr. LISTER. For the whole 81 miles.

Mr. COSTIGAN,—for the 69 miles they received $9,500 and for the other fourteen miles they only received $9,000 per mile, including the Dominion and provincial subsidies, and not over $14,000. The only way the mistake could occur would be by the hon. gentleman taking the subsidy for the 32 miles constructed on the St. Francis Branch. If he did that, he would have to divide the amount by 115 miles instead of by 83; but the whole subsidy paid and voted by this House was $6,000 per mile for the 83 miles and by the Quebec Government for its portion $3,500 per mile and by the New Brunswick Government for its 14 miles $3,000. Therefore, the whole subsidy, Dominion and provincial, for the 83 miles, is $9,500 per mile, and for the next 20 miles $5,000. The House granted in 1888 to the Témiscouata Railway Company for a branch railway of 20 miles from Edmundston towards the Francis River a subsidy of $100,000 for 20 miles or $5,000 per mile. That is completed, and the company has been paid the subsidy and that cost $1,000 less Dominion subsidy and $500 less provincial subsidy. This vote now under discussion is simply to give for the 12 miles, beyond the 20 they contracted at $5,000 a mile, the $5,000 which it was intended to give them for the first 20 miles, and this is to be made the terminus of the road instead of putting it some 13 miles further.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman forgot to say anything with regard to the money the company have drawn from bonds on the road.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not touch that question at all. I merely wanted to correct the statement of the hon. gentleman that $14,000 was paid in Government subsidies.

Mr. McMULLEN. A sum in the neighbourhood of $24,000 a mile has actually been provided between Dominion, provincial and municipal aid, and the bonds issued on the road and put on the market. In the face of the statement made by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) that the road was easily built, that it was not at all a difficult line to construct, and in face of the statements made by other hon. gentlemen, quite aware of the character of the section of country through which the road runs, and who said it would not be at all a difficult line to build, I would like to know how it becomes necessary to spend a bonus, taking the figures the hon. gentleman has given, of $9,500 a mile, and in that I question whether he has included all the provincial and municipal aid secured. I understand that the Provincial Governments, both of Quebec and New Brunswick, granted aid to this road.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not on the same mileage.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is on the same line. It seems to me that this particular line has proved itself a Dominion and provincial and municipal blood-sucker. It appears to me that it has been drawing money from all sources: first, the Dominion treasury, then the municipalities, then the provincial treasuries; and in addition to that they have coated the road with bonds to the extent of $1,500,000, and placed them on the market. I would like to know from some experienced gentleman, able to give an expert opinion, such as the hon. member for South Norfolk, who has had extensive experience in the construction of railways whether he has ever been connected with any road —and I venture to say he has not—which has cost $29,000 a mile. I would like to know why it is considered necessary to give a further grant from the Dominion treasury for the construction of that road. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue says it is not the same line at all. Why, the resolution reads:

"The Témiscouata Railway Company for 12 miles of their own railway from the north end of the section on the St. Francis Branch, subsidized by the 51 Vict. chap. 3, being the first 12 miles on the section subsidized by the 53 Vict. chap. 2, a subsidy not exceeding $1,800 per mile."

I think that is quite clear, yet he says it is not the same company.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not say it is not the same company.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I understood the hon. gentleman to say so. I think that before the Government asks this House to sanction this grant they should at least lay on the Table a clear, and concise, and correct statement of the moneys granted by this House for the construction of that road, and those granted by the Provincial Government, so that we might have some idea of the amount buried in its construction, because for a line to cost within $6,000 of the amount set out here, unless the region it runs through is a very rocky one, and the hon. member for Three Rivers told us two years ago the road could be easily built——

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not two years ago.

Mr. McMILLAN,—in the face of these facts, I do not see how it can cost $29,000 a mile.

Mr. HAGGART. The amount of money paid by the Dominion Government for the first 75 miles was $7,000 per mile. You will see it was voted in two sums of $3,200 and $3,800 per mile for the 75 miles. On eight miles there was $6,000 per mile. These 20 miles are an entirely different road, as my colleague has said, the St. Francis Branch being entirely out of the main line, and being an undertaking gone into subsequent to the building of the main line to Edmundston. The subsidy for the 20 miles is $5,000 per mile. The subsidy for the 16 miles intended first to be built was $3,200 per mile, this is now to be given in full to the 12 miles which is all at present required to be built by those interested. The Quebec subsidy was hypothecated as security for 10 years' interest on the bonds sold. I do not know what the bonds realized.

Mr. LISTER. The interest was secured for ten years?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, on the amount of the issue of bonds by hypothecating the subsidy granted by the Quebec Government, so that the actual amount for the whole would be about $6,000 per mile.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who got the bonds?

Mr. HAGGART. They were sold in England.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did the company handle them or were they given to the contractor?

Mr. HAGGART. I think the contractor made the contract and negotiated the bonds himself.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who was the contractor?

Mr. HAGGART. One of the contractors was John J. Macdonald; I do not know who was associated with him.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friends, the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Railways, have explained to the House the merits of the railway, and their explanations, it seems to me, ought to be quite satisfactory. I can say that the region through which the road runs is a rich one, and the railway subsidized has contributed to the development of that section of country more possibly than any other road.

Mr. EDGAR. And the election fund.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will attend to the hon. gentleman. This road is opening up to the markets of Quebec the forests of a portion of New Brunswick and a portion of the United States, and it is developing the resources of that section of the country to a great extent. Now, the hon. gentleman from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has distinguished himself more than once by propositions which did not appeal to the good sense or the judgment of members of this House, and now he gives as a reason why no subsidy should be given to a railway; why the whole of the population from the St. Lawrence to the frontier, between Canada and the United States, should be deprived of help towards the construction of a railway which is in the interests of the country, the fact that he, the hon. gentleman, has stood up in his place and made charges which I hope he will be present to substantiate. I can tell the hon. gentleman or anybody else, when they bring charges against me, they shall find me ready to meet the charges. If I can believe the rumours that have been spread abroad,

he will not take upon himself the responsibility which his position here as a member of Parliament protects him in making the charges which he has made against me. Let him assume the responsibility in a different place and under different circumstances; let him meet me face to face and I shall be prepared to meet the charges, and, if he can prove those charges which he has brought against me and upon which, under the rules of this House, I have been unable to speak until now on a side issue, so to speak, I will do what he had not the manliness to do, I will risk my seat and walk out of this House disgraced and dishonoured. I say he is unable to prove those charges, and, as far as this present company is concerned, I never directly or indirectly had any communication with any member of it. Whenever I had anything to say, as far as the development of my section of the country was concerned, I did so believing I was looking after the public interest, and scorning the charges which were brought against me, such as the hon. gentleman did and which I tell him he is unable to prove, and doing what I considered my duty.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has alluded, as he says on a side issue, to a matter of considerable importance, and I am very glad he has referred to it. The hon. gentleman has challenged me for taking advantage of my position in this House to make charges against him, and I can tell you, Sir, that before he has done with that investigation he will find those charges proved. I am not shirking any responsibility I undertook, or shielding myself behind my position in regard to any charges I have made against him in this House or anywhere else. This is the first example I ever heard of in this House where a member charged, as I have charged him to his face, has shirked an investigation at the earliest possible moment, by his peers in this House, and that is what the hon. gentleman is boasting of. Have I shirked anything? Did I not stand here months ago and make a charge against him and ask for a trial before a committee of my peers and his peers, where he would be in a large majority, and did I not hold myself responsible for my seat, my reputation and for everything I hold most dear. But he shirked the investigation and his colleagues, as well as he, shirked it. He did not sit meekly under the charge as his former colleague from Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) did and allow his colleagues to drive him out of office. I admire the Postmaster General for his pluck. He said to them that they would all hang together or hang separately, and they will all hang together when these charges are proved. Let him not pretend that he is not shirking the issue. Among my faults, I do not think I have any want of pluck, and I will never shirk the issue till the day I die. Now, as to the matter more particularly in hand, the Minister of Inland Revenue says my statistics are not correct. The Minister of—whatever he is now—the Postmaster General says my statistics are not correct.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I never said that.

Mr. EDGAR. He said the subsidies were not correctly given by me.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I never said anything about the subsidies.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Mr. EDGAR. If the hon. gentleman says he did not, I will not accuse him of saying so. I will refer to the statistics of railways furnished by the Government of Canada and show that every word I used to-night was correct. In the summary of railways for the year ending the 30th June, 1891, it is stated that the Témiscouata Railway is 81 miles in length, and I find that the company received from the Dominion $649,200. The Minister of Railways was telling us just now how much was paid to that company. If they received that amount, that settles it, and, if they have not received it yet, let them wait till they have earned it before they ask for more. I am reading from his own statistics what the money voted to that railway was and I can give him the years when it was voted. Then from the Government of Quebec it was voted $462,000, and by the New Brunswick Government $36,000, as I stated, and by the municipality—I do not know what municipality it was, but it is under the head of municipal aid—$25,000. If they will take the trouble to add these figures up they will find that they amount to $1,172,200, as I said. That, on 81 miles of railway, amounts to $13,471 a mile, exactly as I said. Then as to the bonded debt. He says the statistics show that the bonds raised and paid up on that 81 miles were $1,574,640, exactly as I said. But I reduced this, and instead of putting them at par, I took them at 75 per cent. But if the hon. Minister is correct in saying that the Quebec subsidy was used to stiffen those bonds and to guarantee the interest, they must have gone at par. But I only calculated at 75 per cent, and they made $1,180,980, or altogether in subsidies and bonds, $2,353,180, or $29,051 per mile for that 81 miles of railway. Let the Minister of Railways and his colleagues dispute those statistics, if they are wrong, and I do not believe they are wrong. These statistics were got up by responsible officers, who, I suppose, knew what they were doing, and had no case to make out one way or another. Therefore I say that in addition to that the paid-up stock is shown to run just as I gave it, at $791,000, or $9,765 per mile. This is the same railway which has been subsidized to the extent of $14,471 per mile by the Dominion and provincial and muncipal bodies, and if sensible men in this House or in this country can believe that this railway is entitled to another subsidy in addition to the $3,200 which they are given for this 12 miles, I will be very much surprised. I say it is a flagrant waste of public money to give this vote to that pampered company. I maintain that while there is a charge pending, not before a committee of this House, but before a Royal Commission issued by that very Government that is asking this vote, to enquire into charges made in respect to this very railway, I say it is indecent and improper to vote this or any other sum to that railway. Therefore, I move that this vote be struck out.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Postmaster General stated in the House that this road had rendered valuable services to that section of the country and was doing quite an extensive trade. Now I find from the Railway Statistics just furnished to this House that on that railway, 81 miles long, the total earnings last year were $36,634.77, and I find that the total working expenses of the line amounted to $49,872.95 or $13,500 more for the working

expenses than the entire earnings of the road. Certainly it cannot do a very extensive trade if that is a correct statement. After we have made statements to this House of the enormous subsidies granted to this road by Dominion and Provincial Governments; the hon. Minister has tried to deny that this road has been subsidized to the extent of $14,471 per mile.

Mr. COSTIGAN. And deny it yet.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then you are prepared to challenge the statement made in this report? I think the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Railways should get together and discuss the contents of this book before it is placed in our hands. Everything my hon. friend has quoted has been taken from this book.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I dare say the statement is correct with regard to the payment, but this was for 81 miles besides 20 miles additional, and 12 miles besides.

Mr. McMULLEN. It says 81 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the length of the Témiscouata Railway alone, the St. Francis Branch is 32 miles besides. I may correct another statement of the hon. gentleman. I say there has been no payment to the branch at all except the Dominion subsidy and the $2,500 voted by the New Brunswick Government, not a dollar more.

Mr. HAZEN. I think the mistake which hon. gentlemen opposite are falling into arises from the fact that they have charged against this road from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston, the subsidies voted to the whole of the road, including the 83 miles between Rivière du Loup and Edmundston, and the 32 miles between Edmundston and St. Francis.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the last road you mentioned?

Mr. HAZEN. From Edmundston to St. Francis is 32 miles, and the entire mileage of the road is 115. It is 82 miles from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston where it joins the old New Brunswick, which is at present under Canadian Pacific Railway management; and then there are 32 miles from Edmundston to St. Francis.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Where can I find this? The Edmundston and St. Francis is not mentioned in the Railway Statistics.

Mr. HAZEN. It is a branch of the Témiscouata. If the hon. gentleman will look at the map he will see that what I am stating is correct. From Edmundston to St. Francis is a part of the Témiscouata system, that is, it is built by the same company and controlled by the same company; but it is 32 miles in addition to the 83 miles of the main line of the Témiscouata Railway. Now, the subsidies granted by this Parliament are as follows:—On the 83 miles from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston, this Parliament has granted $6,000 per mile, which amounts to $498,000. For the first 20 miles leading from Edmundston up to the St. Francis Branch, $5,000 per mile was granted by this Parliament, which amounts to $100,000; and then for the 12 miles in addition on the St. Francis Branch beyond the 20 miles, we have added $3,200 per mile, which amounts to $38,400. If hon. gentlemen opposite will add these figures together, the $498,000 for the main line, the $100,000 for the first 20 miles, the branch line, and $38,400 for the 12 miles, they amount together to $636,400.

Mr. EDGAR. In 1890 there was a grant of $51,200.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That was 16 miles.

Mr. HAZEN. If hon. gentlemen will take the whole road, 115 miles, and divide it into this $626,400 in subsidies voted by this Parliament, they will find that the average is $5,534 per mile. Now in addition to that—I am confining myself to the subsidies alone, I am not speaking about bonds—they got for that portion of the Témiscouata Railway leading from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston, which is 69 miles within the Province of Quebec, $3,500 per mile from the Quebec Government. That would leave for that portion of the road within the Province of Quebec total subsidies from the Local and Dominion Government of $9,500 per mile. Then when we come to the Province of New Brunswick they have $6,000 from the Federal Government and from the Provincial Government $3,000 per mile; so for that portion of the main line within New Brunswick they have $9,000 per mile. In other words, the company have $9,500 per mile from both Governments for the portion of the road within the Province of Quebec, and $9,000 from both Governments for the portion of the main line in New Brunswick. Then taking the branch line of 32 miles leading up to Edmundston, they receive $5,000 per mile from this Government for the first 20 miles and $2,500 per mile from the Government of New Brunswick, or $7,500 per mile from both Governments. For the 12 miles, the company receive $3,200 per mile from this Government and $2,500 from the Government of New Brunswick, or $5,700 per mile from both Governments. That is all they receive in subsidies, except, as stated, a sum of $25,000 from a municipality, I think in the Province of Quebec. If you divide $25,000 over the whole line of 115 miles, hon. gentlemen will see that it gives only $217 per mile. That is the position in which the subsidies to this road stand at the present time. The error into which hon. gentlemen opposite have fallen is in taking the subsidies and applying them only to 82 miles instead of the whole 115 miles.

Mr. LISTER. The road does not so appear in the Railway Statistics.

Mr. HAZEN. The St. Francis Branch is not mentioned in the Railway Statistics in connection with the Témiscouata road; but it is really part of the Témiscouata which runs from the junction of New Brunswick and the main line from Edmundston up the River St. John.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the length of the Témiscouata road?

Mr. HAZEN. It begins from the main line at Rivière du Loup and runs to Edmundston, where it joins the New Brunswick system. The distance is 83 miles. The distance of the branch line, or the St. Francis Branch as it is called, is 32 miles, giving a total length of 115 miles.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are not both the sections spoken of by the hon. gentleman not included in the grant spoken of by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar)?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes. But the mistake hon. gentlemen opposite have made is in applying these

charges to a mileage of only 83, instead of adding the branch, which gives a total mileage of 115 miles.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We have 82 miles completed and 32 under contract.

Mr. HAZEN. The charges in the Railway Statistics are charges against the whole mileage of the road. I hope I have made myself clear to hon. gentleman, as I believe I have to other members of the committee.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not think the hon. gentleman has made it clear to himself.

Mr. HAZEN. I hope I have made myself clear to the hon. gentlemen.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not wish to detain the committee, but I desire to refer to a remark made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister). I would characterize his attack as unwarranted and unjust did I not believe that he made it without knowing the facts of the case of which he spoke. I refer to his attack on the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway Company. The hon. gentleman has characterized the work of that company as work of an inferior kind, and he has characterized the subsidies received and the profits obtained by those connected with the company as really scandalous. I say that is unjust and unfair.

Mr. LISTER. I never used the word "scandalous."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman says that hundreds of thousands of dollars in profits would be made by the promoters of that enterprise with the bonding powers of the company, and so on. I do not want to make a plea, *pro domo mea*, but I know the difficulties under which the company are now striving. The hon. gentleman said the company had received very large subsidies. The company have received from the Province of Quebec $6,000 in cash. By an old statute giving to the construction of a railway to deep water—which was the beginning of the projected Canadian Pacific Railway—a subsidy of $6,000 per mile was granted. The usual subsidy of $3,200 per mile has been added by this Parliament, making $9,200 per mile. A subsidy which the hon. gentleman seems to have forgotten was $100,000 as a bonus from the municipality of Pontiac, and this was added for a railway of the length of 100 miles, which is now built for a distance of 71 miles. The hon. gentleman said—I am sure the hon. gentleman did not know the facts when he made the statement—that the road could be built, at the highest figure, for $14,000 per mile.

Mr. LISTER. $15,000.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I know the promoters of the enterprise have expended a good deal more than that amount, if you take into consideration the equipment of the road. It has cost in the vicinity of $17,000. At all events, the work could not be constructed for $15,000 per mile. Take only $9,200 per mile, and there is a difference between that and $15,000 of almost $6,000 per mile for the 70 miles now built, and for the other 30 miles to be built in order to complete the road; and from this calculation it will be apparent what balance remains to be obtained on the security of the company. The road has been built not by inferior work. The bridges are not of inferior quality, for although under the contract they were to be build of wood, they are being constructed of iron with stone foundations, piers and abutments, which place these structures among first railway bridges. I am bound to say this much in justice to the enterprising contractor who has taken hold of the railway, Mr. Beemer. He has built the Lake St. John Railway, the Quebec and Montmorency, the Laurentide, the Montreal and Western, the Gatineau Valley, and the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway. To carry to a successful issue those important enterprizes, he has struggled with and is struggling against great difficulties which do not warrant such an attack on this enterprise which he is endeavouring to carry to completion. I may add that this company has not spent a single dollar for directors' fees, for press expenses, for promotion expenses, for legal expenses in organizing the company; in fact, not a single dollar of the subsidy received from the Federal or Local Government has been expended outside of the actual work performed by the contractor who is building the road. Some of the promoters of the railway have invested their own money, not to a very large extent, but to a pretty large extent, and that money, which they hope to recover from the enterprise, is not now more secure than the money which is invested in any fair enterprise; and the great difficulties met by such enterprises will not be diminished if attacks of the kind that have been made by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) are to continue. I say this only in justice to the man who has put his energy and his money in the enterprise, and to the capitalist who has also invested his money—I speak of the late Senator Ross of Quebec, whose heir and successor (Mr. Frank Ross) has left the investment in that road, in order to try and struggle against difficulties, and in order to build a railway more for the benefit of that part of the country than to the profit of those who are promoting the line, or even of the contractor who has built it.

Mr. LISTER. Would the hon. gentleman say how much the road has been bonded for?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think the power of bonding the road is equivalent to $20,000 a mile. If my hon. friend would give me the quotation at which these bonds can be floated, and if he wishes to place them on the money market, I am perfectly sure he can get a good bargain by securing a fair quotation. The road can be bonded, under the power given in the statute, to $20,000 a mile, but not a dollar of the bonds has been floated yet.

Mr. LISTER. Has the company borrowed money on them?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, sir. The company has only had the advance of the late Senator Ross to the extent of about $300,000 or $400,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have gone over the figures submitted by the hon. gentleman opposite and after comparing them with the figures submitted in the Railway Statistics I find them as follows:—$462,000 was granted by the Quebec Government; $36,000 was granted by the New Brunswick Government, and $649,200 was granted by the Dominion Government, in all $1,147,200. Then the bonded debt is $1,574,680, gross total $2,721,640, or taking the road at 115 miles as hon. gentlemen opposite

state, that would make about $24,000 a mile without counting the municipal subsidies at all.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman's figures with regard to Dominion subsidies are practically the same as mine. He makes them $649,000 and I make them $636,000; but the hon. gentleman is taking the bonds at par, as if these bonds could be sold at par. I do not think the bonds are sold yet.

Mr. TISDALE. The Quebec subsidy is only $321,500.

Mr. HAZEN. I fail to see how the hon. gentleman got the figures which he has quoted for Quebec.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 50 of the Railway Statistics he will find "Témiscouata Railway Company: aid granted railway by Government of Quebec, $462,000." That is what I quoted.

Mr. TISDALE. They must have made a mistake in giving their return.

Mr. EDGAR. Suppose I give hon. gentlemen opposite the benefit of all they claim. Suppose we take the length of this road completed and uncompleted at 113 miles; 81 completed and 32 uncompleted, although by the Railway Statistics up to the 30th June, 1891, there were only 81 miles completed. The Dominion subsidies given here are correct, because I checked them and the total is $649,200. In 1885 there were $498,000 voted; in 1888, $100,000; and in 1891, $51,200, or a total of Dominion subsidies of $649,200 as I said. These Railway Statistics give the Quebec subsidies at $462,000.

Mr. HAZEN. That cannot be right. The subsidy voted by the Quebec Government was $3,500 a mile, and there are only 65 miles of the road in Quebec. Quebec did not subsidize the part in New Brunswick.

Mr. EDGAR. Will the hon. gentleman explain, or will the Minister of Railways explain, or will some member of the Government explain to the House, how they come to report year after year to the people of this country, that the Quebec subsidies to these railways were $462,000, if that is not a fact?

Mr. TISDALE. I will explain. If you know anything about it, you know that the Government have no more to do with these figures than you have. Each company makes a return at a certain time of the year, and the Government are bound to put in that return. The company may have done this, but the hon. gentleman asks how are the Government responsible? The company may have made the mistake.

Mr. EDGAR. The Government is responsible for the Dominion return.

Mr. HAGGART. If you look at the amount paid out it is only $847,470 instead of $1,000,000 odd which these sums make.

Mr. EDGAR. I am giving what is voted.

Mr. HAGGART. What is paid is $847,470.

Mr. EDGAR. If, as the Minister of Railways says, a larger sum has been voted to this company than has been paid, what is the use of voting more money to this railway. Wait until they require it. This is an additional reason for not voting this sum to-night. If there is a large balance unpaid to this railway, let them earn it, and let them get paid if paid they must be. What I claim is, that these amounts have been voted and granted to this railway, and if you take these sums amounting to $1,172,000 of subsidies, and divide 113 miles into them—as hon. gentlemen opposite maintain that much is finished—you will find that this railway gets a bonus of $10,300 a mile at the very least. I say that that is quite enough for any railway, and I notice that the Minister of Inland Revenue did not say anything about the quotation in his speech I made from *Hansard* of some years ago, when he said that a New Brunswick railway company were prepared to build this road for a subsidy of $6,000 a mile, and it had already got $10,000 a mile. That is another reason why we should not vote the present subsidy.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. Minister of Customs assumed that I had made an attack on the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway Company, and he felt called upon to rise in his place to defend it. I desire to say that I made no attack upon that company; I was attacking the system of building railways adopted by the Government of the day. So far as that railway is concerned, I have seen the portion constructed, and I can say without any hesitation at all, that it would be difficult to imagine a section of country where a railway could be constructed cheaper than the country through which that railway runs. The rock excavations are almost nothing, and the country is almost a dead level. I would remind the hon. gentleman of his statement that the company had received from the Quebec Government $6,000 a mile, and from the Dominion Government $3,200 a mile, in all $9,200 a mile, in addition to which they were voted by the County of Pontiac a bonus of $100,000; making subventions amounting to over $10,200 per mile. Then, the hon. gentleman says that the company pledged their bonds for $300,000; so that the total cash receipts available for the construction of the road amounted to $13,000 a mile. Now, I stated that I believed that road could be built and equipped for $15,000 a mile, and I adhere to that statement. My hon. friend says that the company are in deep water, and that they have never been able to sell their bonds. All I can say is that having the right to bond the road for $20,000 a mile, they should have had the sagacity of this company which is now asking for an additional subsidy, and out of the proceeds of the bonds retained enough to secure the purchasers of the bonds ten years' interest. That is an old and well understood trick, which has been carried out in all the provinces. But the gentlemen promoting that road never put a dollar of their own money into it, hardly enough even to get their Bill through Parliament. The hon. gentleman has not informed the House whether that road was constructed by a construction company composed of Mr. Beemer and others, or whether it has been constructed by Mr. Beemer alone. A favourite system in this country is to form a construction company inside of the railway company, and to give the construction company all the proceeds of the bonuses. If the road passes through a favourable section of country, sooner or later it must become a profitable undertaking; and the company have bonding powers to the extent of $20,000 a mile, with the possibility of receiving $30,000 for the construction of the road, it is not difficult to imagine how much profit there must be

in it for some of the promoters. As to the manner in which the road has been constructed, I repeat that the culverts are wooden; I said nothing about the bridges: and I say again that the iron on the road is light and not at all suitable for heavy traffic. More than that, the road has no station at Aylmer; it has a couple of small stations along the line; it has a few passenger and freight cars; but its total equipment is quite insignificant, and would not to any great extent enter into a consideration of its cost. So that I venture to say that there is not a dollar of the money of the promoters or the present stockholders in that road, but that it has been built entirely out of the subsidies granted and the money borrowed on the bonds issued by the company. I am not complaining of the hon. gentleman. I am not saying that he had anything to do with the road, directly or indirectly; I know nothing about that; I care nothing about that. I simply instanced that road to show that we were adopting a system which, in my judgment, was pernicious. People are now beginning to think that instead of asking for $3,000 a mile, they must get enough money, by hook or by crook, to build the whole road, and they are coming to this House for $6,000 a mile, and one road a few years ago received $12,000 a mile. I protest again against a system that makes the people lean upon the Government for everything instead of depending upon individual enterprise and capital. All that this Government ought to do is to encourage the investment of private capital by slight aid to these undertakings. The mere fact that a road passes through a section of country that requires accommodation is no reason why the Government should undertake to provide the principal cost of its construction. It is shown unmistakably that this road which the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue speaks about has been subsidized enormously, and at this particular time this Parliament should not entertain the proposition to subsidize it further. The proposition should be postponed, at all events until the conclusion of the investigation which the Government have shirked in this House, and which they have handed over to a tribunal appointed by themselves. Sir, the hon. Postmaster General in his utterances showed considerable courage—not Dutch courage, I hope. That hon. gentleman had no right to charge the hon. member for West Ontario with want of courage when he was afraid himself to face the charges in this House, and the Government came to the determination to vote down the charges entirely, but I have no doubt that, on account of the pressure of their followers, they devised the scheme of referring the charges to a special commission for investigation, which was an act of cowardice on the part of the hon. gentleman and the Government who permitted him to escape in that sort of way. If my hon. friend should refuse to appear before that commission, he would, I conceive, be doing nothing more than he has the right to do, because having made those charges in this House, it was the plain duty of this House to investigate them and not throw the responsibility of doing so on other shoulders.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I repeat what I have said, that the statement of the hon. gentleman who has last spoken is unwarranted, ungenerous, and untrue. I say this of my own motion, and not as

speaking on behalf of those connected with that company; and in so doing, I speak especially for the gentleman who has devoted his energies to the building of that road. I refer to the promoter of the building of the road. My hon. friend has said that those who are interested in that company never risked a dollar of their money in it. That is untrue. Mr. Beemer has put more than $100,000 of his money into the enterprise, and has involved his credit to a still larger extent. Those who are assisting him in a smaller proportion have also risked their money, and they have never asked for or received a single dollar out of any subsidy voted by any government or municipality; and if an investigation were had, it could be conclusively proved that not a dollar of public money has been expended on anything except for the work actually done on the road. I challenge an investigation into this matter, and I do so in the interests of the gentlemen who have advanced their money to construct the road, and of the capitalists who have assisted them. My hon. friend has insinuated that these railways were built by construction companies. They were built by the regular chartered company, with the money of the promoters and the assistance of the two Governments and the county which subsidized them. The enterprise is not one of those great commercial enterprises, the bonds in connection with which require only to be put on the market to find purchasers, and it is not by slandering the gentlemen connected with it in the way they have been slandered and by treating them in the acrimonious and ungenerous manner in which they have been treated, that hon. gentlemen can show their zeal for the interests of the country. The attacks made are unwarranted and untrue, and calculated to do injury to the promoters of this enterprise, who are honestly striving to bring it to completion. These parties are beside engaged in other public enterprises, as, for instance, the bridge on the Ottawa River, the construction of which will cost $200,000 or $300,000, and which might be impeded by these slanderous accusations with reference to the enterprise under discussion. I challenge my hon. friend to ask for an investigation; and if he should do so, I am confident it will result in proving that the promoters have not spent a dollar on that railway of all the Government and municipal subsidies except in its lawful, just and economical construction, and that the work, which is of the best description, has entailed considerable sacrifices on their part.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The company in making their railway returns, gave the orginal subsidy granted which was a bulk subsidy of $462,000, being the value of the land given them, valued at 70 cents per acre. But that land subsidy was afterwards commuted by the Quebec Government for a cash subsidy of just half that amount, or $3,500 per mile, and that is the only subsidy paid in cash under that arrangement. The first subsidy, however, was put down in the return, and this explains the discrepancy. The actual payment by the Quebec Government was $3,500 in cash instead of twice that amount in land.

Mr. FRASER. When a road of only 12 miles is to be built, Parliament should see that the promoters have means of their own to build it before granting any subsidy. I can very well understand how a large enterprise may be depending upon the

Government subsidy for the progress of the work, but a company which has not sufficient backing to build a road only 12 miles long, without first being paid the Government subsidy, is not deserving of being subsidized. Take, for instance, the road in the County of Pictou, a subsidy for which was voted a little while ago, what did the promoters do in that case. Did they go to the Government and ask for a subsidy before they proceeded to construct it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is the last 12 miles of a road 115 miles long.

Mr. FRASER. It ought to be all the easier to build the last 12 miles than the first, because the company have got all the previous subsidies. That only makes the argument all the stronger. What did the company which built the road in the County of Pictou, to which I have just referred, do? They did not ask for a subsidy at all until they had built the road, and the road was in operation before the subsidy was voted. That is the proper policy to be followed in building railways. A railway company which cannot stand except with the aid of the Government subsidy, and which requires to have its subsidies paid before its road is completed, ought not to be subsidized at all. That ought to be the general principle on which the Government ought to proceed. It may be taken for granted that a company which cannot build a road until it is subsidized is not capable of carrying through the work. In the case of the company to which I refer, the junior member for Halifax and other capitalists put their money into the road and completed it, and built a furnace that cost $250,000 before they asked the Government for a dollar. They paid for the whole thing, and now that it is completed and they have shown their *bonâ fides*, they ask for a subsidy. It is all right to assist railways by means of Government subsidies: but when the subsidy is the chief factor in building the road, that is sure evidence that the road is not such a one as ought to be built. In a case, where there is a long stretch of road to be built like the Canadian Pacific Railway, it may be necessary for a company before completing it to receive their subsidy, but in the case of small roads like this, to grant the subsidy in advance is simply opening the door to enable a number of men to undertake building railways with no other means at their disposal than the Government aid. Before a dollar of the subsidy is paid, the road ought to be in operation; and if this were insisted on, the Government could not make any mistake. Otherwise you will find companies pledging their Government subsidy to raise the money to go on with the work, and in such cases you are not likely to have roads that will prove of benefit to the country. Before the construction of a railway is entered upon at all, the people undertaking the enterprise should be assured that the section through which it runs is likely to furnish a traffic that will make it a paying property. It will not be contended, unless the Government are going to own every road in the country, that the assistance it gives ought to be the chief factor in going on with the work. If the principle is to be laid down that the Government ought to build the road, then let it equip it and run it; but otherwise we should certainly refuse to pay over the Government subsidy on a road only 12 miles long before it is begun. In doing that, this Parliament will be going outside its legitimate duty, I think the Government should impose the condition that not a dollar of the subsidy will be paid until the road is completed. If that course were followed, we would have none of these scenes we have witnessed and would not have all these comments we hear from time to time about these railways. I agree with the hon. member for Lambton that the road under discussion cannot be difficult to build. I know nothing about the internal economy of the company and therefore am not going to speak on that matter, but I know of my own knowledge that there are roads built throughout the country just as difficult to construct as this one, which have been built with the amounts of Government grants and municipal aid. As to that $100,000, the company have got it.

Mr. HAGGART. How much is that?

Mr. FRASER. $10,000 a mile.

Mr. HAGGART. They have not got that.

Mr. FRASER. They have $6,000 from the Quebec Government. I mean the Pontiac road.

Mr. HAGGART. I thought the hon. gentleman was speaking of the Témiscouata road.

Mr. FRASER. The Pontiac road has received $100,000. They sold the bonds which the county issued to Mr. Ross and got the money.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. FRASER. They sold the municipal bonds.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. LISTER. Ross sued on them and recovered.

Mr. FRASER. Ross sued on them. Were they afraid to sue themselves? They parted with the bonds, because the man must have got the bonds before he could sue. I say that a similar road could have been built for $10,000 or $11,000 a mile.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is the difference between truth and fancy.

Mr. FRASER. There is no fancy about the $9,200 a mile.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. FRASER. Neither is there any fancy as to Ross having got the bonds.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. FRASER. Where is the fancy?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The fancy of the hon. gentleman is that this road could be built for $9,000 a mile when it cost $16,000.

Mr. FRASER. Of course, I do not know as much as the hon. gentleman about that, but what I said was that I know of a road which was as well built for $9,000 or $10,000 a mile. I know the roads in Nova Scotia have sometimes cost twice as much as that. If it were known that the Government subvention would not be paid over until the road was built, it would lead to economy in the construction of the road. If a company know they have to build the road out of their own means before they get the Government subvention, then they build the road cheaply, but otherwise they are liable to be extravagant. This Pontiac road, though a very good road, does not strike me as one that should have cost very much. When you have to buy your ticket in a little ordinary car at Aylmer,

I am sure the road could not have cost that much. But I submit, as a matter that members on both sides of the House ought to agree upon, that, upon all the roads, and particularly upon these short roads, not a dollar should be paid over by the Government until the company show that they have sufficient funds themselves, and that their credit is good enough to finish the road before they get the Government subvention.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had a trip over that road lately, which may have left him a little sore.

Mr. FRASER. No, I am never sore. I can fight and laugh if I win, and if I do not win I can laugh just as well. But the warmth which the hon. Minister shows may indicate something behind the scenes as to how we were beaten in the county, and that may show it came about that those who made the promise in that county succeeded in their desires.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is another fancy.

Mr. FRASER. That is no fancy, because I heard it.

Resolution agreed to on a division.

To the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway, for 16 miles of their railway from Port Burwell to Tilsonburg, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $51,200.

Mr. HAGGART. The object of this road is to connect with Lake Erie at Port Burwell. It is a very good section of the country and this will be a benefit to the farming community in that district.

To the Woodstock and Centreville Railway Company, for 6 miles of their railway from the west end of the 20 miles subsidized by the 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, to the international boundary between the Province of New Brunswick and the State of Maine, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $19,200.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if this is not granted to connect with an American line at the boundary?

Mr. FOSTER. No; there is no American line there.

Mr. McMULLEN. What object is there in connecting with the American boundary?

Mr. FOSTER. Just the same as there was in paying anything towards that road. It goes through a fine farming country and runs to the Aroostook border.

To the Lake Témiscamingue Colonization Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway from the Long Sault to the crossing of the Kippewa River, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and a subsidy of 15 per cent on the value of a wooden truss bridge over the Ottawa River near Mattawa, not exceeding $15,000, nor exceeding in the whole $63,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much subsidy has been granted to this road?

Mr. HAGGART. $3,200 a mile for 50 miles. 35 miles of this have been renewed, and this is for a bridge and the 15 miles which I explained some time ago on the other vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see, by the statistics furnished to-day, that this Lake Témiscamingue Railway has already received $177,200 of a bonus.

Mr. HAGGART All I am aware of their having received, is $3,200 for 15 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much of the road is actually constructed?

Mr. HAGGART. 15 miles.

Mr. McMULLEN. That would be about $48,000. I cannot understand how the Railway Statistics make out $177,000 paid by the Dominion Government.

Mr. HAGGART. Is not that liability on the whole road?

Mr. SPEAKER. Is not that $177,200 the amount that has been granted in the way of subsidy, and a part of which has not yet been paid? That is the amount granted, but there is a revote, as the hon. gentleman will see in a former resolution, of $12,000, which shows that only a comparatively small portion of the amount of aid that has been granted by this Parliament, has been paid to the company.

Mr. EDGAR. I notice that in the Railway Statistics there is no distinction made in the payments by the different governments. For instance, in this railway under consideration, the Dominion and Quebec Governments have voted large subsidies, and there is only one item for the amounts paid by both, not distinguishing how much each Government has paid. That is a mistake that ought to be corrected in the next edition of these statistics.

Mr. HAGGART. I am glad the hon. gentleman has found the paid-up column, and the amount of cash that is actually paid on the railways. If he had found that column before, he would not have made the mistake that he made in regard to the Témiscouata Railway a little while ago. The hon. gentleman will find that between the Quebec and Dominion Governments, only $3,200 per mile for 15 miles has been granted.

To the Goderich and Wingham Railway Company, for 31 miles of their railway from Goderich to Wingham *viâ* Port Albert, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $99,200.

Mr. HAGGART. The object of the road is to form a connection between Wingham, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the thriving town of Goderich. That is the nearest connection from Wingham across.

Mr. McMULLEN. I suppose this is in fulfilment of the promise made to West Huron for electing the Secretary of State. No doubt the same use is made of this subsidy that was made of the subsidy granted in the County of Northumberland. If the hon. Secretary of State should deny that this vote has any reference to the promise that was made to West Huron, we may require to search up and find out what was said by the papers. This was a projected line for some years; there was a charter granted. It is a singular coincidence that just as soon as a constituency reverses its vote, and, in place of a supporter of the Reform party, sends to Parliament a supporter of the Administration, the Government wake up to the fact that it requires a subsidy for a railway, or requires to be relieved from some obligation. And after that the Government say they do not buy people nor constituencies where our friends are unseated.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am glad to see this sum placed in the resolutions, because I think we have more than an ordinary claim for assistance in that section of the country. This road will

be extended from the town of Wingham to the town of Goderich, through a very fine section of agricultural country, which is not very conveniently situated to a railway. It will make Goderich—a town in which I take a good deal of interest, because it is the county town of the county a part of which I have the honour to represent—a competitive point, and it will certainly draw traffic from the north of the lakes and across the lakes from Michigan, and the Goderich people will have a competing railway to carry the trade that will centre there. This line was surveyed about two years ago, and we then expected to receive a subsidy from the Government, because the Government having adopted the policy of subsidizing railways, we thought we were entitled, under that policy, to a subsidy for a railway for the purpose of opening up that section of the country. Now, I may say that the County of Huron has contributed, probably, as much to the revenue as any other county in the Dominion of Canada, and all that it has ever received in aid for railways is $16,000. The county itself has contributed to the building of railways, $596,000 and after those railways had been built by municipal and county aid they were taken in charge by the Dominion Government. Therefore, I think it is only an act of justice for the Government to make this grant; I am very glad to see it, and I will accept it with thanks.

Mr. McMULLEN. I agree with my hon. friend who has just spoken that the county he represents will reap considerable benefit from the construction of this road, but the point I wished to make out is that the money has been withheld from that county up to the present moment simply because it was represented by an opponent of the present Government. But the moment that constituency reverses its political complexion, the Government immediately proceeds to grant this bonus. Again, this grant is in violation of the pledge made by the First Minister two years ago, when he said that the Government had decided that they would not grant bonuses to roads that were competing lines to any existing lines, but they would only grant bonuses to roads that would open up new sections of country. In this case, that section of country is already accommodated with railways. This will be a competing line. The Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway both go to Wingham, and this will be a continuation, I presume, of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, which is now a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Goderich. Goderich has also the Grand Trunk which, in going to Goderich, crosses a branch of the London, Huron and Bruce. It must cross that to go to Goderich. So that virtually that section of the country has already accommodation by one line. No doubt the Government might possibly present as an excuse for not giving this grant, that it would be a violation of the principle laid down some years ago, that the Government would not subsidize roads in a part of the country where accommodation is already given. But that principle is set at naught in order to grant aid because West Huron has changed its political complexion.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). This proposed vote is to accommodate one of the most important districts in that section of the country, and the railroad will go through a part of the country which has no railway accommodation, although it is one of the oldest settlements in that part of Ontario. The grant now proposed is submitted in fulfilment of a promise made by the late First Minister two years ago, as I am assured by the directors. The allegations made respecting what took place during the late campaign by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) are of a purely imaginary character. I was never asked to promise a political favour in the County of Huron during the recent contest; I never promised to grant one, either of a public or private character. This road can stand on its own merits, and I have no doubt it will find favour with the hon. gentleman when it is completed, and the hon. gentleman takes the opportunity of travelling over it. I understand the projectors, who are not of one political party in their relations, include Messrs. J. T. Garrow, M. G. Cameron, Dr. Holmes, Horace Horton, William Lee and other leading gentlemen of the district. It is stated that the intention is to run the railway in a northerly direction to a point between Port Albert and Dungannon and thence easterly to Wingham, with the intention of continuing it in a northerly direction at a later date from the neighbourhood of Dungannon as far as Kincardine. In this way it is considered that this road will furnish accommodation to the people of Huron and Bruce, who are so well entitled to this recognition on the part of the Dominion Government.

To the Joliette and St. Jean de Matha Railway Company, for 8 miles of their railway from St. Félix de Valois to St. Jean de Matha, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $25,600.

Mr. HAGGART. The object of this vote is to facilitate the settlement of the vast fertile country to the north of the Counties of Joliette, Berthier and Maskinongé.

Mr. LIPPÉ. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the subsidy now asked for in order to help the building of a railway between St. Jean de Matha and St. Félix de Valois is of a very great importance for the advancement of colonization and agriculture. This railway will be the great channel which seven or eight parishes will naturally take for the conveyance of their imports and their exports. For these parishes St. Jean de Matha is much nearer than any other point to the commercial centres. I will point out that we already have several grist mills, 17 saw-mills, 15 cheese factories. This alone constitutes quite a trade. We have lumber in quantities; fine water powers still unoccupied, and fertile lands where cattle are raised. When our farmers will have secured this road, which they so long prayed for, they will be remunerated for their work and encouraged to stay in the country. As to those who have left they will hasten to come back; it is their most earnest wish. I have lived long enough with them to know their dispositions. Our mechanics and our manufacturers will also be encouraged. They will double and treble their operations. On another hand, the unimproved lands which are numerous, will soon be taken up, occupied and cultivated. We have there fine lands capable of forming 20 new parishes, which will all have St. Jean de Matha as their outlet. The building of this road is then a direct work of repatriation and colonization. It will be an encouragement for farmers, who can carry on an enormous trade in hay, wood, grain, butter, cheese, cattle and other farm produce. It will facilitate the

development of our mining industries which are already promising much. This road can hurt no other railway, I am positive of that. Besides, I think that all the hon. members of this House are satisfied that it is useful to work for the development of the resources of the country, and the growth of their yield. This railway will be an important means of reaching that end. For these reasons and many others, I believe that the resolution now before us is very wise and very patriotic.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) For my part, I am quite ready to admit the reasons urged by the hon. member for the voting of this grant. But will the hon. member allow me to ask him a question? I see that in a letter which he addressed to the Minister of Railways on the 24th March last, he said?

"While hoping that my request will be listened to, and that the subsidy asked for will be granted without delay, I will add that if the Government takes in consideration the immense good which this new line can do the country, the necessity of our having this subsidy immediately in order not to lose the Quebec grant, and the services which I may have rendered last year and this year in the County of Joliette, I have reason to believe that they will grant us a generous subsidy, and that they will let us know as soon as possible their decision, so that we may start without delay on the necessary preliminary work."

I see that my hon. friend does not share the opinion of the member for Bagot, who holds that we should not subsidize railways which have already received a grant from the Quebec Government. But I would like to ask my hon. what are those services which he may have rendered in the County of Joliette?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I will point out to the leader of the Opposition that the Joliette and St. Jean de Matha Railway justly depends on the Quebec Government as a colonization road. It is assuredly allowable for the Quebec Government to subsidize colonization roads. On the other hand the railway interested in the subsidy before us this afternoon was not such a road, and the subsidy wanted had no reason to be given.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) The parishes of St. Jean de Matha and St. Félix de Valois are as old as that of Ste. Rosalie.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) This is not in the interest of St. Jean de Matha, but of the twenty new parishes spoken of by the hon. member for Joliette.

To the Bracebridge and Baysville Railway Company for 15 miles of their railway from Bracebridge towards Baysville, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the Minister will explain this new vote?

Mr. HAGGART. This subsidy is for a promised railway from Bracebridge on the Grand Trunk Railway, to Baysville, a small place situated on the lake or bay. It is for the purpose of connecting a large watershed, which is over 100 miles in length. It is an enterprise of a most laudable character.

To the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company for 25 miles of their railway from, at or near North Bay station on the Canadian Pacific Railway towards James Bay, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $80,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister explain this item?

Mr. LIPPÉ.

Mr. HAGGART. This railway will start from North Bay and pierce a magnificent timber country to the north, and also a large tract of land available for settlement. It is opening up the timber resources of the country, and there will be a connection at North Bay with the line that runs from Toronto, and a connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is a road the claims of which have been urged on the Government by the citizens of Toronto and the western portion of Ontario.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the road is going to James Bay, 25 miles will prove an exceedingly small section. To what are the Government committing the House by this proposal? How many hundreds of miles further will be required to reach James Bay?

Mr. HAGGART. About 420 miles. But we are not committing ourselves to any such scheme as that; we are only committing ourselves to 25 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are the promoters of this enterprise, and what guarantee have they given the Government that they possess the requisite funds to go on with the enterprise?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. W. D. McMurrich, of Toronto, and several other gentlemen are promoters of the scheme.

Mr. TISDALE. The Ontario Government have already granted aid for 50 miles of the road. This will reach a large timber and mineral region, and also a valuable agricultural region, as shown by the report of Mr. Bayley. I have no doubt that the one section of 50 miles, if the road was never helped any further, would be of great benefit not only to that part of the country, but connecting as it does with the Grand Trunk Railway at North Bay, it would enable a large lumber region to be reached. Two years ago the Ontario Government voted $3,000 a mile for 50 miles of this road, and the company have made arrangements with the Grand Trunk Railway to operate this road when it is built. They have also arranged that so soon as this aid is granted, making a total aid of $6,200 per mile, construction will be at once proceeded with. Mr. W. D. McMurrich, of Toronto, Mr. Hendry, Mr. Jaffray, and other men of that stamp, are interested in this scheme, so there is no doubt as to the work being commenced so soon as this assistance is given. In regard to committing this Parliament to a larger scheme, the 50 miles aided by the Ontario Government is the first section, and there is no other road started or projected to go into that part of the country. This Nipissing and James Bay road has been before the public for some years, and large expenditures were necessarily involved to make a thorough exploration, the results of which were submitted to the Ontario Government before they granted aid; but the Dominion Government has never seen its way until now to grant aid, which is now proposed at the request of a large part of the western portion of the province. The Boards of Trade of Toronto, Hamilton, and other cities, have sent deputations to wait on this Government, as they waited on the Ontario Government, and urge the granting of this aid to a road which will open up a valuable agricultural, mineral and timber region.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This may be a road of some merit—possibly it is—but all the

hon. gentleman has said only goes to show the extreme impropriety of the course adopted by the Government in bringing down these important measures at this late period of the session. In all honour and conscience, every one of those resolutions should be laid before us at an early stage of the session, together with the papers connected with them, in order that we might examine into them, and be able to have some sort of an intelligent idea of what we are voting millions of money away for. Not half the House is here now, nor is it possible for us who are here to examine the papers which were put into my hon. friend's hands on Saturday last, at a time when only one or two at the outside could possibly examine them. I say that this whole system of keeping back these railway resolutions to this time of the session is perfectly disgraceful from a business point of view and in every other way.

For a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway between Ste. Flavie and Little Métis station to Matane, for 50 miles of such railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $160,000.

Mr. HAGGART. This road is projected from the Intercolonial Railway at a point near little Métis station to follow down the St. Lawrence river to Matane. It is claimed that the construction of this road will be a great boon to the agricultural and commercial interests of the district. I believe this is a very good port, and that if a railway was constructed there, that, perhaps, it would be the best place for the purpose of landing mails from the steamships. I believe, also, that it is a road that is greatly commended, and in which a great deal of interest was taken by the late Government of Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. I find no fault with the appropriation itself. If any section of the country is deserving of public aid I suppose this portion is as much entitled to it as any other. I see no provision yet as to whom the subsidy is to be paid, and I am not aware even that there is any intention of forming a company. The whole project seems to be so far in a very crude state.

Mr. HAGGART. I intend to add to the resolution the usual form giving the Government power to give it to a company to be formed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are the promoters who come to the Government asking for this money, and what guarantee do they offer that they will go on?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think the hon. gentleman will find in the Quebec Act the names of the incorporators who have organized a company for the purpose of building this road. What the Minister of Railways has just stated, that he intends to surround this vote with the usual precautionary measure which is adopted in all these subsidies, makes it quite safe, and I do not see that there can be any more difficulty about this than about the other subsidies which have been granted under similar circumstances.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to know what reasons there are for not naming the company in this case?

Mr. HAGGART. I intend to amend the resolution in the same form as the others.

Mr. EDGAR. That is not the point. In a good many cases where it was intended to take a general vote without naming the company, it was agreed that that was not desirable, except under exceedingly special circumstances, and in every case except one where these special circumstances were given, we have amended the resolution and inserted the name of the company to whom the money is to be paid. The Minister has told us that there is an authorized company for this railway, and I suppose it is to that company you wish to give the grant.

Mr. LAURIER. It is manifest that the subsidy must go to that company. They have got the Quebec subsidy, and no other company has been incorporated or can be incorporated.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The subsidy granted by Quebec in 1890, was granted to the Matane Railway Company.

Mr. LAURIER. No other road can be chartered as long as this one is in existence; and as I suppose the Government do not contemplate to have a rival company organized, and the Dominion subsidy given to one, and the provincial subsidy to another, I do not see why this subsidy should not be given to the company which has undertaken to do the work.

Mr. EDGAR. If there is a reason why it cannot be given to that company, and it is apparent no other company can get it, why not strike the subsidy out and wait until there is another company ready to take it. There is no hurry in putting this subsidy through unless there is a company ready to take it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It seems to me that one of the first duties of the Government would be to ascertain all about this company. Under a clause in the statute which is framed for the purpose of protecting the money which will be voted by Parliament, it is said:

"The subsidies hereinbefore-mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose, shall be granted to such companies respectively. The other subsidies shall be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council, as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively."

Under this clause it is quite evident, without mentioning anything about the present company, that it would be the duty of the Government to ascertain by every means in its power, the desirability of that company being given the subsidy which is voted. If it be not given to that company it must be given to a company which is acceptable to the Governor in Council.

Mr. LAURIER. We would suppose that the Government would have ascertained all that before they asked for the appropriation. There is no special application made for this subsidy, and the provincial subsidy is made to the Matane Railway Company.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That does not tend us.

Mr. LAURIER. I know that very well, but are we to understand from the hon. gentleman that he has not ascertained whether that company is ready to build the railway or not? Are we to understand that he is going to vote $160,000 without knowing where it is to go, or ascertain the condition of the country? If that is all the information

the hon. gentleman can give us all we can do is not to vote for the appropriation. The hon. gentleman cannot seriously ask us to vote for it when he has no reasons whatever to give us for it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have given reasons, but the hon. gentleman does not seem to accept them. The country is thoroughly well-known, and a couple of surveys were made—one I know, because I met the engineer personally when I was travelling around that section of the country. Judging from the fact that the company have already received a subsidy from the Local Government, they must have shown to the Local Government that they were in a position to build the railway; otherwise I suppose the money would not have been given to them. What we want to do is to ascertain whether this company are still in the position they occupied before, and if they cannot satisfy the Government of their ability to build the road, then it will be given to a company that will be acceptable to the Governor in Council.

Mr. LAURIER. That company will have no charter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friends on this side are certainly hard to please. My hon. friend the Postmaster General met an engineer who told him that the road was necessary and that the country was a very good one through which to build a road, and that ought to satisfy Parliament of the propriety of voting this large sum of money. I would like to know if that is all the information we are to receive. It does not seem that a railway company has been organized to build the road or that any organization has made an application for a subsidy; but the Government have so much money that they do not know what to do with it that they propose to advertise that we have some hundreds of thousands of dollars ready to appropriate in this way if somebody can be found who will take the money. That is about the proposition which the hon. gentlemen makes to us. One would suppose that before appropriations of this sort could be asked for from Parliament by the Crown, there would be carefully prepared surveys, estimates and statements showing the population of the particular district, the amount of trade likely to be secured, and all that information that any private company could find it necessary to possess before they would undertake to launch their money in such an enterprise.

To the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company for 240-100 miles of their railway from the end of the section subsidized by 53 Vic., chap. 2, at Huntingdon, towards the international boundary, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $7,680.

Mr. HAGGART. I wish to substitute for this the following:—

To the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company for 5 42-100 miles of their railway from Huntingdon towards the international boundary, which, with the distance between Valleyfield and Huntingdon 12 58-100 miles, makes up the distance of 18 miles named in 53 Victoria, chapter 2, and for 2 40-100 miles from the east end of the 18 miles referred to, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $25,024.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to ask the hon. Minister if he is quite certain that his figures with regard to this railway are correct now? A mistake was made last year in inserting the word Huntingdon. The number of miles were given correctly, but owing to the word Huntingdon being inserted the Auditor General refused to pay for more than 12 miles. I understand that the deficiency of 6 miles is provided for here.

Mr. HAGGART. The original grant was for 18 miles from Valleyfield to Huntingdon; but the distance is only 12 miles and the road I understand was built six miles beyond Huntingdon. The Auditor General refused to pay for the 18 miles, only paying for the 12 miles to Huntingdon. This vote is to cover the six miles and the $2\frac{4}{100}$ miles.

Mr. LAURIER. There is a point of order in reference to this vote. It is proposed to increase the vote.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman takes the point of order I am afraid there will be nothing left for me but to give notice of the amended resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it should be done. I do not urge the point at all in a captious spirit, but the matter is one of importance, and I rather think it would be illegal if carried without notice.

To the Ontario and Pacific Railway Company, for 53 87-100 miles of their railway from Cornwall to Ottawa, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $172,400.

Mr. HAGGART. This is a revote.

Mr. EDGAR. What is the prospect of getting the railway? Has anything been done towards its construction, even if the subsidy has not been earned?

Mr. HAGGART. There was nothing hard in regard to the construction, but a large amount of money has been expended in the shape of surveys, &c. From all I can learn, I believe that the company is in a position now, if it gets the subsidy, to go on and build the road.

To the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company, for 58 miles of their railway from a point at or near Cedar Creek to the town of Ridgetown, in lieu of the subsidies granted to the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company (provincial charter) by the Acts 53 Vic., chap. 2, and 52 Vic., chap. 3, $224,000."

Mr. ALLAN. In the proposed grant to the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company, no provision is made for the Amherstburgh Branch as in the grant of 1889 of which this is a revote with that of the grant of 1890. I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Railways what his intentions are as to that part of the line.

Mr. HAGGART. There was an application, I believe, for the building of that branch, but we were limited in the amount of money for Ontario. I believe it is a very important branch, and I hope it will receive favourable consideration at another time from the Government.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I feel strongly, with the hon. member for South Essex, the desirability of aiding this portion of road from Harrow to Amherstburg, and I hope that in the coming session it will receive the consideration it merits.

Mr. McGREGOR. I might add to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken my opinion that no grant given by Parliament would be of more service than the one just referred to.

To the Montfort Colonization Railway Company, for 25 miles of their railway from Lachute, St. Jérôme, or a point at or near St. Sévère, on the line of the Montreal and

Western Railway, to Montfort westward, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $67,200.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the reason for this change?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The attempt was first made to have that railway start from St. Jérôme. A petition was sent to the Government to start the railway from St. Jérôme, which is the *chef-lieu* of the County of Terrebonne. It would then run however almost parallel to the Montreal and Western Railway, which will be very soon the property of the Canadian Pacific Railway and would duplicate that railway for a distance of about 10 or 12 miles. The resolution is therefore proposed in this form to make it in conformity with the grant given to the Montfort Colonization Railway Company by the Quebec Government, giving it option to start from any one of those three points.

To the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidies granted by the Acts 50-51 Vic., chap. 24, and 51 Vic., chap. 3, a subsidy of $15,100.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to move an addition to this resolution. This railway, really a branch of the Grand Trunk Railway, passes through the county I have the honour to represent, the county of Huntingdon, and the township bordering on the frontier, through which it passes, the township of Dundee, a populous and fertile township, has never been given a railway station by this company. The railway has been in operation some years, and the people resident in that township are subjected to very great inconvenience for the want of this station. The company have shown themselves exceedingly unreasonable with regard to the whole question. Not long after the railway was built, a proposition was made by the representative of the company to the effect that if the municipality would grant the sum of $2,000, the company would give them two railway stations, showing plainly that the company at that time recognized the reasonableness of the township having this accommodation. For some reason or other that arrangement was not carried out. I believe the municipality were willing to grant the sum, but the company finally decided that they would only give them one instead of two stations. The matter fell and nothing has been done since. Since that period, the financial condition of the township has been rendered a great deal worse than it was then by the necessity it was under of raising $50,000 to settle with the Indians. The township being on a reserve, in order to obtain a title to their lands they were obliged to borrow $50,000 to pay to the Indians, so of course their financial position is a serious one, as they are paying this money by instalments with the interest, so they are not in a financial position to put up the station. I think this company which has already received a subsidy from the Government should be compelled by the Government to give the people of Dundee the accommodation they require. As a matter of fact, they have to cross the line and go to Fort Covington, which is a mile beyond the boundary line, in order to load their produce there and send it to Montreal. The American customs officers have been very kind in allowing them to do it, though it is in violation of the law, but when cattle come into question, it is a different thing. Our law prevents cattle being imported, and the result is they have to be driven eight miles to White's station in Godmanchester. I beg to move:

That the said unpaid balance of subsidy shall be paid to the said Montreal and Champlain Railway Company only upon their undertaking the building and completion by the 1st July, 1893, at St. Agnes Crossing in the township of Dundee, P.Q., of a railway, passenger and freight station, to cost not less than $1,200.

Speaking for the people of that township, I think I am very modest in my demands.

Mr. HAGGART. We have made a contract already with the railway company, and I do not see how we can embody any more conditions in that than we have already made. This is only a revote for the purpose of paying them under the contract already entered into. I will promise the hon. gentleman that I will enquire into the facts, and I believe they are true, because I have heard of this from the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Baker). I will remonstrate with the railway in regard to it.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman is asking for a revote, it must be because the original conditions have ceased to exist.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, it is because our power to pay has ceased. I understand the company are entitled to the money under the contract, but we have no authority to pay it. I am sure, if anything can be done, short of breaking faith with the company, to meet the views of the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) we will do it. It would be much better to do this by agreement between the Government and the company than by coercion. If we stipulate the putting up of the station, we must require that the trains should stop there, and I think it would be better to do both by negotiation.

Mr. SCRIVER. Upon the assurance which the Minister of Justice has been good enough to give me, that the Government will use all its influence with the company to build that station, I will withdraw the amendment.

For a railway from the parish of St. Rémi, in the County of Napierville, to St. Cyprien, in the said county, for 12 miles of such railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $38,400.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) I see with pleasure that the Government has had a thought for my county. As I had occasion to say last year, when I had the honour to present a request for a subsidy for this railway, the County of Napierville has never been spoiled by Government favours. This is the first time the county is the object of any favour. I do not think that this can be laid to partiality or party consideration. As to partiality the statement I just made shows that the Government could not be accused of that. It could not be called either a party favour, since I am not a supporter of the Administration. The reason of it is that the grant is just, and that the necessity or desirability of this road has been noticed by one of the members of the Government, I mean the Minister of Customs. At the time of the bye-election which took place in the county in 1890, the Minister of Customs paid us a visit which alarmed me first, not groundlessly, for I was defeated that time; but I feel gratified of it now, since having on that visit, noticed the desirability of this railway, the hon. Minister urged the Government to grant the subsidy

which is now before the committee. In consideration of this favour to the County of Napierville I forget the past and I thank the hon. Minister.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I did say in the course of the election campaign referred to by the hon. member, that the request made for a subsidy to this railway should call for the most serious attention on the part of the Government. To prove that we feel towards the county no ill-will for having returned an opponent of the Government, the promise I then made is now fulfilled, as I was sincere in the view I had expressed regarding the desirability of that road.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Before the adoption of this resolution, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks. This is certainly one of the most important railways to which our attention is called, the most important railway of the district of Quebec, I dare say, after that of Lake St. John. In looking over the papers which were put before the House in connection with these grants, I find an interesting letter from Mr. King, and I will take the liberty of quoting a part of it:

"The line projected will start from St. Jean des Chaillons, in the County of Lotbinière, taking a southerly course will pass at a distance of about six miles through the young and thriving parish of Ste. Philomène. South of this place it is fully expected that three or more parishes will speedily be opened.

"Striking the line of the Grand Trunk Railway at a point about thirty miles from the starting point, it will pass through the village of Lyster station, continue on through the parish of Ste. Anastasie, and thence to the proposed terminal point, at or near Glen Lloyd, in the County of Mégantic.

"The section between the St. Lawrence River and the line of the Grand Trunk will afford an outlet to a large portion of the County of Lotbinière and the easterly portion of the County of Nicolet to both navigation and a trunk line of railway in summer: and, in winter, to the trunks lines of railway, no outlet at present existing with the exception of very indifferent, and in many cases, almost impracticable colonization roads.

"To the south of the line of the Grand Trunk Railway an impetus would be given to the farming interest in a fine section of the County of Mégantic, with the prospect of encouraging capitalists to invest in and utilize the magnificent water power in the neighbourhood, on the Bécancour River."

This railway will pass between the seigniories of Mr. King and Mr. Joly, and will serve a territory of at least 250 miles in area, where a large lumbering trade is carried on. I have no doubt that the company will perform the work undertaken, for Messrs. King, who are at the head of the company, are about millionaires. St. Jean des Chaillons is a very important parish. There are in the place a number of brick-yards and a large trade is carried on there. The fact is that you find in the locality merchants quite as important as in any parish of the Province of Quebec. I wish also to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to another improvement with which he could favour the County of Lotbinière. About a mile east of the church of St. Jean des Chaillons, exactly opposite the terminus of the proposed line, there is a place which could make a very fine harbour, and I believe that Mr. King himself will share this opinion. If the Government would build a wharf at that place, the Richelieu Company boats, and even vessels of a larger tonnage, could easily come alongside. I have no doubt that if this was done, the result would be very favourable to the prosperity of that locality. I have no doubt either, Mr. Chairman, that if the railway which is now being subsidized is built, the parish of St. Jean des Chaillons will become a very important one. Not only will that parish benefit thereby, but the parishes of the Counties of Lotbinière and Nicolet must also largely profit by the building of this road.

Mr. HAGGART. In the resolution granting aid to the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway I wish to made an amendment, so that it shall read:

For 19 miles of their railway from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway in addition to the subsidy granted by 53 Vic., chap. 2, and from the end of the 30 miles subsidized by that Act.

That means eastward from the part that was subsidized before.

On resolution 3,

Mr. LAURIER. I have an amendment to offer at this stage. I think our legislation has been deficient with regard to all the subsidies which we have voted, because no precaution has been taken either to prevent fraud, which may take place in the misuse of the public money, or even to account as to the employment of this money. Therefore I beg leave to move the following amendment:—

Resolved, Tthat within four days after the opening of each session, the Minister of Railways shall lay upon the Table of the House, copies of all agreements made by any of the companies with the Government, together with a statement of all payments made by the Government up to date, for subsidies earned by any of the said companies, and the Orders in Council authorizing such payments.

Resolved, That within a month after the payment to any company of any portion of the subsidies, the president and manager of the said company shall furnish to the Auditor General a statement under oath showing if the whole of the subsidies so paid to the company have been applied in the manner herein intended, and that a similar statement shall be supplied by every contractor of the company who is to receive or has received the payment out of any such subsidies or out of the proceeds thereof, and that within four days after the opening of each session, the Auditor General shall lay all such statements upon the Table of the House.

Resolved, That all such documents thus laid on the table of the House shall be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts, to be by them investigated in the same manner as the Public Accounts.

Resolved, That every officer and director of the said companies, and every person having a contract with any of the companies for the performance of any work, the doing of anything, or the furnishing of any goods, effects, food or materials, and having or expecting to have any claim or demand against the company by reason of such contract, who either directly or indirectly, by himself or by any person on his behalf, subscribes, furnishes or gives, or promises to subscribe, furnish or give, any money or other valuable consideration for the purpose of promoting the election of any candidate, or of any number, class or party of candidates to a legislature or to Parliament, or with the intent in any way of influencing or affecting the result of a provincial or Dominion election;

Is guilty of a misdemeanour and liable to a fine of not less than one hundred dollars and not exceeding one thousand dollars; unless the value of the amount or thing paid, offered, given, loaned, promised, received or subscribed, as the case may be, shall exceed the last mentioned sum, in which case the fine may be raised to a sum not exceeding such value, and also to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year and not less than one month, and in default of payment of such fine, to imprisonment for a further term not exceeding six months.

I may say the object of the amendment is simply to provide that public moneys voted by Parliament shall be audited and investigated in the same way as other public moneys, and if any fraud takes place with respect to these moneys, it shall be punished in the same way as is the case with other public moneys.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think I shall have to ask the hon. gentlemen to allow this motion to

stand until to-morrow, in order that I may have time to examine it. There are some points of detail which are objectionable. Four days after the opening of Parliament is too soon for the papers to be laid on the Table. Then, it is not in order to direct the Auditor General to lay a statement before Parliament. I think it is very objectionable to insert in subsidy resolutions any provision of the criminal law. Probably the existing provision is wide enough to cover the case ; if not the provision of the criminal law should be amended in that respect. It would be very awkward to have a criminal law provision in a subsidy Act. Furthermore, it would be an anomaly to have this provision applying to only one set of subsidies.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection to the wording of the provision carrying out this object being amended, if the hon. gentleman accepts the proposition.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Let the motion stand until to-morrow.

Amendment postponed.

Resolutions reported.

MAILS IN LOTBINIÈRE COUNTY.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. A question was asked to-day which I was not in a position to answer at the time, and which I desire to answer now. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) asked :

"Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant a daily mail service to the parish of St. Edouard, Post Office 'Rivière Boisclair,' in the County of Lotbinière? Is it the intention of the Government to alter the mode of carrying the mail for that locality and to cause the mail to be sent from Ste. Croix, in place of from Lotbinière as at present?"

I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is not the intention of the Government to alter the mode of carrying the mails in that locality.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 5th July, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga) moved the adoption of the second report of the committee appointed to supervise the debates of the House. He said : The report recommends a change in the way of printing the official report so as to meet the suggestions made by the Queen's Printer in his annual report. He has found that the issue of the printed revised edition was insufficient, while the publication of the daily sheet to the extent of 1,750 copies was too much, while for practical use the revised edition was desired by members. In order to meet that demand, the committee, after having consulted with him, has decided to recommend that 300 copies of the daily sheet shall be published instead of 1,750, and 1,750 of the revised copies shall be published. In order to ensure the prompt delivery of the *Hansard* after the session, a rule has been made which requires the proper officers who are entrusted with the preparation of the index to prepare it along with the English and French editions as they are prepared, and it is expected that in that way the bound copies of the debates could be delivered to members within one month after prorogation. There is also a revision of the rules governing the publication of the *Hansard*, but there is no material change. These rules have been prepared after consulting the Queen's Printer, the chief reporter and the chief translator. It is expected that by the adoption of these rules the printing and delivery of the *Hansard* will be more regular than it has hitherto been.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what delay the change will involve in the distribution of the *Hansard* to the public ?

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). A delay of five days. Three days are given to the members after the publication during which they are entitled to make corrections, and, if the copy is not sent to the printer within three days, the printer is instructed to go on with the printing, so the revised copy will be ready for distribution to the public four or five days after the printing of the first copy.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Do the changes involve any extra expense ?

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). I think rather a reduction, because there will only be 300 daily sheets instead of 1,750.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand there is to be one copy in place of three for each member.

Mr. BOWELL. I would suggest to the chairman of the committee that a good deal of the expense might be avoided in carrying out the scheme of official reporting. Those who have any knowledge of practical printing know that, where the corrections are as numerous and as great as they are in almost all the speeches that are sent back to the printer, the expense of correcting and making changes and alterations is almost equal to the cost of composition itself. It strikes me that, if the official reporters made their copy on a half sheet, as it is now nearly all done on the typewriter, leaving one-half blank for the member to make his corrections, then the speech would go to the printer already corrected by the member, and save all the trouble and delay and expense attending these corrections, and running over, which very often occurs. In addition to that, the only remaining work would be the ordinary proof-reading to correct typographical errors and "outs" and matters of that kind. I think there are some practical printers on that committee who will understand fully the force of what I have pointed out to them, and I would strongly recommend this suggestion to them as I think it would reduce by at least one-third, if not more, the expenses of official reporting as far as the preparation of the speeches for *Hansard* is concerned.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). The difficulty will be this. You require the daily publication of the *Hansard*, and it must be ready for 3 o'clock the day ensuing, so, if you were to give the copy to the members before it was printed, it would be impossible to

get it back in time for daily publication. It is for that reason that that scheme, which has been already discussed, has been left aside, because it would be impossible to have the regular publication of the daily sheet. We know that it would save much of the expense if we could do that, but it would be impossible to do it to the satisfaction of the members, so the corrections must be made only for the revised copy.

Mr. BOWELL. I confess that I foresaw the objection which might be made to this plan. If the committee were to impress upon the members the absolute necessity of their returning the proof-sheet immediately, the delay would not occur. But that delay to which the hon. member refers always does occur, so far as it applies to the corrected report. Now, many of these reports that are sent broadcast throughout the country really do not contain, in many cases, not only the exact words, but even the meaning of the utterances of those who have spoken in this House. In many cases speeches are quoted at election times as having been made by members in Parliament, that are directly opposed to what they really said, either through a mistake of the printer in setting up the copy, or through the reporter failing to catch the particular idea of the speaker. I do not find fault with the reporters, because sometimes when members are speaking there is so much noise, and trouble, and interruption, that it is almost impossible for the reporter to hear correctly what was said. I know that there is a strong feeling arising in the House against the expense attending this official reporting. Although the delays might occur to which my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) refers, I think it is much better that those delays should take place than that the errors which occur in the reports of *Hansard* should be circulated throughout the country. I do not think that the country will suffer much by it.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). It is for the very purpose of meeting these objections that the committee propose, instead of distributing the daily sheet to the public, to wait four or five days and send out only the revised copy. We propose that henceforth there shall be only one copy for the use of members, or about 300 copies in all, and this copy will not be sent out to the country, but will be limited to the use of members; and the edition which will be sent out to the public will have been revised by the members who have spoken.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I quite appreciate the remarks made by the Minister of Militia with regard to the first copy sent to the printer being correct before it reaches his hand, but he will see the great difficulty which will attend that course. For instance, when the House sits very late at night the speeches would have to be brought in to the members immediately, and they would have to be corrected before the printer could be put in possession of the copy, and the printers would have to set up the matter for publication so as to be delivered to members here at 3 o'clock on the succeeding day. It would be practically impossible to carry out that rule, for the simple reason that after speeches are delivered by members, say, in the course of the afternoon or evening, it often happens that they leave the House and go off by the train, and such delay would be caused in the preparation of the copy that it would be impossible to publish the *Hansard* at the hour mentioned. The suggestion is a good one if it could be carried out, but I think it is impossible to carry it out. I think the determination arrived at by the committee is quite an improvement on the old course. We agree by this report to furnish to the members an original copy of the *Hansard* as printed at 3 o'clock. One single copy is allowed to each member upon which he may make his corrections, and then the additional copies are furnished to him, stitched and cut ready to be sent out corrected, so that when his speech is sent out to the public it is sent in a corrected form, and there is only a delay of about four days. I think the House will agree with the committee that this is a very desirable change to make in the publication of the *Hansard*. I agree with the Minister of Militia that if the other suggestion could be carried out it would be preferable, but I do not think it would be possible to carry that out. I am satisfied that if the House adopt this report it will be a move in the right direction, and be satisfactory to every member of the House.

Mr. DAVIN. I am a member of this committee, but I must say I do not quite agree with the recommendation. Anybody who has gone on a marine excursion knows how completely late newspapers lose their interest. One of the things that makes *Hansard* valuable to the public, in my opinion, is the rapidity with which an approximately correct account of what is said in this House reaches the public through the country press. We have been told in the committee, on the authority of prominent members of this House and prominent members of the committee, that the newspapers would prefer to wait until they get a corrected report. I never met myself a newspaper man that would. I must say that they have just about as good a chance of getting a correct report from *Hansard* as they will from the reporters on the daily papers where the speeches are given in full, and where men have to write under far more exigent conditions than they have to write on the *Hansard*. I may point out that *Hansard* is of this peculiar value at this present time, that it does give to the public an account of what is said in this House. We must remember that since *Hansard* came into existence, or for this cause or for some other reason that I am not aware of, the leading newspapers in this country, such as the *Globe*, the *Mail* and the *Empire*, no longer give the full reports that they used to give 10 or 15 years ago. I remember some 14 years ago that you could take up the *Globe* newspaper and get a fairly full report of what had taken place the night before. The leading men on each side had their speeches reported in full, and those who occupied a less high rank in their respective parties, had a fair summary given of what they said. But we know now that all the leading papers have abandoned that. In the United States the leading newspapers do not report what takes place in Congress, but Congress is in a wholly different position from this Parliament. Congress is not nearly in as close relation with public opinion as the Parliament of Canada, or the Parliament of Great Britain. It is of the utmost importance, in a system of government such as ours, that what is said in this House and what takes place in this House, should get into

touch with the public mind outside as soon as possible. Even in the interest of hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, that is of great importance. No matter how small the Opposition may be in this House, no matter what party is in power, yet if there are able men in the Opposition, no matter how few in number, they are yet formidable if what is said by them gets to the public ear outside. Now, what I am afraid of is this: If the suggestion of my hon. friend—and the committee generally were of his opinion—is carried out, four or five days will elapse before the country newspaper editors in each constituency can give the people any account of what their member said, because they cannot get it from the leading newspapers in Toronto. Four or five days afterwards their speeches will come out, and that strong interest in a subject that has been discussed a night or two before in the House of Commons, will have gone entirely from those stale reports. I am not sure that the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Militia is practicable. I am not going, of course, to make any counter motion, but I will say this, that no matter what the defects may be in *Hansard*, I do not consider they are greater than the defects that I have known to exist in the reports of the leading newspapers in London, England, and in Toronto, made by reporters late at night, and in the hurry of the occasion. I say that at present it is the only means by which the public outside can get at what is done in this great council of the nation, and that is something of great importance to the public, and of great importance to the efficiency of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not agree with the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in his suggestion: I think he is entirely wrong. Some time ago I put a notice on the Paper that the reporting of the *Hansard* should be abolished, and one of the strong reasons why I did so was that an incorrect copy of the *Hansard* was sent out to the press and the public. In many instances members of this House were reported by the weekly papers in their locality to have made speeches which they never made, or at least, speeches conveying an entirely different meaning from what they intended to convey. Another objection is the increasing expense of the *Hansard*. I believe when it was contemplated to issue *Hansard*, it was for the purpose of giving information to the people, correct information, and it was supposed that this could be done at a moderate cost to the country, and would prove to be valuable. I have before me returns showing the cost of *Hansard* since 1878, and instead of the expense being kept within reasonable bounds it seems to have grown very rapidly. In 1878 the cost was $20,364; 1879, $16,000—I am only giving the amount in round figures, the hundreds are left out; 1880, $20,000; 1882, $26,000; 1883, $28,000; 1884, $38,000; 1885, $69,000; 1886, $38,000; 1887, $39,000; 1888, $42,000; 1889, $43,000; 1890, $58,000, and for this year the cost will be over $64,000. These figures show the rapid increase in the cost of the work. If the result of this very large expenditure was to get a correct review of what was said in the House, there would be less objection to it; but we find, at all events I have found, and other hon. members must have also found, that speeches made from time to time are so reported as to convey an entirely different meaning from that which the speaker intended to convey. The suggestion offered by the Debates Committee is a valuable one, because it has for its object the keeping back of the incorrect report until corrections have been made, and thus the newspapers will publish correct reports. This change will do away in a very large measure with some of the strongest objections against *Hansard*. I do not agree with the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that it is a matter of so much importance to have this information presented to the country at once. The intention was to have these reports go to the various districts of the country. If they were printed in the daily papers, a difference of four or five days in the issue would be of importance; but, in nineteen cases out of twenty, the reports are printed in weekly papers, and very often speeches delivered in the early part of the week in this House would be issued in time to appear in that week's papers. In many instances reports which appear from time to time from the committees are printed in the weekly papers two or three weeks afterwards, and are practically new matter, for thousands of people take only a weekly paper. I do not see any valid objection to holding back the report two or three days, if we can thereby obtain a correct report of what has taken place in this House. It would be much more valuable to the people who read it, and it would do greater justice to the members who deliver the speeches, and provide for this very large expense for the purpose of getting a correct report before the people. I hold, on the other hand, that *Hansard* might well be done away with for one of the reasons stated by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). It is this: because we have *Hansard*, which is incorrect but which ought to contain what is said, the daily papers in the large cities and towns refrain from reporting at the length they should report what takes place in this House. They are saved expense, and they are willing to remain in that position just so long as the *Hansard* furnishes the report. What is the result? The work of giving this information to the country is thrown on the different members of the House, and the information is not distributed so widely as it would be if it reached the country through the daily papers. The members have to distribute these reports through the mail; much increased work is thrown on the Post Office Department, and the distribution of the information is not nearly so extensive as it would be if given through the leading papers. Those who read the daily papers hardly ever get an extended report of what has taken place in this House. In my opinion, *Hansard* should be abolished. It involves an expense which will not be justified by the country after a time, and it really takes away the work from the daily newspapers with which they would charge themselves if we had not the *Hansard*, and the press would give at an earlier date a more correct report than is given to the country at present. If we must have *Hansard*, the next best course is to carry out the suggestion of the Debates Committee and delay the report for three or four days until corrections are made, so as to have a correct report of what has been said in this House, because this will be doing justice to members of Parliament and will be giving correct information and not misleading information as at present.

Mr. DENISON. This may be the proper time to offer an observation in regard to *Hansard*, so far as reporting in committee is concerned. In the House many valuable speeches are preserved by

having the *Hansard*, but in committee a great many speeches are delivered which are entirely unnecessary, and these go into *Hansard* and fill up the pages. During the all-night sittings a great many speeches that were immaterial and unnecessary, and contained material foreign to the subject under consideration, were delivered and appeared in *Hansard*. It appears to me that if we could abolish reporting in Committee of the Whole, a lot of unnecessary matter would be omitted, and the volume of *Hansard* would be decreased probably by two-thirds. I think that would be a move in the right direction. In the House the Speaker can control the debate, and the same speeches cannot be repeated because the rules will not permit it: but in Committee of the Whole it is patent to every one that the same matter is gone over time and time again. I think we should do away with the reporting in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot permit the remarks of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to pass, as they cast a reflection on the *Hansard* reporters. I think any person who has carefully read over the reports of the debates of this House must come to the conclusion that the duties devolving on the *Hansard* reporters have been most efficiently and correctly performed. I cannot allow this slur cast by the hon. member for East Grey to pass unnoticed.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is entirely incorrect, if he says I cast a slur on the reporters. I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman stated that the reports were very incorrect, that in some cases hon. members were made to say the very opposite to what they intended to say. A man who allows his mouth to run ahead of his thinking faculty may be in that position. There are some men who speak first and think afterwards, and the hon. member for East Grey belongs to that class. I do not much wonder that he makes such blunders; these are not due to the reporters, but to himself. With respect to the continuation of *Hansard*, I am sorry to find the cost is annually increasing. I should very much like to see the Debates Committee curtail the expense as much as possible; at the same time I do not think the people will be willing to abolish *Hansard*. I hold that the expense necessary for the production of a verbatim report of what is said in this House will be sanctioned by the people of this Dominion; and when the working of the report is now in an effective condition, with an efficient staff of reporters, it would be a pity to abolish this very valuable reproduction of the business transacted and speeches delivered in this House. I quite agree with the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) that there are a great many things said in committee that might as well not be reported. While that may be true, yet often very important discussions occur on items of Supply, and a verbatim report is perhaps necessary. Taking our *Hansard* as a whole for the last ten years, the volumes contain matter which is a very creditable production to the Parliament of Canada. The work done by the *Hansard* staff, as well as by those employed in getting out *Hansard*, is highly creditable, and the record of the proceedings of this House from year to year can be handed down to succeeding generations as a memento of the ability of members who have sat here I certainly would not like

to see this institution abolished. I hope that hon. gentlemen will find that as a rule they are correctly reported in *Hansard*, and that they will not find themselves in the unfortunate position in which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) described himself to be when addressing the House.

Mr. SCRIVER. As a member of the *Hansard* Committee, I ask permission to say a word or two. I may say that this proposed change was carefully discussed by practical newspaper men on the committee, and the conclusion arrived at, and which appears in the report, was a unanimous one. The committee were influenced by two considerations: one of economy, and the other a desire to secure a report which, when it goes to the newspapers of the country, will be perfectly accurate. Now, any hon. gentleman who has paid any attention to this matter must be convinced that the reports of the speeches made in the House which appear in the country newspapers are almost altogether in the first place made from extracts taken from the metropolitan press, and are not taken from the *Hansard*. The speeches in which the constituents and the various members take a deep interest are printed from corrected copies of the *Hansard*. It was felt by the committee that it was especially desirable that the report sent to the newspapers for publication should be correct. To this conclusion I may say that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) assented, but with that facility of changing his opinion which he has shown with regard to various matters, he seems to have changed his mind since the meeting of the committee at which this report was adopted, and he has to-day favoured the House with new theories, which would seem to me not to be in accordance with what it is desirable that the House should adopt.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend is entirely wrong. I spoke strongly against it in the committee and used the same arguments that I used to-day, but I did not vote for the proposal, as I was overwhelmed by the contrary opinion in the committee. As I stated a moment ago, the feeling of the committee was very strong in favour of the proposal in the report, but I opposed it on the same grounds as I did to-day.

Mr. WELDON. I merely rise to endorse the suggestion of the Minister of Militia. I have not had an opportunity of being present at the meeting of the committee at which the report was adopted, and therefore I could not take part in its deliberation. The suggestion made by the Minister of Militia of sending in to the members who are in the House a type-written copy of the speeches before being sent to the printers, seems to me better than the suggestion contained in the report, and I heartily endorse it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I endorse that recommendation too, and I think that the House might very well consider the suggestion made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison), that we should abolish *Hansard* in Committee of the Whole. There is another thing too which I think ought to be considered by the Printing Committee, and that is that if the *Hansard* is to cost the large amount of money that it does, members should be supplied with a greater number of copies for distribution. If it is for the purpose, as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says, of giving

information to the country, we should be supplied with a larger number of copies than we receive at the present time.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I wish to add one word to what has been said with regard to the existence and continuance of *Hansard*. In the session of 1886, on the motion in Supply, to vote a sum of $60,000, to cover the expenses of *Hansard*, I moved simply that the *Hansard* should be abolished. That was so favourably received by this House that it came within, I think, forty votes of being carried. It received the support of the then leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and I may say that having then given the matter a good deal of attention and consideration, I have not changed my mind up to the present time. I believe that the proceedings of this Parliament would be very much improved if we could abolish *Hansard* in committee. As the years have gone by, and I have given the subject more careful attention, I am more firmly of that opinion than ever. Hon. gentlemen must agree with me that owing to the elasticity of our procedure, advantage is taken of the privilege of *Hansard*, and it is abused by making speeches entirely foreign to the item under consideration. I believe in many cases these speeches are made for the purpose of satisfying the curiosity or interest of a certain constituency and not for the good of the country generally. Therefore, whenever the hon. member can bring forward his motion, if he cannot do it this session, I shall support it. I shall not only support it, but I shall do all that I can to get it to pass this House

Mr. TAYLOR. As a member of the *Hansard* Committee, I may say that at our last meeting I moved that the reporting should be abolished in the committees of the House, but while many members of the committee were in favour of that view, the opinion was that it was a question for the House to decide and not for the committee to deal with. I, like my hon. friend the member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), strongly favour abolishing the reporting of *Hansard* in committee, but I am in favour of having the speeches reported while the Speaker is in the Chair.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) suggests that a greater number of copies of the *Hansard* should be printed for distribution, but one can readily understand that if such a course were taken, it would add enormously to the cost of printing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not very much. It is not the extra copies that causes the expense, it is the setting of the type.

Mr. LISTER. Oh yes, the number of extra copies would need to be very great indeed to be of any real value, if a member is disposed to send them to his constituents.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Say six copies more.

Mr. LISTER. That would be a very trifling number. I may say that if hon. gentlemen desire to send the *Hansard* to their constituents they are now able to get it from the printing establishment for almost a nominal cost. Formerly, when these speeches were printed at the regular printing office, they cost a considerable sum of money, but as it is now, hon. gentlemen are able to get them by the thousand in corrected form at a mere nominal cost. I think it would not be advisable to add to the number of copies sent to the members but rather to leave that part of the publication as it is now. So far as the reporting of the committee proceedings is concerned there is a good deal that can be said against that, because, as the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) says, hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House take advantage of that for the purpose of making speeches for the benefit of a particular constituency.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why should they not?

Mr. LISTER. It is a question as to whether the public should pay for it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am inclined to think that if the speeches are not for the benefit of the constituents it is hardly worth while to make them, because we do not apparently make many converts in Parliament, whatever we do outside. There are these considerations with regard to the abolition of reporting in committee. Very often members specially devote themselves to the work of a particular department and examine into the manner of its management, and when supplies are being asked for, the public reap the advantage of whatever information they have collected and whatever suggestions they have to make. If you do away with reporting in committee altogether, you would in a large measure do away with perhaps the reporting of the most important part of the work of the session, so far as practical details are concerned. When Mr. Speaker is in the Chair we discuss the general principles of measures that are brought forward, but when you come to discuss the practical administration, and when you come to consider the question of Supply, then your committee are discussing matters which have a special value. While, if the matter is left wholly to the reporters they might make a fair condensation. I would be very sorry to see reporting in committee omitted from *Hansard* altogether. I think that would be a great mistake. I think it is one of the mistakes that our friends on the press make, that very often they overlook important matters that are discussed in committee.

Mr. HAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I fail to appreciate the line of reasoning which brings an hon. member to the conclusion that it is desirable to continue *Hansard*, but that it is not desirable that it should contain reports of what takes place in Committee of Supply and in the other committees of this House. I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that if it is important that there should be a correct report of the proceedings of this House, it is especially important that there should be a correct report of what takes place in Committee of Supply and in committees on Bills affecting the well-being of the country, it seems to me that it is of the greatest importance, if we have a *Hansard* at all, that there should be a correct report of what occurs in this House when the expenditure of money is under consideration, and I for one would strongly oppose the omission from *Hansard* of the discussions in committee. I was pleased to hear the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) express the hope that the expense of *Hansard* would be curtailed in future. One very excellent way of curtailing the expense of *Hansard* would be for hon. members to curtail their speeches, and not speak at such length or so

often as they are in the habit of doing; and if the hon. member is sincere in his desire to curtail the expense, I am afraid we shall not have the pleasure of hearing him in the future so often as we have heard him in the last two sessions.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to say just one word in regard to this matter. I am very much inclined to agree with the view expressed by my hon. friend for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). It does seem to me that it would be very unfortunate if we had no official record of the criticisms and arguments which have been made in Committee of the Whole. One of the difficulties that the public have to contend with at the present time is that we have no newspaper in Canada which gives an impartial report of the debates that take place in this House. Each newspaper gives a report of what has been said by its own side, and if any person wishes to know what has really occurred, it is absolutely necessary for him to take at least two newspapers. I recollect very well on one occasion, when an important debate on the boundary question took place in the Ontario Chamber, where they have, unfortunately, no official report, being very anxious to ascertain what could be urged on one side or the other, I was obliged to take two papers, the *Mail* on the one hand and the *Globe* on the other; and when I had read one speech on the Conservative side in the *Mail*, I laid it down and took up the *Globe* and read a Reform speech, and then took up the *Mail* again, and so on. I think it is of the utmost importance to the public that there should be some official record which is admitted on all hands to be correct, and I think that the debates which take place in committee are of such importance—the very greatest importance, in fact—that the public should have some official record to fall back on. I know that it is felt by some hon. members that if *Hansard* were done away with altogether, the debates would be curtailed very much, and we should have a very much shorter session. I do not altogether coincide in that view. It seems to me that the session would be prolonged very much in another direction. We would have statements made with reference to something that had fallen from one side of the House or the other. For example, some one on this side would get up and say that the hon. member for South Brant, perhaps, had made a certain statement. The hon. member would probably differ, and there would be a debate between those two gentlemen on that subject; different members would get up and support one side or the other, and we should have interminable debates on side issues of that kind—and debates which would not be unimportant either, because it might be very important to decide what statements had been made on the floor of Parliament. Therefore, I am not at all of the opinion that doing away with the *Hansard* would curtail the debates in committee as much as some hon. gentlemen suppose. What I think desirable is that hon. gentlemen themselves should curtail their remarks. They are undoubtedly altogether too lengthy, and not only so, but are often repetitions of matters that have been discussed *ad nauseam* in the House. With regard to the *Hansard* reporters and what my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said, I entirely agree with him as to the incorrectness of many of the reports that go out in *Hansard*. At the same time, I utterly repudiate the statement made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to the effect that in such a statement it is implied that the *Hansard* staff are inefficient. There are very many reasons which conspire together to make the reports inaccurate, however able the reporter may be to discharge his duties at the table. It is almost impossible to have an accurate report if the report is not corrected by the speaker. In the first place, the reporter may not hear accurately what the member says. Every one knows how difficult it is for us to hear in this House what is going on. In the second place, suppose the reporter does hear, the matter may be of a nature which he does not very well understand, and the mere change of a word may make all the difference in the sense. In the next place, suppose he reports with absolute accuracy what is said on the floor of this House, it has then to be written by the type-writer, and the type-writer may make a mistake; and then, suppose the type-writer does not make a mistake, it has to go to the printer, and we all know how many mistakes are made by the printer. If we write a letter to the press, we know how many mistakes are introduced into it as it is printed. Therefore, it is necessarily the case that these reports may go out stuffed with errors, and that without any fault on the part of the reporters. I am delighted to hear the proposal that the reports should be corrected before they go to the public. It has always seemed an absurd thing to me that the only *Hansard* which the public see—because the bound copy is scarcely seen at all—is the *Hansard* which must necessarily be liable to be stuffed full of errors, and which, in many cases, is really a libel on the speakers whose speeches are supposed to be accurately reported; and you must remember that it is the official report, and that the public read it supposing that the speeches are accurately reported. I think the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Militia is a good one, and it should be adopted.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). How many of the public see that report?

Mr. McNEILL. It is the only report they do see. If the *Hansard* be worth sending out at all, it is worth sending out in a correct and not an incorrect form.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to make an explanation. When this proposal was brought up in the committee, I spoke strongly against it, but, as I have said, the opinion of the committee seemed to be overwhelmingly against me. At the meeting, however, at which this report was adopted, I was not present. There were present, according to the minutes, Mr. Desjardins, chairman; Messrs. Béchard, Taylor, Innes, Somerville, Scriver and LaRivière, a bare quorum. That shows how inaccurate my hon. friend is, who is generally very fair, when he wants to make a partisan lunge at me.

Mr. SCRIVER. I disclaim any intention whatever of making a partisan lunge at the hon. member for Assiniboia or any other member of the House on this or any other occasion. That is something I have never done and never will do. I spoke from recollection, and I am borne out by the chairman and my hon. friend who supports me as to my recollection of what the hon. gentleman did say at the meeting at which he was present. My recollection is that he supported the principle contained in the report now submitted to the House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would affirm what has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken.

Mr. DENISON. A number of the members agree in the idea of abolishing the *Hansard* completely.

Mr. SPEAKER. Unless the hon. gentleman has a personal explanation to make, he is out of order, because he has already spoken.

Mr. WALLACE moved in amendment :

That the said report be referred back to the committee with instructions to consider the advisability of instructing the *Hansard* reporters to condense the speeches made in the Committee of the Whole to the utmost extent possible.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I second that motion.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think it would be very bad policy to adopt any such motion because the *Hansard* Committee has now arranged matters so that the members of the House and the public will be put in possession of a correct report of the speeches delivered here. The effect of the passage of the motion would be that at the beginning of next session we will be back in the old track in which we have been for years, and we will have a *Hansard* which will be incorrect. The attempt by the committee to furnish the House and public a correct report of the speeches ought to commend itself to the approval of the House, and to pass this amendment would be to set the efforts of the committee at naught. In regard to the value of the reports of speeches in the Committee of the Whole, some of the most important debates take place in Committee of the Whole, and if we are to have any report at all, we ought to have a report of the discussions which take place in committee, when matters affecting the expenditure of public money are under consideration. With regard to the publication of the *Hansard* itself, of course there are some inconveniences arising in that connection, but taking it altogether, I believe that it has a good effect upon the members of the House and the country at large, and it would be ill-advised for the House to attempt anything in the way of curtailing or abolishing the official reports. As regards the correctness of the reporting, I am satisfied that the staff on the *Hansard* is the best that can be found on the continent. I believe the whole staff of *Hansard* is composed of men who are thoroughly up in their profession and who give accurate reports of whatever is said in this House, and they are entitled to all the credit we can possibly give them for the efforts they put forth.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would suggest to the hon. member for West York that he change his amendment so as to make it a motion for the total abolition of reporting in Committee of the Whole. I do not think any member of this House could support the amendment in its present shape, as it would leave to the reporters, who are not members of the House, the decision as to what should go upon record in the *Hansard*.

Mr. TISDALE. I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw his amendment altogether. Next session we will see how the new plan suggested by the committee works, and will then be in a better position to discuss whether there should be any change. I am prepared to say at present that I would be in favour of curtailing some of the reporting, but at the same time I think the matter ought to be left over until we have experience next session of the working of the plan recommended by the committee. I am glad that the hon. member for Grey mentioned the matter, because otherwise he would not have any chance to reach his motion this session; but in view of the report of the committee, which a large majority of the House will support, I think he ought not to press it. I think it most inopportune that we should prolong the discussion any longer, and am in favour of our adopting the report of the committee, and I would ask the hon. gentleman, as one who to a certain extent supports his motion, to withdraw it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The amendment, as it stands, will supersede the report altogether, and will thus defeat the object the hon. gentleman himself has in view, which is to have his amendment adopted without superseding the report. The hon. gentleman would carry his amendment if he could get a majority to vote for it, but in that case the report of the committee would be set aside altogether. I trust the House will not force a discussion on the propriety of abolishing reports in committee at this session. I am satisfied that, when hon. gentlemen come to consider that subject, they will find that they would make a great mistake if they undertook to abolish reports in committee.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not so understand the effect of the motion in the Speaker's hands. As I understand the amendment, it only provides that the committee should change their report to that extent. Whatever might be the report they might make as to the mode of securing correct reports with the Speaker in the Chair, it would not affect this report of the committee, because, if this recommendation were passed, which I do not think it will be, it would not have the effect of superseding the report of the committee altogether.

Mr. SPEAKER. If this motion were adopted, it would entirely supersede the motion for the adoption of the report, because this is a motion that all the words after the word "That" be left out.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the amendment is put, as I had not an opportunity of setting myself right after the remarks of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I desire to say that I am not in favour of this amendment. I do not think it reaches the question as it should, nor do I think that an amendment to the amendment, which I would like very much to make, for the abolition of the *Hansard*, would be in order at the present time, or I would make it. I do not think the arguments of some of the members who have spoken in favour of the continuance of the *Hansard* are worthy of consideration, particularly when you analyse the length of the sessions of this Parliament from the time when we started the *Hansard*. Look over the length of the sessions from the time the *Hansard* was commenced until the present, and you will find that it has materially lengthened, that something like 23 days have been added to the length of the session since the system of reporting by *Hansard* was introduced. I am only speaking from memory. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), by some strange mode of reasoning, came to the conclusion that I intended

in my remarks to reflect upon the *Hansard* reporters. Nothing was further from my intention. I believe we have as good a staff of reporters as could probably be found in Canada, men who endeavour to do their duty faithfully, and who do it creditably, taking into consideration the circumstances by which they are surrounded; but, when you take into consideration, as the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has said, the numerous circumstances by which they are surrounded, and when you consider the numerous reasons for the reports going out incorrectly, it is not to be wondered at that incorrect reports reach the newspapers in the country. It is utterly impossible for the reporters to reproduce a man's speech correctly, and have it copied perhaps the third time, and expect it to reach the country in the form he delivered it. It is no reflection on the *Hansard* staff to say that incorrect reports are made. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), in his remarks said that possibly the expense might be reduced if members would curtail the length of their speeches. I do not know any member in this House to whom that remark would apply with as much force as the hon. gentleman himself—a man who has occupied the time of the House so much as he has, and has made 800 or 900 speeches during the present session. I think it would be well if he tried to curtail his speeches. As to the matter of these speeches, as to whether they are relevant or irrelevant, I think I may leave it to the public to judge, but I may safely say that a great deal of it is irrelevant, and I think what the hon. gentleman says adds no additional light to the other speeches which are made in this House. I agree with the hon. members who suggest that the *Hansard* should be abolished when we are Committee of the Whole House. That would be a step in the right direction. It would tend to lessen the expense, it would tend to shorten the speeches, and also to shorten the session, but I would go a step further and would abolish the whole report. Then we would have the newspapers giving a much more lengthy and more correct report than they do now to the public, and the public would be better satisfied with it.

Mr. BERGERON. As I seconded the amendment of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), I think I should state that I did so through courtesy and that I hardly heard the terms of the amendment. I would not support it even as it reads. I would be in favour of abolishing the *Hansard* in committee, and that has been my opinion for many years. I would not have said anything to-day on this subject, because it might be thought I wanted to gain time for myself in presiding over the committees, but I spoke about this ten years ago, long before I ever dreamed having the appointment of chairman of committees.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not recollect that.

Mr. BERGERON. The member for Grey was not in the House at that time. It seems to me that, instead of this being, as it ought to be, a debating Parliament, it is more like an essay school. No doubt the *Hansard* affords an opportunity to some gentlemen who would not try to enlighten the House and country if there was no *Hansard* to carry their remarks to their electors, and I have found sometimes that the very same speeches are heard in committee and then delivered before you, Mr. Speaker. Those who are in favour of economy would be in favour of abolishing the *Hansard* in committee, and that would save a great deal of money.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It appears to me that the recommendation of the *Hansard* Committee is an eminently proper and good one. There are two things to be had in view in publishing the *Hansard*. The first is the convenience of members of this House, and the second is for the correct information of the public. For the first, the convenience of the members of this House, it is necessary that a copy of *Hansard* should be in the hands of each member at the earliest possible moment. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, who are so well acquainted with this question, that this is probably one of the worst rooms in the country to hear anything in, that there are not twenty members who can stand in their places and speak so that all the members in the House can hear them, and, when a member makes a statement, it is necessary that that statement should come to the knowledge of the other members of the House so that they can either controvert it or agree with it. Take the case, for instance, of the leader of this House, the hon. Minister of Justice. I venture to say that on the back seats on this side of the House, and even where I sit, his utterances, particularly when there is any noise or disturbance, are impossible to be heard correctly, and I venture to say—though I have no experience myself in regard to that—that gentlemen sitting behind him have the same difficulty. For such a thing there is only one remedy, and that is to put a copy of what the hon. gentleman says, or any other member says, in the hands of the members at the earliest possible moment. This report of the committee contemplates the members having a copy within 24 hours after the speeches are delivered. Then the recommendation of the committee provides for the correct information of the country. They recommend a plan by which all the newspapers in the country, and all those to whom the *Hansard* is sent, shall two days later receive correct copies of it. I think this is an eminently proper arrangement, and one that will meet all the necessities of the case. Now, one word with regard to the amendment. The amendment entirely does away with the recommendation of the committee, and it leaves the matter just where it stood in that respect. But it goes further, and it demands that there shall be no report of the debates in Committee of the Whole. Now, allow me to ask, why does the House go into Committee of the Whole? Is it not to be better able, untrammelled by the rules, to bring out all the facts of the case, and to give members a chance to look at it in all its aspects, and to discuss the question freely and fully? If the intention of going into Committee of the Whole is to have a more full and free discussion of the question, certainly it is of still greater importance that the speeches delivered in Committee of the Whole should be reported. I hope, therefore, that the House will not adopt the amendment, but that it will adopt the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. DENISON. The amendment of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) meets with my approbation. The only argument I have heard against it is that it puts too much power into the

hands of the reporter. Now, we have had the reporters lauded to the skies on both sides of the House, and I can agree with all that has been said on that score. Our reporters are, I am sure, of the highest class. We all know that the reporters, even now, often drop sentences that are repetitions, and if they can do that now, why could we not allow them to exercise a still further discretion, and curtail the speeches to the utmost extent in Committee of the Whole? A great many members are in favour of abolishing reporting altogether in committee, and I would vote for that, if I did not think it would be going a little too far, while the amendment of the member for West York about meets the case.

Amendment (Mr. Wallace) negatived.

Mr. GILLIES. I beg to move another amendment which I think will meet with the views that have been put forth by many members of the House. I think we all agree that any measure that will tend to shorten the proceedings of the House without at all impairing the record of Parliament, will be treated with acclaim. It is with that object that I move this amendment:

That the report be referred back to the committee, with instructions to amend the same by recommending that there shall be no report of the discussions or proceedings in Supply or in Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope the Minister of Finance will be the first to rise and oppose this amendment. He knows better than anybody else that if the reports of *Hansard* were suppressed in Committee of Supply, one of the greatest values of that publication would disappear. I am quite aware that a good deal of the discussion that takes place in committee is irrelevant, but it sometimes happens that the discussions with the Speaker in the Chair are of no more relevancy. The discussion when in Committee of Supply is often of the most important character, even more important than the discussions that take place with the Speaker in the Chair. The discussions on the changes in the tariff which are made in Committee of Ways and Means, are of the most important character; it is in Committee of Ways and Means that the most important questions of finance are debated, and if we are to have a *Hansard* at all, I submit that it should be maintained especially in committee.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the report of the committee is in the right direction. I would like to see this amendment discussed in a full House. I think that the hon. gentleman, in making this proposition at this stage of the session when the House is not full, is making a mistake in the interest of the end which he wishes to gain. His amendment should be calmly discussed in a full House. I would like to hear it so discussed, and I might perhaps favour it; but in face of a report so excellent as that of the committee, I must vote against the amendment.

Amendment negatived, and report concurred in.

DRILL HALL, OTTAWA.

Mr. LISTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the Minister of Militia if he is prepared to answer the question that was put to him yesterday, as follows:—

"1. Who has the contract for roofing the Drill Hall, Ottawa, with zinc? 2. Were tenders asked for? 3. Who tendered? 4. What is the amount of each tender? 5. Will there be extras on account of change in the work? 6. If so, what is the estimated amount consequent on such change? 7. Is it the intention to raise the side walls of the Drill Shed to the same height as the roof? 8. If so, have or will tenders be asked for? 9. Will the lowest tender be accepted?

Mr. BOWELL. 1. Wm. Borthwick, Esq., Ottawa. 2. Yes. 3. Wm. Borthwick, Ottawa; Vieille Montagne Zinc Company, per T. C. Jordan, Ottawa; Geo. L. Chitty and Joseph White, Ottawa; T. R. Esmonde, Ottawa; Montreal Roofing Company, per J. James; B. Batson (Batson). 4. W. Borthwick, $2,430; V. M. Zinc Company, $2,778.37; Chitty & White, $2,989; T. R. Esmonde, $3,150; Montreal Roofing Company, $3,480; B. Batson, $3,987. 5. No extras are to be paid for by the Government to the contractor on account of any change in the character of the work. The weight of the zinc is, however, to be changed from No. 10 gauge to No. 13 gauge. 6. Simply the difference in weight between the two gauges, amounting, probably, to about $1,000. 7. Yes. 8. No. The walls will be raised by day's work under the inspection of a departmental officer.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH SPAIN AND THE SPANISH WEST INDIES.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to amplify an announcement that I made the other day with respect to trade relations between ourselves and Spain and the Spanish West Indies. It will be remembered that I stated at that time that we get the minimum tariff in Spain and the minimum tariff in the Spanish West Indies. The question was put to me afterwards with respect to our position relative to that of the United States, and a question was also put yesterday on the same line. I made no other answer to those two questions than that which was contained in the statement which I made at first to the House. I immediately telegraphed for further information, and I find the state of the case to be to the effect that we get the minimum tariff in Spain, we get the minimum tariff in the Spanish West Indies, and negotiations are in progress towards giving to our trade, if possible, the more favoured tariff that is accorded under the reciprocity arrangements with the United States. Spain has a maximum and a minimum tariff. She gives us the minimum tariff both in the mother country and in the Spanish West India Islands; but she has a more favourable arrangement with the United States under their reciprocity treaty made last year. We have not the advantage of that as yet, although the British Government on our behalf are pressing for the same treatment to be extended to us as to the United States.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the hon. gentleman able to tell us at this moment what is the difference between the minimum tariff with us and the tariff treaty with the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not able to say at this moment. I am having the matter tabulated in the department, and as soon as I am able to obtain the information, I will furnish it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has any correspondence, which the hon. gentleman is at liberty to lay before the House, taken place in regard to this matter, or has this business chiefly been conducted by cable?

Mr. FOSTER. It has been conducted by cable and by correspondence. I have no objection to lay the whole correspondence before the House—it is of a routine nature.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a matter of very great interest to many of our merchants, and it is desirable, if the hon. gentleman can do so without prejudicing our interests, to lay the correspondence on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. I will look up the correspondence, and what can be laid on the Table I will bring down.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolution adopted yesterday in Committee of Ways and Means was reported, read the second time, and concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 100) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1893, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is now in a position to state the Orders which the Government intend to proceed with, and those which they intend to drop.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The announcement as to what the Government intend to drop can only be made tentatively. I think it is the intention of the Government to drop item 6 (Bill to amend the Fisheries Act).

Mr. LAURIER. What about item 7 (Bill respecting Witnesses and Evidence)?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not yet quite certain about that Order; we have time to consider the Bill. I think it is the intention of the Government to drop item 8 (Bill to amend the North-West Territories Act), but I am not quite certain until the Minister of the Interior is here. That is, I think, all the Orders that will be dropped, and the others will be proceeded with.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ST. JOHN HARBOUR.

Bill (No. 99) to amend the Act relating to the Harbour of St. John, N.B., was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. I observe that this Bill is not printed in French.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the committee rise and report progress.

Committee rose and reported progress.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HAGGART moved third reading of Bill (No. 84) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). After the observations I submitted to the House some days ago, I will confine my remarks to moving an amendment, which I propose to submit to the House to amend the regular tariff charged by railway companies in regard to passenger traffic. But at the outset it seems I have first to vindicate the right of this House and of the Parliament of Canada to regulate railways. It is pretended that we have no right to regulate railways here and regulate the tolls of railways. I take issue directly with those who advance that contention, and I say that a Parliament which has subsidized railways by large grants of money and of land, a Parliament that has given railways large powers of franchise, and a Parliament which has done so much to forward railway interests, has a right to, and ought to, exercise the right to regulate the railways in every respect. I lay down that principle here, I contend for that principle, and it is a sound principle to be maintained by the Parliament of Canada. Take even our street railways. The city of Toronto not only regulates its street railway and prescribes its tariff, but regulates the railway in every respect, and we ought, at least, to go as far in this Parliament in regulating our railways as a municipality can go in regulating street railways within its boundaries. Now, the Parliament and Legislatures of the various countries of the world do regulate their railroads. They have fought out the question in the United States, and Congress does to-day regulate the railroad tariffs, as it has appointed an Interstate Commission which really controls the railways. So it is in England, and so it is in all the great countries of Europe. They do regulate the railroads, and they maintain the right to regulate them, and I maintain that we in Canada should uphold the same right and should go further and regulate the railroad tariff. As hon. gentlemen in this House are aware, the railway problem is the great problem of the day. It is only second to the labour problem, if that takes precedence of it. I wish, therefore, at the outset to maintain the principle that we have a right to regulate railroads in the matter of tolls, and that it is our duty as a Parliament to do so. As a matter of fact our Statute-book to-day prescribes that all tolls on railroads shall be subject to the approval of the Railway Committee of the Government of Canada. That being the case, we have already accepted the principle that Parliament has the power and ought to regulate the rates. I advocate this proposal for a 2 cent passenger rate, first of all, in the interest of the people, because I believe that it would be in the interests of the people of this country if they could get cheaper travel. It would promote trade in this Dominion, and most of all, it would tend to greater and more frequent intercourse between the people of the different provinces. We are often told that this Dominion is made up of disintegrated provinces. Now, what better means can there be of binding the people together and of creating a community of interests between the different provinces than the establishment of cheaper railway travel. Commerce would be greatly benefited by it. I have met a great many of the merchants of Toronto who have told me that if they could get cheaper travel on railroads—although at present commercial travellers have a preferred rate—they would send out more travellers, they would go out themselves, and more country merchants would come into the centres of commerce to buy their goods. I do not think any one can be found to deny the statement

that cheaper rates would promote traffic and would promote every kind of interest and communication between the people of the country; and, Mr. Speaker, it is travel that makes the man. Another great point in favour of this proposal is that it is in the interest of labour. There are hon. gentlemen in this House who profess to advocate the cause of the workingman, and I trust they will give support to this proposal. The great trouble with the workingman to-day is to find work, not that there is not work in the country, but the workingman must get to the point where that employment is. If we had cheaper railway travel in Canada workingmen would be able to move easily in search of work; as they say in Europe, there would be greater mobility of population, and men would be able to get to the large centres of industry. I shall read to the House by and by a short extract, in order to show that the argument made in Europe that cheaper travel on the railway is in the interests of labour. In the next place, I am advocating this measure in the interests of the railroads themselves. I contend that they would make more money and that their shareholders would have a better return if they encouraged larger travel by the reduction of their fares. It has been shown that wherever there has been a reduction in rates generally, there has been increased travel, and that wherever they have given reduced rates to privileged classes there has also been a great increase in the passengers carried. If the railways reduce their rates the increase of revenue to them would be greater in proportion to the reduction in rates, and therefore it is in the interests of the railways that they should adopt the 2 cent rate. They have regulated the railway fares in England, and the different roads were obliged to run a parliamentary train at a penny a mile rate; the result of which was that third-class travel, which had been discouraged previously by the railways, became a great source of revenue, and became in the end the only part of their traffic out of which they made any money. I contend that the railways in this country must be governed by examples of that kind, and especially must they be governed by the success of railroad passenger fare reform in Hungary, the particulars of which I propose to cite to this House in a few moments. Let the railways take example by the reduction in the costs of telegraphy, and the cost of postage and parcel delivery, and they will reap the same success. Every time the postage rate has been reduced there has been a great increase in the postal business and a corresponding increase in the revenue of the Post Office, with the result that revenue and expenditure have come very nearly together, whereas formerly the expenditure was always in excess of the receipts. We have not come to the end of postal reform yet. It has been going on for years, and I hope it will go on for years to come, and after I have obtained my 2 cent railway rate, I trust that I may be successful in pressing on our Government the advisability of adopting a 2 cent rate on letter postage. Wherever a reduction in rates has been tried in regard to postal matters it has been a great success, and it has been a success also with regard to the cheapening of telegrams in England. When the English Government reduced the cost of each message by one-half, the revenue was greatly increased, the efficiency of the service was greatly benefited, and the Government made money rather than lost as had been the case previously. I believe, therefore, that if we had a 2 cent mileage rate on railways in this country, not only would it be in the interests of the people, but it would be in the interests of the railways as well. We have been told that the railways, and not Parliament, are the best judges of what is in their interest. I cited a quotation here the other day in the case of England to show that for years the railroads were opposed to cheap third-class travel, and discouraged it in every way, while to-day, when cheap travel was made compulsory on them, they find it is the only branch of their passenger traffic from which they derive any profit. Let me point out that outside criticism has always been in the right direction. The British army and navy has been improved time and time again by outside criticism. At one time they would not hear of reform coming from the outside, but the public pressed their measure on Parliament, and the English army and navy have been repeatedly reformed by reason of the outside criticism. Therefore, though I may be only a small fish, yet I claim that I can tell that great whale, Mr. Van Horne, that he ought to reduce his passenger rates. When I call him a great whale, I mean to say that he is the greatest whale in this country, and it is time the small fish of Canada should have some regard to him, or otherwise that great whale may gobble us all up if we do not regulate him. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that there has been a reduction in the cost of everything consumed by the people of this country, except a reduction in the maximum passenger rates on railways. For the present what I urge here is a reduction in the maximum rate. It may be that if there is a reduction in the maximum rate there may have to be an abolition of the lower rates that are obtained now by certain classes. Well, I cannot object to that, but I do contend that the reduction in the maximum railway rate should take place right away, because it is the ordinary passenger on the railroad that I am interested in. It is the man who wants to go from Toronto to Montreal and buys his ticket at the station and has to pay 3 cents a mile for it; that is the man whose interest we ought to look after in this Parliament. The commercial travellers and others who have preferred rates can look after themselves, but it is our duty to have the maximum rate reduced even if the minimum rate has to come up somewhat. This is the strong point of the argument I wish to urge here to-day, because the railways are carrying any number of people for a cent a mile, and even less, and yet they have the hardihood to charge the regular traveller, their best paying customer, 3 cents a mile. I can tell the House that this is a live question, and that the press from one end of the country to the other have taken it up. I have a number of extracts from newspapers which I will not trouble the House to read, but there is one article I would like to refer to from the paper with which my hon. friend,—a very old friend of mine,—the member for Cardwell (Mr. White) is identified. The Montreal *Gazette*, in criticising my proposal, says:

> "The proposal of Mr. Maclean is, however, more than ordinarily ambitious, because if Parliament should undertake to arbitrarily fix the rate of passenger fares by railway, it can of course regulate the rates for freight."

Mr. Speaker, that is the very point I do

contend for, not only that Parliament can and ought to regulate the freight rates, but passenger rates as well. It does not become a paper like the Montreal *Gazette* to tell this Parliament that it cannot regulate the rates for freight and passengers in this country, because I take it that that paper is a protectionist paper, and it has endorsed the action of this Parliament in regulating the prices of goods throughout the country; for tariff legislation does involve the regulation of prices, and the *Gazette* is quite inconsistent in saying that we exceed our duties when we attempt to regulate the prices of railway travel. Then the article goes on to say:

"If investors' rights are to be entertained, and in common justice they cannot be ignored, it is obvious that in respect of the great majority of Canadian railways the capital invested has been practically thrown away."

If that capital has been thrown away, it has not been the fault of the Parliament of Canada; and if it is in the interest of the people of Canada that the rates should be regulated, even though the railways do not make any money as a consequence, that is their concern, and not ours. But as I said in my opening remarks, the reduction of rates would increase the revenues of the railways, and not be to their detriment. But the strongest evidence I have to bring before the House in support of the 2 cent rate is that furnished by the experience of Hungary, which is supposed to be one of the backward countries of Europe. It may be said that the case of Hungary is not analogous, but I say that in the result it is analogous, and I propose to read an extract from a recent article in the *Review of Reviews* dealing with that case:

"On Aug. 1, 1889, a radical reform in railway passenger rates was introduced by the Hungarian Government—an innovation which has attracted wide attention everywhere. The railroads of Hungary belong for the most part to the governmental system, which has an aggregate length of 6,000 kilomètres, or nearly 4,000 miles. The new system was also adopted by some of the privately-owned and operated railways of the country. What is now universally known as the 'Zone Tariff' has already accomplished the very best results in Hungary, and it promises to become the starting point for almost revolutionary changes in passenger tariff arrangements in other countries. The information upon which the following account of the character and consequences of the Hungarian system is based has just been sent to the American editor of the *Review of Reviews* by a high Hungarian authority, Dr. Joseph Korosi, whose communication is herewith almost literally translated.

"'In countries of vast extent passenger rates will never assume the absolute uniform character of the penny post, by which one could for the same fee make the shortest or the longest journey. The two kinds of business are not analogous. The forwarding of a letter requires such a minimum of service that it is practically impossible to fix a scale of charges based upon distance, whereas the transportation of each individual passenger requires some additional outlay and trouble. The mail bag which contains a hundred letters can be made to carry a thousand without appreciable enhancement of cost, while the same increase in the passenger traffic of a railway would cause an enormous addition to the working expenditure.

"'Passenger rates must, therefore, in the main, always make account of distance, especially upon railways traversing extensive territory. With this fact firmly grasped, it is obvious that improvement in passenger tariffs can only be sought by means of a general reduction to the lowest possible point, a simplification of the system and an improved organization of the service. The Hungarian Zone Tariff embodies reforms in all these directions. As to its general reduction of rates the new tariff averages from 40 to 50 per cent less than old rates for distances up to 225 kilomètres (a kilomètre is five-eighths of a mile). Thus a trip of 150 kilomètres—a ticket for which formerly cost 4½ florins—the charge at present is 2½ florins, the florin being worth 40 cents of our money.

"'It is very important to note, however, that beyond the 13th zone, whose outer circle is at a distance of 225 kilomètres from Buda-Pesth, the capital, there is at present one uniform charge of four florins only, regardless of the distance. Thus, the longest distance within the State of Hungary is nearly 1,000 kilomètres, and the price of a ticket for this journey previous to August, 1889, was 28 florins; but this long journey may now be made for the uniform four-florin ticket, which will carry the passenger on any of the Hungarian lines from the centre at Buda-Pesth to any point outside the 13th zone. With the utilization of cheap steamboat connections it is highly interesting to know that the traveller may now accomplish the long journey from the furthest frontier of Hungary—that is, from the Roumanian border—all the way to the Adriatic Sea, thence by water to Italy, and thence by rail to Rome, for a trifling sum amounting perhaps to one-fifth of the old time charges.

"'For local travel the great advantage of the Zone Tariff consists in the uniform small rate of 25 kreutzers (10 cents) per zone, these zones having such an extent as to put all local business upon practically the same basis of a uniform fee as one finds on the New York elevated railways or on any ordinary American street railway line. Most of the zones have a width of 15 kilomètres, the two outer ones being 25 kilomètres in extent, while the unified 14th zone includes all the irregular outlying parts of Hungary which extend in any direction beyond the even circumference of the 13th zone.

"'As has already been explained, this uniform long-distance price to any point in the 14th zone is four florins. This great reduction is based upon the supposition that the long distances are only travelled as a rule for business purposes of some importance. It is held, therefore, that facility of communication must be attended by excellent economic and commercial results, especially when one takes into account the state of the labour market in Hungary and the desirability for a greater freedom of movement of the industrial population. As regards the transportation of labourers it is further to be observed that under the existing arrangement workingmen in groups are carried at half of the regular Zone Tariff prices, so that labourers from the remotest provinces may now go up to the capital for the trifling sum of two florins.

"'But besides these remarkable reforms in long-distance rates, Minister Baross, who invented and introduced the entire new system, has provided a no less remarkable arrangement for the small-distance travellers who wish to go simply from one station to the next inside of zone limits. He has established a special so-called 'Vicinity Tariff,' which includes a uniform ticket of ten kreutzers for a one station journey and of 15 kreutzers for two stations. The ten kreutzers is worth about four cents of our money, and the 15 kreutzers about six cents. Such rates, considering how thinly-settled the country is, are much the lowest that have ever been made anywhere.

"'This tariff system, moreover, introduces an admirable simplicity and clearness. It does away with an enormous amount of book-keeping and red tape. Railway tickets are purchasable like cigars at any tobacco store, and no formalities of stamping or punching are needed, nothing being required except the purchaser's own record on the back of the ticket of the day of the month upon which he uses it. These facts being taken into account, it is plain that the Hungarian system is not a mere 'zone system,' and still less is it a simple 'penny-post' system. It is an entirely peculiar and independent creation of Herr Gabriel von Baross, and quite unlike anything either before or since attempted elsewhere.

"'The enquiry naturally arises to what extent this new system has influenced the volume of travel, and the equally important question what are the financial results, will occur to any enquirer. It might, of course, be taken for granted that the reduced rates would very considerably increase the movement of population, but the official reports show even greater than any one could have anticipated. In the first year of the zone tariff the number of passengers increased from 6,000,000 to 18,000,000. Against this extraordinary success the opponents of the zone tariff (for this innovation has its home critics) claim that formerly the number of passengers was underestimated, insufficient allowance having been made for people carried on return tickets, while under the new system the number appears so enormous because the capital city of the country now forms the central and dividing point, so that every passenger who passes through Buda-Pesth is obliged to purchase two tickets. This objection has its measure of truth. It is time that the statistics of the number of passengers carried and the statistics of the number of tickets sold, should not be regarded as identical.

"'Notwithstanding all this it remains true that the Zone Tariff has increased the actual amount of travel in an altogether unexpected ratio. This is positively proven if we compute, instead of the total number of passengers carried, the number which falls to each kilometer. In

this way we find that in the last year of the old tariff there were 71,800 passengers carried for every kilomètre of distance, while in the first year of the Zone Tariff, on the other hand, the average number per kilomètre was 124,000. The enormous increase of passenger traffic is further demonstrated by the fact that whereas under the old system each passenger travelled on the average a journey 61 kilomètres long, with the inauguration of the new system the average has come down to 41 kilomètres. In Germany, it should be said, the average at last accounts was only 28 kilomètres. This reduction in the length of the journey indicates, when compared with the total amount of business done, an enormous new development of the travelling habit with people formerly accustomed to make journeys only at intervals.' "

[At one o'clock the House suspended the sitting, and resumed at three o'clock].

Mr. MACLEAN. Before the House took recess, I had read an extract showing the immense increase in the volume of railway travel in Hungary, under their present system, and I will now read another paragraph to show that the railways have made more money under that system, and the quotation is as follows :—

"It is obvious that the general prosperity of the country must be greatly enhanced by this wonderful increase of mobility in the population ; so that even if for the present the railway department could show no net revenue gains the system might nevertheless be declared a financial success. It is true that while formerly for each passenger carried a hundred kilomètres (or for each hundred passengers carried one kilomètre) there was a revenue of 264 kreutzers, the amount under the new system is only 170 kreutzers. But the significant fact is that the grand total of the revenue has increased by 30 or 40 per cent, that is, from a sum ranging between 9,000,000 and 10,000,000 florins to about 12,500,000 florins. The expenses, to be sure, have increased in a somewhat corresponding ratio, still there remains a net advance in the revenue over and above the additional expenses incurred, and this net benefit amounts to about 1,500,000 florins per annum."

And the article concludes :

"When one considers how great a saving to the general public this new system has effected, and what a marvellous expansion in the economic and industrial life of the people has already resulted from it, while on its own part the state has not only sustained no loss, but is able to show an actual gain as the result of its experiment, one may well pardon the Hungarian people for their pride in what they call a 'new institution,' and can, moreover, readily understand why the Minister of Commerce, Herr Von Baross, should have become so popular. This lamented statesman and economist was a man to whose activity his fatherland owes a long list of important reforms, and who has in this wonderful railway departure built himself a lasting monument of fame. While the precise details of the Hungarian system cannot be regarded as applicable to American conditions, it is nevertheless true that there is very much that might be learned from a study of the Baross system and its results."

Not to take up any more time of the House, I simply wish to review my position. I consider that Parliament is supreme in this matter, and that it is not only its right but its duty to regulate the tariff ; and in the next place I say that such a reduction as I propose in the rates of passenger travel would result in benefit to the people, first of all, and then in benefit to the railway companies. That is my pretension. In conclusion, I wish to say, with reference to the statement that the railway companies themselves will make this concession in proper time, that they have never made concessions unless forced to do so by reason of competition or legislation, and that we will never have reduced rates until we demand them ourselves. I therefore propose to move that the Bill now before the House be amended as follows :—

Nothing in any by-law or regulation of any railway or railway company, whether approved of by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or not, shall be so construed as to allow, on or after the 1st July, 1893, any rate of fare for way passengers greater than 2 cents per mile to be charged or taken over the track or tracks of such railway or company east of a meridian line drawn through Port Arthur, in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I desire to say a few words on the amendment of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) before the vote is taken. I will premise by observing that that hon. gentleman has evidently learned something from the House since he first addressed it on this subject a few days ago. Reading the speeches made upon the resolution then introduced by the hon. gentleman, I fail to find in them any reference to the line he now draws, dividing the Province of Ontario and making the principle of the amendment only applicable to a certain portion of the country. On the contrary, its application then was general over the entire railway system of Canada. I am, therefore, quite justified in saying, and I am glad to be able to say it, that the hon. gentleman has learned something from the discussion which has already been had here. I would add further, before entering upon the few remarks I desire to present on this subject, that I am quite in favour of a reduction in railway passenger rates—in fact not only the members of this House but every man in this country possessing any common sense is in favour of it—and in favour not only of having the average passenger rate upon railways in this country reduced to 2 cents per mile as a maximum rate, but even to 1 cent, or nothing at all, if we can ride on railways for nothing. But the principle, in so far as the practical carrying out of this amendment is concerned, is one involving consequences most serious to interests which have been created upon the faith of legislation granted by this Parliament. Whoever supposed, Mr. Speaker—that in a question of this kind, involving consequences so far reaching, affecting those who live outside this country and who have invested their money here on the faith of legislation we have given them—of anything so important being made the subject of arbitrary legislation in the shape of the amendment now being sought to add to our general Railway Act, without first having made it the subject of special enquiry either before a special committee or the Railway Committee of this House. I believe I am quite within the recollection of hon. gentlemen in this House, of those who are among its oldest members, when I say that there is not one member of this House and not one business man in the country worthy of the name who would be in favour of arbitrarily adding this amendment to the general Railway Act of this country without first having made it the subject of parliamentary enquiry, so that the interests of those who may be opposed to it may be discussed in all their phases, in order that whatever legislation we may pass here, aside from the mere sentimentality of the Act itself, will not involve injustice to outsiders. We must bear in mind that while it is our bounden duty to legislate in the interests of the public, it is at the same time our manifest duty to see that the interests of those who have invested their money in it are not in any way prejudiced. I would say to the hon. member for East York that the allusion he made to the article which appeared in the *Gazette* was somewhat

unfair. I do not mean that he personally intended to be unfair, because I am quite sure he would not forget that unvarying courtesy which prevails among newspaper men, but if he will read that article in the spirit in which it is written, I am quite sure he will come to the conclusion that the writer did not mean that this Parliament had not the power to regulate the traffic of railway companies, for we have done so already, and indeed no action of this Parliament can possibly clothe the Committee of the Privy Council with larger powers than it now possesses in that very respect; but what the writer of the article in the *Gazette* meant was this, and he wrote the words in this spirit, that this Parliament ought not to deliberately confiscate rights which it has enabled outsiders to obtain on the strength of its own legislation. That is a perfectly fair proposition, and one which, I am sure, will meet the approval of every one who has given the subject any attention whatever. What does this amendment involve? Where is the necessity for it, in the first place? As I have said, we are all in favour of cheap passenger rates, but the hon. gentleman has, unfortunately for himself, chosen as illustrating his amendment, a country where, I do not hesitate to say, the maximum passenger rate per mile is lower than in any other country or state on this continent. I do not wish to trouble the House at great length—you all know that—but I am disposed just to draw its attention to some of those rates, as they are at present:—

Railroad.	Year.	Rate per passenger per mile.
Southern Pacific	1891	2·137
Pennsylvania	1891	2·583
Union Pacific system	1891	2·477
Lake Shore and Michigan Southern	1891	2·177
Boston and Maine Railroad	1891	1·818
Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad and Branches	1891	2·081
New York, Ontario and Western	1891	2·822
Wabash	1891	2·177
Northern Pacific	1890	2·548
New York, New Haven and Hartford	1891	1·687
Great Northern	1891	2·30
Chicago and Alton	1890	2·135
Chicago and North-Western	1891	2·17
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific	1891	2·198
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul	1891	2·391
Fitchburg	1891	1·87
Michigan Central	1891	2·249
Canadian Pacific	1891	1·70
Grand Trunk (about)	1891	1·73

From this it will be seen that, in comparison with the passenger rates in other countries, we live in a highly favoured land. Every person will admit that it is essential to the development of the vast resources of this country that capital should be directed this way, but, if the legislation proposed by the hon. gentleman were adopted in this arbitrary manner, one of the first effects would be that capital, which is always sensitive, would be alarmed at the difficulties in the way and would hesitate in investing in the development of railways which are for the interests of Canada. In Mulhall's Railway Statistics, I have looked at the figures, and I have prepared a statement which shows the rates in different countries as follows:—

Mr. WOOD (Brockville).

RATES FOR PASSENGERS AND GOODS IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES.

—	Pence per 10 miles.			
	1st class.	2nd class.	3rd class.	For goods per 100 miles.
United Kingdom	21	16	10	140
France	20	15	10	110
Germany	15	11	8	82
Russia	18	14	8	120
Austria	19	14	9	115
Italy	18	13	9	125
Spain	21	16	10	.....
Portugal	18	14	10	.....
Sweden	15	11	8	160
Norway	8	5	2½	120
Denmark	16	11	8	144
Holland	16	13	8	78
Belgium	12	9	6	80
Switzerland	19	13	10	165
Greece	14	9	7	.....
Roumania	36	14	10	78
Turkey	29	26	14	.....

We thus see that, reckoning in pence instead of cents, our average rates are cheaper. I say that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has chosen a country which really needs railway development, and where the average railway development is less than that in any other country; and a country which needs so much in the way of railway development is not the one in which the experiment should be tried. I shall show that this would have a tendency to injure the railway system of this country. I give the hon. gentleman every credit for intending to benefit the railways themselves, but, with all deference to him, I think the railways are never very much behind in legislating on matters which affect their own interests. I have been for ten years a member of the Railway Committee and a member of this House, and I have never known a case where the railway companies were indifferent to their own interests. I am certain that, if I were here for the next ten years, I should not witness a case in which it would be necessary to advise the railway companies as to their own interest. I do not think the experience of any hon. member will differ from my own in that respect. What would follow if the hon. gentleman succeeded in making this a part of the railway law of this country? This would follow. In the districts where different roads are running, in the County of Oxford for example, or in the neighbourhood of Montreal and Toronto where special rates are given to commercial travellers and others, those special rates would be abolished and the maximum passenger rate of 2 cents would be charged, and, while possibly the ordinary traveller or passenger would have his rate reduced from 3 cents to 2 cents between Toronto and Montreal, for example, it would come very hard on the railway companies and on outside districts, and the result would be, in the country where the population is sparse, that there would be a falling off in the revenues. Who would suffer? To start with, the fixed charges, the payment on outstanding bonds, have to be met by the railway companies, and the wages of the workingmen would have to be reduced. There would be a scrimping all along the line, and it would not be the head officials who

would suffer but the men who work day and night, and whose wages are little enough now. On behalf of 100 railway employés whom I represent in my own riding, as well as on behalf of many others, I say I believe it would be harmful to the railway companies themselves to adopt this proposal, and I am perfectly sure it would be injurious to the interests of the workingmen, whose wages now are no higher than they ought to be. I desire also to say something as to a class of roads that would be affected by the motion of the hon. member, as he has altered it, that is, not to take in the western part of the country. The railway legislation of this country has affected outlying districts, and moneys voted by this Parliament have as a rule been devoted to the aid of struggling railways which are feeders to the main lines, and which have entered the country northward and westward. The people were so anxious to get railway accommodation that they voted railway bonuses, and this Parliament voted subsidies to these railways, but still most of them are not paying, and it will be some years before they will be able to pay a fair dividend on their first securities. Those railways now charge 3 cents a mile, and in some cases 4 cents a mile. It is true that the people along the line would desire to have their fares reduced to 2 cents, or even to 1 cent a mile, but they are glad to have the road, and they find it very much better than the old stage line. Are these people to be exempted from the payment of the higher rate? In the County of Leeds, where they used to haul their freights 40 or 50 miles, I consulted these people and found that, as I expected, they would rather pay a higher price than do without the increased accommodation. If the proposal were at all feasible, it would have a most injurious effect upon all those small roads, branches or feeders of the trunk lines, which are now scarcely able to pay expenses even at 3 cents a mile. These are, briefly, the reasons why I am opposed to the proposed amendment. I am not opposed to any proposition looking to an improvement in the passenger and freight rates, that is first made the subject of examination by a committee; I am willing to listen to everything that can be said pointing in that direction; but to make this amendment a part of the General Railway Act of this country, without ever consulting the managers of railways, or those interested in the various railways of this country, and without giving them an opportunity to show whether they are now failing to pay interest, I say would be a monstrous thing for us to do, and I have not the slightest doubt that it will not be done. Now, we know that railways are keenly alive to their own interest, and I think there are some cases where, perhaps, something in the shape of a railway commission might be useful. While I am on my feet I will draw the attention of the House to the conduct of the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway in so far as they are attempting to serve the interests of the people in eastern Ontario. Some years ago when the Brockville and Ottawa Railway was but a small institution it served the interests of the public along the line very well indeed; when it became the Canada Central Railway and enlarged itself somewhat, it served the interests of the public very well indeed. But it has now become a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system; and there being a rivalry between the Canadian Pacific system and the Grand Trunk system, the result is that whilst it is highly amusing to the officials and others not interested of both these railways to see the passengers of western trains come into Brockville on the Grand Trunk Railway just in time to see the Canadian Pacific trains moving off, it is very awkward and inconvenient for the travelling public who come in on the western-bound trains. I have in my humble way endeavoured to cure this by writing, and by getting some boards of trade to write, to these different companies, and unless something is done to remedy this palpable neglect of duty on the part of these two companies I shall ask the House next session to refer the matter to the Railway Committee, to see if they cannot in some way have this matter amended. I will only say that it is unworthy these two great railway companies to act in the way they are doing in so far as the interests of the people of eastern Ontario are concerned. If the hon. member for East York will show me anything in the way of a grievance I will join hand in hand with him to see that it is corrected; but I trust that the House, before they vote upon this amendment of the hon. gentleman—I have no doubt that they will not pass it—will look into it and appreciate the very great interests that are involved, and if there is a necessity in a future session of taking this matter up, I see no objection to appointing a special committee to look into the matter and report to the House on the subject. The fact is, I think, that if we had more special committee work it would be very much better for the House. Our sessions are getting very long, and I believe that the special committees would shorten the length of our sessions. Take the Railway Committee; the work of that committee comes into this House and passes without any discussion. If we had to discuss over again all these questions that are settled in that committee, we would be here six months. Now, in conclusion, I repeat that there is no legislation that the hon. member for East York seeks that we have not got now. He has simply got to go to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and lay before them any grievance he has, as under the Railway Act they have power to remedy every evil that has been mentioned here to-day.

Mr. EDGAR. I have no doubt the intentions of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), in making this motion, are most praiseworthy, and that the object, if he could accomplish it as he wishes, is a desirable one. But I am afraid he has not given the matter that thorough consideration which, I think, a legislator ought to do. This is a matter which should not be approached in a hurry. The interests are altogether too large to be dealt with in an off-hand way towards the close of the session, and I am sure that the hon. member who has made the motion does not expect that they can be dealt with in as serious a manner as could be desired on this occasion. I think that many things will have to be considered, if this matter comes before the House again, as to the power of this Legislature to legislate in the direction of which he speaks. Now, I am not so clear as he is about that; I think the Legislature has rather tied its hands in that respect. I find that in 1851 the Parliament of old Canada, legislating almost for

the first time on the subject of railways, and passing a general Railway Act for the first time, made a provision which affects this question. It was then enacted :

"The Legislature of this province may, from time to time, reduce the tolls upon the railway, but not without consent of the company, or so as to produce less than 15 per cent per annum profit on the capital actually expended in its construction; nor unless on an examination made by the Commissioner of Public Works of the amount received and expended by the company, the net income from all sources, for the year then last passed, shall have been found to exceed 15 per cent upon the capital so actually expended."

Now, that clause has been re-enacted in every Railway Act until 1888 ; I think it was left out of the Act of 1888, as for some reason it does not appear there. Still, the railways which would be affected by the legislation proposed by the member for East York, were all, or practically all of them, brought into existence before 1888, and while that clause was the law of the land. Now, whether that clause was right or wrong we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that an enormous amount of foreign capital, chiefly British capital, was brought into Canada under provisions of that legislation. Why, Sir, the amount of capital that has come into this country to build railways is something stupendous ; it is a great deal more than double the gross national debt of Canada. The securities upon Canadian railways amount to over $600,000,000, and all that investment has been made under the shelter of this clause in the Act of 1851. Well, Sir, are we, in a hasty manner, and in violation of that law, whether it was right or wrong, to say now that this Legislature shall reduce the tolls by Act of Parliament and without the consent of the railways? I am sure it needs only to be pointed out to the House, or to any committee that may be appointed that that would be in a large measure an act of confiscation. What would be the effect if we were to do that? I presume the people who hold these railway securities in England, are largely the people who hold the securities of the Dominion of Canada, and they would immediately resent it ; the credit of the country would be endangered, and the Dominion as a whole would be discredited. The provision of that Act alluding to 15 per cent profit upon the capital expended in the construction, was rather an extensive one, and was one, I suppose, put there to show the absolute protection that investors would have. Of course, if a share earned 15 per cent or anything like it, he could very well afford to reduce his fare ; but as a matter of fact when you look at the railway statistics of the country and at the net profits, deducting the working expenses from the gross profits, you find that there will be not as much as 2½ per cent paid as interest on the capital invested on our railways. If that is the case, it behooves us to go rather slowly before we enter upon this legislation. The restrictive clause to which I have referred is still law in the Province of Ontario. Suppose this Parliament choose to do so, and suppose we had the power to do so, and we reduced the rate to two cents, the railways under the provincial charter would not be bound by this legislation. So that on the whole I think the House is not in a position, without making further investigation, to proceed with this amendment. I am sure the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) will find a great many ways, if he has himself placed on the Railway Committee, in which he can be of great assistance to the public in guarding their interests against the railway companies, and he will find, when he has been on the Railway Committee as long as some of us, that there is a great deal to be done there of a practical character, without undertaking this gigantic scheme which the young member has undertaken, and which he will find when he is a little more mellow in parliamentary ways, is much beyond his reach or the reach of any of us.

Mr. CORBY. In the argument addressed to the House by the mover of the amendment I did not hear him state that the railways in this country were earning very large dividends. In fact, we are all well aware that there is a large investment of British capital made in our Canadian railways, especially in the Grand Trunk Railway, which never receives even interest. I certainly think this House should be careful in dealing with this question, as the interests of stockholders and bondholders are involved, and we have no right to pass an Act that will cut down the revenues of these roads when we know that the people of the old country have invested their money in our railways in good faith. Our Canadian railways should not be compared, as has been done by the hon. member for East York, with American railways and railways in Europe. We are all aware that in London alone there is as large a population as in the whole of Canada. We have built our roads throughout this country, the Grand Trunk Railway extending over 4,000 miles, and the Canadian Pacific Railway possessing about the same mileage. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have built a road from the Atlantic to the Pacific, part of it being through a country from which no revenue is derived. It is unfair to compel these companies to reduce their rates, when they are not at present paying fair dividends on their investments ; as an hon. member has just stated, they are not paying to-day more than 2 or 2½ per cent. As member for West Hastings I hold that if the railways in Canada to-day were paying enormous profits their rates should be reduced in regard to passenger traffic ; but I certainly hold that if we pass in this House an Act to reduce the passenger rates to 2 cents per mile, such a reduction must injuriously affect the working of the road. The companies must reduce the running expenses in order to meet that reduction in revenue. Representing as I do 100 railway employés in Belleville, I stand here to protest against the passing of a resolution which will have the effect of reducing the wages of men working on railways in Canada. This legislation proposed is not in the interest of the workingmen, as it is not in the interest of the railway men. It is in the interest of the rich men. We all know that workingmen do not travel a great deal, and rich men, if they want to secure a low rate, can take a 1,000 mile ticket at 2½ cents per mile, and that is sufficient protection for them. I understand that the only road in the United States which has a 2 cent rate is the New York Central. I believe a large number of the western roads charge 3 and 4 cents per mile. The Canadian railways are very liberal, as a rule. If ten or a dozen persons want to go on an excursion either by the Canadian Pacific or the Grand Trunk Railway, they can secure excursion rates from one end of the country to the other. If we had a thickly settled popula-

tion as in London, in Europe, or the United States, it would be a different matter, but when we have to carry our railways 4,000 miles through a sparsely settled country, the present passenger rates cannot be considered excessive. I certainly cannot vote in favour of the amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. In seconding this resolution I do so because I believe it is the commencement of an agitation which is ultimately intended to remove a long-standing grievance in the country. It is a fact, nothwithstanding what may be said to the contrary, that the public feel that railway corporations have very little consideration either for the convenience or for the pocket of the public. No matter what assistance we give them, no matter what consideration we extend to them, no matter how much exemption from taxation we allow them, when we come to use the road the company shows very little consideration for the people. I was rather amused at the argument of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) regarding the great injustice that would be done to the railway companies if the amendment were adopted. In the hon. gentleman's closing remarks he said he had been a member of the House for a number of years and also a member of the Railway Committee, and he was aware of the fact, as every hon. gentleman must be, that if the public have any grievance against a railway corporation all they had to do was to appear before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and the grievance would be remedied, and he added that he was not aware of a single instance in which any inconvenience on the part of the public had not been removed. Yet in the same breadth the hon. gentleman told of an inconvenience in his own part of the country where the passengers arriving on the Grand Trunk Railway, and desiring to leave by the Canadian Pacific Railway found the train had just left. He had appealed to the corporation through the Board of Trade and in various other ways, but the difficulty had not been removed, and up to the present time that inconvenience had not been remedied, and he might be compelled to appeal to Parliament to force the companies to remedy it, provided they held out much longer. Yet the hon. gentleman stated that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is prepared to remove any grievance brought before it. I wonder the hon. gentleman did not think well to appeal to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council in order to remove this grievance of which he complained. Some hon. gentlemen contend that Parliament has no right to regulate the tolls on railways or the rates of railway tariff. I do not so understand the rights of Parliament. Nor do I consider it to be outside the province of this Parliament to pass a law to regulate such rates. At the present time we regulate the rates of traffic on a ferry. If we give a corporation the right to run a ferry we authorize it to charge a certain tariff and no more, and we oblige it to keep within the provisions of that tariff. We fix the rates, not according to the arguments advanced by the promoters of the enterprise, but according to the judgment of Parliament. Then, again, if we allow a corporation the right to build a bridge, we fix the rates for foot passengers. Then, again, if we give a corporation the right to build a telegraph line we fix the tariff, 25 cents for 10 words and 1 cent for each additional word, and so on. In all these cases, while we give certain powers to these corporations we hold them down by law and compel them to charge only a certain consideration to the public when they use either bridge, ferry or telegraph line. We have had very extensive agitations from time to time springing up, not only in our Parliament but in Parliaments of other countries, having for their object, that the Government shall take over the railways and telegraph lines of the country. The cause of this agitation existing is, because the public, after subsidizing these railway corporations with both land and money, find that after all the assistance given, they have very little consideration for the interest or convenience of the public. Many believe to-day that the time will come in Canada when Parliament will he obliged to buy out the railway companies of this country and to take over the telegraph lines also, so that they may prevent the people from being charged exorbitant rates for the use of these public conveniences. We profess to regulate the charges of the railway traffic in this country. We say, that when a railway corporation earns 10 per cent on their money invested it cannot go any higher. It is merely a nominal protection to the public, because we find that the restriction amounts to nothing at all, for these railway companies either water their stock, or lay so much to rest account, or double up the expenditure in one way or another on capital account, so as to evade the law by showing that they are not able to pay 10 per cent on the capital invested. Nominally the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has control over the tariffs, but when they are sanctioned by the Committee of the Privy Council we have practically no control over them whatever. We say that railways shall charge so much per hundred for first, second and third class freight, but immediately the railway companies set their ingenuity to work to evade the law. We say that the railways should carry third class freight for so much per ton per mile, but they turn round and say that a certain class of goods which weighs a few hundred pounds shall be charged as a ton, and they bring it under the tariff for that quantity. Take, for example, the carriage of cattle on railroads. If you put a mere calf on the train, they will charge you freight on 2,000 lbs. while perhaps the animal only weighs 200 lbs. In a hundred different ways they evade the law, so that it is of no value whatever. They say that your freight is bulky and therefore they charge so much more for it, or they say that it is dangerous to carry and consequently they increase the rate. By these various devices they evade the law, so that theoretically while we have control over the freight rates, practically we have no control over them whatever. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) criticised the case cited by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) when he said that in Hungary experience had proved that when the rate was reduced the passenger traffic was increased.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I never said anything of the kind. It was some other member who said that.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the only instance cited. At any rate, if I correctly understood him, he referred to the instances cited and said that an old and populous country was selected and that

there could be no fair comparison between it and Canada.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think it was the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Corby) who said that.

Mr. SPROULE. I have before me a return which shows that the passenger travel in Hungary, before the reduction in rates, only amounted to 6,000,000 persons per annum, while in Canada I find from the return that over 13,000,000 passengers were carried on the railways in one year. Therefore, Canada must be either a much more populous country than Hungary, or else it must have many more miles of railways and more travelling. At all events, we know that in Hungary where the railways only carried 6,000,000 passengers per year, before the reduction in rates, after that reduction the number increased threefold. It seems to me a very easy problem to ascertain how far the railways would or would not benefit by a reduction in the cost of travel. If you can increase the number of passengers carried threefold by reducing the rates one-third, surely the companies must have the benefit in their favour. If the same result from a reduction of rates followed in Canada as in Hungary, and it is reasonable to suppose that it might, the railways would reap an enormous benefit. Suppose the reduction of one-third in the rates charged, only doubled the number of passengers carried, the railway companies would still be the gainers. I can well understand that there is a great difference between carrying passengers and carrying freight on a railway, because if you increase the freight, it, of necessity, requires an increase in the number of hands for loading and unloading. It is not so with the travelling public. When a car draws up to a station the passenger gets on or off the train, and whether he travels one mile or one hundred or one thousand miles, there is no additional cost to the company. It is true that it might require more rolling stock to move increased passenger traffic, but that would be but a small additional expense compared with the increased earnings of the road. I have no doubt whatever that the time will come when Parliament will be obliged to control the railways. A few years ago we made a motion in the direction of appointing a Railway Commission, but that was abandoned on the plea that the Government was about to appoint a Railway Committee of the Privy Council and, by an amendment of the Railway Act, to give extended powers to that committee so that they could deal with the grievances between railway companies and the public, and between the railway companies themselves. We thought that by this means we would be able to overcome the difficulty, but we find, unfortunately, that many of the grievances that the country had to contend with are not touched at all by this Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Unfortunately it is very difficult to fight these powerful railway companies. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) says: You can lay your grievances before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, but let a private individual or a small corporation lay a grievance before that committee and let a great corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway with millions at its back, fight you on the other side, and what chance has the individual got? We know that even in the courts of the land where they are supposed to deal out justice without fear, favour, or affection, that if you take a rich man on the one side and a poor man on the other, or a millionaire on the one side and a pauper on the other, the pauper must generally go to the wall. It is a very difficult matter for a private individual to fight a railway corporation, and for that reason we hear nothing at all about many of the grievances that exist in this country on the part of individuals against such corporations. It is true that if you go to court the findings have been usually against railways on the other side of the line and to some extent it is the same thing here, but poor people are not able to fight these wealthy corporations and in the end they succumb. We give these railway corporations large subsidies, we enable them to take the best of our property whether it pleases us or displeases us so long as it may be in the public interest; we put low municipal taxes on their property, we give them very many considerations, and then if we ask them to move our local freight they sometimes refuse to do so. At many of the stations along these lines there are car loads of pease, oats, barley and other commodities, which has perhaps been sold to be delivered within a certain time, but if you ask a railway company to move it for you, the chances are ten to one you will not get it carried until the time for delivery has passed. I have known dozens of contracts that have had to be cancelled, and where persons have been subjected to a great deal of loss and trouble because the railway companies would not furnish cars. Their excuse was: Our through traffic is so great that we are unable to supply the local demand and in very many instances, the people are obliged to suffer without being able to seek redress from the railway company, and they suffer because the railway wants to compete with corporations outside of our country and carry freight on long hauls which does not pay them. We are told that the amount of money invested in railways yields a very small return. I believe it does; but I think that the money invested in most of these railway corporations, with the assistance which has been given by the public, yields to the owners of the stock quite as much as it would if they had the money in banks in England, where they could not get more than 3½ and 4 per cent. They are getting more than that from the money invested in many railways here; but, in addition to that, railway officials have a great many conveniences and advantages which might be considered in lieu of any loss they sustain by virtue of the small dividend they receive on their stock. They have the advantage of travelling for nothing, and they have the advantage of being associated with large corporations, which promotes their interest in many ways. Now, these grievances against the railways are growing. We know that these great railway corporations do not serve the public as well as they might in many localities. For instance, in my part of the country we had a railway which we subsidized to the extent of $300,000, besides giving it property for railway station grounds and other conveniences for nothing; and, notwithstanding that, we are today paying as much for carrying freight on that railway, a distance of 20 or 30 miles, as we would have to pay for carrying it by team. Not long

ago, I was talking to a gentleman who lives within 30 miles of Toronto, and who told me that it cost him 10 cents a hundred to get his freight carried to Toronto. Time and time again we have teamed freight 30 miles at 10 cents a hundred and made a profit out of it. After having paid for our railways exorbitant amounts of money in the shape of municipal bonuses and Government subsidies, we find that they do not supply the public with those conveniences which we might naturally expect to receive. While I feel that there is a good deal of force in the argument advanced by the hon. member for Brockville that perhaps it would be a rather radical move to tack such an amendment as this on to the Railway Act before giving the railway corporations an opportunity to come before a committee of this House and present their reasons to show why it would be unfair to enact such a provision; yet I suppose that the hon. gentleman believes, as no doubt does the hon. member who made the motion, that it will not carry to-day. But unless we advocate the correction of these grievances they will never be remedied. The subject will be discussed in this House and by the press of the country, and I have no doubt it will be brought up again, when perhaps a committee will be appointed to consider it. The hon. Minister of Railways intimated a few days ago that the Government would be disposed to grant a committee, and I think that cannot be done too soon. Then, when we have all the necessary information before us, we shall be able to deal with the subject more intelligently than we can to-day. But when we have on record the fact, which cannot be refuted or gainsaid, that railway corporations similarly circumstanced to the railway corporations of Canada, have reduced their fares and at the same time increased their revenues enormously, it is a very strong argument to prove that we would be justified, even against the wishes of the railway companies, if necessary, in adopting such a course here. What has happened in other countries must happen in Canada. The companies have in the past fought against amendments which have proved to be valuable and in the interest of the companies themselves, as well as in the interest of the country. The fact that the railway corporations oppose a change is no reason why the House should not adopt it. If any remedy is needed, we should apply that remedy, whether it pleases or displeases the railway companies. We hear a great deal about the sensitiveness of money. There is no doubt that money is sensitive; but we sometimes allow ourselves to be carried away by that idea. Many men invest money where it yields a very small return; but if this amendment were adopted, I believe it would only have the effect of increasing the earnings of capital invested in railways instead of reducing them. Now, I hope that this agitation will continue from session to session until the Government either take the matter into their own hands and regulate the rates of the railways, and insist upon their providing the public with the conveniences which they have a right to expect in return for the privileges we have given to them, or else take the railways into their own hands and run them like the Intercolonial, in the interest of the public. Who are the parties suffering to-day? They are the weaker and poorer class of the country. Commercial men, clergymen, and corporations get reduced rates. The hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby) has said that we can purchase a thousand-miles ticket at 2½ cents a mile. I never knew it before. I know that many men would take advantage of that if they were aware of it. But the people who are obliged to bear this burden are the people who are the least able to bear it—the poorer classes, who would travel more if the rates were reduced. If wages were low in one locality, the labouring class would move to another locality where the wages are better. If one class of the community would benefit more than another from reduced rates, it is the poorer class. The rich man can travel all the time if he likes, for he is able to bear the expense; but the poor man is able only to travel on excursions when reduced rates are given; he must accept the time fixed by the railway company instead of suiting his own convenience. But give him this reduction in rates and he would travel more, while the railways would have very little additional expense. I have no doubt they would have the same experience as the railways of Hungary, they would find that the travelling public would be threefold what it is to-day, and their revenue would be very largely increased without any increase in their working expenses.

Mr. COCKBURN. Representing as do a constituency containing a considerable number of railways employés, I desire to say a few words on the amendment now before the House, and I promise that at this stage of the session they shall be very few. I fully sympathize with my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) in his desire to render cheaper the facilities for railway travelling, especially in the interest of the labouring man; but I am afraid he has somewhat mistaken the situation, and while desiring to benefit that class, would really inflict an injury upon them. I must say that he has chosen a rather inopportune moment for introducing a proposition of this kind, just after we have been voting railway subsidies to the amount of $4,000,000 or $5,000,000. We have already voted about $140,000,000 of subsidies to railways in Canada and we have granted these on the simple ground that without such subsidies the railways would not be built; and yet at the same time we are asked to diminish by 33⅓ per cent the earnings of these railways. It is absurd to come and ask us to vote millions of dollars to help to build railways on the plea that if these millions be not granted these railways cannot be built, and then, within an hour after, ask us to diminish by 33 per cent the net earnings to be obtained from the passenger traffic on these very roads. The one proposition is absolutely in contradiction to the other. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has told us that in his own county they voted $300,000 in aid of a railway. Why? It must have been on the understanding given to the county and accepted by it, that unless this sum were voted the company would not be able to build the road and run it. Yet now he wants to deprive these people, who were in such poverty that they were unable to build the road out of their own resources, of one-third of their earnings. He has told us that capital is not shy, and that it always looks to its own profits. Of course it does. It makes no difference to the capitalist, so long as he gets a safe and adequate return, where he invests his money, in Canada, or the United States, or Great Britain, or France, or Germany, or Hungary, or Bulgaria; but if he finds

that, after the solemn assurances given by this House to the railway companies, the earning powers of these companies are to be suddenly reduced 33 per cent, he would be very shy indeed of investing his capital in our Dominion, and there is nothing we need more to develop our resources than the introduction of foreign capital. If the dividends of our railway companies were as large as they are on the New York Central, there might be some reason for this amendment. The New York Central, on which the 2 cent per mile rate is carried out, is one of the oldest roads in the United States, but it is a road running through a comparatively small country with a population of over 6,000,000; and it was found that the directors were still able, after watering and rewatering the stock, to pay an 8 per cent dividend. The powers at Washington then took the matter up while dealing with a proposed amendment to the charter, and said: If you are able to pay 8 per cent dividend on your watered stock, you ought to be able to run your road at a certain diminution of profits, and they have been able to do so, and they were mulcted accordingly in the same manner as that now proposed by the hon. member for East York. But the conditions were diametrically opposite to those of railway companies in this country. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says, why, you fix the rates for bridges and ferries and telegraph companies. Well and good. He says you fix the rates on the bridge over the River Ottawa here. But, Mr. Speaker, we can all see the Ottawa River. It is the same service rendered to every one, but the hon. gentleman does not mean to tell me that he is going to put a 2 cent per mile rate as a return on the capital invested in making a road through the Rocky Mountains, because we fix the rates over a bridge across a river, or because he would fix them on a railway from Ottawa to Montreal?

Mr. SPROULE. This amendment only affects railways west of Lake Superior.

Mr. COCKBURN. Well, there are other roads west of Lake Superior to which the hon. gentleman's argument would be equally inapplicable. There is no analogy whatever between fixing the rates for a ferry or over a bridge, and fixing the rates of passenger travel over a railway extending 1,500 or 3,000 miles through every variety of country. We have been referred to Hungary. Well, I have travelled there, and I must say that there is not a Canadian with any self-respect who would consent to travel in one of their lower class carriages. It is all very well to speak about what you can get in other countries; but the question is, what is the accommodation our people are accustomed to and would consent to accept? Three years ago, for the fun of the thing, when in Switzerland, I took a short trip of 20 miles in a cattle car over one of these foreign roads, at less than a 2 cent per mile rate. There were some forty of us in a railway cattle car, fourth class, and I assure you, Sir, I do not wish to repeat the experiment. I do not think that you can get the Canadian people, accustomed to their present accommodation, to travel in such a carriage; nor do I think that if we were to adopt this 2 cents per mile rate we would be able to build any more roads, or, indeed, that the roads that we have would be able to run and furnish the facilities that they are now granting. We have been told by gentlemen earlier in the debate that all the passengers pay per head on the Canadian Pacific Railway was 1·70 cents per mile on an average, and on the Grand Trunk Railway, I believe, they cost about 1·60 cents per mile.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the poor man get that rate?

Mr. COCKBURN. The poor man travels over that road at a 3 cent per mile rate like any other man. The hon. gentleman mentioned clergymen. Well, they are pretty poor men, and he also mentioned the average member of Parliament, who is also pretty poor and who travels at less than that as a rule. I cannot but feel that in adopting this amendment, we would be falsifying and stultifying our own policy, and that instead of diminishing by one-third the charges on the passenger traffic, while we are granting these enormous subsidies to railway companies, it would be more sensible for us to leave the railway passenger rates as they are and dispense with these railway subsidies. It is all nonsense to say that we are to launch out these millions, and then at the same time take back with the right hand what we have given with the left. One of the main objections I have to this amendment, so far as my own constituency is concerned, is that I believe the railway employés do hard work and are honest men, and I feel that if a pressure of this kind were put upon the railway companies, the inevitable result would be a tendency—however much it might be against the will of the management—to reduce the wages of the workingman. But apart from that, there is not a man, I think, in this House who can say that he has before him sufficient information to justify his taking so radical a step as that proposed, especially at this hour of the session, by the hon. member for East York. I would suggest, therefore, that the hon. gentleman should either withdraw his amendment or allow it to stand over until next session and then call for a committee of enquiry; and I think that then the whole matter can be fully discussed, with such evidence before us as will justify us in dealing with the matter fairly and liberally.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not propose to occupy much of the time of the House, and wish first to correct the hon. member for East York in two or three particulars. In his remarks the other night, he read a letter from a gentleman in London, which led to the inference that the president of the Grand Trunk Railway had been so impressed by this 2 cent rate that he promised to lay it before his board. The general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway cabled to the president, who answered as follows:—

"The statement of the resident of London untrue. Oppose the 2 cent rate to the utmost."

I was merely asked to make that correction, lest it might convey the impression to the country that the Grand Trunk Railway board were going to consider the possibility of granting this rate. The hon. gentleman was misinformed with regard to two propositions he advanced in his opening remarks. One was that in the United States to-day, he understood that the commission regulated or rather fixed the railway rates.

Mr. MACLEAN. What I intended to say was in the States the Interstate Commission prevented the

railways from making discriminations in their tolls.

Mr. TISDALE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say just the opposite. I understood him to say that in the United States to-day and in England there were authorities who had power to fix the rates, and it is his misunderstanding on this point which I wished to correct. In neither of those countries have they any power to fix rates. They have power to prevent discrimination, but in the United States they have what are called maximum rates in every state almost in the Union; and, therefore, so far as the hon. gentleman's argument goes, the legislatures in that country have power to fix the rates, and he is quite right in this respect. They have the same power in England. There, since 1864, the maximum rates have been 6 cents for first class, 4 cents for second class, and 2½ cents for third class. But the hon. gentleman will look in vain, either in the United States or in England, or, I apprehend, in any country in Europe, unless it is a very modern precedent indeed, for a parallel to this legislation, except in the case he mentioned, that of the New York Central Railway, over which line a 2 cent rate has been fixed. He will look in vain for any case where, after the railways have been constructed, the maximum rate has been lowered except in the case of the New York Central, which forms no parallel to this case. The New York Central was a rich road and had watered its stock, and when it went to the legislature the legislature said: We will not give you what you ask unless you agree not to charge more than 2 cents a mile on your own line, and any other lines which you now operate upon which you now only charge 2 cents per mile. The maximum rate in the State of New York is 5 cents a mile. The hon. gentleman said there had been no reduction in the rates for thirty years. I have a statement under the hand of the auditor of the Grand Trunk Railway showing the average rate; and that is what should govern in all matters of business, because, if any unfair advantages are taken to discriminate in favour of one person and against another, the law is and has been for many years such that that can be prevented. In 1872 the average earnings for passengers were $1.55, and at the end of 1891 they were only 89 cents. The freight charges in 1872 amounted to 1·42 cents per ton per mile, and at the end of 1891 the average freight charge per ton per mile was only ·72 of a cent. I think that no one will compare the accommodation given twenty years ago with what is given now. I do not think it is any argument to say that legislators should see that this is a popular question. The whole question is whether it is fair and just, and I think it would be dangerous to experiment in a matter of this kind. On the Canadian Pacific Railway their average earning per passenger per mile is 1·70 cents, allowing for their long mileage, and on the New York Central the average per mile per passenger is 1·96 cents. Now, I propose to take up the question where the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) left it. In 1888, as he stated, the law in this country was that the railway company could arrange their own rates unless they paid more than 15 per cent on their own capital. In 1888 a royal commission was appointed, of which Sir Alexander Galt was chairman, and they visited several states of the Union and took evidence, and they reported as follows:—

"TARIFFS.

"The commission have carefully considered all the information before them on this important subject, and believe the interest of commerce will be best served by leaving the arrangement of tariff rates for passengers and goods in the control of the several railway companies respectively, subject only to approval and revision of the maxima rates by an authorized tribunal.

"They therefore recommend:—

"'That the railway companies may make and establish tariffs, subject to the approval and revision of the maxima rates, by such tribunal as may be constituted.'"

Again, on page 13, they further recommend:

"That it is expedient to adopt a rule of equal mileage rates, irrespective of distance and cost of service."

And on pages 19 and 21, they recommended as follows:—

"In considering the important question of the character and composition of a tribunal to give effect to the various recommendations made in their report, the commission have felt themselves limited to the selection of one of two courses:

"1. The creation of a commission, independent of Government control with practically irresponsible authority.

"2. The maintenance of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council with such extension of its powers and requisite departmental machinery to secure the proper execution of the law.

"After the fullest discussion and most deliberate consideration the commission desire to report as their final recommendation:

"That the powers of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council be enlarged so far as to enable them to administer the proposed law, providing:

"1st. That the committee shall itself hear and determine all disputes arising between railway companies, with power to appoint proper officers to take evidence locally.

"2nd. That the committee shall itself decide all questions of classification of freight, tariff and uniform railway returns.

"3rd. That the committee shall have power to appoint officers in each province, to hear and determine all complaints against railway companies, subject to power of reference by such officer of any point to the committee, and also subject to the right of appeal to the committee itself."

Now, following up that recommendation, in the consolidation of the Railway Act of 1888, by section 11 it was enacted:

"The Railway Committee shall have power to enquire into, hear and determine any application, complaint or dispute respecting:

"*k.* Tolls and rates for the transportation of freight and passengers:

"*l.* The adjustment of such tolls and rates between companies:

"*m.* Running powers or haulage:

"*n.* Traffic arrangements:

"*o.* Transhipment or interchange of freight:

"*p.* Unjust preferences, discrimination or extension:

"Sec. 12. The Railway Committee or the Minister may appoint or direct any person to make an enquiry and report upon any application, complaint or dispute pending before such committee, or any matter or thing connected therewith or incident thereto."

Now, that is still law. It shows after all how quickly we forget, unless we are interested in some way in looking into them, the most important transactions, important enquiries, however full they may have been, or however expensive. That was an expensive commission, a full report, made by competent men. They gave to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, a tribunal responsible to Parliament, an authority that no other country has yet entrusted to any tribunal, that is, the power not only to fix rates, but to regulate and change them. And here, in my opinion, comes the whole pith of the objection to the hon. gentleman's motion, it is in relation to fixing a maximum rate. If there is any reason why it should be fixed at all, it should

be done after an enquiry into the position, cost of maintenance, cost of operation, and quantity of freight and number of passengers carried on any one line, or any part of the line. Now, I want to tell hon. gentlemen who think there should be a further enquiry, that I think we cannot improve the present state of the law. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that we can have now any such discussion as ought to take place. It would weary the House were I to give them an idea, by reading quotations, of the vexed questions that arise with regard to regulating rates. Therefore, we have got to consider the whole question, and it would be tantamount to asking us to vote a want of confidence in the executive of the day, were we deliberately to make a change of that magnitude. The proposition has not been supported by arguments, and to make a change in the law passed only four years ago, after an exhaustive and extensive enquiry by competent railway authorities would be a great mistake. I think a deliberative body is not just the proper one to take either the time or the pains to enquire into a question of this magnitude. Neither of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken in favour of this proposition, showed any reasons, or gave any statistics, or presented any grievances, to show that the decision come to four years ago ought not to remain the law of the land. My hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood), who holds very strong and sensible views upon the impropriety of this resolution, alluded to a grievance which exists at Brockville, and I wish to say to him that all he has got to do is to bring these two railway companies before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, if he wants to prevent them from running their trains so as to discommode the public. I venture to say that that committee would not dare to sanction such an arrangement as the hon. member speaks of. If my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) will go to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and show that over certain roads or parts of them, under the circumstances of their construction, operation and maintenance, the maximum rate charged is unfair, under the law as it now stands, the matter can be investigated and the rate changed if any grievance is established. Now, what is the maximum rate? 3 cents, and 2 cents on the Grand Trunk, that is the local rate. They never charge higher than 3 cents for first class, and 2 cents for second class; whereas the minimum rate in England is 2½ cents for third-class accommodation, and we get other concessions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. A penny a mile in England.

Mr. TISDALE. No, it is five farthings. Since the hon. gentleman put this notice on the paper I have examined the English Act of Parliament, as I do not like to make positive assertions in Parliament without being sure. I thought it was a penny, but I find it is three pence, two pence and five farthings; these are the rates fixed by the Act of 1864, and they are still in force in England. Five farthings are about two cents and a half, as near as you can make it. I shall conclude my remarks by saying that before we overturn the expensive and well-considered arrangement of this matter that was made in 1888, a very strong case indeed should be made out.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). I wish to take up the time of the House for a moment only in answering one or two objections.

Mr. TISDALE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that unless he is rising to make a personal explanation, or unless he has been misunderstood and wishes to explain himself more clearly, he cannot speak again. The rule is that a member moving an amendment cannot speak twice.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Maclean:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Béchard,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Choquette,
Colter,
Denison,
Devlin,
Dupont,
Flint,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Jeannotte,
Landerkin,
Leduc,
Maclean (York),
McNeill,
Mignault,
O'Brien,
Sanborn,
Sproule.—20.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan,
Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Bain (Wentworth),
Beith,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bernier,
Bourassa,
Bowell,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Boyle,
Burnham,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Chapleau,
Christie,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davis,
Dawson,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Dickey,
Dyer,
Earle,
Edgar,
Fairbairn,
Featherston,
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Forbes,
Foster,
Fréchette,
Frémont,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Godbout,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Grieve,
Guay,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Henderson,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Innes,
Ives,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Langelier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lippé,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Algoma),
McAlister,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McGregor,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McMillan (Huron),
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McMullen,
Madill,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Monerieff,
Monet,
Montague,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Colchester),
Perry,
Pridham,
Proulx,
Putnam,
Reid,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Scriver,
Semple,
Simard,
Somerville,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Turcotte,
Tyrwhitt,
Vaillancourt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
Wilmot,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville).—128.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House again resolved itself into committee to consider certain resolutions on the subject of subsidies to be granted to railways.

(In the Committee.)

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:—

To the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding, with the amount already paid, $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $114,125.

Mr. HAGGART. This is a renewal of a subsidy already granted. The road is to be 85 miles in length, and is running into the region south of the west of Port Arthur. It is nearly completed, and all the subsidy has been earned and paid, except $114,125, which has lapsed. The object of this resolution is to revote that sum.

2. *Resolved*, That, notwithstanding the expiration of the time limited by the Act 47 Victoria, Chapter 8, and by the contract entered into with the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, the Governor in Council may pay the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the said Act to the said company, according as it becomes due and payable in accordance with the said contract, and subject to the terms and conditions applicable to the said subsidy under the terms of the said Act.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the explanation about this?

Mr. HAGGART. It is only a renewal of the subsidy already granted to that road; an extension of time.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the hon. gentleman state what are the reasons which prevented the company fulfilling the conditions of this contract up to the present time?

Mr. HAGGART. Some of the road is not built.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Including the bridge across to Pembroke.

Mr. LAURIER. What are the reasons which prevented the company from fulfilling the contract in the time assigned?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is the reason that prevented me, some years ago, from buying a new coat: I had no money.

Mr. SPEAKER. I should like to enquire from the Minister of Railways how much of this road still remains unbuilt, and what amount of the original subsidy of $272,000, granted in 1884, still remains to be paid to the company upon the portions yet to be built?

Mr. HAGGART. I have not the railway returns here; it is in my report of this year.

Mr. SPEAKER. The reason that I ask this question is this: I understand that under the agreements which are usually made by these railway companies the subsidy is not paid in amounts of $3,200 per mile upon every 10-mile section; but that the companies are required in their agreement with the Government to give an estimate of the cost of each 10-mile section, and the subsidy is paid upon each 10-mile section in the proportion that the cost of the section bears to the whole cost of the railway. As I understand it with regard to this particular enterprise, the last section will be very much more expensive than these sections which have already been constructed. As a consequence I understand that a very considerable sum has been reserved out of the $3,200 per mile on these sections that have already been paid for. What I want to draw the attention of the committee and the Minister of Railways to, and what I wish to learn from him, is—whether it is proposed that any portion of that sum which is so kept back will be paid to the company before the road is completed, in accordance with the original agreement entered into with the Minister of Railways in 1884 or 1885?

Mr. HAGGART. As I understand it the actual cost of the road is calculated as a whole, and a particular 10-mile section may require less to do it per mile than the average of the whole. Then that amount is retained, and it is paid on the more difficult portions of the road. The amount I suppose that is retained was arranged on that principle, and the amount that is retained will be given to the more difficult portion of that road, when it is built, but not till then. No portion of that amount will be paid until the more difficult portion is built.

3. *Resolved*, That notwithstanding the expiration of the time limited by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, and by the contract entered into with the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, the Governor in Council may pay the balance remaining unpaid of the said subsidy granted by the said Act to the said company, according as it becomes due and payable in accordance with the said contract, and subject to the terms and conditions applicable to the said subsidy under the terms of the said Act.

Mr. HAGGART. I propose to amend this resolution and make it read as follows:—

4. *Resolved*, That notwithstanding the expiration of the time limited by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, and by the contract entered into with the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, the Governor in Council may pay the balance remaining unpaid of the said subsidy granted by the said Act to the said company, according as it becomes due and payable in accordance with the said contract and subject to the terms and conditions applicable to the said subsidy under the terms of the said Act.

And further resolved that the balance of the amount remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the 51st Victoria, chapter 24, amounting to $12,800, be paid on the four miles of road from the north end of the main line subsidized, toward Roberval, four miles.

Mr. EDGAR. How much is unpaid of these amounts that have been earned? There were $64,000 voted under 52 Victoria.

Mr. HAGGART. By the 52nd Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy was granted to this company for the construction of 30 miles, Chicoutimi branch. The contract was entered into and work proceeded with and $14,916 has been earned and paid, leaving a balance of $81,060 unpaid. By the 51st Victoria, a subsidy was granted for 9 miles of the railway, amounting to $28,800—$16,000 was earned and paid, leaving a balance of $12,800 which has lapsed, and it is proposed to revote this: also the amount unpaid on these two sections of $93,890. The former 9-mile subsidy that was granted was not considered sufficiently clear as to its location, it being contended by the company that it was to apply to the Lake St. John end, whereas the Government officials maintain that five miles apply to the Lake St. John end and four miles to the Quebec end. This resolution is the better to define the location of the four miles. I move that the committee rise and report the resolutions.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the Minister of Justice now, whether he is prepared to accept the resolution which I offered last night.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, Mr. Chairman. For the reasons I gave yesterday I think, as at present advised, I cannot accept it; but there will be an opportunity to discuss that when we come to the Bill. The Minister of Railways wishes to insert in the Bill the provisions usual in subsidy Acts, that the returns and contracts should be laid on the Table early in the session.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved second reading of Bill (No. 44) further to amend the Chinese Immigration Act. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I may state that when the House goes into committee, it is my intention to propose amendments thereto. For instance, I think the first clause, permitting the number of Chinese immigrants carried by steamships to Canada to be one for each 100 tons of the vessel, should disappear from the Bill, and the Act should be left as it is in that respect, namely, that the proportion should be one immigrant to every 50 tons of the tonnage of the vessel. I think the second clause should be amended so as to meet the great grievance which exists in British Columbia in regard to the forgery of the certificates, or the using of forged certificates by Chinese coming to Canada in order to avoid paying the duty. Section 13 of the Act allows any Chinaman who has already been admitted to Canada and who has paid his entrance duty, to re-enter the country on obtaining a certificate from the comptroller of immigration. Numbers of Chinese immigrants have come into the country on certificates which have been found to have been forged. I may say that the Government have taken measures to prosecute the authors of these forgeries, and to punish them if they can be convicted. Some means should be provided for preventing these frauds, either by dispensing altogether with the certificates, or by providing some other method by which Chinese who in good faith ask permission to visit their native country, may do so on condition that they return within a certain time. The time should be limited, if not to four months as provided in the Bill, at least to six months; and the *onus probandi* of the identity of such returning emigrant should rest with the latter. I make these explanations, because the Government would not wish to be responsible for the Bill in its present form.

Mr. GORDON. I must express my extreme regret that a Bill of such importance to our province should have been brought on at a time when, so to speak, the sand is shivering in the glass at the last hour of the session. That is through no fault of mine. It will be remembered that this Bill was introduced at an early period of the session. It is a measure far below what was requested by our province. The Province of British Columbia has protested against the immigration of the Chinese as a class, not only by resolutions of the legislature and minutes of council, but by petitions from the people from all parts of the province. It is well known that Chinese immigration has driven from our shores many respectable labouring people who have come from the eastern provinces. These people have travelled across the continent, thinking that labour there was as honourable as it is here in old Canada; and upon their arrival there, with nothing to depend upon but their labour, what do they find? They find that they must submit to work side by side with servile labour which is farmed out by one of the Chinese companies, a class of labourers who have no personal identity, but who are hired out by the hundred, and whose payment is collected by one individual. These are facts which have come under my own observation. It is a difficult matter for me, especially as I have been rather unwell during the last month, to attempt to deal with this question at this late hour of the session. But I will read to the House, in justification of the limited course which I have taken on this Bill, a Minute of Council of the Provincial Government, which shows that what I have asked in this Bill is far more moderate than the requests of the Provincial Government:

"The Committee of Council submit for the approval of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, the following resolution passed by the Legislative Assembly during its present session, viz.:—

"Whereas the Chinese Immigration Act of Canada has proven in a great measure beneficial, but in some respects defective, more especially as the 5th section permits vessels to carry one Chinese immigrant to any part of Canada for every fifty tons of its tonnage; but we are of opinion that a much larger restriction should be imposed and fewer Chinese carried on each vessel, or their importation prohibited;

"And whereas the 8th section imposes only an entrance duty of $50 on every person of Chinese origin entering Canada, when $100 is in our opinion the lowest entrance duty that should be charged, if Chinese are allowed to enter Canada at all:

"And whereas the 4th sub-section of the 8th section provides that the entrance duty of $50 should not apply to any Chinese person who resided or was within Canada on 1st January, 1886, and the 13th section authorizes the issuance of a certificate of leave to depart and return to Chinese who wish to leave and return to Canada, but in our opinion the entrance should apply to all Chinese other than those mentioned in sub-section 'A' and 'B' of section B, and the issuance of the above mentioned certificates should be entirely abolished:

"Be it therefore resolved, that a respectful address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, requesting him to move the Dominion Government to cause the 'Chinese Immigration Act of Canada' to be made more restrictive in the manner indicated.

"The committee advise that a copy of this Minute if approved be forwarded to the Honourable the Secretary of State for Canada.

"Certified,

"Victoria, 2nd March, 1891.

(Signed) "JOHN ROBSON,
"*Clerk, Executive Council.*"

In drafting this Bill which I have submitted to the House, I have made but two amendments to the original Act, with the view of not disturbing, more than was necessary the labour market of that province; and I thought it was better and more conservative to approach the amendments to the Act by degrees, feeling assured that this Parliament would, in the interests of the people, amend it further from year to year as might become necessary. I may say that in other parts of Canada the people have interested themselves in the difficulties which confront the people of British Columbia, and from the great centres of population petitions have been laid on the Table of this House this session, some of which I mention, in order that they may be brought more clearly to mind as indicating a feeling of approaching danger to themselves and families. Among the petitions were the following:—

"March 10th.—Of Cabinet and Piano Makers' National Union; of Builders' Labourers' Union, No. 2; of Journeymen Coopers' Union; and of United Association of Journeymen Plumbers, Gas and Steam Fitters, all of Toronto, Ontario; severally praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the importation of Chinese labour into Canada.

"March 11th.—Of Iron Moulders' Union, No. 136, Oshawa, Ontario; praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the importation of Chinese labour into Canada.

"March 14th.—Of Toronto Trades and Labour Council, Ontario; and of Miners' and Mine Labourers' Protective Association, Nanaimo, British Columbia; severally praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the importation of Chinese labour into Canada.

"March 17th.—Of Typographical Union, No. 159; and of District Assembly, No. 20, Knights of Labour, all of Quebec; of Cigar Makers' Union, No. 58; of Cigar Makers' Union, No. 226; of Assemblée Grande Hermine, No. 7806, Knights of Labour; of American Flint Glass Blowers' Union; of Hope Assembly, No. 3745; and of Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, No. 311, all of Montreal; and of Fidelity Assembly, No. 2056, Knights of Labour, St. Catharines, Ontario; severally praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the importation of Chinese into Canada.

"March 18th.—Of Vancouver Branch of Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association of North America; of Vancouver Branch of Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners; of Vancouver Trades and Labour Council; and of Brotherhood of Carpenters' Union, No. 617, Vancouver, all of British Columbia; severally praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the importation of Chinese labour into Canada.

"March 21st.—Of Champlain Assembly, No. 10581, Knights of Labour, Quebec; of Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, Toronto; and of London Trades and Labour Council, all of Ontario; severally praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the importation of Chinese labour into Canada.

"March 23rd.—Of Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Union No. 83, Halifax, Nova Scotia; praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the importation of Chinese labour into Canada.

"Of Local Assembly, No. 6952, Peterborough, Ontario; praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the importation of Chinese labour into Canada.

"March 28th.—Of Local Assembly, No. 6250, Knights of Labour, Toronto, Ontario, praying for the passing of an Act the prohibit the importation of Chinese labour into Canada.

"March 30th.—Of Dominion Trades and Labour Congress; praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the importation of Chinese labour into Canada.

"March 31st.—Of Lévis Assembly, Knights of Labour, Quebec; and of Local Assembly, No. 2305, Toronto, Ontario; severally praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the importation of Chinese labour into Canada.

"April 1st.—Of Local Assembly, No. 6798, Knights of Labour, Thorold, Ontario; praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the importation of Chinese labour into Canada.

"April 4th.—Of New Westminster Trades and Labour Council; and of Brotherhood of Painters and Decorators of America, Union No. 117, Winnipeg, Manitaba; severally praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the importation of Chinese labour into Canada.

"April 7th.—Of Winnipeg Bricklayers' and Masons' Union, No. 1; praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the importation of Chinese labour into Canada.

"May 20th.—Of David A. Carey, Master Workman, and Hugh McCaffry, Recording Secretary of Local Assembly, No. 2622, Knights of Labour, Toronto, Ontario, praying for certain amendments of 'The Chinese Immigration Act.'

"May 30th.—The petition of James Brown and others, of Iron Moulders' Union, No. 29, Brantford, Ontario; praying for certain amendments to 'The Chinese Immigration Act,' was read and received."

Then there have been resolutions of the Legislative Assembly and Minutes of Council of the Government of British Columbia protesting against Chinese immigration: On 9th May, 1876; on 31st July, 1878; on 28th March, 1879; on 21st April, 1880; on 26th February, 1882; on 19th August, 1882, Minute of Council; 28th February, 1883. Now, Mr. Speaker, the difficulties which confront the labourers of the Pacific province have not as yet, to any very great extent, affected, seriously at any rate, the various classes of labour in the eastern provinces. In the Province of British Columbia if you exclude the Indian population, the Chinese are about one-eighth of the entire population, and hon. gentlemen will readily imagine the effect of placing in these older provinces, in the city of Toronto or Quebec or Montreal, for instance, a Chinese population equal to one-eighth of their present population. In order to do so, you would have to displace three whites for every Chinese immigrant who would settle there as a labourer. There is not a white labourer in any of the older provinces who has not depending on him either wife or child, or who does not work to maintain a widowed mother or a sister, and it is fair to assume that nearly every male labourer in these older provinces represents a population of three in the Dominion census. Now, if you were to follow this to its legitimate conclusion, and allow this class of immigration to enter Canada freely, what will be the condition of Canada in a very few years? Take the Province of Quebec, and you would find in the city of Quebec 7,886 Chinese, who would displace 23,658 of the white population. You would find that in the city of Montreal, whose population is 216,650, giving it the proportion of Chinese which British Columbia now has, that you would have 27,081 Chinese who would displace 81,443 of the present industrious, law-abiding population of that city, and the same may be said of every city and town throughout this Dominion from Halifax to the Pacific Ocean. If such a policy as that were to be considered as a favourable course for this Dominion to pursue, I would have to express my absolute dissent from it, as one who feels as deep an interest in Canada as any man who has a seat in this House. The Chinese population, as will be seen by the remarks of the Minister of Customs, contrive to make their way into this Dominion by means of forged certificates, which they forge and upon which they attempt to enter this country in violation of the law. I would ask the Minister of Customs if he could tell me how many of these forged certificates he has now in his department. I think I may safely say he has more than 100, and I think I may also safely say that there has not been one prosecution under the 17th section of the Chinese Immigration Act for violation of the clause relating to the forgery of certificates. I do not wish to detain the House by going over all the difficulties which a continuation of this unsuitable immigration, this slave immigration, this class of criminal immigration which is farmed out to the Chinese companies who bring them into this country, are calculated to produce. California has had hard experience of that undesirable class of immigrants. The United States has had legislation on the subject and has recently renewed that legislation. It has been contended in a portion of the press of this Dominion since I introduced this Bill that the effect of it, if carried out, might hurt our trade with China, but I am glad to know that the hon. the Minister of Customs did not lay any stress upon that phase of the question. I will call your attention to that, because that seems to be the principal objection urged against excluding that class of people from Canada or of limiting the number that may come. During the 19 years from 1873 to 1891, our imports from China and Japan amounted to $29,226,592 for home consumption, and during the same period our exports to those countries amounted to only $1,191,822. It is

believed, and I think truthfully, that during that period no less than an average of 7,000 of the natives of China were resident in the Province of British Columbia. They sent at least $100 each per annum of their earnings to that country, leaving nothing whatever in British Columbia except the results of their labour. Everything which they could obtain in the way of food and clothing from China they did obtain. Of course the Dominion treasury received duties on the articles, but you will see that they sent not less than $13,300,000 in gold and silver to their own country. Then turn to the trade of China and Japan and compare it with the trade of South America. During the same period the exports from Canada to South America amounted to $20,762,990, and our imports for home consumption to $14,284,429. The same comparison will prevail with regard to every other country. Turn, if you like, to any of the South American states, or to the British colonies, where we have people of the same race as ourselves, and you will see that we have a greater advantage in dealing with them. Take the Newfoundlanders, if you like. They take an interest in our country in which they feel a pride, but such a population as this which I refer to has no interest whatever in this country, beyond the gold and silver they can extract from it. They bring small-pox and leprosy to our shores, and I would draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that the citizens of Victoria and Vancouver are paying for the maintenance of a lazaretto for the care of lepers. It is not their fault that they have to maintain that class of people.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Those lepers came from the States.

Mr. GORDON. It does not matter where they came from. They were Chinese, it is one of their national misfortunes to have leprosy. Our people are in daily dread of small-pox. Three vessels have arrived since March last with the small-pox, and our people are in consternation at the prospect of it spreading and of more coming. At this late stage of the session, I shall make my observations as short as possible, but I desire to call the attention of the House to last year's trade. The imports and exports from China were as follows:—

IMPORTS FROM CHINA, 1891.

—	Dutiable.	Free.	Total.
	$	$	$
Ontario	2,379	145,261	147,640
Quebec	2,291	118,159	120,450
Nova Scotia	.....	2,567	2,567
New Brunswick	16	32,664	32,680
Manitoba	50	11,658	11,708
British Columbia	456,567	97,370	553,937
	461,303	407,679	868,982

EXPORTS.

Ontario	390	.....	.....
Quebec	9,397	.....	.....
British Columbia	43,136	.....	52,923

From Japan we imported $1,254,329 worth, and we exported $17,776 worth. The Japanese population have not yet paid much attention to the Pacific coast, but as a labouring class they are not desirable. One coal company did bring out, under contract, a certain number to work in the Union Mines, but they proved either inefficient or too independent, I don't know which, and the latest word I have is that they have not been successful competitors in that field of labour. Now, I think if the Government will carefully consider the effect of such a population upon Canada they, at least, would consent to the Bill I propose, because the first clause merely limits the number that may be brought out in vessels of a certain tonnage. It doubles the tonnage, and consequently limits to one-half the present number. The number that vessels are allowed to bring, at the present time, is one Chinese passenger for every fifty tons of its tonnage. Section 2 does away with the issue of return certificates altogether, and consequently avoiding the possibility of fraud and forgery. Then, again, the Province of British Columbia receives only one-fourth the amount of this head tax, although her population has to suffer all the misery and all the evil which this class of immigrants inflicts upon the municipalities who have to maintain order and take care of the lepers, which no christian community would allow to suffer. I hope that the Minister may see his way to transfer to that province the head money collected from these immigrants, on account of the increased cost of the administration of justice, due to their presence in the province, and permitted to continue to arrive there in disregard of its Government and people. I am not aware of the feeling of the House upon this important question. I am satisfied that if every member had the same proportion of Chinese in his county that there is is my county, there would be only one voice from the head of the Government down through the ranks on both sides of the House, calling for protection. There is not a member of the Government, nor a member of this House who, if he had one-eighth of Chinese population in his county as I have in mine, but who would not only accept this Bill, but he would even go to the length of the United States and declare for absolute prohibition. Now, some portion of the press has been kind enough to point out that this Bill of mine is a Red Indian Bill, that I am pursuing the same course that has been pursued in the United States, and that I want to drive the Chinese into the sea. Sir, the United States have decided this question on its merits, and they have decided that the Chinese population is not a congenial population to inhabit their country along with the whites, that they are like so many ugly ulcers upon every community where they have congregated. They have decided that the trade question, so far as China was concerned, is of little consequence as compared with the evils of Chinese immigration as a condition of that trade. During the period from 1866 to 1890 inclusive, the exports from China to the United States were $452,278,487, and the exports from the United States to China were $144,950,174, showing a balance against the United States during that period of $307,328,318. During that same period there was exported from the United States to China—of gold and silver coin and bullion, $213,742,336, and there was imported from China into the United States $2,209,130. It is believed by careful business men in California, that during

that 25 years there were on an average 75,000 Chinese residents in that state who sent annually to China from their earnings, at least $100 per head annually, which would aggregate $187,500,000. This accounts for the immense drainage of the gold and silver that has been mined not only from the mines of California but from those of British Columbia. But the great harm, the great injury, and the great curse which we have suffered from Chinese immigration, lies in the fact that the white man, every brother of ours who goes from this country to the Pacific coast, has to confront Chinese labour, and he scorns to compete with it, and immediately goes somewhere else where they are prohibited from entering, and in that way we are losing some of the best young men that go out from this country. I hope that the Government will accept this Bill and allow it to become law.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee).

Mr. BOWELL moved that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I desire to say a word or two in opposition to the anti-Chinese Bill now before this committee. I have no sympathy with any legislation which discriminates against any class, creed or nationality, and I hold that all classes and all nationalities should be placed exactly on the same basis. We have treated the Chinese rather unkindly, rather harshly. The present law imposes a tax of $50 per capita on every Chinaman coming into the Dominion. It appears to me that this is a heavy penalty for the crime of being born a Chinaman. That tax of $50 is not sufficiently restrictive apparently to shut them out, and now it is proposed to increase the tax to $100. Possibly that may exclude them altogether from the Dominion. If the Chinese Government should retaliate, and they might do so, and if the same treatment should be extended to white men going to China, a storm of indignation would arise at their barbarous action. It is quite true I have been told that the cases are not parallel, that the Chinese are immoral, are addicted to the use of opium, are filthy in their habits and that their presence in the Dominion tends to corrupt and demoralize our people. But I believe these statements are very greatly exaggerated; and if some of them are addicted to the habit of opium eating, and that is a bad habit, we ought to remember who are responsible, who forced the opium on them at the point of the bayonet. But I believe their immorality and opium eating are not the chief causes of this hostility to the Chinese. The real reason is that they live more cheaply, that they work at cheaper rates than white men and their labour enters into competition with white labour. If we examine the report of the Committee on Chinese Immigration in 1884-85 we will find the Chinese labourer has been a great benefit to Canada and that his exclusion will prove a great injury. If we were to treat these people kindly, if we were to throw open our schools and allow their children to be educated, they would become just as good citizens as people of other nationalities. We know that even now under the treatment which has been extended to them, many have become christianized, even in Victoria. I was reading a few days ago in the *Missionary Review of the World* that 105 of these Chinese had united with the Methodist church in Victoria alone, and in other places in British Columbia many others had united with churches and become christians. In San Francisco the mission schools have educated 5,000 Chinese children, and all of them have renounced idolatry. Under these circumstances I think it would be in the interests of humanity, in the interests of christianity, and not only so but in the interest of trade and commerce, that we should endeavour to have friendly relations with the great Empire of China. In order to prove the accuracy of the statements I have made, I should like to read an extract or two from the report on Chinese immigration, an able report and I think a fair one. The first clause of the résumé says:

"That Chinese labour is a most efficient aid in the development of the country, and a great means to wealth. As a railway navvy the Chinaman has no superior, and his presence in California has given the state a start many years ahead and added incalculably to its material prosperity; while in British Columbia Chinese labour has been attended by great advantages to the province and the same excellent effects would, most likely, for many years from now follow its utilization."

With regard to their immorality, the same report states:

"That the statement as to their bad moral effects on the community are grossly exaggerated. In fact their morality is not lower than that of the same classes of other nationalities."

We are told in the same report that the Chinese excel as market-gardeners, as domestic servants and as laundrymen. I will not occupy the time of the House by reading other extracts; but these statements are very clear and authentic, and I believe they are fair and impartial, and they are worthy of being considered by this House before we adopt the restrictive legislation proposed. I will not further trespass on the time of the House, but I will simply express the hope that the House will deal kindly and humanely with the Chinese and will not adopt this restrictive policy. Personally I am an out-and-out free trader, and I am in favour of free trade in labour as well as in anything else.

Committee rose and reported progress.

THE SCHOOL SAVINGS BANKS.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). Yesterday, when the Order for Private Bills was called I was asked by the Government to defer the consideration of Bill (No. 36) to amend the Act to incorporate the School Savings Bank. With the consent of the House, I now move that the House resolve itself into committee on the said Bill, and, in view of the lateness of the session I hope the motion will be adopted.

Motion agreed to, Bill considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Bill (No. 74) to amend the Act respecting the Civil Service was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to stop at the words "public service" in the seventeenth line. We do not need to describe what salaries shall be paid, because another part of the Act provides that they may be paid at the rate of $400 a year, and persons having special qualifications may be paid at a higher rate.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has not given any reason why this exception which is made in the law should apply to this particular class of public servants.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The policy is briefly this: The Civil Service Act contains an entire reorganization of the method, not only of employing and paying permanent civil servants, but temporary employés as well. It was the policy of the Act and indeed was declared upon its face, that those who were in the Civil Service at the time it came into force should not be prejudicially affected by it as regards their emoluments. So far well. The Act also contains provision that persons who were in the temporary employment of any department when the Civil Service Act came into force and remained therein continuously afterwards might be continued in temporary employment, but that provision about temporary employés was dropped, in amending the section in which it appeared. I do not know whether it was by inadvertence or otherwise, but I am sure that the hardship which it worked was unforeseen. I think it is fair and proper that the protection which was extended by the provisions of the original Civil Service Act not only to the regular staff but to the temporary employés should be continued, and there are some of them who are still in the departments. It is proposed, therefore, that those who were at that time in temporary employment may be continued in temporary employment still, notwithstanding the provisions of the Civil Service Act. The provisions of the Civil Service Act as regards temporary employés are that they cannot be employed at all unless they are persons who have passed the qualifying examination under the Civil Service Act. Therefore if we do not retain the provision, that those who were in temporary employment when the Civil Service Act came into force could still be continued in temporary employment, the Act does prejudicially affect them, and that was not the policy of the Act. It extends not to many cases, but to some deserving clerks who were on the 1st of July, 1882, in temporary employment.

Mr. LAURIER. Let them pass the examination and qualify themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER. They cannot pass the examination because they are over the age prescribed in the Civil Service Act. If they did pass the examination they would not be eligible for employment.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the Act should be made to read "on or before the 1st of July, 1882." There are not many clerks, but there are a few whose services may have been temporarily dispensed with before the 1st of July, and who may not have been recalled until after the 1st of July. They may have become too old to pass the examination, and I would suggest that they should be included in the benefits of this provision. I do not think any abuse would arise from taking that course. I think that there ought also to be power to give to temporary employés who might be appointed permanently, a salary not greater than the maximum which they obtained while temporarily employed; otherwise they would have to go into the minimum of the class in which they were employed, though, perhaps, having been in the service 10 years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My hon. friend will see that these are persons who had no rights practically at the time the Civil Service Act was passed. I do not want to enlarge the provisions which were made in the Civil Service Act itself to guard the rights and privileges, if I may so term them, of those who had no acknowledged status when the Act came into force. There may have been many persons employed before that who possessed no rights of that kind, and these persons, I think, ought to pass the qualifying examination. I do not know the fact, but it may be that the number of temporary employés was reduced in view of this provision of the Civil Service Act, in order that there might be a smaller number having claims upon us. Besides the amendment I propose, I think they all ought to be able to pass the promotion examination, which is nothing more than an examination in the duties of the office; but I think that to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for South Norfolk would be to enlarge the class who have claims and to infringe on the policy of the Act.

Mr. LAURIER. Though I do not like to press the objection very strongly, because after all it is an invidious matter, and no one cares to stand in the way of the promotion of this class of public employés, still there are considerations of a broader nature which should not be forgotten. The examination required for the civil service has been adopted for good reasons, to provide for a class specially qualified for the work intended to be performed by them. Now, it must strike everybody that time and again we have adopted amendments in this House which practically not only diminish but altogether destroy the advantages which are contemplated to be derived from the civil service examinations. It is proposed now that when men have been in the service ten years and have failed year after year to take advantage of the opportunity of qualifying themselves, they shall be relieved altogether from the necessity of passing an examination and incur no penalty or loss for their neglect to comply with the law. It is said that they may be beyond the age, but whose fault is that?

Mr. SPEAKER. They may have been beyond the age in 1882.

Mr. LAURIER. That may have been a reason for not appointing them; but they knew the law in 1882, and if the Government appointed them though they were beyond the age at that time, it seems to me that the Government was still more derelict in their duty, because they practically connived with the employés in evading the law. The whole thing seems to be ill-conceived and likely to injure the service. The examination is not a severe one, and since it is deemed to be for the public advantage, I think we should adhere to it more stringently than we have done in the past.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member forgets that the Civil Service Act of 1882 made a special provision with regard to those then in the employ of the Government. It was not until the revision of the statutes took place in 1886 that the saving clause which existed in the Act of 1882 was eliminated, as the hon. Minister of Justice says, either by design or inadvertence; and it seems to me that it would be a hardship to those men who were in the service on the conditions existing prior to 1882, and who have been in the service ever since, if they should be deprived of their employment because they have exceeded the age at which they could now enter the service; and although the examination may not be a very severe one, yet I think the leader of the Opposition will agree with me that there are a great many who would find it difficult to pass it. A great many of the clerks in the department who are very efficient and perfectly competent to discharge their duties would find it very difficult to pass the examination.

Mr. LAURIER. I must confess that if I had to pass the examination without any preparation, I would probably be among those who would fail; but I think that after a few weeks or months preparation I could stand it. I have a vague recollection, and perhaps you, Mr. Speaker, have also, that we had the very same question before us five or six years ago, and it was then decided that some indulgence would be given the public employés on condition that they would sin no more.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to know whether all these parties are able to read and write or not, because I have heard of some in the public service who cannot?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They have been reading and writing for upwards of ten years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is perhaps a violent presumption.

Mr. McMULLEN. I presume the change in the Act will bring these people under the operation of the Superannuation Act?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; the only change made is as to temporary clerks, and they are not within the Superannuation Act at all.

Sections 3 and 4 dropped.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the leader of the House inform us now what measures he proposes absolutely to discharge?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My colleague tells me that No. 38 and No. 6 will be dropped. These are the only ones we expect to drop.

Mr. LAURIER. If you do not drop No. 7, we might discuss it this evening.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman does not propose to bring the Criminal Law into operation until July, 1893, he need not press this measure this session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I had it in my mind that it might stand over until next session, but I would ask my hon. friend not to press me to discharge it to-night.

Mr. LAURIER. What about the judges' salaries?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow whether we will take that up or not.

CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman promised us some time ago to give us some information with regard to the negotiations at Washington.

Mr. FOSTER. I promised the hon. gentleman the other day to make a short statement with reference to the discussion that was had with the Secretary of State of the United States on the canal tolls question. The conference that was had in February of this year had for its object the discussion of a set of questions which had been previously outlined. In the course of the discussion of these questions, that of the canal tolls arose, and what was asserted to be the discrimination exercised against United States vessels and citizens on our canals by the Dominion Government came in incidentially and was discussed very briefly in an informal way. The result of that discussion produced an impression of a different nature upon the delegates on each side respectively.

Mr. LAURIER. On that question only.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; Mr. Blaine, the Secretary of State, and his coadjutor, General Foster, having taken the impression that the Canadian delegates acknowledged there was discrimination and promised to have the grievance redressed at once on their return to Ottawa. The impression which the Canadian delegates had was quite the opposite, namely, that they promised to take the matter into consideration when they returned to Ottawa, in conjunction with their colleagues, and to consider it as fairly as they possibly could. That was done on the return of the delegates. After discussing the matter in council thoroughly, the Government came to the conclusion that the tolls should be imposed as it was last year, and an Order in Council was passed to that effect. Naturally, Mr. Blaine, having the impression, as I have stated, that the Canadian Government had not treated him and the United States fairly, complained, and some correspondence ensued, the result of which was that representatives of the Canadian Government went to Washington and had a personal conference with the Secretary of State. The Minister of Militia and myself were sent for that purpose. We had a conference with Mr. Blaine and General Foster, and on two occasions we discussed the matter thoroughly. We did not arrive at an agreement as to our rights under the treaty, and as to whether we were discriminating in our policy against citizens of the United States. I am not now going over the ground of the discussion, because I propose to lay on the Table a Minute showing the grounds which this Government took. Suffice it to say that, after a full interchange of views, the delegates returned to Ottawa, and a proposition which is embodied in the Minute which I will lay on the Table was sent to the British Ambassador at Washington. In the meantime, as is known, President Harrison sent his Message to Congress, and since that he has added the statement which we sent to the British Ambassador for the Secretary of State. There is no necessity for me to go further, because the inten

of the Government is pretty fully set forth in this Minute.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What about the correspondence which preceded it?

Mr. FOSTER. That was largely of a routine nature. I have not that correspondence with me, and I am not in a position to lay it on the Table to-night.

Mr. LAURIER. Will you to-morrow?

Mr. FOSTER. The correspondence we had was through the British Government, and permission will have to be asked from them.

Mr. EDGAR. Do I understand that is the same memorandum which has been communicated already by the President of the United States to Congress?

Mr. FOSTER. This memorandum has been in whole or in part forwarded to the Senate in the second Message.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is a provision in the Washington Treaty as to the use of the canals in the State of New York, and the endeavours which the Washington Government were to make in order to obtain the free use of those canals for the citizens of Canada. I would like to know what effort has been made to obtain the fulfilment of that arrangement?

Mr. FOSTER. That was brought under the attention of the United States Cabinet and was fully discussed with the Secretary of State at both interviews.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it referred to in the memorandum?

Mr. FOSTER. Not in this memorandum.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is there any memorandum on the subject?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so. A good deal in reference to that matter is in documents already before the House brought down in 1874 and 1876.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am aware of that, but when this question was raised by the American Government we would like to see how hon. gentlemen opposite discharged their duties in regard to it.

Mr. FOSTER. We endeavoured to discharge our duties effectively.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose we shall see what the action of the Government was?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a difficulty in laying these papers on the Table to-night, but to-morrow I will move for an Order of the House to bring them down.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 9.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 6th July, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

I. C. R.—SHIPMENT OF HAY.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, 1. Whether the Intercolonial Railway authorities have any right to charge demurrage on cars detained on their railway when said cars belong to other companies, and when these companies agree to forego such charges? 2. Is the Government aware of such charges being claimed by the Intercolonial Railway authorities from Mr. Charles Arpin, of St. John's, P.Q., on some cars of hay shipped to the Maritime Provinces on the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway cars, in March last? 3. Were not the Intercolonial Railway authorities made aware of the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway Companies agreed to forego any charges for demurrage which they might have claimed from Mr. Arpin? 4. Was it not agreed between the authorities of the Intercolonial and said Mr. Arpin, on the 12th of April last, that in case of such agreement being made with the said railway companies, no demurrage would be charged to Mr. Arpin? 5. What are the reasons of the Intercolonial Railway authorities, under such circumstances, for refusing Mr. Arpin the possession of his hay, and thereby causing him considerable damages?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. Yes, that is the practice under the system of exchange of cars between the railways; they are practically the cars of the road on which they are for the time being. 2. Yes, the Government is aware of it. 3. Yes; Mr. Arpin informed the General Manager of the Intercolonial Railway that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway were willing to forego any charges they might have. 4. No; what was said to Mr. Arpin was this: That if the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway had any charges for demurrage and agreed to forego them, the General Manager of the Intercolonial Railway had no objection. 5. Because neither the Canadian Pacific Railway nor the Grand Trunk Railway had any charges for demurrage; the demurrage was due the Intercolonial Railway, therefore Mr. Arpin could not be given possession of the hay until the charges were paid.

CANAL TOLLS—U. S. AND CANADA.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That an Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General for a copy of a report of a committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the 17th June, 1892, on the subject of a despatch dated 4th November, 1891, from Lord Knutsford, inviting an expression of the views of the Canadian Government upon the complaint of alleged discrimination on the part of the Government of Canada against citizens of the United States in the matter of canal tolls.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES

Mr. HAGGART moved that the House, at this sitting, resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:

To the Drummond County Railway Company, for 4 6-10 miles of their railway from Bull's Wharf, on the St. Lawrence River, near Nicolet, to Ste. Rosalie Junction, an excess of distance by the constructed line over the subsidies heretofore voted for a railway between the said points, $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $14,720.

To the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company, for 5 42-100 miles of their railway, from Huntingdon towards the international boundary, which, with the distance between Valleyfield and Huntingdon, 12 58-100 miles, makes up the distance of 18 miles named in the 53 Victoria, chapter 2, granting a subsidy to this company, and for 2 40-100 miles from the last end of the 18 miles referred to, to the international boundary, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $25,024.

2. *Resolved*, That the subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to the companies named for that purpose shall be granted to such companies respectively; all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council; and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications and upon upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, and which the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location, also, of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council: and all the said subsidies respectively shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister, or upon the completion of the work subsidized.

3. *Resolved*, That the granting of such subsidies respectively shall be subject to such conditions for securing such running powers or traffic arrangements and other rights as will afford all reasonable facilities and equal mileage rates to all railways connecting with those so subsidized, as the Governor in Council determines.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no objection to taking them up at this sitting, if there is no other business to occupy the House. My consent will depend upon the business we have before us.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think we had better allow the motion to pass, and unless hon. gentlemen opposite are willing, we will not go on with it to-day.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER AT STE. ANGÈLE.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before passing to the Orders of the Day, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that at the beginning of the present session I asked for certain papers concerning the dismissal of the postmaster of the parish of Ste. Angèle, in my county, and that the papers have not yet been brought down. On the 7th March last the House ordered their production as follows:—

"Copies of all petitions, correspondence, vouchers, depositions, reports and documents whatsoever, respecting the dismissal of B. Loiselle, Esq., postmaster of the parish of Ste. Angèle, County of Rouville.

I do not know whether there is any mystery in the file.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would advise the hon. gentleman not to make a speech, as he only rose to ask a question.

Mr. BRODEUR. I want to get some explanation of the non-production of these documents.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think you had better not make a speech, as this is not a question of privilege.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would like to know, at all events, the reasons why the Government does not produce these documents.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I understand that the House has ordered the production of these papers, and I do not see why they should not be brought down.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Are the papers the hon. gentleman mentions, in connection with the difficulty at the parish in Rouville of which he has spoken to me?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Last year I sent for these papers myself, immediately after the session, and the Postmaster General sent them to my office. As I was about absenting myself, I charged one of my officers to have an interview with the hon. member for Rouville on this matter. The officer in question was Mr. Taché, my private secretary, who has now left the service. These papers were put into his hands, and I now understand that they have been mislaid, if they are not in his possession. The last time I wrote to Mr. Taché, he stated that he had probably put these papers with his own, and at that date he had not been able to find them, but thought they were mixed up with some papers he had taken with him when he left the department. I have written to Mr. Taché about it within the last few days. I am sorry my hon. friend has not yet seen the papers, as I wanted him to see them, although I considered them confidential. Still, as a member of Parliament he has a right to see them, and I desired that he should see them. I will make another enquiry, and I promise the hon. gentleman that the papers will be forthcoming as soon as possible.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is some misunderstanding about these papers somewhere, because the gentleman in whose hands the Minister says the papers were put to be shown to me, has declared to me many times that I could not see them for the reason that they were confidential. That was last year, and this is the reason why I ask this year that these documents should be brought before the House. Now I am told they are lost. The document I should like to see is especially the inspector's report, and it would be very easy for the Government to have a copy of the inspector's report brought down.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am sure my colleague the Postmaster General would be willing to obtain a duplicate of the inspector's report. I thought what the hon. gentleman wanted to see was the envelope and the letter, the stamp of which was tampered with, which were among those documents. The inspector's report was confidential, but I had asked my secretary to have it submitted to the hon. member.

Mr. BRODEUR. I desire not so much to see the documents, as to see the inspector's report.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman called at the department on more than one occasion in regard to the papers to which he has referred. I am not at all disposed to admit that I should bring down the report of the inspector. The hon. gentleman knows it has been the practice, and it is the practice followed in every Post Office Department, that reports, especially inspectors' reports, are always of a confidential nature. If the hon. gentleman, as my colleague the Minister of Cus-

toms, has just stated, desires for his own information to read the report, if we have it in the department I shall be glad to communicate it to the hon. gentleman. We have endeavoured in every way to find out what has become of the papers to which the hon. gentleman has referred. The hon. gentleman told me they had never been in his possession, and I willingly admit the accuracy of what the hon. gentleman said. But, for one reason or another, it has been quite impossible for the department to find those documents. If the inspector has the original, or a copy of the report sent in by him to the department, and if the hon. gentleman desires, for his own information, to see it, I shall be very glad to allow him to do so: but I will not admit the principle that reports of inspectors can be called for and laid on the Table of the House. It will seriously interfere with the efficiency of the service and with communications made to the head of the department embodying information which it is indispensable he should possess, if these reports should be liable, at any time, to be called for and laid on the Table of the House.

INSPECTION OF MILK CANS.

Mr. FEATHERSTON asked, Whether the Government has issued instructions to the inspectors of Inland Revenue in the Province of Ontario, or at Toronto and immediate vicinity, to compel all milk dealers to present their milk cans for inspection? If not, does the Government intend issuing instructions to their inspectors of Inland Revenue to compel all milk dealers in the Province of Ontario, or at Toronto and its suburbs, to present their milk cans for inspection, in accordance with the Weights and Measures Regulations and Inland Revenue Act?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In reply to the first portion of the question, I answer that instructions have been sent to the inspectors. In regard to the second portion of the question, I answer that, it having been decided that this matter came under the provisions of the Weights and Measures Act, these cans will be inspected. No further instructions have been issued to the inspectors beyond those I have already read to the House, because further instructions were not necessary, but if it should be found that the milk dealers do not comply with the law, then steps will be taken to enforce the law.

ST. JOHN, N. B., HARBOUR.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 99) relating to the harbour of St. John.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. Since this question was before this House the other day, I have been informed of the reasons which have hitherto prevented the carrying out of this Act, which has been so long on the Statute-book. The Act we are now proposing to amend has been on the Statute-book since 1882. We contemplated to transfer the marine property now held by the corporation of the city of St. John to a board of commissioners, the appointment of which is provided for by the Act. I am informed that when the question was submitted to the people, they did not take a favourable view of the Act and refused to transfer that property to the harbour commissioners, for reasons of their own. I desire to ask the Government if they will agree that the power intended to be conveyed to the harbour commissioners to secure the transfer of this marine property in St. John be not carried out, except with the approval of the municipal electors of the city. Is the Government prepared to receive such an amendment?

Mr. McLEOD. Advantage cannot be taken of this Act, and the harbour property cannot be transferred to a proposed commission, except by vote of two-thirds of the city council. So the matter is guarded in that way, and this protection is more effectual than any provision to leave the question to the people, because on a matter of this kind it is very difficult to get a popular vote. When this question was submitted to the people two objections were raised, which we are now endeavouring to avoid. One objection was that the Government have the appointment of three members of the commission, and they are not obliged to be citizens of St. John. They affirmed that as the management of the St. John railways was controlled at Ottawa, the management of St. John harbour might be located there. The second objection was, and it was pressed especially by private wharf owners, that as the Government would control the commission, they should acquire all the private wharves, as it was unfair that private wharf owners should be called upon to compete with wharves owned by the Government. The passing of this Act does not place the harbour in commission, because this cannot be done except by a vote of two-thirds of the city council. So I hold that both the city rights and private rights are protected in every way by this Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit that the very facts stated by the hon. gentleman go to support the amendment which I have suggested. The subject-matter was referred to the people some years ago, and the people voted against it and rejected it.

Mr. FOSTER. Three years ago.

Mr. LAURIER. Three years ago the people rejected this very proposal to transfer the property to the harbour commissioners, and now a demand is made, which was rejected by the people, that the Parliament of Canada should absolutely refer it to the city council. The hon. gentleman will remember that there has been no demand from the corporation of the city of St. John for this resolution, for reasons which are not apparent. It is the three members who represent the city of St. John in this House who have made the demand, but the council of the city of St. John have not themselves joined in it. It is true that the transfer of property must take place by the city council itself, and it is true, perhaps—I take the hon. gentleman's statement for that—that it would require a two-thirds vote of the council. But, Sir, if three years ago only the people of the city of St. John were consulted upon the matter, if the city council did not choose to vote on the matter themselves, but preferred to consult the people, and if the proposal was rejected by the people, it seems to me that that is all the stronger reason why the property should not be transferred by the council, but that it should be subject to the vote of the people and that they should be consulted once again as they were consulted before. If the people have now changed their minds upon the question

they can so express their opinion at the poll. The very statement made by the hon. gentleman confirms me in the opinion I have expressed, that this proposal should meet with the sanction of the people at the polls.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think my hon. friend is reasonable in making this demand, and I will tell him why. Before anything can be done in the way of putting the harbour of St. John under a commission, even after the Act of 1882 was passed, by which we took power to advance a certain sum of money; before the city of St. John could dispose of its property, and before the harbour could be put in commission, an agreement was made and legislation had as to the conditions under which this should be done, and the Local Act provides that the city may accept the scheme for a harbour commission on a two-thirds vote of the representative body of the city. That was the arrangement made by the people of St. John in their Local Legislature, looking towards the putting of the harbour in commission. When the question came up before the city council to vote upon, the city council was not obliged to ask for a vote of the people upon it, but they said among themselves: This is a matter in which the people of the city are interested, we are their representatives, we have the power given to us by a two-thirds vote to accept this scheme, but we will first ask the people their views upon the matter. It was of their own free will that they referred the matter to the people and took their views upon it. Now, I do not think that we should impose upon the city of St. John, or upon the common council of St. John, a limitation of the powers which were given them by the Provincial Act. They are just as sensible now as they were then. If they think that instead of carrying it by a two-thirds vote in the city council they should ask the people to give their opinion upon it, it is within their right now to do so, and I do not think that we should be called upon to make that condition obligatory. We very often find, even in representative institutions, that the representatives of the people choose to consult public opinion either in one form or another, and I think that we should leave that choice to the representative body of the city of St. John. Every one knows that a two-thirds majority is a very large majority, and that is the condition upon which the city council of St. John, if they wish, can take action in this matter. It is quite unreasonable, I think, that the proposition of the hon. gentleman should be insisted upon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does it mean two-thirds absolute majority, or two-thirds of those present?

Mr. FOSTER. At least two-thirds of the members of the common council. It is an absolute majority.

Mr. McLEOD. That question was decided before the courts. The question was raised as to whether it meant an absolute majority or a majority of those present, and the court held it was an absolute majority. So far as this amendment is concerned, I think it is an amendment that this Parliament has no power to make. We cannot say that the city of St. John shall not sell its harbour to the commissioners without a popular vote. The right to sell is vested in the city council by the Local Legislature, so that, although you could amend this Act to stop its going into operation until certain conditions were observed, yet I believe that this Parliament has no right to say that the city of St. John shall not sell without a popular vote, when they have the power to sell under an Act of the Local Government.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not dispute that, but that is not the point.

Mr. McLEOD. The city council of St. John can to-day by a majority vote, if in their wisdom they see fit, refer the matter to the people again. That is a matter for their consideration. It is a matter entirely for the city council of St. John to decide what course they shall take, and I do not believe any particular course should be made obligatory under this Act. The members of the city council are elected for a year, and I submit that they are better judges than this Parliament as to the best mode of procedure.

Mr. LAURIER. I quite agree that the city council of St. John can part with their property in any manner they please, and anything we might do here would not detract from their power in that respect. However, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLeod) will not dispute that if we authorize the Governor in Council to grant a million dollars to the harbour commissioners, on the condition that they should receive from the city of St. John certain property, we have a perfect right to say that this money will be granted provided the people of the city of St. John approve of that transaction. It is a condition which we have a right to put upon the favour which we are now giving to the city of St. John. I know very well that the city council of St. John can take action in this matter without referring to the people at all. Still, if they did not choose on a former occasion to apply the power which had been given them by the Local Legislature in passing this by-law by a two-thirds vote, manifestly it was because the movement was not popular among the people of the city and because there was strong objection on the part of the citizens. The city council would not have hesitated one moment to take advantage of the power given them by the Local Legislature if they had felt public opinion was with them. If they did not take advantage of this power, it was simply because they knew that popular feeling was against the scheme, and as the event proved it, because when it was referred to the people it was defeated. Under such circumstances what right have we to impose on the people of the city of St. John a provision which they rejected only three years ago?

Mr. FOSTER. We do not impose it on them.

Mr. LAURIER. The city council of St. John have not moved in this matter, the people of the city are taken by surprise in this matter, and since it became known that this resolution was introduced, I have received a communication on the subject. If the city council had come here and petitioned for this favour, I could understand it, and we could hear them and hear their reasons; but not a word has been heard from them upon this subject, and therefore the very precautions which were taken at one time, should be made obligatory to be taken again. The people have rejected this matter once before, and I insist all the more that they should be consulted before this legislation is passed.

[At one o'clock the committee adjourned, and at three o'clock resumed.]

On section 2,

Mr. LAURIER. I move that the following be added to this section :—

Provided, however, that the powers herein granted to the Governor in Council shall be exercised only on the condition that any contract entered into between the said corporation of the harbour of St. John and the said corporation of the city of St. John, for the acquisition of the said harbour property, shall have been previously approved by the municipal electors of the said city."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the proposition is a reasonable one. The city of St. John has already had this subject before it, and it was referred to the electors of that city by the municipal council, and the electors have rejected the proposition. The Government have nothing before them to show that the view taken by the city of St. John has changed, and there is no certainty, if the council of the city of St. John were to agree to this proposition, that it has the approval of the electors. Now, in the end they ought to be regarded as the best judges of what is for their own interest. I do not think that any obligation ought to be imposed upon them without their consent. The fact that the Provincial Legislature has conferred a power of this sort does not in the smallest degree change any moral obligation that rests on this Parliament or on the representatives of the city with respect to the matter. There is this fact established, in the information which has been presented to us : that there has been some communication between the representatives of the city of St. John in this House and certain members of the council ; but it has never been put before the council in their official capacity, and there has been no expression of their opinion upon it. I do not see how the council, at any rate, would have any right to enter into negotiation with the Government—certainly no more right after they have referred the question to the electors of the city, and the electors have pronounced against it. I think it is rather an unusual proceeding to undertake to make an appropriation of this kind, after there has been a formal expression of the citizens on the subject ; and I do not think it is at all unreasonable, and certainly it is not an improper proposal, that this reference should be made. What harm can be done ? I do not suppose the Minister of Finance would want to go on and act, whatever might be his own personal opinion on the subject, if he thought the majority of the electors were opposed to the proceeding. Supposing the electors were to pronounce against it by petition or by public meeting ; are the Government prepared to go on and enter into the arrangement and bind the city, at the instance of the corporation, simply because the corporation hold the power by law ? I do not think that should be done. Certainly no harm can arise from submitting the question to the electors, because if the electors approve there will be that additional sanction, and if they fail to approve the Government ought not to want to proceed with the matter.

Mr. HAZEN. I can assure the hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this Bill that there is not the slightest danger that the rights or interests of the citizens will be in any way violated or infringed upon.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, support the proposition.

Mr. HAZEN. I do not support it, because I think it is a very wrong principle to introduce into a measure of this kind. Before this Bill can be effective, and before the harbour of the city of St. John can be put in commission, the proposal has to be sanctioned by 18 out of the 26 members of the municipal body of the city of St. John. As the hon. gentlemen opposite probably know, those gentlemen are elected every year. They also know that men in their position, who have to go back for election every year, are very sensitive to public opinion, and are not at all likely to do anything contrary to public opinion. If it were a majority of the council that had to be obtained, the rights and interests of the citizens might be placed in jeopardy : but as a two-thirds majority has to be obtained, and as every man at the council board who votes on this measure knows that he will have to go back to the electors within a few months after giving that vote, hon. gentlemen opposite may be satisfied that before voting they will be reasonably sure what the view of the electors on the subject is. I can assure my hon. friends that these gentlemen, representing all shades of politics and every part of the city, are in a better position to give correct information on this subject than some of those who have written to my hon. friends in regard to it ; and whatever two-thirds of the council of St. John may decide on the question, I am sure they will act from a public stand-point and in the interests of the citizens. The hon. gentleman commented on the fact that three years ago the people voted upon this scheme. True, they did ; and the reason the council asked for a vote of the people was that the council themselves were in very great doubt as to what the state of public opinion was. The two-thirds necessary would not then take the responsibility of placing the harbour in commission. But my hon. friends opposite must remember that the scheme voted on then, was, to a certain extent, a defective scheme compared with the present one, and the main objection to placing the harbour in commission three years ago was that if the city authorities gave away their harbour rights for $750,000, the balance remaining, $250,000, would not be anything like sufficient to put the commission in a position to provide for the requisite accommodations to make the harbour a success. That difficulty is removed by the provision of the present Bill. Another objection to the previous Bill was that the commission would be run in the interests of the Government, and that the Government might appoint as commissioners men who were not citizens of the city and perhaps did not live there at all. But that objection is also met by this Bill. These two principal objections being met, the present scheme is, therefore, not that which was submitted to the people in 1889. As to whether the council would adopt the scheme or not, I cannot say. They have not sent any representatives here, and I have not had any correspondence with any of them to know whether they will accept it or not. But from my own stand-point as a citizen of St. John, speaking in the best interests of the city, I believe it will be to the interests of St. John to accept it, and I believe the Government will have a good asset and receive interest on its money every year.

Mr. LAURIER. Did my hon. friend vote for it on the previous occasion ?

Mr. HAZEN. I was not residing in St. John at the time, and do not know how I would have voted, but I believe I would have voted in its favour.

Mr. LAURIER. Most of the arguments the hon. gentleman has given do not apply at all. I do not know what the complexion of the council is to-day and whether it will be in favour of this Bill or not, but I do not know what the public feeling is with regard to this question. What I object to is giving the council of St. John the power of binding the people on a question concerning which the people were never consulted. We stand in this position to-day: that three years ago the people of St. John did not want to barter away their property even for the consideration of obtaining $750,000 from the public treasury. Now it is supposed they have changed their mind. They may have, or they may have not, but in either case, what harm can be done by the amendment? There is every reason why the people should be given an opportunity to say whether the Bill is acceptable to them or not.

Mr. HAZEN. The council have full power to do and may do it.

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly, and if the council had petitioned for this, we would be in a position to know what their views are. But this proposal has not emanated from the council, and we have not a word from them to show that they are in favour of it. On the contrary, the resolution has been sprung upon the House, and not at the instance of any responsible body. I have seen the signatures of my hon. friend and his colleagues in its favour, but we have nothing else to show in its favour.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend's argument scarcely leads him to the conclusion to which he has come. He says that if the council had sent a petition for this, we would have known their views, and we must infer that if they had petitioned for it, he would not ask us to adopt this amendment, and would have no objections to the Bill passing through as it is. But if the council are in favour of the measure, the amendment of my hon. friend will put them in no better position, and if they are not they will simply not accept it, and they will be thus under no disadvantage by our passing the Bill as it is. The point I make is this: that when the city got the power to dispose of this property, it obtained that power deliberately, with full knowledge of all the circumstances, and on condition that this property could be disposed of in this way when the representatives of the city, by a two-thirds vote, had decided that it should be so disposed of. Now, I think we had better leave the city with the powers they thought sufficient for the purpose, and if the majority is in favour of this measure, we have no right to impose a condition on the city. We gave this council, as a representative body, the power to accept this legislation, and we should not now seek to curtail that power.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to add as an amendment to the third sub-section of clause 8, by adding after the word "harbours" in the fifth line: "And the construction of such works as may improve facilities for shipment therein."

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER moved, in amendment, that the Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with power to amend the same by adding the following words to section 2:—

Provided, however, that the powers herein granted to the Governor in Council shall be exercised only on condition that any contract entered into between the said corporation of the harbour of St. John and the said corporation of the city of St. John, for the acquisition of the said harbour, shall have been previously approved by the municipal electors of the said city.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,
Armstrong,
Bain (Wentworth),
Béchard,
Beith,
Bernier,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Bruneau,
Campbell,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Christie,
Coltez,
Dawson,
Edgar,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Fréchette,
Frémont,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Innes,
Ives,
Landerkin,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Livingston,
Lowell,
Macdonald (Huron),
McGregor,
McMullen,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Paterson (Brant),
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Vaillancourt.—53.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baker,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bowell,
Boyle,
Burnham,
Calvin,
Cameron,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Davin,
Denison,
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Gillies,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
LaRivière,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Algoma),
McAlister,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McKay,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Montague,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Patterson (Huron),
Pelletier,
Pridham,
Putnam,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Lisgar),
Skinner,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,

Haggart,	Turcotte,
Hazen,	Tyrwhitt,
Hearn,	Wallace,
Henderson,	Weldon,
Hodgins,	White (Cardwell),
Hughes,	Wilmot,
Hutchins,	Wilson,
Kenny,	Wood (Brockville).—93.
Langevin (Sir Hector),	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Corbould,	Mr. Davies (P.E.I.),
Mr. Macdonald (Winnipeg),	Mr. Choquette,
Mr. Wood (Westmoreland),	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. McDougall (C. Breton),	Mr. Fraser,
Mr. Ryckman,	Mr. Perry,
Mr. McLean (P.E.I.),	Mr. Yeo.

Mr. GUAY. The hon. member for Montmagny has not voted.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I have paired with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald).

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER moved third reading of Bill (No. 100) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1893, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose now the hon. gentleman is in a position to inform the House when Parliament is to be prorogued, and what business he intends to go on with.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The day of prorogation is not fixed, and cannot at present be fixed, in view of the business which is still before the Senate. It is not unlikely that the Senate will still be occupied for a good many days. I am not in a position to state that we propose to abandon any measure on the Paper other than those which I have already indicated will be dropped.

Mr. FOSTER. As to the Supply Bill, we are now on the sixth day of the current year with bills maturing for payment from the first of the month, and we are without a dollar to carry on the public business. It is important, as we have made no partial Supply Bill this year as we did last year, in order to meet the current wants, that we should get this Bill passed through so that the public service may be provided for.

Mr. LAURIER. No doubt that is a consideration, but I have understood from the Minister of Justice that the Senate are likely to sit some weeks.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Some days.

Mr. LAURIER. Why should we sit for some days?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no objection to our sitting when the Senate is sitting.

Mr. LAURIER. We might adjourn.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not till we get through the business on the Paper.

Mr. LAURIER. Many members desire to know if we are to have an adjournment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If there is a prospect of the Senate being kept for a week, which is likely, we might propose a short adjournment, but we cannot know till to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

WORK ON RIVIÈRE DU SUD.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before proceeding any further with the Orders of the Day, I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works what he has decided to do concerning the work which should be performed on Rivière du Sud? The matter was to be settled by his predecessor, the Hon. Frank Smith. I hear that certain complications have arisen—I do not think they are very serious, however; but the affair is still pending, and I would like to know what he proposes to do?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) As I have already had the honour to state to my hon. friend for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), a question of jurisdiction has arisen which for the time being prevents the definite settlement of the question. Consequent upon the representations made by the member for Montmagny concerning damages which he alleged to have been caused to the owners of land bordering on Rivière du Sud, a first survey was made by the employés of the Railway Department. These gentlemen made a report representing that the department was in no way responsible for the damages, since they were not caused by the work on the Intercolonial bridge; so that that department found no cause for action. Later on, the question was referred to the Department of Public Works. I know not why, for if the damages were caused by works under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals, the latter should have to answer for them, and not the Department of Public Works. However, the matter was referred to the Department of Public Works. The then Minister of Public Works good-naturedly sent an engineer to examine the locality with a view of reporting on the causes of the damages complained of by the hon. member. I must say that the report of our department is to the effect that the damages were caused by the works of the Railway Department. Hon. Mr. Smith, who acted as Minister during the interregnum which preceded my accession to the department, gave the member for Montmagny a *quasi* promise that the department would see that the required works should be done. A request to that effect was made, but as there was conflict between the engineers of the two departments, the Government thought better to have a new survey made, so as to justify the Government or one of the two departments to undertake the work. I may say that the Minister of Railways purposes to go himself with his engineer, soon after the closing of the present session, to examine the locality and see the cause of the damages. If really the Government is responsible for them, they shall be repaired.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I must say that I do not find much fault with the answer just given me by the Minister of Public Works, but I must say also that it is not altogether satisfactory. The hon. Minister says that Hon. Mr. Smith with much kindness granted my request. I will say it was no kindness, but justice. He did so because he found that he should. Again, it is not a *quasi* promise which he gave me, but an official and

authentic promise of the department that the damages should be repaired.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that he has already spoken, and cannot speak again unless he wishes to make a personal explanation.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) If the House will allow me I will say just a few words more to settle the matter. I must say that I have no wish to judge the Government with more severity than I should under the circumstances. I am to a certain extent happy to find good-will in the answer given me by the Minister of Public Works. As it will be the pleasure of the Minister of Railways to come down soon, I hope that he may let me know the date of his trip, so that I may be at home, first to receive him, and then to see him myself to the grounds.

I was saying that I am not entirely satisfied with the answer of the Minister. I am sure that if the Minister of Railways will visit the place himself and see the situation of the bridge, he will be convinced that the Government is responsible. I am glad I shall have the pleasure of a visit from the Minister of Railways, and I should like him to inform me beforehand of the day he will arrive, so that I may receive him as well as I can.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House resolved itself into committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (p. 4644) to authorize the granting of subsidies to certain railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways therein mentioned.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider railway subsidy resolutions reported from Committee of the Whole.

Témiscouata Railway Company..... $21,600

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I have several reasons to give why this item should not be concurred in, and I will try to state them as briefly as I can to the House. In the first place the subsidies which have already been voted to this railway have been ample if not excessive. Even taking the figures which the Minister of Railways claims to be correct, as the amount of the vote for the Témiscouata Railway Company, and taking his own statistics, we find that for the whole length of the line, including the portion that was mentioned in the Railway Statistics as uncompleted, there were 113 miles of road,—if it is all finished as they say it is—and his own statistics show as I pointed out in committee that the subsidies, Dominion, provincial and municipal, granted to that railway company amounted to $172,200, or a public subsidy of $10,373 per mile for 113 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that by the Railway Statistics published in my department that is the result.

Mr. EDGAR. Yes, that is the result for the 113 miles completed and uncompleted shown in the Railway Statistics. I will not go over the details now, but the hon. gentleman has them as I gave them the other night. It is now proposed to aid that railway by giving it $1,800 per mile for a portion of it, in addition to all that. When this railway was under discussion some years ago in this House, we had statements made by the Minister of Public Works, who had charge of the vote, and by the Minister of Inland Revenue—who are both in the House now I am glad to see—on the subject of the estimated cost of the construction of that road. In 1885, Sir Hector Langevin, when he was proposing to increase the subsidy to $6,000 per mile, said, as I find it reported at page 2975 of the *Hansard*:

"We have been informed by the parties connected with this company that if the subsidy were increased to $6,000 per mile, they could obtain the necessary funds to carry on that work."

There was no discussion then or no hope, apparently, of any provincial subsidy. It was supposed, and it was proposed to the then Minister of Public Works, that a subsidy of $6,000 per mile would enable this road to be constructed. During the same debate on the same day we find the Minister of Inland Revenue, who seemed to be familiar naturally with that locality and the railways there, as of course a portion of this is in his constituency, said:

"Whether $6,000 is sufficient or not, I may say that the New Brunswick Railway Company are very anxious to push the road through, as they repeatedly represented that if a subsidy of $6,000 per mile were given, they were prepared to put the road through vigorously, and I have no doubt they will do so."

Then he went on to give a little more particulars about the reasons for his hope. He said:

"I may say that Mr. Burpee was vice-president or manager of the road, and he was here and he told me in conversation I had with him that the company would consider a subsidy of $6,000 a mile sufficient to put the road through, though he did not seem very anxious about it at the time, but if this subsidy was voted and given to them they would undertake to push the road through."

That was in 1885, the second time this railway was before Parliament for a vote increasing the subsidy from $3,200 to $6,000 per mile. I have shown that this company got $10,373 per mile, and I think that they should have no more. However, there is another reason which I think should prevent the House from passing this resolution. During the earlier part of this session, some three months ago, I made in my place in Parliament very serious charges connected with the dealings with the subsidies of this very Témiscouata Railway Company, and that there can be no doubt about the distinctness of the charges and the applicability of these charges to the matter we are now discussing, I will read charges 7, 8 and 9:

"7. That the Témiscouata Railway Company was given incorporation by letters patent issued by the Canadian Government on 6th October, 1885, and since that date the said railway company has received from the Dominion of Canada subsidies to the extent of $642,200.—which subsidies were voted by Parliament on the recommendation of Ministers of the Crown.

"8. That since the 6th October, 1885, and while the said Témiscouata Railway was being constructed in part by means of the said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money from the persons who from time to time controlled the said Témiscouata Railway Company and the said subsidies, or who were beneficially interested in the said subsidies.

"9. That also since the said 6th October, 1885, the persons who from time to time controlled the said Témiscouata Railway Company and the said subsidies, or who were beneficially interested in the said subsidies, paid and contributed large sums at the request and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and support-

ers of the Government of which he was a member, and that after some of such last-mentioned corrupt payments and contributions were made, further and other subsidies were granted and paid to the said railway company by the Government of which the said Sir A. P. Caron was a member.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these charges were made three months ago to-day. It is not my fault that they have not been investigated. There was plenty of time to have had them fully investigated long before this. It cannot be said to-day, when the House is asked to vote another subsidy to this railway, that they have not had the fullest kind of notice of these charges, and if they vote this subsidy they vote it in the face of these charges standing uninvestigated. Now, whether these charges have been properly referred to a Royal Commission or not, or whether only a parody of them has been referred, I do not care. In either event this vote should not be passed by this House until the investigation takes place. I know it is contended by some hon. gentlemen on the other side that all the charges made on this head have been referred to the Royal Commission. I do not think they have; but assuming that they have, can hon. members consistently vote to grant another subsidy to this railway company when they admit that the investigation of these very charges is pending? I say they cannot do it, and they will stultify themselves if they do it. In such a state of affairs we ought not to be asked to vote this money. There is no excuse for it. The Government cannot get out of it. They have to face, and their supporters have to face, this question before the public: Whether in a condition of affairs like that they are going to vote a large additional sum of public money to this company to be expended in the same line. There has been no change in the control of that road, so far as we know, and if there were that would not make much difference. I made those charges, and they may or may not have been referred. But there was another charge which, intimately affecting this railway, I made at the same time, and which was not referred at all, but which was boldly and squarely struck out of the charges which were referred to the Royal Commission. I refer to charge 10, in which I said:

"That the said sums of money hereinbefore mentioned in paragraphs 6 and 9, as paid and contributed for election purposes, were so used, together with other sums contributed by public contractors with the Dominion Government, and were controlled and distributed by the direct authority and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, in lavish and illegal amounts for the purpose of corruptly influencing the electors, and in the general election of 1887 alone, upwards of $100,000 of moneys so contributed were so used for the purpose of corruptly influencing the electors in the following electoral districts."

And then I named them. I was not allowed, even through the farce of a Royal Commission and an emasculated reference, to go into that charge at all. But although the doors of Parliament were shut against me, I am glad to say that there was one door open, that was the public press; and on that charge 10 the public press, in the interest of the public, has taken up the investigation which was absolutely refused to me in this House, and has proved distinctly that moneys were "controlled and distributed by the direct authority and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, in lavish and illegal amounts for the purpose of corruptly influencing the electors." If anything was ever proved by publication in the newspapers, that was proved. Why, Sir, to take one case alone—the case of the constituency of the Postmaster General, the County of Quebec. Photographic copies of documents were published, which were not denied and not disputed, and which cannot be denied or disputed, over his own signature, showing that the expenditure in that one election was $4,250, whereas his election agent returned only $904 as the total legitimate expenses. Therefore, I say that portion of that charge has been proved. The other portion is uninvestigated; but I say here that every word of my charges 7, 8 and 9, I am prepared to prove, and there are members of this House, whether they are in the Chamber now or not, who know that I can prove them. Therefore, I say that this vote should not pass. Now, I would like to give the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) an opportunity of correcting a very gross error into which he fell not long ago—I will not say where—when he undertook to show the public that the charges which I had made were included in those referred to the Royal Commission. I remember hearing it said that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) for one, and I think some other members of this House, were influenced in their judgment as to whether the Royal Reference Commission covered the charges or not, by the opinion of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon); and I want to show that hon. gentleman that unwittingly he made a very gross error, which must have misled him, and must have misled other gentlemen who depended on his judgment in this matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume the hon. gentleman is not going to reopen a past debate. He is evidently doing so under the guise of saying that he does not intend to say where the debate took place.

Mr. EDGAR. I have not referred to the debate, and am trying not to refer to a previous debate. The hon. member for Albert is here, and I am sure he will be the first to desire to correct the mistake he has made. I say that when he was explaining in a public place that the charges referred to the Royal Commission were practically the same as those I made, he quoted charges 3, 4 and 5 of my original charges, and said that they were just the words of those referred to the Royal Commission. He also quoted clause 6 of my charges, which he said were equally the words of the charges referred to the Royal Commission.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is discussing a past debate. I do not wish to call him to order, but I would be very glad if he would discuss the matter without doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to confine himself as closely to the question before the House as possible. I have listened carefully to what the hon. gentleman has said with reference to the motion before the House, and I assumed he was arguing that this vote should not be passed until the investigation ordered by the House had taken place. Of course the hon. gentleman will understand that he cannot refer to a previous debate.

Mr. WELDON. I would ask the hon. gentleman to be good enough to tell me whether or not what he refers to he took from the first printed copy of *Hansard*, such as it is on the files?

Mr. EDGAR. Of course I have not seen the corrected proof.

Mr. WELDON. I can only say that the first printed report of what I said in the Caron matter gave wrong quotations. The reporters quoted the sections 3, 4 and 6, and did me entire injustice, and if the hon. gentleman will look at the corrected copy he will see what I really did say.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is not referring to the debate.

Mr. WELDON. If he is, all I can say is that the *Hansard* men, through some fault, miscited the sections, as the hon. gentleman will see if he will refer to the printed revised copy, and I may add that I have never spoken outside this House on the subject.

Mr. EDGAR. I am glad, indeed, to hear that the hon. member for Albert has taken this opportunity to put himself right, although I submit he should have taken an earlier one to correct what undoubtedly has been spread throughout the country, and what he says is an erroneous report of his speech.

Mr. WELDON. If that is the practice, I never heard of it until now. I know I have the unhappy gift of speaking in such an abrupt manner that the reporters always report me badly on technical questions. In the first proof, there is not a single report which does not make me speak unmitigated nonsense. The fault is not with the reporters, but with myself. They tell me that I speak in a rapid, abrupt way, and they cannot catch my words, so that when the argument is technical they do not catch what I say, although the hon. members of this House will not charge me, I am sure, with always talking nonsense.

Mr. EDGAR. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman's explanation. The error, he says, was made by the *Hansard* reporters, and unfortunately it was carried through a very long period of his remarks. It is not only in clauses 3, 4 and 5, but afterwards in clause 7, and again in clause 8, and then when the hon. member undertook to quote from the original charges which I made, he is made to quote clause 8 of the amended charges, so that the whole thing is in a hopeless muddle.

Mr. WELDON. That is true, but that is not my fault, and I am not to be blamed unless it be that I should have called the attention of the House to the matter before. I never have done so, but the reporters did me no more injustice in this speech than they did in others.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Unwittingly the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is referring to a past debate.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has referred to it, and I could not help doing so also, and am sorry to have transgressed the rules so far. However, I have little more to say except to move my amendment. It would almost look as if this enquiry had been delayed in order to give this additional vote to the railway before the enquiry takes place. It has, at any rate, that appearance and that effect. Therefore I think the vote should be postponed as well as the enquiry, and would beg to move :

Whereas it appears by the official railway statistics that Dominion, provincial and municipal subsidies have been voted in aid of the Témiscouata Railway Company to the amount of $1,172,200 for an entire distance of 113 miles, being at the rate of $10,373 per mile; and whereas a charge has been formally made in this House that Sir A. P. Caron, a Minister of the Crown, corruptly received large sums of money from the persons who from time to time controlled the said railway company and the said subsidies, or who were beneficially interested in the said subsidies; and whereas the said charge has not been investigated; therefore, in view of the unusual extent of the existing subsidies and in view of the serious charges now pending, and uninvestigated as aforesaid, this House refuses to concur in this item.

Mr. HAGGART. I wish to say a few words in reply to the hon. gentleman as to the amount of the subsidies he says this road has received from Dominion, provincial and municipal sources. Yesterday, when the discussion of this item was up, he stated that upwards of $14,000 per mile had been received from sources of that kind, according to my statistics.

Mr. EDGAR. That would be for the 81 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, for the 81 miles. To-day this amount is down to $10,873 a mile, and the hon. gentleman still quotes, as he did yesterday, my Railway Statistics to prove it. If the hon. gentleman will read the Railway Statistics carefully, he will see that they prove no such thing. The Témiscouata Railway is stated to have a length of 81 miles, and the length of the branch is 32 miles, or, as the hon. gentleman has stated, 113 miles in all. The amount of bonuses given to the railway by the different Governments is as follows:—from the Dominion Government, $649,200; from the Quebec Government, $462,000; from the New Brunswick Government, $36,000; or in all, $1,147,200.

Mr. EDGAR. You have forgotten the municipal subsidy of $25,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I am coming to that afterwards. That is a total of $1,147,200; but the hon. gentleman forgets to look at the amount which has been paid upon that, which he will find in the next column, where he will see that the total amount paid to the railway is $847,470. Add to this the $25,000 of the municipal subsidy, and that will make $872,470 as the total received, according to my statistics, by this railway in the form of Dominion, provincial and municipal subsidies, or, instead of $10,873 a mile, a total subsidy of $7,721 a mile. There is nothing in the returns to prove anything else. The hon. gentleman knows, because it was explained to him last night, how the total amount of the Government subsidy from Quebec was not paid, that it was a land subsidy at the rate of 75 cents per acre, and that the company settled with the Provincial Government for 35 cents an acre, or about $240,000 as a total which they received from the Quebec Government. If he goes over the figures again, he will find there is no mistake that the total amount paid in the form of subsidies from all these sources, instead of being $14,000 a mile as he said yesterday, or $10,373 as he said to-day, is $7,721.

Mr. WELDON. I would ask the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) if he would say where the public place was in which I am reported to have used the words he quoted, and which I declare I did not use.

Mr. EDGAR. It was in this House, and I find the report in the *Hansard*.

Mr. WELDON. If I remember aright, the member for West Ontario was in the House during that night.

Mr. EDGAR. No; I was not in this part of the country.

Mr. WELDON. A number of members were present and some of them followed me on that argument. If I had misread the resolutions of the hon. gentleman, I would acknowledge it, but the blunder was not mine but that of the reporter, and I think the hon. gentleman should make the *amende honorable* to me.

Mr. EDGAR. I made the statement in order to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of explaining, because, when the first copies of these *Hansards* are distributed, they have to be accepted, and nothing will be seen for a year afterwards of the hon. gentleman's corrections. These copies are distributed to the members of the House, to the press, and to the public institutions of the country, and, if the hon. gentleman did say what he is reported to have said, it would mislead everybody who read it.

Mr. WELDON. I thank the hon. gentleman for giving me this opportunity of putting myself right.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I desire to say a few words more in reply to some of the remarks of the mover of the amendment, and in the first place to state that I think the discussion on his part was rather an unfair one. I do not think that, in calculating the cost of the road, the portion which is referred to as a branch should be charged with a proportionate rate of the cost of the whole construction. The Témiscouata Railway was a road by itself, forming a link between the Intercolonial Railway and the New Brunswick system, and years ago a land subsidy was voted by the Quebec Government amounting to 10,000 acres a mile. It was after that was granted by the Quebec Government that a vote of $6,000 a mile was made to supplement that grant, and it was thought that would be sufficient. It is impossible to prove by the records, even taking the subsidies which have been voted, that the Témiscouata road can be charged with anything like what the hon. gentleman has stated. The grant of 10,000 acres a mile by the Province of Quebec was valued at 70 cents, which would represent $440,000, but, as I showed last night, before a contract was entered into, the Quebec Government altered that to a cash vote of half the amount, or about $221,000, so that the sum granted or paid to the road by the Quebec Government was $221,000, just half the amount mentioned by the hon. gentleman. Another thing which I want to point out to the House when it is asked to vote down this appropriation to the Témiscouata Railway Company, is that this has nothing to do with the charges the hon. gentleman has made, whether they are well founded or not. The charge which he made was that this company had used part of this money to demoralize certain constituencies—where? In the Province of New Brunswick? No, in the Province of Quebec. This vote applies to a branch road in New Brunswick, and there is no charge made that any corrupt practice took place there in connection with these subsidies. He states that the House is asked to vote $20,000 more to this company which has received so much before. I want this transaction to be judged on its own merits. This $20,000 has nothing to do with the original construction of the Témiscouata road, which has been completed long ago. There was a separate contract made for the construction of the road from Edmundston into the constituency which I represent, 20 miles at $5,000 a mile. Then another contract was made for 12 miles more, but only $3,200 a mile was voted, but the road was constructed on the expectation of $5,000 a mile, and this $21,000 is to give them the benefit of that understanding that the amount paid would be the same as on the first section, at $5,000 a mile. If that branch is constructed in New Brunswick, it will cost $1,000 a mile less than the amount voted for the first line. You will give a subsidy of $5,000 instead of the amount of $6,000 which was voted for the line in the Province of Quebec, and they will receive a local subsidy of $25,000 instead of $35,000 as they did in Quebec. So, in giving this subsidy, the House will be doing something which has no connection with the original building of the road. The building of this 32 miles will have cost this country a subsidy of $5,000 instead of $6,000 which was voted for the Quebec portion, which may be more expensive possibly, and the local subsidy will be $25,000 instead of $35,000.

Mr. EDGAR. Are the proprietors of that road not the same as they were before?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is the same company, but I do not feel that the road constructed in my province, in regard to which no charge of misappropriation of the funds has been even hinted at, should be made the ground for bringing up the charges in the way they have been brought up to-day as to the construction of the other portion of the road. This vote is for the two sections in New Brunswick, one of 20 miles and the other of 12 miles, and this will bring the subsidy for the last 12 miles even with the subsidy for the first 20 miles. It is evident that, instead of the road being charged with more than $10,000 a mile, it is not chargeable with more than about $7,250 a mile.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The argument of the Minister of Inland Revenue is rather extraordinary. His argument is that that portion of the railway belonging to this corporation in the Province of New Brunswick has nothing to do with, and is in no way tainted or affected by, the charges against the corporation, because they relate only to the portion of the road lying within the Province of Quebec. I take it that this corporation is a unit. It does not matter whether a part of their railway lies in New Brunswick.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I forgot to mention one thing. Of course, they are the same company, but you should look at the dates and at the time of the charges. This company never received a dollar for the New Brunswick portion until 1890.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The subject of the first appropriation of the road was discussed in this House before the 1st July, 1885, and I find that the railway company was incorporated on the 6th October, 1885, so that it had no existence as a corporation when the appropriation was first made, and could not at that time have received any subsidy from the Province of Quebec, which must have been given after the date of the incorporation,

because there was nobody in existence to whom a grant could be made at the time the Government asked Parliament here to make an appropriation for this road, and at the time the hon. gentleman stated what the cost of the railway would be. At the present time the position is this: My hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) charged against this corporation, and against the Postmaster General in connection with this corporation, that a very large amount of the subsidy that had been voted by Parliament to aid this railway corporation in the construction of this road, was diverted from that purpose to a political purpose to aid the friends of the hon. gentleman in the Province of Quebec and the supporters of the Administration in their efforts to win certain seats in that province. It seems to me, if that statement was well founded, and the hon. gentleman has assumed the responsibility to establish that, if the opportunity is given him which, up to this moment, it has not been, then it is clear that this railway corporation ought not to receive further aid from the public funds of Canada. It is a misuse of the appropriation already made. It does not matter whether the railway lies wholly in the Province of New Brunswick, or wholly in the Province of Quebec, or partly in one province or partly in the other. It is not with the railway itself that Parliament is called upon to deal by the motion of my hon friend; it is with the corporation, it is with the railway company. It is the company that has allowed these moneys to be diverted from the purpose for which Parliament voted them, to another and different purpose, a purpose for which Parliament could not without a high crime against the people of this country, have applied any portion of the public money. Now, that is the position in which this matter stands. Then the Minister of Railways has undertaken to show that my hon. friend has, in his motion, over-stated the amount of moneys per mile which this railway corporation has received, or is entitled to receive, from the public treasury. The statement of the motion is that the amount of $1,172,200 was voted for the entire distance of 113 miles, that is at the rate of $10,373 per mile. I think the hon. gentleman will find this calculation correct. The Minister of Railways says they have not received so large an amount; it is true that amount has been appropriated, he says, but the money has not been paid. Well, Mr. Speaker, why has the money not been paid? Because the road has not yet been completed. There are only 81 miles of road completed, and 32 miles are still under construction, and that being the case it follows that the amount of money which has been voted by Parliament is not the amount of money which the railway corporation up to this moment has received. I find that the Dominion Parliament has voted $649,200, the Legislature of Quebec has voted $462,000, New Brunswick has voted $36,000, and a municipality has voted $25,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The total amount of Dominion subsidies that has been voted has been paid on the 32 miles and the 81 miles. As I told the hon. gentleman, the amount was not a money vote by the Quebec Government, it was a vote in lands of the value of 75 cents per acre, which they resold again to the Quebec Government for 35 cents.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am reading from the statistics which the hon. gentleman himself has furnished, and if a railway company chooses to give away its lands, I do not think that would make any difference. If the hon. gentleman can show that the lands were not of the full value which the Government have placed upon them, then of course to the extent to which he could show that the lands were worth less than that sum, the amount in cash would be diminished. But the hon. gentleman might undertake to show that a railway company had disposed of its subsidy in advance for less than it was actually worth; but if a railway company chose to make improvident use of the property placed at its disposal, that is no reason why Parliament should make a further appropriation to that company. What amount this company may have received from the Province of Quebec in the shape of land, or what amount of money they may have received, I do not know. If the Minister of Railways has figures to show that they received less, and that they have received all they are entitled to, then the hon. gentleman could perhaps make out a case that the amount stated in the abstract before me is over-estimated. But the hon. gentleman says that the whole sum voted by the Dominion, $649,200, has been paid; and if that be so, then it is a matter for the hon. gentleman to explain to this House. Surely the hon. gentleman does not pretend to say that the Government have paid to this railway company moneys they had not earned. If the Government have paid the whole of the subsidies, they have paid the amount on the 12 miles yet to be constructed. How came the Government to pay moneys that had not been earned?

Mr. HAGGART. I believe the 12 miles are constructed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the hon. gentleman proposes to give $20,000 more than the company already have received for the road.

Mr. HAGGART. That amount is to be paid on the 12 miles already constructed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). All I can say is that the Government are dealing very generously with the public funds. The Government pledge themselves to give a certain sum per mile, and the railway company on receiving that pledge proceeded to complete the whole line. The money has been paid, and now the Government ask Parliament to give money that has not been pledged, $20,000 odd, in addition to the sum already granted. Parliament has made no promise to give this amount. The only object Parliament has in view in making these appropriations is to enable railway companies to complete roads, in the public interest, which otherwise would not be constructed. Now the Minister says the Government have paid out the money which Parliament promised to the company. The road is built, and yet Government now comes to this House and ask for a further sum of $20,000 to the same railway company for the road which is already completed. I think the hon. gentleman's statement is more indefensible than one would have been inclined to infer from the actual statement we have before us. But whether the road is completed or whether a portion is yet to be built, whether this is to encourage an enterprise or whether it is to pay an additional sum to a railway which is an accomplished fact, is not the principal question now before us? The principal question before us is that an hon. member has

made certain specific charges in connection with this company; he has charged that the funds have been misdirected and used for other purposes than those for which Parliament appropriated them, and it seems to me until the company is purged of this charge a further appropriation, whether it were under ordinary circumstances meritorious or not, should not be made.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. Edgar:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Grieve,
Armstrong,	Guay,
Bain (Wentworth),	Innes,
Beith,	Landerkin,
Bernier,	Laurier,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Bowers,	Livingston,
Bowman,	Lowell,
Brodeur,	McMullen,
Bruneau,	Mignault,
Campbell,	Mills (Bothwell),
Carroll,	Monet,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	O'Brien,
Casey,	Paterson (Brant),
Christie,	Rider,
Colter,	Rinfret,
Dawson,	Rowand,
Edgar,	Sanborn,
Featherston,	Scriver,
Flint,	Somerville,
Forbes,	Sutherland,
Geoffrion,	Vaillancourt.—45.
Godbout,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Lippé,
Bain (Soulanges),	Macdonald (King's),
Baker,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bennett,	McAlister,
Bergeron,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bergin,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bowell,	McKay,
Boyle,	McLennan,
Burnham,	McLeod,
Calvin,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Carling,	Madill,
Carpenter,	Mara,
Chapleau,	Marshall,
Cleveland,	Masson,
Cochrane,	Metcalfe,
Cockburn,	Miller,
Costigan,	Montague,
Craig,	Ouimet,
Curran,	Patterson (Colchester),
Davin,	Patterson (Huron),
Denison,	Pelletier,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Pridham,
Dewdney,	Putnam,
Dickey,	Reid,
Dugas,	Robillard,
Dupont,	Roome,
Dyer,	Rosamond,
Fairbairn,	Ross (Dundas),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Ross (Lisgar),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Simard,
Foster,	Smith (Ontario),
Fréchette,	Sproule,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Stairs,
Gordon,	Stevenson,
Grandbois,	Taylor,
Guillet,	Temple,
Haggart,	Thompson (Sir John),
Henderson,	Tisdale,
Hughes,	Turcotte,
Hutchins,	Tyrwhitt,
Ives,	Wallace,
Jeannotte,	Weldon,
Kaulbach,	White (Cardwell),
Kenny,	Wilmot,
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wilson,
LaRivière,	Wood (Brockville).—92.

(Pairs same as previous division.)

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. HAGGART moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 101) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of lines of railway therein mentioned.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read first and second times.

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

After Recess.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means. He said: Mr. Speaker, in asking the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means I desire to make a brief explanation of what it is proposed to ask the committee to consider. I do not intend at this late hour in the session to propose any very extended changes in the tariff. In fact, although a good many subjects were brought to my attention, they did not appear to be of such a nature as to make it advisable at this session, and so soon after a somewhat general revision of the tariff had taken place, to undertake again any general revision; and my view in this regard is all the stronger on account of the late hour of the session. So that what I have to propose this year is largely in the way of a reduction of duties, not very important in themselves, but yet of assistance in certain directions, and in one or two cases an increase of duties for specific objects. One of the greatest difficulties that we have met in the course of the year has been in connection with the article of molasses. The duty placed upon that article by the tariff was on molasses over 40 and up to 56, 1½ cents per gallon. Below 40, in fact at 40, molasses is not of very good quality, and going downwards, it rapidly deteriorates; and in order to protect the market against the poorer qualities, and to encourage the trade and consumption of the better qualities, which have really saccharine material in them, the duty was graded, a certain addition of duty being made for every degree below 40. That, however, was not a very large addition, and it has been found during the year that the market has been flooded with molasses, or what is called molasses, of a very poor grade, showing by the test a very small proportion of saccharine matter; and it is to protect the legitimate and the better trade in this article, and to keep out the spurious and worse article, that I propose to amend the tariff by adding a larger percentage per gallon for each degree or fraction of a degree under 40. I propose, instead of ⅓ of a cent per gallon, to add 1 cent per gallon for each degree below 40. When it goes down to 30 or 25, the duty becomes nearly prohibitive, and that is the intention of the enactment, because stuff which will not show more than 20 or 30 degrees of saccharine material, is molasses of very indifferent quality, the use of which ought not to be encouraged as coming in competition with the better article. Then, strong representations have been made by the tanners of this country in favour of the introduction free of duty of two articles used in the process of making leather. One is an article known as degras, and the other as oleostearine, neither of which is manufactured in this country, and both of which are necessary to the manufacture of the better grades of leather,

especially leather which is now being made in increasingly large quantities for the foreign market, especially the English market, in which a considerable and promising trade is opening up. This article of oleostearine was classed with stearic acid and wax and charged a duty of 3 cents a pound. The value of the article is 6 cents a pound, so that the duty is a very heavy one; and it is proposed to allow that article to come in free of duty for the use of tanners in making their leather. Glove leathers, which are a special item by themselves, are admitted at 10 per cent, while leathers of similar kinds, but not used in the manufacture of gloves, pay a duty of 15 per cent. In that list of glove leathers, the names were given, but amongst the names, that of lamb was left out. Every one knows that the finest grade of kid which is used is made from the skin of the lamb—a sort of imitation of kid made from the skin of the lamb—and in order to make the item consistent and prevent difficulty in the rulings of the Customs Department, the word "lamb" has been inserted with the other designations. On the free list also will be placed tin waste in strips; tin itself in sheets comes in free, but for some reason or other, the waste, which is used in the manufacture of heads of tacks and for various other purposes, has been charged a duty of 20 per cent, being put in the unenumerated list. For dyeing purposes, we let in most of the articles free, amongst others nitrate of soda, but another substance somewhat similar to this but different in some of its elements, nitrite of soda, which is used for dyeing purposes, is not mentioned in the list, and I propose to put it in the free list. There is no distinction in duty between lime juice refined and the crude lime juice. Neither is charged a very high duty, but it is proposed to make the crude lime juice free, the refined lime juice being charged a duty of 10 cents per gallon. It is also proposed to place a duty on eggs of 5 cents per dozen. I notice that this pleases the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin), and I hope he will not have to pay any more for the article. Eggs come from Canada into the United States, which country, up to the passage of the McKinley Bill, constituted a very large market for that product, and we propose to charge a duty on eggs of 5 cents per dozen. In looking over the returns and studying carefully the trade, we find that a very considerable number of eggs are imported from the United States into this country, and we consider it only fair to give the farmers of this country a protection of 5 cents per dozen, so that they may have the home market for such of their products as are required for consumption in this country, inasmuch when they have to seek a foreign market, they are obliged to seek it largely outside of the United States. It is also proposed, owing to certain reasons, to take power for the Governor in Council of ordering that, at any time when it is considered in the public interest to suspend the discriminative duty, which is very small—5 per cent on the value—on sugars imported into this country otherwise than by direct shipment, the discriminative duty may be suspended for a stated period, and the duties upon the article so treated made the same, whether imported by direct or by indirect shipment. It is also proposed to add a resolution giving power to the Governor in Council, when it is deemed in the public interest to do so, to suspend certain provisions of the Customs Acts, in so far as they provide for the remission of duty, or otherwise, on sugars, molasses and tobacco, when imported from any country which it may be shown to our satisfaction does not accord to Canada the most-favoured-nation treatment, and to order that, during such suspension, the sugars, molasses and tobaccos shall be subject to certain duties. This step is taken in view of the fact that, in the development of tariff negotiations and trade negotiations, we have been treated by our sister colonists in the West India Islands very fairly indeed. Owing to their peculiar circumstances, owing to the fact that their export is largely in sugars, and that that market has been found very largely in the United States, they have had to negotiate with the United States, in view of the third section of the McKinley Bill, for a continued entrance into that country for their products free of duty; and, in order to secure that benefit, as they consider it, they find it necessary to give corresponding advantages on certain articles coming from the United States, consisting largely of agricultural products, together with some manufactured articles. Although subjected to great pressure, the British West India Islands made no distinction in that respect as regards Canada, and placed Canadian products of the same kind that are scheduled in their arrangement with the United States on exactly the same plane as those of the United States, giving us in all respects an equal treatment. We hope to gain the same advantage from other countries which raise these products in which Canada deals largely, and to which, so far as her tariff is concerned, we give very liberal treatment. If, however, it is found that, in the end, our arguments do not prevail, and it is impossible for us to get that equal and fair treatment, it would be unfair to the British West India Islands—which produce those articles largely and have treated us in the manner I have indicated—to place their exports to Canada, such as sugar and molasses, in no better position than the same articles raised by other countries which will not grant to us the most-favoured treatment; and, therefore, I ask that this power be given the Government, so that, should it become necessary, we will be in a position to give an adequate return to those who give us very favourable treatment with regard to these products, and the House may rest assured that we will use this power with wisdom, prudence and for the benefit of our trade. This is about all the explanation I have to give in regard to the items which I am going to ask the House to resolve itself into committee to consider.

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to amend the Act, Chapter 33, Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act respecting the Duties of Customs," by repealing the item numbered 610 in schedule "C" to the said Act; and to amend the Act 53 Victoria, chapter 20, intituled: "An Act to amend the Act respecting the Duties of Customs," by repealing the items numbered 95 and 122 under section 10 of the said Act; and to amend the Act 54-55 Victoria, chapter 45, intituled: "An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs," by repealing the item numbered 1 under section 1 of the said Act, and to provide otherwise by enacting that the following rates of duty be substituted in lieu thereof:—

1. Eggs, five cents per dozen.
2. All molasses n.o.p., all syrups n.o.p., all tank bottoms, all tank washings, all cane juice, all concentrated cane juice, all beet-root juice and all concentrated beet-root juice, when imported direct, without transhipment from the country of growth and production;

(a) Testing by polariscope, forty degrees or over and not over fifty-six degrees, a specific duty of one and one-half cents per gallon.

(*b*) When testing less than forty degrees a specific duty of one and one-half cents per gallon, and in addition thereto one cent per gallon for each degree or fraction of a degree less than forty degrees.

(*c*) And in addition to the foregoing rates a further specific duty in all cases of two and one-half cents per gallon when not so imported direct without transhipment.

The packages (when of wood) in which imported to be in all cases exempt from duty.

3. Paraffine wax, stearic acid and stearine of all kinds n. e. s., three cents per pound.

4. Glove leathers when imported by glove manufacturers for use in their factories in the manufacture of gloves, viz., kid, lamb, buck, deer, antelope and water hog, tanned or dressed, coloured or uncoloured, ten per cent *ad valorem*.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the duties of Customs, if any, imposed by the said Acts on the articles named in this section are hereby repealed, and that the said articles may be imported into Canada or taken out of warehouse for consumption free of duty.

1. Oleostearine when imported by manufacturers of leather for use in the manufacture of leather in their own factories.

2. Tin strip waste.

3. Nitrite of soda.

4. Lime juice, crude only.

3. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may order, at any time when he may deem it in the public interest to do so, that item 2 under the foregoing resolution 1 shall be suspended for such period as he may name and that during such period the following be substituted therefor:—

1. All molasses n.o.p., all syrups n.o.p., all tank bottoms, all tank washings, all cane juice, all concentrated cane juice, all beet-root juice and all concentrated beet-root juice:

(*a*) Testing by polariscope, forty degress or over and not over fifty-six degrees, a specific duty of one and one half cents per gallon.

(*b*) When testing less than forty degrees, a specific duty of one and one-half cents per gallon, and in addition thereto one cent per gallon for each degree or fraction of a degree less than forty degrees.

The packages (when of wood) in which imported to be in all cases exempt from duty.

And also, that for the like period item 2 of section 1 of the Act 54-55 Victoria, chapter 45, intituled: "An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs," shall be suspended.

And the Governor in Council may, as aforesaid, further order that section 2 of the said 54-55 Victoria, chapter 45, shall be suspended for such period as he may name and that during the said period the following be substituted therefor:—

The duties of Customs, if any, imposed by the said Acts on the articles mentioned as follows are hereby repealed, and the said articles may be imported into Canada or taken out of warehouse for consumption free of duty, that is to say:

All cane sugar not above number fourteen Dutch standard in colour, all beet-root sugar not above fourteen Dutch standard in colour, all sugar sweepings, all sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, all melado, all concentrated melado, all molasses n.o.p., all concentrated molasses n. o. p., all cane juice n. o. p., all concentrated cane juice n. o. p., all beet-root juice n. o. p., all concentrated beet-root juice n. o. p., all tank bottoms n. o. p., and all concrete n. o. p.

4. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, at any time when he may deem it in the public interest to do so, suspend the provisions of any and all Acts relating to duties of Customs in so far as they provide for the payment of duty or otherwise on any sugars, molasses or tobacco, when imported from any country which may be shown to his satisfaction does not accord to Canada most-favoured-nation treatment, and may order that during such suspension all sugars, molasses and tobacco, when imported from such countries, shall, in lieu of any other provisions, be subject to and chargeable with, and there shall be collected thereon Customs duties as follows:—

All cane sugar not above number fourteen Dutch standard in colour, all beet-root sugar not above number fourteen Dutch standard in colour, all sugar sweepings, all sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, all melado, all concentrated melado, all molasses n. o. p., all concentrated molasses n. o. p., all cane juice n.o.p., all concentrated cane juice n.o.p., all beet-root juice n.o.p., all concentrated juice n.o.p., all tank bottoms n.o.p., and all concrete n. o. p., testing by polariscope over seventy degrees—one cent per pound, and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree, three and one-third cents per one hundred pounds additional.

All sugars above number fourteen Dutch standard in colour, and refined sugar of all kinds, grades or standards, and all sugar syrups derived from refined sugars, a specific duty of two cents per pound.

All molasses n. o. p., all tank bottoms, all tank washings, all cane juice, all concentrated cane juice, all beet-root juice and all concentrated beet-root juice—the rate payable under the tariff at the time in force—with twenty-five per cent of such rate additional.

Cut tobacco, fifty-five cents per pound and fifteen per cent *ad valorem*.

Manufactured tobacco N. E. S., and snuff, forty-five cents per pound and fifteen per cent *ad valorem*.

Unmanufactured tobacco, twenty-five cents per pound.

5. *Resolved*, That the foregoing changes in the duties of Customs shall come into force and take effect on the 6th day of July, 1892.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would really seriously ask the hon. Minister of Finance and the Government to consider what they are doing. Without desiring at this moment to go into the question of the merits or demerits of the several propositions now made, I wish to submit to them and the House that it is a matter of the gravest possible injury to the trade and commerce of the country, that measures of this kind should be introduced into the House at such a stage of the session as this. I have never known in all my experience—and if the hon. gentleman has any precedent to give, I should be glad to hear it—a case in which alterations in the tariff were made after the Supply Bill had been read the second time. More than that, everybody who has had the slightest acquaintance with ordinary commercial transactions, knows that if there is any one thing more than another, as to which it is desirable that the commercial community should be informed in proper time, it is the matter of changes in the tariff. With all the attention the Finance Minister can give, and all the information he can obtain, he is constantly in danger of being misled by the representations of interested parties as to changes of this kind in the tariff; and if these changes are brought down when the House is on the very verge of prorogation, if they are pushed through the House without the commercial community having had any opportunity whatever of knowing what the Government propose, or any opportunity whatever of communicating with the representatives of commercial interests and communities in Parliament, all I have to say to the House and the hon. gentleman is this, that they are establishing a precedent which is certain in the future to be fraught with innumerable mischievous consequences. It is always a very difficult matter for a Minister of Finance to resist pressure made upon him to change the tariff. If he chooses to hold out a premium to all those persons who find an interest in making tariff changes, if he chooses to hold out an expectation that long after his Budget has been disposed of, long after the House, as it supposes, and the community at large as they suppose, have had the opportunity of learning what the Minister of Finance intends to do, that at the twelfth or thirteenth hour changes more or less important may be sprung on the House, I tell him for his own sake he ought to pause, because in the future he will find most mischievous consequences arise. In this particular instance, there are some changes which may be of considerable importance, and some

that, as far as they effect trade interests, I should have thought might have been dealt with under the authority which we have vested in the Treasury Board. But, whether the case be good or bad, whether the change be important or not, it is the duty of the Minister and of the Government to give reasonable notice of such changes, or, at any rate, after these matters have been proposed, to allow a reasonable time to elapse so that the commercial community, if they have any representations to make in regard to these changes, should have an opportunity of making them. That is impossible at the present moment, but, if we go into committee and allow these provisions to become law before the parties who have an interest can be represented, knowing the mischief which will result, I desire to warn the hon. gentleman in the strongest possible manner against the precedent he is setting of introducing tariff changes at this late moment. He has had four months and a half to consider what changes he should make in the tariff, and surely such changes should have been laid before the House and indicated to the country before this. I hope the hon. Minister and the Government will see the extreme inexpediency of persisting in what they are now proposing to do.

Mr. BOWELL. The protest made by the hon. gentleman, and the reason given why delay should take place in this case are not well founded. It is certainly to the advantage both of the trade concerned and to the revenue of the country, where material changes are to be made, that the public should not have notice. I have a distinct recollection, when acting on behalf of my colleague some years ago, when changes were made in the tariff, that the hon. member for South Oxford called attention to the fact that merchants and the commercial community had taken advantage of the knowledge which they had obtained by some means of the changes that were to be made in the tariff, and thereby profited by them to the loss of the revenue. I remember also distinctly, and I think it will be borne out by the official report, that that hon. gentleman used strong language of condemnation that that information had been given. Now, it is in the interest of the revenue, where changes of an important character are to be made, that the commercial community should not know it, and that it should be sprung, if I may use that term, not only upon the House but upon the country with as little notice as possible. I know it may be said, on the other hand, that after these resolutions have been proposed and published, those who are interested should have an opportunity of approving or rejecting them, and that I take to be the principal argument of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. But in a case of this kind where there are no material changes which will affect the general trade of the country, the hon. gentleman's argument does not prevail to the same extent as he supposes. I am, however, quite free to admit that it is a precedent which ought not to be followed where radical changes are proposed to be made, either in increasing or reducing the tariff, as the result might be inconvenient to the commercial community. Now, the only article in this whole proposition that affects the trade materially is that of molasses, and it is necessary, in order to protect the consumers and the importers, that this change should take place, otherwise the country will continue to be flooded with an article which has really no saccharine strength or quality. In the other articles, with the exception alone of eggs, the change in which will not materially affect the trade of the country, the changes are in the direction of a reduction of duties, and to place articles which are used by manufacturers upon the free list, a proposition that I should suppose would meet with the approbation of the hon. gentleman, as it is in consonance with his trade policy. If the hon. gentleman will reflect for a moment he will come to the conclusion that he is altogether wrong in his estimate of the powers which, he says, are vested in the Treasury Board to deal with many of the articles mentioned by the Finance Minister. The only power given to the Treasury Board is to place an article upon the free list which is used in the manufacture of another article, and not to reduce a duty. The hon. gentleman himself has advanced the argument that it is objectionable for the Governor in Council, through the Treasury Board, to exercise any of these powers with which they are vested by the Customs Act, except in extreme cases, or in cases of absolute necessity where it is required in the general interest of the public. So far as that power is concerned I fully concur in the view that it should be exercised as discreetly as possible, and only when it is in the interests either of the manufacturing or the consuming community. Now, I have pointed out to the House that if any great changes were proposed affecting the general trade of the country, there might be some force in the advice presented to the House by the hon. member for South Oxford; but in the present case the change only affects an article the trade on which is actually ruined by the tariff as it stands, the tariff allowing an article to be placed upon the market at a very low price which has really no value. When we reflect that the policy of the Government, ever since 1879, has been to prevent as much as possible the introduction of that particular article called blackstrap, or the washings of tanks in the refining of sugar, we are doing good to the community by keeping it out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is it that escaped the attention of the Government until now?

Mr. BOWELL. In the same way as many other things have escaped attention. The processes employed in the manufacture of sugar and of many other articles change rapidly, and the process which is in force to-day may be replaced by one entirely different 12 months hence. The system of producing sugar was formerly by the centrifugal process, and by the draining process, by which you had a quality of molasses that would test from 40 to 50 and 55 per cent saccharine strength; but new machinery has been perfected to such an extent that almost all the saccharine matter has been taken from this very article which is brought into the country and sold as molasses, and which really has no intrinsic value. That is one of the reasons why this change is necessary, and why changes are constantly necessary in any tariff based upon the principles upon which our tariff is based. If you were to introduce the free trade principle in its entirety, I admit these arguments would be of no avail. I might mention other reasons arising from the working of the McKinley tariff in the United States, but I do not desire to detain the House by going into a minute description of the manufacture

of sugar. I have given one reason which I think is quite sufficient to sustain the position taken by the Government, and when the House reflects a few moments upon the proposition, they will come to the conclusion that the commercial community of Canada are not at all menaced by the dangers predicted by the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think when the House reflects upon the alleged necessity for making these changes, it will be surprised that the Minister was not able to discover this necessity before, and introduce the Bill at the proper time. The proceeding of the Government is without precedent and, I think, is altogether objectionable. The Minister of Militia admits that if the changes had been more numerous it would be objectionable. I think it is objectionable under any circumstances, and, as has been forcibly pointed out by the hon. member for South Oxford, to introduce resolutions of this kind at the very closing hours of the session, after the Supply Bill has passed its second reading, is something that is wholly extraordinary and altogether unjustifiable. The Ministry must have had knowledge of this matter with reference to molasses and with reference to eggs: they are acquainted with the tariff of the United States and with our own tariff, they are in possession of the figures showing the amount of the importations of those articles, and no doubt representations must have been made to them long ago with reference to those articles; yet the proposition is delayed until this season, and I think some valid reasons ought to be given to justify this extraordinary proceeding before the House consents to it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Militia says that if there were any important changes in the tariff he would consider himself that such a proposition, made under these circumstances, would be objectionable, but how are we to distinguish between changes of a material character from those which are less so? You cannot draw a distinction between a very important change and a change of less importance. If the Government had proposed great changes in the tariff, I apprehend that hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, would be disposed to agree that a proceeding like this would be dangerous. But it is because the changes are not of great importance, that the House is in danger of giving its assent to an objectionable precedent. I do not remember an instance during the present century in the English Parliament where, at the close of a session, changes were proposed in the tariff. The subject of tariff changes is always dealt with at a very early period in the session; and now hon. gentlemen, at the very close of the session, are proposing to make changes in the tariff. The hon. gentleman has spoken of certain kinds of molasses that possess very little saccharine matter, that are being introduced, and that ought to be kept out, and he says the character of the article prevents the purchaser from distinguishing between that which is of some value and that which is of scarcely no value. I admit the soundness of the proposition, but that proposition was just as sound ten years ago as it is to-day. There is no difference in that respect, nor does the process of manufacture make the slightest difference. Why, if you introduce molasses possessing 20 per cent of saccharine matter, is it a matter of any consequence whether that molasses is produced by the manufacture of sugar in one way or another? Every one who has given any attention to the subject of the manufacture of sugar knows that there are inferior varieties of molasses produced, and that since the modern process of refining has been adopted you have, perhaps, as bad a quality as you well could have, and it is not a whit worse under the process of manufacturing to-day than it was ten years ago. The fact is that molasses of a very inferior quality ought to be subjected to a higher taxation to discourage its introduction. That may be a sound principle, but it does not depend upon the question of free trade or protection; it depends wholly upon another principle, the inability to distinguish between one variety of an article and another. You are in this case adopting the principle of free trade, and you might require that parties should mark the percentage of saccharine matter upon the cask containing the article which they offer for sale. The subject which the Government now brings before us is one that was just as obvious at the beginning of this session as it is at this moment. It does not matter how inferior a quality of molasses is produced, there is the fact that you are putting upon the market an article which enables the vendor to impose upon the purchaser, and if you wish to prevent that being done you ought to have considered the subject of taxation at an earlier period. I think no inconvenience that the public are likely to suffer, no loss that the treasury could suffer, is at all as great as the inconvenience or danger that is likely to arise from an attempt to introduce such a measure at this period of the session. I think the Government had better take the advice of the hon. member for South Oxford and pause before pressing this measure through Parliament. They might have introduced this measure three months ago just as well as to-day, and Parliament would have had time to consider it. Everybody knows that nearly one-half the members of this House are absent; they supposed that the work of the session was practically over, and under these circumstances it is highly improper for the Government to propose these changes at this period of the session. I think it is most inexpedient that this should be done; it is introducing a dangerous principle—a principle that might be used in case revolutionary changes were proposed in the tariff as readily as in the case of these insignificant changes which the Minister proposes to make. I admit that a tax of 5 cents a dozen on eggs, on the few dozens imported into Canada, is not a matter of very great consequence. The Government may believe they will thereby encourage home industry, and the hon. Minister may perhaps agree with one of their former supporters who declared that the hens laid bigger eggs and more of them under a protective tariff than under a policy of free trade, and the Finance Minister may cackle over that idea if he likes; but I do not think he will persuade any hon. gentleman on this side of the House that he is going to relieve the necessities of the farming community by the benefits he is undertaking to extend to the hens. The hon. gentleman, if he wanted to propose changes in the tariff, ought to have submitted them earlier. The Minister of Militia says that the public ought not to know the changes that are about to take place. That depends altogether on circumstances.

If the Government are proposing a very great increase in the tariff,——

Mr. FOSTER. Which they are not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell),—and if the changes became known, the effect might be to hasten importations. Gentlemen engaged in importing the particular article in question might import large quantities before the change came into force, and thus anticipate the change and cause the country to lose a certain amount of revenue. But it may work the other way. Let us suppose that the hon. gentleman was taking off a tax; that change might affect seriously parties who had made large importations a few weeks previous. That might happen, and the considerations which the hon. gentleman has mentioned are not those which are operating in this particular case. What we have to consider now is the impropriety of forcing an important matter of this sort upon the attention of Parliament at the very close of the session; and in the second place, of tinkering with the tariff at every possible period of the session. There ought not to be changes constantly made. Men engaged in business carry on their operations on certain principles based on the actual condition of affairs. They purchase at particular prices, they have paid certain duties to the Government, and they have placed their articles on the market with respect to the duties they have paid to the Government and the prices at which they have purchased, and the Government by undertaking to tinker with the tariff two or three times during the session, at the beginning and the end of the session, are creating a spirit of distrust and doubt that will do infinitely more mischief to trade and commerce than possibly can be done by the evil which the hon. gentleman says he desires to remove before this session closes.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1, item 1—eggs,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I simply point out to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is not probably a member in this House, unless he is a party engaged in the trade, who can, from hearing you read that resolution, form any idea of the changes proposed. It may be as the hon. Minister has stated, or it may not be so. It may have the effect he indicates, or it may have an effect different from what he imagines; not one of us can tell. The House is proceeding blindfold in this matter, which may have considerable consequence, which may have more important consequences than the Minister is aware of, because we know that gentlemen connected with the sugar refineries have obtained the passage of measures through this House of a similar character to this one which resulted in consequences not at all perceived by the House at the time they were passed, and most assuredly no member of the committee can offer any kind of opinion as to what the results will be of the changes now proposed.

Mr. FOSTER. There is not, certainly, a school boy 11 years old but what can take the tariff as it is to-day—and the hon. gentleman can certainly get a copy of the tariff—and follow the items and understand the whole thing. In the first place, the resolution refers to item 610. That is not difficult to find out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You do not state what item 610 is.

Mr. FOSTER. When he turns to No. 610, he will find it is the article which now makes eggs free of duty; and as it is proposed to put a duty of 5 cents per dozen on eggs, it becomes necessary, in the first place, to repeal the item which now places eggs on the free list. When we come to the second item, the resolution proposes to amend items 95 and 122. He will find these items relate to two articles, one with respect to glove leather, and the other with respect to oleostearine, and repeal those items so as afterwards to enact them with the changes which I have explained to the House. In the same way we act with respect to molasses. It is all simple and easy, and the hon. gentleman is conjuring up a difficulty which does not exist.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have had plenty of experience of these changes before. We know very well that changes have been made, which apparently meant very little, in fact almost nothing at all, which when practically carried into force placed very large sums of money in the pockets of individual manufacturers. My remarks now are more particularly confined to molasses, and I simply say this, that on hearing such a statement read, as has been read now, it is quite impossible, even for the Minister himself, to know precisely what the results are going to be. We have time and time again seen changes, apparently as innocent and innocuous, put through, and we have found that afterwards they involved very considerable changes in the tariff. It is a matter of common experience, and well known to us all.

On item 2—molasses,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Chairman, would you please to let us have a few printed copies of these resolutions and then we can understand them better? We have been accustoned to have them when we are making those changes.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend I do not think can cite an example of where printed copies have been prepared at this stage. The resolutions have always been introduced in this way. They have been read a first time and then they have been printed, and then discussed by the House, and I propose the same method shall be followed now.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who brought this question of molasses to the attention of the Minister and pressed upon him these changes?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell my hon. friend so as to relieve his very great anxiety, that it was not the sugar refiners.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My question was not who had pressed these changes upon him, but my question was, who brought the matter to the attention of the Minister? We are accustomed to hear the Minister tell us in making tariff changes that he has been moved, or incited thereto, by parties either interested or disinterested, and when he remembers the fact that this matter has been going on for a long time, one would suppose it had been pressed upon his attention. I would like to know who did it and when it was done?

Mr. FOSTER. Having given my friend the negative answer, I will now give an affirmative answer. After satisfying him that it was not press-

ed upon my attention by the sugar refiners, I will say it has been pressed upon my attention and the attention of the Department of Customs by the dealers in and importers of molasses, and from I think nearly every city in the Dominion of Canada. They have been here repeatedly pressing this matter upon my attention, and I can assure my hon. friend that it is a matter which the trade in genuine West Indies molasses feels very keenly all over the country. If there is any item which has ever been pressed upon my attention strongly, and I think with the best of reasons, it is this one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, why did not the hon. gentleman introduce these resolutions at the proper time, and give us an opportunity of discussing this resolution? These things ought to have been brought to our notice months ago. We have been here since the 25th February and there have been any quantity of opportunities, if the hon. gentleman considered it a proper change, to have moved the House into Committee of Ways and Means at a time of the session when the question could have been discussed, and when we could have communicated with parties interested. That is utterly impossible now.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not seem to me that the changes are so important or so many that it is difficult for any one to understand them. I do not think it would require much effort on the part of this House to understand the importance of putting a duty of 5 cents per dozen on eggs. It is an easy matter to find how many have been imported, and to understand how it affects the trade here in Canada. It must also be an easy matter for any one who understands what molasses are and what is meant by increasing the duty as the grade in quality goes downwards, considering that a grade at 40 is about as suitable a preparation of molasses as can be used, and that you increase the duty as the grade works downwards. It is just on the same principle as the inspection of food in order to give the consumers an unadulterated article. I do not think it is difficult to understand that, nor do I consider that any of the other tariff changes proposed are difficult to understand. I do not agree with the hon. member for Bothwell that the introduction of this principle is objectionable, because it happens to come late in the session, and because he cannot look back for 100 years and cite precedents for what is done. It seems to me that a good thing cannot be done out of season at any time, and though it may be late in the session, it is much better to have it adopted by the House now than to leave it over for another year. I regret that the Government did not go much further even at this late stage of the session. They have put a duty on the article of eggs which is a very important matter to the agriculturists of this country. The farmers of the country have been expecting that for years, and they thought they were justly entitled to have it; but, although it is a little tardy now, still it has come at last and will be welcome. What I do regret is that the Government have not gone further and increased the duty on mess pork as the farmers of this country expected they would. The Trade and Navigation Returns furnish us with the very strongest arguments in favour of imposing a duty on mess pork. When the duty was raised to 3 cents a pound a few years ago, the importation of the class of pork that come under that regulation dropped off more than three-fourths inside of one year. When the duty on mess pork was put on at only 1½ cents a pound, the importation continued, but, whereas the importation the year before that duty was put on was about 14,000,000 lbs. of mess pork, the year after the duty it dropped to 11,000,000 lbs. In the other kind of pork we stopped the importation by putting the duty on, but, in this line, we did not put the duty as high as it should be, and as high as we believe it ought to be. I regret very much, in the interest of the agriculturists of this country, that the Government did not go as far as we expected them to go, or as far as they should have gone, and increased the duty on mess pork to 3 cents a pound, the same as on other k nds of meat imported.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). While the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) tells us the farmers have been looking for years for this measure of relief as he calls it, he will be prepared to blame the Government that they have let the farmers suffer under that grievous injury for four months of this session.

Mr. SPROULE. That is just what I am doing.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am glad to know that he once in a while can speak a little word in that direction. However, I think we are discussing molasses just now. I was about to ask the Minister of Militia—who, with all due respect to the Minister of Finance, I suppose understands the matter a little better—does it necessarily follow that this molasses run down in polariscopic test should be black in colour and unsaleable-looking, or are there bright molasses that come under that head?

Mr. BOWELL. I have seen bright and almost amber-coloured syrup of an inferior grade. An importer had come to the department while I was at its head, complaining bitterly of the ruling of the officials, declaring that it was not only an article fit for food but that it was a superior article; but when he was taken to the laboratory and shown by the polariscope that this amber-coloured syrup, as clear as crystal almost, would only polarize from 22 to 24 per cent of saccharine matter, he went away satisfied, to use his own expression: "That although he had been importing molasses for 20 years he knew nothing about it." There are cases in which molasses of darker colour have been imported, and when tested there was not one single degree of saccharine matter to be found. It is sweetened by the aid of the new article called saccharine, which I have no doubt the hon. gentleman understands as well as I do, and of which a small particle not so large as a pea will sweeten a gallon of water to the extent almost of half a pound of sugar. By the aid of that saccharine placed in the washings of the sugar vats, it will give the substance as sweet a taste and flavour as if it had saccharine matter in it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The reason I asked the Minister was that that was my impression. I understood the Minister when speaking to refer to this low grade as "blackstrap" and I imagined that he could find the brighter coloured article with a low grade of saccharine matter.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. FLINT. I desire to join in the protest that has been uttered on this side of the House against the Government making these changes at this late hour of the session, without giving to members of the House an opportunity of considering the effect that these alterations will have upon the trade or upon the consumer. I think the Government are taking a very serious responsibility in bringing down measures of this kind at this period of the session, even although the matter may not be of such grave importance as it would have been had the view of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) been carried out. I can very well understand, from the course of the hon. member for East Grey here, that he would support the Government most heartily at this late hour of the session in bringing down very extensive changes in the direction of protecting the line of goods he has mentioned, and increasing the duty on mess pork and articles of that kind. But I beg leave to differ entirely with him as to the propriety of the Government taking such serious action, affecting so largely the welfare and prosperity of large numbers of the people of this country, when gentlemen who are intimately acquainted with the trades interested, and the effect of these changes on the consumers, are prevented from making proper enquiries and participating intelligently in this discussion. I hope that the Government will not soon yield to the views of the hon. member for East Grey in regard to increasing the duties upon what are almost the necessaries of life to large numbers of the most industrious population of the Maritime Provinces. Of course, it is improper at this time to debate the question he has raised, because it is not involved in the resolution before the House; but I do protest against the Government making any changes of such importance unless they are made at an early period of the session, when every member has a full opportunity of discussing them in their full bearings before they pass the House. Now, I think it is very strange that the discovery has been just made at this late hour of the session that it is of vital importance to the trade of this country that an extra duty should be levied on the low grades of molasses. I think there must have been information in possession of the Finance Department long ago to the same effect as that which the Minister has given us to-night. If there have been these strong representations from the trade, I am surprised that the Government have been so neglectful of their duty in the past as not to have made these suggestions when their tariff changes were being made in the House; and the fact that these changes are brought down at this late hour, without any notice having been given to the members that they were contemplated, naturally causes those who are not familiar with the effect of these changes, to suspect that some deeper reason than that stated to the House for making these changes may possibly be in existence. I have no doubt, of course, that these alterations will be accepted by the House, in consequence of the large majority supporting the Government; but as a member of the Opposition at any rate, and as representing a community largely interested in these trades, I must join in the protest against the action of the Government in suggesting these alterations at this late hour of the session. I think we should have an opportunity of considering and discussing them, and of communicating with our constituents as to their probable effect; and I do trust that in the future we shall not have the Government attempting an outrage of this kind by proposing important alterations in the taxation of the country within twenty-four or forty-eight hours of the close of the session.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I cannot ascertain from the Trade and Navigation Returns what percentage of molasses under 40 per cent has been imported. The Minister must have been furnished with some information as to whether the proportion is large or small.

Mr. FOSTER. The proportion has been very considerable. Of course, a record of that is kept in the Department of Customs where the testing is done. The hon. gentleman knows that it would take but a small proportion of that kind of molasses put on the market to demoralize the whole market, but the proportion is very considerable.

Mr. BERGIN. It appears to me that the protest of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) was a rather extraordinary one to come from a Maritime Province representative. We all know that molasses and syrups form very important articles of consumption by the fishermen and others in the Maritime Provinces, and it really does seem to me that a member representing a maritime constituency would desire good, honest molasses and syrup to be furnished to his people. He complains also that this change is going to disarrange trade. I cannot see that any class of the commercial community is likely to be injured by the introduction of this measure now, except it be the manufacturers of these spurious, false syrups on the American side. The protest comes from the honest dealers in Canada, who find that the spurious article has been imposed upon them, and that they are selling to the community as a syrup that which is not syrup, but only sweetened water; and if they ask the Government to protect the public and themselves against the introduction of this deleterious and unwholesome article of food, the Government are to be commended for doing it, even though at the very last hour. It has not been a secret for some weeks past that this spurious article has been placed on the market, because leading dealers, among others Lightbound, Rolston & Company, have sent circulars I think to all the members of this House, calling their attention to the flooding of the market with this spurious article, and asking the Government to impose a duty on that which does not reach 60, so as to drive that article out of the market.

Mr. STAIRS. I would like to say to the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) that the change now proposed is certainly in the interests of his constituency. Not only will it have the effect mentioned by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), not only will it tend to give the consumers of molasses in the Maritime Provinces a very much better article, but it will also encourage the development of the West Indies trade, in which the hon. gentleman's constituents are largely interested. For that reason, he should be inclined to support it, even though it does come down at a late period in the session. The effect of the resolution in the tariff last year was seriously to interfere with the importation of pure, sweet and good molasses from the West Indies. It was found, as

pointed out by the Finance Minister and the Minister of Militia, that a very inferior syrup is being largely sent into this country from the United States, thus interfering with our direct trade with the West Indies, besides furnishing our people with an unwholesome and inferior article. This change is proposed, not in the interests of the refiners of Canada, but of the West Indian merchants and the consumers in this country; and it is the only way by which the desired results of encouraging further the West India trade and providing our people with what they desire to have, a better article than they are getting from the United States, can be obtained. I trust, therefore, that even though the measure be brought down at this late period, the hon. gentleman will see that it is in the interests of his constituents.

Mr. FLINT. From the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, the impression would be derived that my objection to the measure before the House was aimed at the effect of the measure. I was careful to state as one of my objections, that, owing to the fact that the resolution was brought down at such a late stage of the session, thus giving us no opportunity to study the subject or communicate with those interested, it was impossible for us to come to any conclusion as to its effect. My objection simply was to bringing forward changes of this kind at such a late hour of the session, and I endorse the opinions of those who spoke before me on this point from this side of the House. Another objection which I ventured to make, or rather another observation upon the subject, was that it appears very strange that so very important a proposition should have only occurred to the Ministry within the last few days. There certainly must have existed for many years the same danger to the fishermen the Government now dread, and to the other consumers of molasses, through the manufacture of liquids containing saccharine matter. This danger must have existed ever since the importations began. Many years ago we heard of the manufacture of material of this kind of a very low grade and of its being imported into this country from the United States, but the Government did not then think fit to bring forward any measure to prevent that importation. There has been no popular agitation in the matter, and I may say, so far as I am concerned, that I have not seen any of the complaints alluded to by hon. gentlemen opposite. I, therefore, think we are justified in asking the reason of this sudden and fiery zeal on the part of the Government to protect these people at all hazards, by bringing down these changes at this late hour. I do not think that the people are so absolutely helpless, I do not think that the importers or consumers are so absolutely helpless with regard to what they import and consume, that they require the Government to rush in at any time or season, as it suits their convenience, to protect them in this way. The people have managed to protect themselves for 150 or 200 years in this country, and might be trusted to protect themselves seven or eight months longer without the interference of the Government, but at the same time, if, as a result of information given by those who understand and are interested in this matter, it is shown that this change is desirable, I would have no objection to it on its merits; but I object to changes being made in the tariff at any time whatever without the House being given full opportunity to consider their effect. This will be the introduction of a precedent which may have a very bad effect upon the legislation of this House at some future time.

Mr. BOWELL. The position of the hon. gentleman is simply this: that while he is not prepared to admit that this proposition will have any injurious effect, on the contrary he tacitly admits that it is in the interests of his own constituency, and more particularly in the interests of the West India trade and of the fishermen who are the largest consumers of molasses, still he is prepared to oppose this beneficial change in the tariff solely because it was not brought down at an earlier period in the session, and despite the fact that it is in the direct interests of his own constituents. Had the hon. gentleman studied the question, he would not have made the remarks he has just uttered. He asks why this proposition did not suggest itself to the Government before two or three days ago. The hon. gentleman seems to be a sort of Rip Van Winkle, and to have just awakened from a long sleep during a number of years. The principle involved in the changes we are making were embodied in the tariff resolutions by Sir Leonard Tilley, when Minister of Finance in 1879; and the same reasons which were given then for the imposition of a higher duty upon the lower grade of molasses are given to-day, but under different circumstances. That article of saccharine, to which I called the attention of the committee a short time ago, had not then been discovered or its extraordinary sweetening qualities fully known, consequently the results which have followed that discovery could not by any possibility have then been known; yet the hon. gentleman tells the committee that the Government have been derelict in their duty because they did not foresee the effect of this discovery, which has completely revolutionized the sweetening qualities of almost every article in which it is used. The hon. gentleman should at least study the tariff and the principles on which it is based before rising to condemn any proposition. I am fully in accord with my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Sproule) that if a proposition be in the interests of the people it is the duty of the Government, even at a late moment in the session, to give effect to such proposition, and legislate for the benefit of the people. I do not believe that it is good policy on the part of a Government to come to the conclusion that the people can look after themselves in all the changing circumstances of trade which are constantly taking place, and to refuse to deal with such changes in a manner that will benefit the people, simply because they may have to do so at a late period of the session. It is not my idea of statesmanship or of wisdom in governing a country, that because you have not given the community or the members of the House a month's notice therefore you should not legislate in the interests of the people. When we find that an injury has been done by any provision of the tariff upon the community, we believe it to be our duty to come down to the House at once and ask power to apply a remedy, and that is precisely what we are doing now. If the hon. gentleman will reflect a little, and forget for a moment that he is in the ranks of the Opposition, and considers it his duty to oppose everything the Govern-

ment submit to the House, he will come to the conclusion that our action in this respect is eminently proper.

Mr. FLINT. Remarkable as the address of my hon. friend has been, I would not refer to it, were it not his evident intention to place me in a false position with regard to my attitude in this matter. The whole assumption of the hon. gentleman's address was that I am opposed to the adoption of any measure which would have the effect of protecting or improving the position of consumers as regards these articles. I was careful to state my objection to the proposition to be that I was not aware and had not the opportunity of being aware of the effect it would probably have, so I was careful to abstain from stating that I was opposed to the principle of the proposition. I was commenting on the sudden necessity the Government had found within the last few days of making these changes, though the hon. gentleman admits that the discovery of the invention to detect pure saccharine took place a few years ago. I think he will find his admission was accentuated in 1879 when Sir Leonard Tilley was Finance Minister. I objected to altering the tariff and interfering with the trade and commerce of the country to a larger or smaller degree but to an extent of which we could not be aware, as we had not the opportunity at so short notice to make ourselves aware. I am not willing that the hon. gentleman should place me in the position of objecting to any reasonable measure of precaution as regards the consuming interests of the country. Up to the present the consumers have managed to protect themselves very fairly, and I think they could do so until a few weeks after the end of next session. At all events, I would be willing to trust the good sense of the consumers in my county for that time.

On resolution 4,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that is open to the objection that the House is asked to divest itself of its proper legislative power in favour of the Governor in Council. I think we have done that a great deal too much of late years, and I think it is inexpedient for us to add to that power. The House should reserve that to itself and should not allow the Governor in Council, or in other words the Ministry of the day, to possess the power of imposing heavy duties during the period when Parliament is not sitting. The worst that can happen by leaving things as they are for some three or four months, is that it may be impossible to deal with a particular state of things. Now, that is a far less inconvenience than for Parliament deliberately to hand over its legislative authority, that it ought jealously to guard, to a Government which is after all only a committee of the House.

Manufactured tobacco not elsewhere stated, and snuff, 45 cents per pound and 15 per cent *ad valorem*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that an additional duty, or is that also at the pleasure of the Governor in Council?

Mr. FOSTER. These duties are fixed, but the option rests with the Governor in Council.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are the Government proposing to add to the duties on tobacco by this resolution?

Mr. FOSTER. No, except to take power in the case which is contemplated in the resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a very important departure, and is introducing a new principle in our legislation, and that adds, if possible, still more strongly to the objections we have urged. Very grave changes indeed may be made in the customs tariff on the assumption by the Government that it is for the public interest to do so without consulting Parliament. These will become the law of the land and can only be repealed by Parliament itself. I must say that I think this legislation is about as inconsiderate, as uncalled for, as unconstitutional and as opposed to British precedent as any legislation I have ever heard of. There is something like it to be found in the Mc Kinley tariff, and I strongly suspect that this Government is copying from the McKinley tariff; and this is another illustration of the fact that when an evil is to be done, or an evil precedent is to be found—because I hold the powers the American Congress conferred on their President were very objectionable powers—the Ministry are prepared to take it; they are prepared, as usual, to turn their back upon the English practice and upon English precedent, and to take the American precedent.

Mr. FOSTER. We take a good thing wherever we find it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You take a bad thing wherever you find it, and you are pretty active and diligent in finding it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the proposition of the Government is a very inconsiderate one. At the close of last session the Government took authority by which they secured the repeal of the favoured-nation clause by the Spanish Government in reference to our trade with the West Indies. The hon. gentleman has a proposition here with regard to the most-favoured-nation clause; he proposes to take the power, wherever it is found that Canada is not placed upon the footing of the most favoured nation, to impose a maximum amount of duty upon certain articles imported from that nation. It would be quite as well for the hon. gentleman to name the specific goods he has in view, and to leave the responsibility with Parliament, and I shall state my reason for taking that view in a moment. But the hon. gentleman seems to forget that the principle of the most-favoured-nation clause in certain cases is beyond our control. What the condition of our trade may be with certain nations depends upon treaty stipulations with the Imperial Government. That, I think, is the case with Germany. But the hon. gentleman has no power to put Canada upon a footing of the most favoured nation as respects Germany. Whether in some other instances that rule would apply, I cannot at this moment say, but it is pretty clear to any member of the House who has looked into the subject that the Government cannot in every instance do what they propose to do by these resolutions. Now, I beg to submit to the House this fact, that taxation is assumed under our constitutional system to be a grant from the party to whom property belongs, to the Government. We, sitting here as a Parliament, are acting in this respect, not so much as representatives but as delegates of the people, speaking as their agents, and making to the Crown an appropriation on their behalf. Now, the hon. gentle-

man's proposition is that this property, whether it be in the form of money or otherwise, may be put directly into the hands of the Crown. The hon. gentlemen in this respect are acting, not as members of the House, but as Ministers of the Crown when they advise the Crown, and they are asking us to delegate the power of taxation, during the interval between this session and the next, to the Crown itself, because the hon. gentlemen have no power to do anything in the matter except as advisers to the Crown. The act is the act of the Crown. It is true they are responsible to Parliament as advisers of the Crown, but in point of law it is in the hands of the Crown that the hon. gentlemen ask this Parliament to place the power of taxation. I say this is a most objectionable proposition. It is altogether at variance with the genius of our institutions, because the right of taxation belongs to Parliament. It is a gift and grant. The Crown possesses the revenue raised by customs and excise duties, because it has been given and granted by the people of Canada to the Crown; and the hon. gentleman asks us not merely to give and grant certain rates of taxation on particular articles, but to give and grant into the hands of the Crown the right to fix a rate of taxation on particular articles. That is a most objectionable proposal. and the Minister should not ask Parliament to consent to it. What they should do is to ascertain in what cases and with what countries they wish to apply the rule they refer to, and they should ask this House to assist them in legislating on the subject, if it is necessary to deal with the matter at all.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has been very chary this evening with respect to imparting to the House information as to the motives which led him to propose this extraordinary legislation, but on reading the resolution we understand his motives. He has simply taken a leaf out of the McKinley tariff. This resolution submitted is the same resolution which is incorporated in the McKinley tariff with respect to Latin-America. It provided that if tobacco and sugar producing countries failed to enter into negotiations with the Government of the United States on trade matters, then the President was empowered to levy high customs duties on goods coming from those countries. That is exactly what is provided for here. It is resolved that it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, at any time when he may decide it to be in the public interest to do so, to suspend the provision of any and all articles relating to customs duties in so far as regards sugar, molasses or tobacco when imported from any country which it may be shown to his satisfaction does not afford to Canada the most-favoured-nation treaty, and may order that during such period all sugar, molasses and tobacco when imported from such countries shall be subject and shall be chargeable with such customs duties as follows. So that if the Spanish West Indies have failed to give us the treatment which they have given to the United States by treaty, in such case the Governor in Council may levy high customs duties on their products when imported into Canada. That is practically the provision of the McKinley tariff. What is the difference? It is the same thing. The provision of the McKinley was simply that under certain conditions, if the countries of Latin-America failed to respond to the advances of the American Government, in such case the President was authorized to cause to be levied higher customs duties on their products. I commend this suggestion to hon. gentlemen opposite. They have always opposed the policy of unrestricted reciprocity as one that would assimilate our tariff with the tariff of the United States. If that is not assimilation with a vengeance, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite what it is.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is reciprocity of tariffs.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) I think answered himself. If we have the most-favoured-nation tariff clause with any country, then to that country, while that tariff lasts, this provision cannot apply. It eliminates all countries which have the most-favoured-nation tariff in Great Britain.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). While the most-favoured-nation clause extends to the United Kingdom, it is obliged to extend to the whole empire.

Mr. FOSTER. That is so, and the exercise of the power by the Government will have to be gauged by the circumstances which are found to exist. With respect to the statement of the leader of the Opposition that we have copied exactly the provision of the McKinley Bill, I think he is quite mistaken. The difference in the power is very great, and it is marked in this respect. The third section of the McKinley tariff leaves it with the President entirely to judge as to whether or not the duties exacted in any country are equal and fair, or not, and if he judges these are not, and the range of judgment is wide—that is to say it is entirely within his own power, it is not a question of fact settled by Congress, but simply at the option of the President himself as to whether he considers any country is not giving the treatment which should be extended to the United States — then he may proclaim that certain duties shall go into effect. That is very different indeed from our position. The duties are to go into effect on certain articles on which the rate is fixed by Parliament or by Congress; but when they are to go into force with us is a matter which is a question of fact, not a question of opinion at all, for Parliament lays down the conditions under which such a power shall be exercised, and the exact extent of the power which shall be exercised in such a case. So, I think, there is quite a difference between the two resolutions. The powers given by legislative authority in this case are fixed and definite, as to the extent and conditions; in the case of the United States they are fixed as to the extent, but they are not fixed as to the conditions. The President has the sole judgment and option of these.

Mr. LAURIER. The only difference is that if the Governor in Council is of the opinion that we do not enjoy the most-favoured-nation clause, he can cause the imposition of high duties. I suggest that in order to be consistent, we should supplement this power by giving the Governor in Council the power to abolish subsidies which Parliament has voted to certain lines of steamers with those countries in order to promote trade.

Mr. FOSTER. I have one resolution to add:

The foregoing changes and duties respecting customs shall come into force and take effect on 6th July, 1892.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not hear the Deputy Speaker read the resolution respecting 5 per cent reduction on sugars.

Mr. FOSTER. Every item has been read.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not hear one word of it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not remember reading about 5 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It certainly was not read. I listened very carefully and did not hear one word of it. The only reference to it I heard was when the hon. gentleman introduced the resolution. I will trouble you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to read it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I read everything in my hand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not hear that resolution read.

Mr. BOWELL. I heard it read. The hon. gentleman for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) came over, and he and I discussed the question. He asked me for an interpretation as to what it meant.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I had been at the chair and read it. These resolutions were evidently prepared in a hurry.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not hear one word of that important resolution read.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As a matter of courtesy it might be read again.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not deny it, but I mention this to show that it has been read.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am pretty certain it has not been read, and Mr. Chairman himself distinctly stated he did not recollect reading it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I read everything I have here, but I did not read anything specially about 5 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We are discussing these matters under the extremest disadvantage, and a certain number of copies ought to have been printed. I would be obliged to you, Sir, if you would read that or send it to me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would sooner send it to you than read it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say on looking at these papers that I do not wonder the Chairman found it difficult to know whether he had read it or not. I do not see that resolution which the Minister referred to in his speech about the removal of a certain 5 per cent duty on sugars.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the Minister has changed his mind since that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say it is making a perfect farce of legislation here that with all the appliances the Ministers have at their command, they cannot manage to have a few copies confidentially printed. That is the custom.

Mr. BOWELL. Never.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did it myself half a dozen times and distributed the copies to members of the then Opposition.

Mr. BOWELL. You did what was wrong.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a simple disgrace to the Parliament of Canada that we are called upon to legislate upon a question of this kind and that we are not even able to get read one of the chief tariff resolutions which the hon. gentleman introduces. The hon. gentleman, as I understand, proposes to make an alteration which will involve very important consequences to the trade between the West Indies and the Maritime ports. He proposes that the Governor in Council shall take power to remove the duty of 5 per cent on sugars not imported direct from the West Indies. Such a change as that is doubly objectionable. It may interfere very materially with the West India trade for which we have recently voted large subsidies, and it gives very objectionable power to the Governor in Council to tinker the tariff without referring the special case to Parliament. Over and above that, we have subsidized this line of steamers to the West Indies and now he proposes to affect that trade considerably by taking power in certain contingencies not specified to remove the discriminating duty which now exists, as I understand, in favour of the importation direct to this country from the West Indies to Halifax, St. John or Montreal, as the case may be. On that point the hon. gentleman said very little and I think he had better explain his reasons for introducing a policy of very considerable moment and of still more doubtful expediency. I should like to hear what the hon. gentleman has to say on this subject.

Mr. FOSTER. The resolution is No. 3. "Resolved that it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may order at any time that he may deem it in the public interest to do so, that item 2, of the foregoing resolution (1) shall be suspended for such period as he may name, and that during the said period the following be substituted therefor." Item 2, as my hon. friend will see, is a duty upon molasses, having in it a clause that for indirect shipments the value of 5 per cent additional is added and when that is suspended the Governor General has power to bring in a resolution which is the resolution referring to molasses with the indirect shipment clause left out. The old clause with the direct and indirect shipment in it is extended in the resolution, and in this other resolution the whole clause is extended with that indirect shipment condition left out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand it a large quantity of sugar finds its way from the West Indies to the maritime ports ry considerably in consequence of this discrimination in favour of a direct importation. That the hon. gentleman proposes to do away with. The consequence of that must be, I think, largely to interfere with the projected trade with the West Indies which must, so far as cargoes from the West Indies go, consist chiefly of sugar. The hon. gentleman knows that perfectly well. He has been asking us recently to subsidize lines of steamers to the West Indies for the purpose of promoting that trade, and by this resolution he takes power in the Governor in Council to deal a very serious blow at that trade. Surely some explanation is needed and should be given to the House of the reasons which induced the Government to take such a step.

Mr. MARA. Before the resolutions are reported I wish to state that I think British Columbia had a right to expect that if any changes in the tariff were made this session, the Government would

have asked the House to consider the advisability of increasing the duty on lead. When we remember that the American Government impose a duty of $40 a ton on manufactured lead and $30 a ton on lead ore, which duties are almost prohibitive, and when we know that we have large deposits of low grade galena in British Columbia awaiting development, which if developed would find a market, I think we had a right to expect that the Government would have given this subject some consideration, or, at all events, have asked the House to consider it. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if the Government have taken this question into consideration, and if they have any policy upon the subject?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say to my hon. friend, as he well knows, that full representations with reference to that matter have been laid before myself and other Ministers by the hon. gentleman himself, as coming from that district which is interested in these ores, and the Government have given some consideration to the subject. I myself have given some special consideration to it, as has also the Premier; and if any extensive changes had been made in the tariff in the way of a general rearrangement of the duties, that subject would have received full consideration, with a view to seeing whether or not the Government could have made a recommendation to the House in the line of placing a duty on lead. But as my hon. friend sees, these resolutions do not deal with additions to the tariff, with the sole exception of molasses which was in such a position that the Government did not see their way not to make a change.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And eggs.

Mr. FOSTER. Everybody has a sympathy for the Canadian hen, and the advantage of the small duty on eggs will be recognized by all, even by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. SCRIVER. As eggs have been mentioned, I suppose it will be in order for me to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to some facts, and to ask him a question or two.

Mr. FOSTER. Make the question easy.

Mr. SCRIVER. I will show every consideration for my unfortunate friend in this matter. When I was at home a short time ago, in the little village in which I reside eggs were selling at 10 cents a dozen, while six miles away, across the border, in a little village in the State of New York, they were selling at 15 cents a dozen. Under these circumstances, I want to ask my hon. friend what particular addition to the revenue of the country he expects to derive from this impost, and what amount of protection it will really afford to the Canadian farmer? I believe it to be a fact, however, that for a small period of the year, mainly during the month of March, some importations of eggs are made into Canada from the south-western states. Beyond that I am afraid no good will come from this impost.

Mr. FOSTER. As my hon. friend has answered himself, it is only necessary for me to cite himself in reply. He has laid down the position that the imposition of a duty of five cents a dozen by the McKinley tariff has made the price of eggs five cents a dozen higher in the United States.

Mr. MARA.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But it may be some consolation to my hon. friend from British Columbia to know that although he cannot get a tax on lead, this duty on eggs will add about $10,000 to what the people of British Columbia will have to pay annually if they continue to import eggs from the United States to the same extent that they did last year, when they imported about 200,000 dozen.

Mr. MARA. And if some of the hon. gentleman's friends in Ontario who deal in eggs would take the trouble to put them up properly, so that they could be shipped to British Columbia, they would get from 25 to 50 cents a dozen for them. In British Columbia eggs are never sold at less than 25 cents a dozen; in winter they sell at 50 cents, and during the Christmas season as high as 75 cents a dozen. Though eggs are shipped to British Columbia from Ohio and other western states, the farmers of Ontario do not seem to be able to pack them in such a way that they can be shipped to the Pacific coast.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Minister has held out hopes to the hon. member from British Columbia that there will be a further calamity inflicted on the people of this country in the form of higher taxes in the interest of any one who may undertake to mine what the hon. gentleman calls the inferior lead mines in the Province of British Columbia.

Mr. MARA. I beg pardon. I never said inferior. I said low grade galena, which is widely different.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Low grade means inferior; it means mines in which the per cent of the mineral is not very large——

Mr. MARA. Certainly not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell),—and the hon. gentleman puts us in that position, and it is the necessary consequence of the tariff which hon. gentlemen adopted years ago, and which they persist in adhering to, notwithstanding that it has well nigh driven half the population out of the country, that every new discovery is an additional calamity upon the people of this country. If we had no coal mines or iron mines, we would have none of these high taxes; the agriculturist would have been able to buy his implements for about half what he buys them for now; but every new discovery is a pretext for an additional tax on the population of the country, and here is the hon. gentleman coming before us and saying that at this time it does not pay to work the lead mines of British Columbia, and pleading for the imposition of another tax on the people of this country to increase the cost of lead, so that some person may be able to work mines which in the present state of the country cannot be worked at a profit. Just make the lead twice as dear to every one who consumes lead in this country, in order that somebody may make 5 per cent on his investment in lead mines in British Columbia, when he might make 10 per cent on the same money if he engaged in some business that did not require the protection of the Government. The request of the hon. gentleman further illustrates the absurdity of the policy on which this country entered fourteen years ago. We well remember

a physician in "Gil Blas," who, although he killed a great many patients by a particular system of practice, was never influenced in the smallest degree by the death of the patients to make any change in his system; and so the hon. gentlemen, although they have driven a million people out of the country during the past six or seven years, and although they are impoverishing the agricultural population through the depreciation in the value of real estate to the extent of 30 or 40 per cent, are ready to persist in their policy and to continue to impose additional burdens on every man who has not genius or sense enough to make a good use of his money, in order to enable him to invest it in some profitless enterprise, and to compel the rest of the community to pay tribute to him. My hon. friend from British Columbia will find that whenever that policy is extended in its full force to British Columbia, the people will flee from that province just as they have fled from other provinces of the Dominion.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

ADJOURNMENT—JUDGES' SALARIES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Do the Government intend to proceed with the resolution to increase the salaries of the judges? Many of us intend leaving for home to-morrow; but before doing so would like to know whether this question will come up, because if it should we would remain over. For my part, I am opposed to the resolution, and should like to be here and say a few words on it, because I will not be able to record my vote, having paired with the hon. member for Winnipeg.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have stated fully the matters on the Paper which we will drop, and cannot state before 3 o'clock to-morrow what other measures will be abandoned.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Would it not be possible to let us know at 11 o'clock to-morrow, as there is a train leaving at a quarter to 12?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would gladly inform the hon. gentleman to-night if I could, but I must consult, and we have no opportunity of meeting in Council until 2 o'clock in consequence of the early meeting of the House.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Do you wish to consult the Opposition?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has been good enough to inform me that he is opposed to the resolution, and therefore I need not consult him.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.55 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 7th July, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. BERGIN moved that the eleventh report of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament be concurred in. He said: In moving the adoption of this report, I am instructed by the committee to call the attention of the House to the very large expenditure incurred in connection with the returns which are asked for by members. There are on the Table three reports, which are of no public interest whatever, and which have cost a very large sum in their preparation. One has 838 pages, and cost about $380 in its preparation. All that hon. gentlemen can ascertain from it is the amount which it has cost the judges of the Province of Quebec in travelling expenses and hotel bills during the year. It is of no interest to any one, except the hon. gentleman who moved for it, and that hon. gentleman has not yet seen it.

Mr. LAURIER. What report is that?

Mr. BERGIN. The report of the travelling expenses of judges in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. It has been seen by me and by several hon. members.

Mr. BERGIN. It has not been seen by the hon. member who moved for it; he said he had no interest in it. This return cost not only that sum in preparation, but when the cost of printing was referred to the Queen's Printer, he forwarded an estimate giving the cost of printing at $3,950. There is another return concerning a contested election in the Province of Nova Scotia, which is of no interest to any one except to the contestant, and of no public interest whatever. It contains 832 pages, and cost as much in its preparation as the other report. There is a third return, which came down two or three days ago, in connection with the Temperance Colonization Society in the North-West, which cost as much. These three returns would cost in the neighbourhood of $11,000 or $11,500, if they were printed. The committee ask me to submit the question to the House as to whether some plan could not be adopted by Ministers to curtail these returns. In the great majority of cases, I have no doubt the heads of the departments would be very much pleased to have hon. members go and look over the papers; they would furnish all the information in the department without these returns being brought down to the House at such great cost to the country. The expense of the printing of Parliament has increased within two years to an amount that is almost incredible. For 1889-90 the cost was about $70,000; for 1890-91 about $75,000. The sum of $70,000 was placed in the Estimates for 1891-92, and the committee has been obliged to ask for $35,000 more, and there was not $100 unexpended on 1st July this year. The committee are of the opinion that if hon. members will exercise a little care, if, instead of moving for these returns, they will go to the departments in all personal and local matters and look over the documents there, no doubt Ministers will be only too glad to afford hon. gentlemen every opportunity to examine papers, and large amounts will thereby be saved to the country. When you consider that these three returns would cost the country, if printed, over $11,000, what must be the cost of the many hundreds of returns brought down almost every session? The committee have adopted measures to cut down the expenditure for 1892-93, and if we are as successful during the next session as we have been during the past session, we hope to bring

down the expenditure for 1892-93 to $50,000, instead of $105,000 in 1891-92.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these three returns recommended to be printed?

Mr. BERGIN. No, they are not; we have recommended they be not printed.

Mr. LAURIER. I observe by the language of the hon. gentleman that the committee were unable to make any specific recommendation, except in general terms, that members should abstain from asking for returns which were of a purely personal character. Of course there is no rule in regard to this matter. Every hon. member upon his responsibility as a member asks only for returns that are in the public interest, and never allows himself to be the instrument of party spite, or spite of any kind. I might take exception to the criticisms of certain reports to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. The report in regard to the travelling expenses of judges in the Province of Quebec was a most opportune one. Having looked at this return myself, I must say that I do not construe the statute as it is construed by some of the judges, and if so, the statute may require to be amended. For instance, a judge leaves his district in the morning, goes to Montreal for a few hours, and returns in the evening, and he charges for three days. Under such circumstances the judge has no right to charge for three days; but I see that this sum has been charged by some of the judges.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. And this in cases where a judge left in the morning and returned in the afternoon of the same day.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand from this report that a judge will leave his district by train in the morning, sit one hour or two hours in Montreal, return to his residence on the same day; and charge three days' travelling expenses. I do not think this is fair and right. I understand that when a judge leaves his district and travels part of the day, sits during the next day and returns on the following day, he has a right to charge for three days; and I do not object to that. But we cannot allow a judge travelling under the circumtances I have previously mentioned to charge three days.

Mr. BERGIN. It will have cost, if the return is printed, $4,220 to find it out.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The judge might as well charge three months as three days. I think the committee have done good service in bringing this matter to the attention of the House. The committee have not done it in any fault-finding spirit, but for the purpose of showing members, and Ministers as well, the cost, not only of preparing returns of this kind, but of printing them. There is a great deal of force in what the chairman has said as to the accessibility of the information required. I am quite sure the hon. member who asked for the return respecting judges' expenses was not aware of the cost that would be incurred; but, at the same time, he was perhaps not aware of the facilities given in the departments to obtain any information on any subject or access to any document. If hon. members will bear this in mind they will find that information can be obtained more quickly and satisfactorily, and at less expense, by calling at the departments than by moving for returns. I trust likewise that the fact of the matter being mentioned will induce members to bear with us when we sometimes remonstrate against the great expense that will be incurred by passing a motion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The practice exists in some departments, and I mentioned it earlier in the session, of, where a paper is found in a file that requires to be copied and brought down as a part of a return, they copy the whole file. There may be 30 or 40 documents on the file and one only required. Of course that is in the interests of persons who are paid so much a folio for copying, but often it adds enormously to the cost of a return beyond what is actually necessary. While there ought to be caution, no doubt, on the part of members in asking for returns, it is equally proper that the deputy heads of departments should see that nothing more is copied than is required.

Mr. BERGIN. I quite agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). A return was sent to me this morning with a request from a gentleman in the other House asking for a copy, and when I looked at the return, I found that nearly one-half of it was of just such matter as the hon. gentleman refers to; routine letters between the different departments and individuals, which had no possible interest for the public and which could be of no use to anybody. If the document were copied as desired, it would cost probably $40, while $20 would pay for the copying of all the papers necessary. The gentleman I refer to would not take the paper to look it over, as he had no time for that now, and he wanted a copy to take home with him. Here was $20 thrown away on a matter of no public interest whatever. I would ask my hon. friend, if he will permit me to call him so, the leader of the Opposition, to look at these returns, and he will find that two of them are from Conservatives, so that both sides of the House sin in the matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. One of the returns which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergin) refers to was, however, induced by an amendment to the motion of a Conservative member.

Mr. BOWELL. If I understood the hon. gentleman for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) aright, he stated that certain portions of this correspondence that is on file should be eliminated, providing they are not pertinent to the question and of public interest. If that principle were adopted I am afraid every department would be subject to condemnation for having left out certain letters which were on file, and probably which the person who moved for them was most anxious to see.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that is not my statement. I say that frequently a letter that is contained in a file relates to the subject on hand, while all the rest of the file relates to a wholly different matter; and while the whole file is copied the whole file is not brought down. The very discretion which the hon. gentleman said we find fault with is exercised, and all the rest of the papers are thrown away after they are copied.

Mr. BOWELL. By whom?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). By the officers of the department.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman may be speaking from his own personal knowledge when he was in the department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am speaking of a very different practice.

Mr. BOWELL. That has never been the practice in any department that I have controlled. The hon. gentleman no doubt has means of obtaining information of the mode of conducting departments different from those who are at their head. I assure the hon. gentleman that it has not taken place in my department. There may have been private letters which in the copying have been left out. As to the relevancy of letters I do not think that it would be well to leave that to the discretion of any clerk or any Minister. I know that if I were moving for a return over which the hon. gentleman has control, I would not like it.

Motion agreed to, and report concurred in.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

That when the House adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until three o'clock to-morrow.

He said : The pressure of business is not so much now that we require to sit in the morning, and it might be some inconvenience to hon. gentlemen who require the forenoon to attend to private business.

Mr. LAURIER. I would have expected that when we had adjourned to-day we could have adjourned for six months. I do not see what business there is on the Paper to keep us any longer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We shall of course have to consider any amendments made by the Senate.

Motion agreed to.

BEET-ROOT SUGAR.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution :—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor General in Council may authorize the payment, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, under such regulations and restrictions as are made by Order in Council, to the producers of any raw beet-root sugar produced in Canada, wholly from beets grown therein, between the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-three, and the thirtieth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, of a bounty of one dollar per one hundred pounds, and in addition thereto, three and one-third cents per one hundred pounds for each degree or fraction of a degree over seventy degrees shown by the polariscopic test.

Mr. LAURIER. I would expect the hon. gentleman to give a statement of what has been expended in that matter.

Mr. FOSTER. The amount paid out for bounty last year was about $23,000. The average test, I suppose, would be probably about 90, and that would be about a cent and three-quarters per pound.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What reason is there for bringing on this now ? Could it not be done just as well next year ?

Mr. FOSTER. If it is to be done at all, it has to be done this year, because the seed must be of the very best kind and it is furnished by the factories themselves to the farmers. That seed has to be selected and distributed so that it can be sown early in the season, and it is necessary to give notice this year so that the manufacturers may have some financial basis on which to work. If this were left over until next year, the matter would be in uncertainty, and the manufacturers would not know whether or not they could depend on the bounty and would not feel disposed to go on with their work. It is, therefore, necessary to legislate a year in advance. The Government propose to continue this bounty for two years, chiefly on the ground that the season which has passed was very different from the present season. Last season was a very good one, and the present season is unfavourable, so that it will not be possible to make a fair test by taking the two, the one being a fairly good and the other an exceptionally bad season, and therefore the Government propose to continue the experiment two years longer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the Government propose to do in the long run ?

Mr. FOSTER. We propose to be guided by the success of the experiment over four years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If this is going to crystallize into a regularly fixed charge, we may find ourselves committed to the payment of a vastly larger amount than the House has any idea of. It is proposed to pay $40 per ton for the sugar.

Mr. FOSTER. It will be 1¾ cents per pound.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be $35 per ton, supposing it stopped at 90. That approaches very closely to the actual value of the article in Germany, at the place of manufacture, and also in some other countries.

Mr. FOSTER. Not very far from it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does appear to me to be running protection into the ground to say that we are going to pay for the growth of beet-root sugar here a sum equal to the actual cost of producing it in other places, wholly apart from the fact that we may be involved in very heavy expenditure without any profit to the country, whatever there may be to the individual beet grower.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government does not bind itself by this legislation to carry on the experiment beyond the two years or to a policy of bounty as a permanent policy. But the circumstances prevailing in the country are such as to induce the Government to make the experiment for two years longer. And it is well that we should continue the experiment during the period mentioned in this resolution, so that we may have the practical results, under our climatic and labour conditions, as well as the theoretical information obtained by reports and researches in different directions. It is only with this view that the Government have consented to carry on the experiment two years longer. At the end of that period, it will be for the Government and the House to consider what policy shall govern the country in the future. Now, the amount of bounty approaches very closely to the cost of production in Germany, and there is no doubt, if we propose to bonus all that

is raised, and if it be possible to raise all that we need for consumption, that will entail a very heavy drain on the revenue. The bounty is largely for the benefit of the farmers who engage in the growing of beet. The culture of the beet will have a most excellent effect in the development of farm lands by bringing them into a higher condition of cultivation ; and it is more on that account than for the benefit of the factories, that this experiment is made. It is also based on the circumstances which have grown up under our tariff, and left us, when we abolished the tariff on raw sugar, with an established industry in which a large amount of capital was invested and from which the protection was entirely taken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If any considerable number of people go into the business under the stimulus of this exorbitantly high bounty, we all know that very great pressure will be brought on the Government to continue it, and we may find ourselves committed to a wholly indefensible policy which will cost us a great deal of money. If the thing succeeds under this stimulus, I do not call it a success in the real sense of the term—if it succeeds under this enormous bounty, we will have a great deal of trouble in getting rid of this from our statute. I would rather of the two, if it is decided to assist this enterprise, support a very considerable vote in favour of having an experiment tested in various quarters than to support the placing of this bounty on the Statute-book.

Mr. FOSTER. This must be taken in the nature of an experiment in connection with the existing factories, because no man would undertake to put a sufficient amount of money into a factory to commence a new experiment without sufficient assistance. The experiment which will be carried on with this aid will be much more economical than if the Government were to invest in plant and buildings and carry on the experiment themselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not suggest that, but simply that we might give the amount of aid instead of this bounty which is indefinite in amount.

Mr. FOSTER. This is very much in the way the hon. gentleman's suggests.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is this difference, that, for three years, we pledge ourselves to give this bounty to anybody, and I regard the amount of the bounty as altogether exorbitant. Apart from the economic question involved, I think the sum is too great. You might stimulate the cultivation of oranges in this country, and by giving a sufficient remuneration, you could produce them; but I doubt, if once this is put on the Statute-book and these bounties are kept in force for three or four years together, you will be able to get rid of it. This is one of those questions which it would have been better to bring up three or four months ago in order that the opinion of practical men could have been ascertained. I would be glad to see the beet-root sugar manufacture succeed in this country if it can be done, but I am not in favour of the public at large being taxed for the benefit of two or three localities though no doubt it may be gone into extensively there. There is a possibility of our having to pay one or two millions a year under this resolution. It would not be a very extraordinary yield if fifty thousand tons of sugar were produced in each year, looking at what has been done in other countries, and that would involve a charge on the revenue of from $1,750,000 to $2,000,000 a year.

Mr. AMYOT. I am sorry the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) is not here, because I am sure he would ask the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) not to oppose this resolution. That hon. member, in many speeches, well stocked with figures, has established the importance of this industry to the country, and I am sorry to find that the financial leader of the Opposition is opposed to it. He says that it is only in a few localities that this manufacture will take place, and that it may cost one or two millions a year. I do not see how his statements agree. In our section of the country we want this manufacture encouraged. We find that those who manufacture wood or leather or other things of that kind are protected, and we think the farmers should also be protected.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has not apprehended the remarks of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He simply says that these resolutions commit us to an unknown expenditure which may amount to one or two or three millions. I do not think many farmers are likely to go into this industry. There are only two factories now established for the manufacture of this sugar, those at Berthier and Farnham, and I do not see any probability of any other factories being established, though theoretically the production of the beet-root sugar may appear feasible.

Mr. AMYOT. How can we place a limit on the amount we will vote ? We say to the farmers: Cultivate the beet-root and we will give you a bonus. We cannot say whether it will be rain or fine weather, and we cannot decide how much they will cultivate. This is the only proper way of granting the aid.

Mr. LAURIER. It is easy to place a limit. It is not probable that the beet-root can be cultivated profitably more than 14 miles away from the factory.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). It is cultivated 100 miles away.

Mr. LAURIER. It may be, if it is on a line of railway, but you can fix approximately the amount from the production of last year, when it was about $14,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not say, if the hon. gentleman wants protection for the farmers, that I would not go in with him to a certain extent, but I would go further than he does. I want to see the farmers indemnified for the loss they have sustained on the growth of barley. Let the Government pay them 30 cents a bushel on their barley. If we go into this thing, let us do it thoroughly. Let us give a bounty on every fat animal raised in this country, and put the farmers on the same footing as the manufacturers. It would only cost the country about $150,000,000 a year. The hon. gentleman would consider that well spent money, and so would I. At least, I would consider it better spent money than that which we now spend on the manufacturers.

Mr. SCRIVER. I saw this resolution on the Notice Paper with considerable surprise and regret —surprise, because the Finance Minister stated on

a previous occasion that this bounty was given in the guise of an experiment and that, after two years, probably the bounty would be sufficient to give the matter a fair test. I must say that, as to the experiment made at Farnham, a particular friend of mine having been connected with that enterprise and having been ruined by it, I have some personal and practical knowledge in regard to it, and I have also given some attention to the experiments that have been made in the United States under as favourable circumstances as they have been made here, and under more favourable circumstances as far as the growth of the beet is concerned. At Farnham, our experiment was the most disastrous failure as to the growth of the beet and its manufacture into sugar.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). Not at all.

Mr. SCRIVER. I repeat that it was a most disastrous failure. The hon. gentleman may ask the Messrs. Gault, Montreal, how much that experiment cost them. I am told on good authority that they sunk in that experiment not less than half a million dollars; and, as I said before, a personal friend of mine sunk what was to him a fortune, although it was a small sum compared with the amount that the Messrs. Gault lost in the operation. I say without hesitation that every attempt to make beet-root sugar in this country, and on this continent, has been a failure from first to last, and from all I can learn there is no reason to suppose that it will be a success in the future. The hon. gentleman surely cannot have forgotten that he is putting this resolution on the Notice Paper in face of the report made by an official chosen by himself to examine into this question; he must know what the report of Prof. Saunders was on the cultivation of beet-root sugar. I have studied that report with considerable care, and I must say that it is written with a great deal of ability; it affords proof that Prof. Saunders has given this question an intelligent, careful and thorough study, and I think that any one after studying that report with unbiassed opinions, must come to the conclusion that the prospect of making beet sugar successfully in the Province of Quebec, or in the Dominion of Canada, is not at all encouraging. When these resolutions were introduced I ventured to ask my hon. friend, the Finance Minister, a question affecting my own constituents. I am opposed to this bounty business, but I would say with my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that if it is to be given to one class of people in this country, it should be given to other classes who stand in a similar position. I ventured to ask the Finance Minister: What about maple sugar; and he replied jocularly, "Well, it will be as sweet as ever." I dare say it is, but in one respect it is not as sweet as ever since the change in duties that took place last year. It does not produce the same profit to those who manufacture it that it did before. I can assure the hon. gentleman that, though it may be as sweet to the palate, the effect of the change of duties which was made last year upon imported sugar, has reduced the price of maple sugar by 3 or 4 cents a pound. It was not felt this last spring because of the unfavourable character of the season, the quantity made was much less than usual. Maple sugar, therefore, and syrup at all events, do not bring as high a price as they did last year; but had the season been a normal one and the quantity made as great as usual, the result would have been a reduction of 3 or 4 cents a pound in the value of the products on the market. Now, the hon. Minister, perhaps, does not come from a part of the country where this industry is an important one.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes.

Mr. SCRIVER. So much the better, then he can sympathize in my views. But I come from a part of the country where this industry is important, and the Eastern Townships, east of my county, are also largely interested. There are comparatively few farmers there who have not a sugary of from two hundred to a thousand trees, and the product represents to them from $100 to $500, and it is made at a season of the year when they have little else to do upon their farms. It is consequently a very important industry to them, and the effect of the reduction of duties upon this article is a very serious one for a large class of people in that part of the country.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). As a farmer, I would like to say a few words upon this question. In the Province of Ontario a few years ago beet-root seed was sent out to a large number of prominent farmers, and they went into the cultivation of beet-roots, but there is hardly a farmer at the present time that is engaged in growing beets, and even those who were the most successful have given it up. No system of farming will so quickly run a farm down as the raising of beets for sugar. A farmer at the present time needs to adopt some system that will maintain the fertility of the soil, and he can only do that by returning to the soil in the form of manure a portion, at least, of what he takes off from it. But if he goes into the raising of beet roots, every beet is taken away from the farm and nothing is returned in the way of manure. A report placed in our hands lately shows that the price the farmers in the Province of Ontario received for their beets was only 12½ cents a bushel. Now, I am convinced that no practical farmer will raise a crop, the whole produce of which is taken from the land. Beets require a great deal more cultivation than a general crop of grain. They have to be cultivated thoroughly, and they have to be kept covered up, because if you allow them to grow above ground, it lessens the amount of sugar in them. I am convinced the proposition of the Minister is a step in the wrong direction. Every encouragement to farmers at the present time should be in the direction of inducing them to raise crops that will retain or increase the fertility of the soil, instead of taking it away. It is true that in the neighbourhood of large cities where manure can be obtained in large quantities and very cheaply, the cultivation of beet-roots may prove successful, but in the country parts, where every farmer has to make own his manure, this business can never be successful.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I have not myself given particular attention to the cultivation of beet-roots, but I have often talked with persons who have cultivated them in the Province of Quebec. Some have been discouraged and given it up. But from all they said I could infer that that failure was due to the fact that they had not given proper attention to that cultivation. I have met with many others who have told me that it was a paying business, and they felt greatly encouraged in prosecuting it. Some men, I know,

will differ entirely from the opinion expressed by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) as to the effect of that cultivation on the soil, as they regard it as one of the best means of enriching the soil. Now, whilst the Government is continuing to encourage the manufacture of beet-root sugar, I must say that I entirely agree with the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) in asking for an equal encouragement to the manufacturers of maple sugar. It is quite true that the price of maple sugar was reduced last year by reason of the diminution of the duty upon imported sugar, and if the season had been more favourable last spring to the manufacturers of maple sugar, the quantity made would have been larger, and the price would have been still smaller than it is to-day. There is no doubt that the lessening of the duty on imported sugar has considerably contributed to the reduction of the price of maple sugar. Now, I expect that the Government will give special attention to that article, and that they will be prepared in the future to encourage the manufacture of maple sugar as well as that of beet-root sugar. We all know that the manufacture of maple sugar in this country is very considerable, not only in the Province of Quebec, but also I believe in many parts of the Province of Ontario and everybody knows that it is a very fine article and deserves encouragement. I dare say there is not, in the markets of the whole world, a syrup which can be compared with maple syrup. I have no doubt that all the progress attainable has not yet been made in the manufacture of maple sugar, and if encouragement was given, such as is given to the manufacture of beet-root sugar, within a short time an article would be manufactured which would rival any similar article manufactured in the world.

Mr. OUIMET. As to maple sugar, I may say that the Government have listened with much interest to the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard); but if the consideration given to this question by the Government was no more serious than that bestowed upon it by the hon. gentleman, it would not have been very seriously considered. But, joking apart, I say this bonus is intended to encourage the cultivation by the farmers of beet-root, and also to assist the development of an industry which has achieved great success in other countries and proved a great source of wealth there, especially when entered into on a large scale. The cultivation of beet-root in France and Germany has been crowned with great success; and not only has great success been secured by the farmers but also great success has been achieved from an industrial point of view, and also as a means of revenue to those two Governments. The error has been entertained by many that this sugar industry in those two countries never thrived and prospered except by means of bounties given to it by the different Governments. In France, the excise duty on beet-root sugar is a little over 6 cents per pound, and it yields a large revenue. The only encouragement given is not as regards the production of the beet-root sugar in the country itself, but in the form of a certain rebate given on the beet-root sugar exported to other countries. That is, however, only a rebate on the excise duty which has been actually paid by the manufacturer. I repeat that in France beet-root sugar manufacture is a source of large revenue to the Government. If such is the case, it is positive proof that the industry can exist by itself, and, moreover, in France the beet-root crop, although the farmer does not receive more than $3.50 per ton on an average, is considered to be the most profitable crop in that country, as well as in Germany. Here the manufacturers have been obliged to pay $5.50 per ton, which is considered a very high price, and while it is not expected that this price will be maintained, it affords evidence that this is the most profitable paying crop that the farmer can raise. Not only is this the most profitable crop, but it has the great advantage of being advantageous in the direction of improving land, because it has been established by practical tests that the cultivation of potatoes and beets improve the land, and especially contribute to destroy all the weeds that are now growing everywhere. In France and Germany this beet-root industry is not only self-sustaining but a source of revenue to the Government, and a source of progress and prosperity to the farming community there. If we are convinced that this industry, for the sake of the farmers as well as for the sake of the manufacturers, should be encouraged, we must remember, says the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), that this industry has been the means of ruining a great many people in the Province of Quebec. But this is not the only industry which has been the means of ruining a great many people, and which has ultimately proved to be a great success and a source of profit. To-day we have the evidence of the manufacturers at Farnham who consider that, if this encouragement is continued for two years, this industry will be able to exist independent of any bonus after that period. I do not think it is a laughing matter that these manufacturers, who came to this country when the industry was protected by customs duties imposed on raw sugar equivalent to 3 cents per pound, should find themselves without that protection; and it would be a great injustice if, after they have expended money here, and when they appear to be on the eve of achieving success, we should withhold assistance and condemn them to utter ruin by withdrawing from them the very advantage which induced them to come to this country—a protective tariff on raw sugar. This is the only way of affording encouragement, and it is only of a temporary character. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has stated that this assistance might prove to be a great drain on the treasury of the country, that this arrangement might imply a large expenditure by the Dominion to pay the bounty; but if that were the case, it would not be a loss, for the money would be well invested. This beet cultivation is going to prove the salvation of our agriculture in the Province of Quebec. I do not refer to Ontario, because I am not sufficiently acquainted with that province, but I make this statement in regard to Quebec; and if on account of the bounty our farmers entered largely into beet-root cultivation, and even if as a result of that bounty the Government were called upon to expend $1,000,000 per year, it would show that about five million pounds of beet-root sugar were produced and consumed out of the eight million pounds of sugar now consumed in this country. If the farmers of our country can produce half of what is now imported,

I say that our country will be enriched by the $5,000,000 which will not go out of the country, but which will remain here for the encouragement of our different lines of commerce and of industry. I repeat that it would be a great injustice to the manufacturers who have invested their money here by the inducement of a protective duty, and it would be at the same time a great injustice to the farmers who have commenced the cultivation of beets. Let us suppose that this beet culture will be a failure in the production of the sugar consumed in this country, nevertheless I say that the farmers will discover that the sugar-producing beet-root is the best root that can be fed to the cattle, and that that will be a compensation to them. A farmer in my county told me the other day that he had undertaken to cultivate five acres of sugar beet this year: last year he cultivated only a small quantity which was not worth sending to the manufacturer, and he fed it to his cattle, but he said that the difference between sugar beet and the ordinary beet-root was 50 per cent in favour of the sugar beet for fattening purposes. Even if the refiners of beet-root sugar should fail, the beet-root would still remain one of the staple articles of production for the fattening of cattle, and would be one of the greatest advantages to our agriculturists. Under these circumstances I say that if this experiment is not to be a success it will cost but comparatively little; but if it is to be a success the money will be well invested for the sake of our farmers, for the sake of our industries and for the sake of our country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is pretty difficult to say upon what ground the Minister of Public Works supports this bounty. He told us that there was large excise duty imposed in France, and one would suppose he was arguing in favour of it as a future source of revenue, and that instead of paying a bounty to those engaged in the production of the sugar beet he proposed to tax them the moment it became successful as a source of revenue for Canada.

Mr. OUIMET. I never said that. I said that in countries where this was a success, it became a source of revenue. I never said that it was proposed to become a source of revenue here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman did not intend that this was to be a source of revenue, he was hardly speaking relevantly in pointing out what a large source of revenue it had become in France. The hon. gentleman said it would be a real gain to this country if this were to be successful, even if we were to pay a million dollars from the public treasury as a bounty upon the sugar beet. Well, Sir, who is to pay the million dollars? Is the money to be manufactured by magic? Somebody must pay it, and it is the man who produces barley, and wheat, and wool, and cattle, who will be taxed on his particular system of farming to pay this money. His business is to be discouraged in order that some one may be induced to raise sugar beet. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House why the man who produces wheat should be taxed, while the man who produces beets should receive compensation from the public treasury? My opinion is that the public interest is promoted by letting the beet-root producers engage in their own business which they can follow successfully without coming to the public treasury for aid. The hon. gentleman has a different opinion, and if as he says all the sugar that is consumed in this country can be produced by this system, what would the sugar cost the people of the country? It would cost the ordinary market value with the bounty added, and all this additional burden is to be imposed upon the ordinary business of the country in order that one industry, some fad of some particular party, should receive support from the public treasury, and that people should be induced to divert their energies from one production in order to engage in another. The hon. gentleman has not pointed to a single instance why the producer of the sugar beet should receive aid from the public treasury, and why the producer of wheat, or cattle, or wool, or onions, should not. There is not a single farm product which is not entitled to a bounty just as much as this particular one which the hon. gentleman has named. I do not know whether the production of sugar beet is an advantageous system of farming or not, but if it be advantageous there is no doubt that people will follow it in preference to something else, and it is of the first consequence that the Government should keep its hands off the ordinary industries of the country and allow people to exercise their own judgment as to what is the most profitable industry to which they can apply their labour and capital. The hon. Minister of Finance is in favour of this system of taxation, but he is also in favour of voting upwards of $100,000 a year from the public treasury to promote the West Indian trade. He now says that it would be an advantage if that trade were killed. Why does the hon. gentleman want to encourage trade with the people of the West Indies who produce sugar and then pay a bounty to people here to produce an article intended to keep the West Indian sugar out of the market? The hon. gentleman ought either to oppose the vote to the West Indian steamers, or he should withdraw the bounty to those who are engaged in the production of the sugar beet. If the hon. gentleman considers that this is a kind of farming that is going to be profitable, then he ought to define and limit this resolution in order that those who are engaged in sugar beet production may not be induced to suppose that their particular kind of farming is to become a charge on the public treasury for all time to come. That is the hon. gentleman's proposition, and he says that this increases the fertility of the farm. Why, that is perfectly absurd. There is nothing that you can profitably raise which does not take a certain amount of chemical elements from the soil and diminish its fertility. I do not care what the crop is. You may improve the cultivation of the soil by cutting down noxious weeds and keeping your land clean and giving opportunity for an acceleration of moisture, but you are not going to increase its fertility by what you take out. What is the whole theory of the rotation of crops? It is this, that when you take a crop from the soil, you take a certain amount of the chemical products from it, and when you repeat the process you are incapable of extracting the same quantity out of the soil because the quantity of chemical elements necessary is diminished, so that you must put in another crop of another kind which will take out different chemical elements and allow the former to be reproduced, thus restoring the equilibrium of the various elements that make up the quality

of the soil. By the continued production of the same root, you are taking out certain chemical products which you must replace artificially, or your soil will deteriorate in its character. Everybody who has given any attention to agriculture knows that that is the case, and the hon. gentleman knows that he cannot continue growing one particular grain or root without deterioriating the value of the soil. You are compelled either to have a rotation of crops or have recourse to artificial appliance. I care not for the small amount that this resolution will cost, but the remarks addressed to the House by the Minister of Public Works imply that we are to fasten a burden to the people, in order to encourage a certain agricultural production in the interests of a class who are no more entitled to the special favour of the Government than any other honest industrious class of our population.

Mr. WELDON. Before this motion is adopted, I wish to say a few words on it. I learn from those well acquainted with the sugar trade that the protection given by this resolution is 2 cents per pound.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, I have the exact average, which is $1\frac{7}{10}$ cents per pound.

Mr. WELDON. My information is that the cost of the raw imported sugar used in making the pure sugar is a little less than, or about, 3 cents per pound, so that it is proposed to give protection to the beet-root sugar industry of between 50 and 60 per cent. This I believe to be an excessive protection and a wrong departure on the part of the Government. I have no intention of addressing the House at any length at this period, but merely wish to express my opinion that this seems to be going outside the true principle of protection. I have often expressed myself in favour of encouraging industries with a moderate protection, but in this matter it seems to me that we are taking a step in the wrong direction, and I must energetically protest against the resolution.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Before the resolution is adopted, I wish to make a few remarks on the subject. I entirely approve the idea of the Government of encouraging the cultivation of the beet-root, for I believe that if that industry could be introduced here, it would be a boon not only to the Province of Quebec, but to the country at large. Moreover, I do not see why the farmers would not be put on the same footing as the fishermen. We pay a bonus to the fishermen of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and I do not see why as much could not be done for the farmers. That is the reason why I approve the Government for wishing to encourage the cultivation of beet-root. Only, I find it to be regretted that the Government have not adopted a better way of applying this bonus. I think they ought to have followed the example which was given them and is still given them by the Quebec Government. Instead of paying this bonus to the beet-root sugar manufacturer, as will be done according to the present resolution, I am of opinion that we should give directly to the grower. That is the system adopted by the Quebec Government and I think it is the best. I do not mean by that to cast the least suspicion against the manufacturers of this article, but I believe that the lack of success complained of is largely due to the fact that in the past the beet-root sugars manufacturers did not fulfil their promises to the farmers and that if success is to crown this new attempt made to establish this industry in the country, the growers must be made confident of being duly paid. Every one knows that if, in 1882, the attempt was not successful, it was due to the fact that the growers were not paid. I did not say that there was any fraud. But if success is wanted to be insured, the farmers must first be shown the advantages of that industry. And the best way to make them aware of them would be to pay directly to them the bonus given by the Government, as has been and is still done by the Quebec Government. This would be a popular measure, and it is to be regretted that the Government does not mean to pay this bonus to the farmers themselves, instead of giving it to the manufacturers. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if a vote is asked for, I will be obliged, on this account, to vote against this resolution, although I would be glad to see the Government encourage this industry, for this would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. DAVIN. I want to point out the true principle on which the encouragement of any new industry rests. It is this, that an industry which is not, so to speak, natural to the country, which does not naturally establish itself, and which is not established, but which there is reason to believe would prosper, you may properly encourage; and Mr. John Stuart Mill points out that the proper method of encouragement in such cases is by means of a bonus. My hon friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) talks of onions, and wheat, and barley, as not being bonused. He might also talk of potatoes, because all these agricultural industries have been proved to be remunerative in this country, and the Government which would propose to protect them would be committing an absurdity from the point of view of political economists; and nobody knows this better than the hon. member for Bothwell. But Mr. John Stuart Mill, who is a kind of god with a certain school of politico-economic philosophers, lays it down that in the case of an industry not yet established in the country, you may properly bonus it. Therefore a great deal of what the hon. member for Bothwell has said is utterly fallacious, and fallacious on the surface, and you have only to state what the principle of encouraging new industries is to see that. Then with regard to the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell, that the Minister of Public Works contemplates that this is to be a perpetual charge, I must say that if such were the case I would not support it. But what I understood from the remarks of the hon. Minister is this, that it would be a rational policy—because I hope I am supporting a rational government—to encourage this industry so as to put it on its feet, and then let it run by itself. With reference to the point raised by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) as to the amount of the bonus, he takes the ground, that, in the initial step of encouraging an industry of this kind, we ought to make a comparison between the amount of protection and the relative cost of production in other countries. I take it that that is not the proper principle to act upon at the commencement. But in any case that seems to me a subordinate question. That is a

question to be considered only after this industry had been started ; and once you have set it going, you can then consider what should be the bonus to be given over any length of time. The time proposed here is not long, and if you could get the beet-root sugar manufacturers in the Province of Quebec, by means of this bonus, to go on with their industry, I consider that this bonus ought to receive our support. One word as to what was stated by the hon. member for South Huron. In France and Germany this industry has been gone into extensively. There may appear to be some confusion between what the hon. Minister of Public Works has said and the statements of some hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the growth of beets and the manufacture of beet-root sugar. Where the beet-root sugar industry has succeeded, those who have engaged in its production have, at the same time, gone into cattle raising extensively, and what is taken out of the ground by the growth of the best is given back by the cattle ; and that meets the objection of the hon. member for South Huron. What I want to point out to the hon. member for Bothwell is this. He says that we are going to give these persons a grant of a bonus for an indefinite time, but in doing so we are only doing what is absolutely necessary to encourage a new industry. We are only compensating them for the risk they must assume while establishing the industry, so that we may be enabled to judge whether the industry can be established in Canada or not. Why it should not be established in the Province of Quebec as well as in France, I do not know ; and if it can be securely established, the time will inevitably come, just as in the case of the manufacture of malt liquors, when it will be able to stand on its own bottom, and will besides furnish a revenue to the country as well. Therefore the statement of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as to a charge resting on the public treasury for all time to come, and the fallacious comparison he made in regard to this problematical and new industry, but at the same time one which there is good reason to believe could be established here in Canada, is one which it seems to me should not weigh with the committee.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) says he is in favour of the encouragement of the beet-root culture, but that, if it is carried, the bounty should be paid to the farmer instead of to the manufacturer, as is done by the Local Government. The object of this Government is twofold, first to encourage the cultivation of beet-root, and there is where we encourage the farmer, and then we want to encourage the conversion of beet-root into sugar, and I say that both must go together, and, when the Local Government in Quebec pay 50 cents for each ton of beet-root produced in that province, they are within their jurisdiction, and, when we give a bounty to encourage the conversion of beet-root into sugar, we are doing what the policy of this Government has been for the last twelve years, to encourage national industries. If the hon. gentleman thinks he can assist himself in the County of Rouville by speaking in that way, and by giving a vote against this resolution under the pretext that it is not framed for the encouragement of the farmer but only of the manufacturer, he will not find that the Gerrymander Bill will benefit him as much as he thinks.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) said a moment ago that the attempts at growing beet-root in the Province of Quebec had generally been unsuccessful. I must say that if this is true for certain places, it is nevertheless to be admitted that in others the efforts made to induce the cultivation of this produce have certainly succeeded. Now, if the farmers have been able to raise beets successfully in certain places, why could not we expect that this may become more general? It is clear that the growing of beet-root needs some fostering as well as the application of certain intelligence to the work ; for it is quite an art to raise beets successfully. In different places the farmers tried it on a small scale with very satisfactory results. So many elements go to making the growing of the beet-root a success, that it is impossible to hope that the farmers can from the first meet with the same fortune everywhere. I myself have grown beet-root for the Berthier factory. I can freely say that of a certain number of acres devoted to beets, a part paid me well, while the rest, to which I had not given all the necessary care, did not pay. Hence, I came to the conclusion that we can certainly get to cultivating the beet with profit in the Province of Quebec, as elsewhere in the Dominion, at the price offered to-day. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) said a moment ago that he would prefer to have the bonus given to the growers as is done with the bonus given by the Quebec Government. I am not ready to say that this would not be more profitable and better, but, in my humble opinion the two schemes ought to go together. The low price of sugar on the market to-day would probably not allow the manufacturers to produce immediately an article capable of competing successfully with the imported product. Now, what I regret the most in the resolution now before the House, is not so much to see the Government offering a bonus to the manufacturers only as to see that the bonus is not offered for a period long enough. The bonus is only for two years. I greatly fear, and have all reasons for fearing, that this period will not be long enough to induce capitalists to push any further their attempts at manufacturing beet-root sugar. When we consider the drawbacks which this industry met with at its start in the countries of Europe, especially in Spain and in France, we must not wonder if here, in Canada, where we are used to cultivate farms often too big, where we are consequently not used to the careful cultivation necessary for the growing of the beet-root ; we must not wonder, I say, if the manufacturers meet with some disappointments. But, on another hand, it is evident that the capitalists who came from Europe to put their money in that industry here, are men who understand their business. Now, it is impossible to believe that these men came here to lose their money. We know there have been large sums invested in the beet-root sugar industry at Berthier and Farnham. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were put in the building of the necessary works. I say that these men, with the experience they had, came and started that industry with the certitude that, in the Province of Quebec especially, the growing of the beets could be carried on with advantage both for the manufacturer and the grower. The hon. member for Huntingdon referred to Mr. Saunders's report. That report is

pretty hard to fully understand. The author speaks favourably of the raising of the beets, and gives figures and details which show that it can be carried on in a practical manner. But when he comes to conclude, he says that it would be better to grow the beets for feeding cattle. I will not gainsay this, but if it is true that we can raise beets for feeding cattle, we can also cultivate them for manufacturing into sugar.

[At one o'clock the committee adjourned, and at three resumed.]

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, when you left the Chair at one o'clock, I was saying that the report of Mr. Saunders, the director of the experimental farm, although not as favourable in its conclusions as could be expected for the beet-root sugar industry, is not any the less, as a whole, very favourable to the growing of beets in the country. Mr. Saunders says that it is beyond question that the cultivation of the beets is very beneficial, as it improves the soil. It is already quite a point in its favour. If we could adopt in this country a culture whose effect would be to improve the soil, no one would gainsay the advantages of such a course. Further on Mr. Saunders quotes the words of Mr. Cuisset, who says that experience has undeniably shown that the soil of Canada is very favourable to the production of the sugar beet, and that, with a good system of cultivation, 15 to 20 tons per acre can easily be grown; and further, that "there could be no doubt as to the excellence and saccharine richness of the beets raised in different parts of Canada, as well in the Province of Quebec as in that of Ontario, and they are even exceptionally rich." Mr. Saunders quotes also the report of the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, who estimates that in 1890 the approximate cost of beet-root sugar varied from $15 to $35 per acre. Mr. John Fixter, director of the Ontario experimental farm, shows that in 1891 the cost of an acre of sugar beets on that farm was $37.79. Mr. Cuisset estimates that the cost of an acre of land in beets in the Province of Quebec will be $34, including rent and fertilizers. Mr. Saunders again tells us that on the Government farm, at Ottawa, the yield of beets was from 13 to 35 tons an acre. Now, from these data it can easily be said that his report could not be held to militate against the cultivation of the beets, since by quoting the opinions of those who wrote before him on the approximate cost of the roots per acre, as well as the yield of his own trials, Mr. Saunders shows that there would be a considerable margin left to those who would undertake this culture. As to the richness of the beets raised in this country, Mr. Saunders refers to the report by Mr. F. T. Shutt, chemist of the Dominion experimental farms, who states that 60 per cent of the samples gave more than 12 per cent of sugar, and 38 yielded more than 13 per cent, adding:

"The averages, however, as they stand, indicate a very fair factory beet, and all things being considered, compare well and favourably with those of other countries in which beet-sugar is manufactured. Sufficient work has been done to indicate that both as regards yield per acre and richness in sugar, with a more careful cultivation, sugar-beets may be raised in many parts of Ontario fully equal to those of Europe and the United States.

I now ask how the hon. member for Huntingdon could reach the conclusion that Mr. Saunders is unfavourable to the cultivation of the sugar beet,

when Mr. Saunders wonders that with such chances of success this industry was not introduced sooner? He says that in 1890, we imported 223,841,171 lbs. of sugar, at a cost of $5,837,895; and in 1891, 174,045,720 lbs., which cost $5,186,158; and he asks with reason why this industry, with the advantages it may meet with here, was not established sooner? We must not forget that in Europe this industry met with difficulties of all sorts. We must expect that we will meet difficulties here also. We know this culture requires great care. Our people not being in the habit of such careful cultivation, they are not ready to produce from the first enough beets to supply the factories with profit. Moreover, should it be produced in large enough quantities, the new material would not yet be good enough in quality to allow the factories to work it with profits. We cannot hope for success without a great deal of groping and trying as was the case in Europe. In the report of the Quebec Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Barnard says:

"The average production of raw sugar per ton of beet did not exceed 7 per cent until 1880, while now it is about 12 per cent; while there is room for a possible increase of 40 per cent, after future improvements. Improved varieties of beets are now largely raised, which contain an average of 18 per cent pure sugar, and which will soon give a possible increase of 40 per cent to 50 per cent of sugar."

Now, it is clear that in order to reach this perfection, our agricultural people must needs learn more; they need practice and patient observation, before they can supply the factories with a product of superior quality. As to the advantages to be gained from this industry in our country, they are evident, and need not be shown. No one could deny them, if one considers that to-day, in France, more than 65,000 workmen are employed in beet-root sugar factories, and that more than 110,000 are employed in the beet fields. These figures are enough to show what advantages our country could derive from this industry, if by means of judicious and patriotic assistance the Government encouraged the farmers to raise the beet and the manufacturers to convert it into sugar. The beet-root sugar gives to-day to the world about the two-thirds of its whole sugar consumption. Now, is it possible to believe that here, with a very fertile soil, with an industrious people, often forced to emigrate from lack of labour, we could not build that industry, which would so highly favour our farmers and our workingmen? For it must not be forgotten that it would not only give work to the farmers in summer, but also to the workingmen in winter, while the refuse from the factories would furnish a new food for the cattle on the farms, improving them, and giving their owners the means of increasing their stock. Besides the value of the sugar produced in the country, and besides improved and increased herds, we would attain another very desirable object, namely, the regeneration of our soil, which, although far from being exhausted, still needs the improvement which such a cultivation would afford. At the same time, we would give a vigorous impulse to another industry which is so valuable to the agricultural classes—I mean the manufacture of cheese. For my part, I believe that any attempt which the Government may make to foster the manufacture of beet-root sugar, deserves all the support which we can give. But I ask if, while encouraging this industry as it deserves, the Government ought not to have had a thought

for the farmers? The interests of the farmers and the interests of the beet-root sugar manufacturers are intimately allied. In order that the manufacturers be prosperous, the grower also must be prosperous; and if the grower does not find in the cultivation whose product must supply the factory, the remuneration which he has a right to expect, if this remuneration is not reasonable, he will not continue a system of farming which will not bring him returns proportionate to his labour. Therefore I say that the Government should not in this measure have overlooked the interests of the farmer. The farmer who is willing to devote to this industry all the means and hands that he can afford must deserve the attention of the Government. It is true that the Quebec Government offered a bonus for every ton of beets produced in the province, but I believe that here, in their measure, the Government have too easily forgotten that the two interests are essentially allied, and in my opinion they ought to have remembered that the source, the groundwork of this industry lies with the farmer. I think I have reason to say that the Government should have remembered also that it is especially at the start that the farmer needs protection and assistance, at least as much as the manufacturers themselves.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Before this resolution is adopted, I would like to draw the attention of the House and the Government to the report on this subject of Mr. Saunders of the Experimental Farm. He shows that in France the cost is about $80 an acre. That estimate may possibly be excessive, but I believe the figure of $40 an acre, which is given for Nebraska, Germany and Canada, is about fair. We find that 8 tons per acre have been raised at Farnham, and about $4.50 a ton was the price paid for it. If that is the true price, there is a loss of $10 an acre. I read the following:—

"At Farnham, in Quebec, $4.50 per ton has been paid, delivered at the factory, added to which a bounty has been given for one year by the Quebec Government of 50 cents per ton, increasing the receipts of the farmers to $5 per ton. It is said that the factories cannot afford to pay a higher price than $4.50, and if that be correct, it would appear to be more profitable for farmers to raise sugar beets for feeding stock than for the sugar factories. It would also appear to offer a partial explanation of the reason why in Germany, after the farmers have had the experience of about 50 years in the cultivation of the beets, the owners of the factories are still obliged to grow an average of more than one-half of all the beets they consume."

It may be said that the conditions are very different in Germany from what they are in Canada. That is true. In Germany the price of land is very high but labour is very low, not more than one-third or one-fourth of what it is in Canada, while in Canada the price of land is low and the price of labour is high. This statement, that it is cheaper to raise sugar beets for feeding cattle than to supply sugar factories, should make the Government pause before carrying out this policy. I know that these beets are good for fattening cattle. I have grown them for that purpose myself, but they will not pay. The Minister of Finance said they were excellent for increasing the fertility of the soil, but in regard to that he was well answered. It would be well for the Minister to turn his attention to farming and increase his education on that point. You cannot take anything out of the soil without putting something back to take its place. These artificial fertilizers will only last for a time, but the barnyard manure is the best. As to these beet roots, unless you get back the pulp from the factories, your farm will run back very rapidly. Root crops only bring the fertilizing matter to the surface to be taken up by the next crop. The more thoroughly the soil is fertilized, the more rapidly it goes off in value unless it is renewed. It will not be for the benefit of the farmers of Quebec to grow these beets for the benefit of the factories, and in Ontario it would not pay to grow them even to fatten the cattle, because we have other things which we can raise more cheaply. I hold that this report of Mr. Saunders is, of itself, sufficient evidence to warrant the Government in staying their hands before they induce individuals to come here and invest money, or get the farmers to go into this system. No farmer can change rapidly from one system to another without great loss. I hope the Government will take that precaution, and consider well Mr. Saunders's summing up that I have read, where he shows that it will pay farmers better to raise beets to fatten cattle than to sell to the factories. I am convinced that it will pay no farmer to raise beets to fatten cattle with the systems we have at the present time.

Mr. LAURIER. Would the Minister of Finance at this moment furnish the figures I asked for this morning?

Mr. FOSTER. The total amount of sugar, as reported, is 1,395,508 pounds, and the bounty paid was $23,756.56. A note attached to that says there may be a small quantity yet to come in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a rate of more than 2 cents per pound.

Mr. FOSTER. 1 $\frac{7}{10}$ cents per pound.

Bill reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the Minister of Justice able to tell us what business remains to be taken up?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was asked yesterday evening to state what would be done with item 9, respecting judges' salaries. I regret to say we do not see our way to bring those resolutions forward this session. It is my expectation that the Government will bring them forward and ask a vote upon them at an early period next session. In the meantime, it is intended that some representations shall be made by the Government to the Provincial Governments of some of the provinces, with a view to improving the judicial system. If it meet the pleasure of the House next session, as I hope it may, the salaries of the judges will be made as the resolutions have indicated. Item 6, respecting evidence, will not be pressed, in deference to the views expressed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that so important a measure should be distributed widely throughout the country among professional men and judges.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to remark to the Minister of Justice that he has omitted entirely in his proposal to increase the judges' salaries, any reference whatever to the County Court judges of the Province of Ontario, who, in my opinion, and, I think, in the opinion of a great many members of this House, are fully as deserving of an increase in salary as any of the other gentlemen whose salaries it is proposed to increase; and

I call his attention to that omission in order that, in the interval between now and the next session, the Government may consider the question. My own opinion is that if the salaries are to be increased at all, that class of officials have to the full as good a right as any of the gentlemen whose salaries are proposed to be increased.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of John Bryson, Esq., for the Electoral District of the County of Pontiac.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

JOHN BRYSON, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Pontiac; introduced by Mr. Haggart and Mr. Desjardins (L'Islet).

BOUNTY ON BEET-ROOT SUGAR.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 102) respecting a bounty on beet-root sugar.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times.

SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. FOSTER moved that Bill (No. 100) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1893, and for other purposes relating to the public service, be read the third time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that ought to be the last subject the House takes. Other matters ought to be gone through first before we part with Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. It is so near the last we might as well finish it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But it is not the last yet. I think in all conscience the hon. gentleman ought to wait for this third reading until the other items are disposed of.

Mr. LAURIER. You have Bills which are not yet printed, and as soon as they are distributed I have no objection to take them at once.

Mr. FOSTER. Stand.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means read the second time, and concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 103) to amend the Act respecting Customs duties.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times.

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House now resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution :—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that, for the present session, the deduction of eight dollars per day, mentioned in section 26 of chapter 112 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, shall not be made for twelve days in the case of members who have been absent from a sitting of the House or committee thereof during such number of days, but this provision shall not operate to extend the maximum amount mentioned in section 25 of the Act relating to the Senate and House of Commons, nor in the case of any member elected since the commencement of the session shall it apply to days prior to his election.

Motion agreed to, resolution considered in committee and reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 104) to amend the Act respecting the Senate and the House of Commons.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 44) to further amend the Chinese Immigration Act.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL. It is proposed by the Government to omit the first section of this Bill as introduced, and substitute in lieu of section 2, the following :—

Section 13 of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor: Every Chinese person who wishes to leave Canada with the intention of returning thereto shall give notice of such intention to the comptroller at the port or place whence he proposes to sail or depart, in which notice shall be stated the foreign port or place which such person wishes to visit, and the route he intends taking both going and returning, and such notice shall be accompanied by a fee of $1, and the comptroller shall thereupon enter in a register to be kept for the purpose the name, the residence, occupation and description of the said person, and such other information regarding him as is deemed necessary under such regulations as are made for the purpose by the Governor in Council.

2. The person whose name and description is so registered, shall be entitled on his return, which shall be within six months after such registration, and on proof of his identity to the satisfaction of the comptroller, as to which the decision of the comptroller shall be final, to receive from the comptroller the amount of the entrance duty paid by him on his return.

I may mention in explanation of this provision that when a Chinaman leaves Hong Kong or any port in China he has to deposit with the steamship company a fee of $50 in order that the steamship company shall be held harmless from pecuniary loss, in case he should not be the person who had left Canada upon certificate. This fee is paid over to the comptroller before the Chinaman is allowed to land, but immediately upon his identification having been established the fee is handed back to him. Of course the committee will understand that if he is not the person represented in the certificate, or if he be a Chinaman who has not been in Canada, the $50 is kept by the comptroller and placed to the credit of the Receiver General.

Notwithstanding anything in the next preceding section any Chinese person who has left Canada under the provisions of the section thereby repealed may return to Canada thereunder at any time during six months after the passing of this Act.

That places the Chinaman who has left Canada with a certificate in the position of those who may be returning without a certificate. These are the amendments which we propose to make to the Bill as introduced by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon). I may further state that the principal object of this Bill is to prevent as far as it is

at all practicable the frauds that have been committed by Chinamen who come to this country, or by those at the port of departure from whom the Chinaman, perhaps innocently, buys false and fraudulent certificates. In most of those cases in which certificates have been presented, they have been paid for by Chinamen. There is, however, another practice which has prevailed in the purchase of these certificates. The steamship company is only permitted to bring to Canada a certain number in proportion to the tonnage of each vessel. But those who have certificates do not come within the meaning of that description, and, consequently, if the vessels are entitled, as some of them are, to carry 120 or more as the case may be, those holding certificates are looked upon as Canadians returning to the country, and permitted to enter without payment of the $50 fee. I have some of these certificates before me, and it appears that the Chinese go to brokers, or to some other parties in Hong Kong, or other port of sailing, and receive from them a certificate of entry; but the Chinamen admit, in some cases, when they arrived at Vancouver or Victoria, that these certificates are purchased on the distinct understanding that the certificate is given to enable them to obtain passage on the vessel, and that, on arriving at Victoria or Vancouver, they will have to pay the $50. That condition is written on the back of the certificate which is presented to the comptroller. I propose by this Bill, as amended, to prevent these frauds upon the Chinamen and also upon the comptroller or the Customs officers. I, therefore, move that the first clause be struck out.

Mr. GORDON. I cannot refrain from asking the Government for some expression of opinion, or some definition of their policy, with regard to Chinese immigration into our province, which has suffered exclusively from that class of immigrants for years. That immigration is constantly increasing, as will be seen by the following official figures:—In 1888, 381; 1889, 729; 1890, 1,427; 1891, 2,508. It will thus be seen that they are increasing in a tremendous proportion, but the evil effects are not felt here, and consequently we find very little sympathy among those who have not suffered as yet. Last session the Provincial Legislature of British Columbia passed a Bill authorizing the Provincial Government to borrow $750,000 for the promotion of immigration from the United Kingdom, a portion of which is to be devoted to aid the settlement of crofters, a class of people who are particularly adapted to carry on the fishing industry in all its various branches. It is also intended to aid all other classes of immigrants from the United Kingdom to settle in our province and develop its resources; but if the policy of this Government is to admit these Asiatics, it will be simply a waste of money to spend even $5, much less $750,000 in promoting British immigration, because the latter, when confronted with the former vile element, will not remain but will cross over, as many of them have done, into the neighbouring territory. For this reason I ask for some expression from the Government regarding their policy on this question. Owing to the lamentable death of our provincial Premier, who was engaged in London in raising this loan, a new Government will necessarily have to be formed; and if this new Government are to be confronted with a Dominion policy allowing that class of immigration to flood our province, it will naturally hesitate before incurring such a heavy expense. I do not think I could urge anything more on behalf of our country and the province of which I am a humble representative, than to urge the Government to accept this clause of the Bill, or else give some good reasons why those people should be permitted to come in, as they are now coming, in increasing numbers. I am sure that none of the eastern provinces want them. Look at the Toronto *Empire*, and read the discoveries which have shocked the community of that populous centre. In that paper there is a lengthy article headed: "Opium dens in Toronto discovered by the *Empire* — Sorcery of Madjoun — Strong foothold of the Chinese Curse—A Reporter "Hits the Pipe"—First chapter of an astounding Story — Now let the Police work." That is the first discovery of the Chinese and their attendant evils in the city of Toronto; but these evils are so common with us, in all their extensive degradation and far-reaching effects, that we have become hardened to them, and pay no attention to them now further than to blame this Government for their existence. The *Empire* goes on to state:—"Now let the Police work." Yes, I am sure the Minister of Justice will recognize the fact that a vast amount of money is expended by our province in enforcing the administration of justice solely in connection with this class of people, and I am sure the Minister of Militia will recognize the injustice of inflicting on the people of Victoria and Vancouver the heavy cost of supporting the lazaretto on the Darcy Island. The *Empire* proceeds to give the following alarming headings:—

"Joints proved to have existed for years in the city—A queer business carried on in the back rooms of Oriental laundries—How the information was obtained—An alleged smoker on Queen Street refuses to talk—The man from Chicago and his letter of introduction to Canadian pipe owners—A Saturday morning's visit to shops on Parliament and Jarvis Streets—Why morphine eaters take to smoking—Description of a 'lay-out,' which consists of a pipe, lamp, a 'Yen-She-Gow,' a 'Hop-Toi,' a 'Yen-Hock' and other strange instruments—The wearer of a 'queue' is generally a liar—A sensational chapter to-morrow."

I do not know what number of Chinese forged or fraudulent certificates are on record in the Customs Department, but there must be a great many, and I have not heard of one prosecution under the clause in the Chinese Restriction Act, which provides:

"Every Chinese person who wilfully evades, or attempts to evade any of the provisions of this Act as respects the payment of duty by personating any other individual, or who wilfully makes use of any forged or fraudulent certificate to evade the provisions of this Act, and every person who wilfully aids or abets any such Chinese person in any evasion, or attempt at evasion, of any of the provisions of this Act is guilty of a misdemeanour and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months or to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or to both."

I have never heard yet of a Chinaman who has committed these misdemeanours being prosecuted, and, on the other hand, I have never heard of a white man who has not been prosecuted to the greatest extent of the law who had committed a misdemeanour. It will be for some of the officers to give an explanation of that. My object in calling the attention of the Government to this matter is in the interest of our province. A new steamship company, with a steamer called the *Phra Nang*, has been started from the terminus of the Northern Pacific to Chinese ports. On her

first trip she landed 75 Chinese in Victoria. The Canadian Pacific Railway steamers, in three or four trips, have landed Chinese varying in number from 531 down to 400. They are coming here in greater numbers continually, and, if that is allowed to continue, you will prevent any other class of immigration from settling there, and the greatness of the province will be crippled or blackened to such a degree as to make every Canadian ashamed of it. I do not wish to detain the House, but I ask the Government to accept the first clause of the Act, and if it is claimed that it is necessary that our great steamship line going to China should have some support to enable them to continue that great service which enables our countrymen to traverse the globe by way of the Suez Canal, increase their subsidy by $20,000, $30,000, $40,000, $50,000, or even $100,000 a year, but make it a condition that they shall not bring this class of immigrants to our shores. I make this appeal in the best interests of our province, and, I believe, of every province in the Dominion. I would like to hear some expression of opinion from the Government as to their policy on this matter.

Mr. BOWELL. I have very little to add to what I have already said, further than to state that, if the facts to which the hon. gentleman has alluded are found to exist in the future to the extent he anticipates, it will be the duty of the Government to reconsider the position they have taken to-day on this question, and prevent such a state of affairs if they possibly can do so. I saw the article to which my hon. friend referred, as published in the Toronto *Empire*, and I have no doubt that to the extent that that paper has investigated it may be quite true; but, apart from the opium-smoking portion of the evil which is said to exist, I fancy that the same immoral places and the same immoralities exist in the city of Toronto as among the Chinese, and I fancy it is the same in other cities. The statistics we have do not indicate that the Chinese, or the descendants of the Mongolian race, exist in British Columbia to the extent to which the committee would be led to believe they do from the remarks of the hon. gentleman. Where they go to I do not know, but the last census returns show that in British Columbia, in the whole province, there were only 8,910; in Manitoba, 23; New Brunswick, 5; Nova Scotia, 4; Ontario, 39—including those referred to in the city of Toronto; Quebec, 20; Prince Edward Island, none; North-West Territories, 38; making a total of only 9,039 in the whole Dominion. I have compared that with the statement of my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Gordon) that the steamers are bringing the Chinese over in the numbers indicated by him, and it is possible that the immigration may be larger than in the past from the fact that a new line of steamers has been placed on the route between the terminus of the Northern Pacific and the Chinese ports. Considering that each of these vessels is restricted to a certain number in proportion to their tonnage, the presumption is that they will also bring over a certain number of immigrants, but, until the evils really exist, which my hon. friend thinks will exist, and is supposed to exist at present, but of which we have no official information, and considering the question of trade between this country and China, it is a matter for very serious consideration how far the Government should go in adopting the American system of total prohibition in reference to this race of people. I have the returns of the trade with that people before me, but I do not know that it is particularly pertinent to the discussion now, further than to show that the trade of the United States with China has fallen off considerably since they adopted a restrictive policy, while that of British Columbia—and I mention that province, because it is there that the trade is principally carried on—has increased by a percentage equal to the falling off in the United States. I hope my hon. friend will be content to accept the Bill as we propose to pass it now, with the assurance that, if the Government are convinced hereafter that the great evils arise from a larger number of these people going into British Columbia or any other portion of the Dominion, which he anticipates, they will again consider the question.

Mr. GORDON. I have here, handed to me by a friend, a copy of the Toronto *Globe* with these headings:

"200 Chinamen—Have arrived in Toronto this year—A mysterious influx—Where are the Celestials going to?—Daily arrivals direct from the Flowery Land—Their destination an enigma."

Any one who knows the Chinese character knows that it is impossible to trace them unless you have them in sight all the time. You will not find a man in British Columbia who will not tell you that the census enumerators did not take one-half of the Chinese in that province. An enumerator calls at Ah Sin's house and takes his name, and next morning the enumerator would find every man he met was Ah Sin, who would say, "You catchee me yesterday." The result was that the enumerator had to take those whose face he was familiar with whom he met on the street or in their miserable dens. It is also true, as I read, that they are liars generally. Although the statement was printed in a Toronto paper, it has described their character perfectly, especially when dealing with any of our laws, and particularly when they desire to evade the payment of any taxes or duties, or anything connected with the revenue of Canada or of the province. Now, that these new steamers are running, and the Guion line is going to put on another line of steamers on that route, so it is reported, if you allow them to bring this class of immigrants to our shores, you will find it will seriously injure the prospects of the province. I met a Chinaman the other day, and I was surprised to ascertain that there were six in Ottawa at the present time, and he told me they had been here for three years. I do not know whether he told the truth or not; but at any rate he did not suppose that I was a census enumerator. I certainly do think that no greater harm can be done to this country, when we are endeavouring to get a better class of people to inhabit our new provinces and to develop our country, than to allow a class to come in who make no homes among us, who take no part in our social life, and who create, as it were, so many ulcers in every city where they congregate. What I am asking is far below what the people of the province and the members of the Local Legislature have asked for. For the information of the Minister, I will read some of the remarks made by members of the Local Legislature when that Minute of Council was being considered to which I referred the other night. Mr. Brown moved the following motion:—

"Whereas the introduction of Chinese into the province is highly prejudicial to the best interests of the country, as Chinese never can become citizens in the true sense of the word: therefore, be it resolved that an humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor praying him to take such steps as may seem best to him to induce the Dominion Government to increase the tax on Chinese coming into the country, from $50 to $200."

The Hon. John Robson, whom we all regret to know has passed away while in the midst of his endeavours to bring out a crofter immigration to settle our country, spoke as follows:—

"I am prepared to go the length of $100, and would support $200 or $500 if I thought there was any chance of carrying it. * * *

"He thought the province ought to get two-thirds of the tax instead of what we now receive. The Chinese came here to the detriment of the province, and against the will of the province. He also believed in excluding the Japanese just as stringently as the Chinese, declaring that they had not as strong claims as the Chinese."

And one after another the members of that House condemned Chinese immigration, and I think I but feebly echo the voice of the people and of the Legislature of British Columbia when I ask that we go only half the length that our Local Legislature has asked, in restricting Chinese immigration.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister said there were restrictions as to the number of Chinamen a vessel might carry; I do not remember the provision. In Australia they allow one person for 100 tons of the ship's register to be carried as a passenger from China. What is it here?

Mr. BOWELL. The fifth clause of the Chinese Act, chapter 67, provides:

"No vessel carrying Chinese immigrants to any port of Canada shall carry more than one such immigrant for every 50 tons of the tonnage; and the owner of any such vessel who carries any number in excess of the number allowed by this section, shall incur a penalty of $50 for each Chinese immigrant so carried in excess of such number."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If that be so, then I do not see how the steamships could carry anything like the number which the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon) mentions, unless they are violating the law, because that would be only two Chinamen for 100 tons, or 20 Chinamen for 1,000 tons. I do not suppose that the tonnage of these ships is more than 3,000 or 4,000 tons, and that would allow less than 100 Chinamen that the ship would be allowed to carry without violating the law. I understood my hon. friend to say that over 500 came at once.

Mr. GORDON. 531 were brought over in April on one steamer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is five or six times, perhaps seven times, as many as the steamer could carry without a violation of the law. Now, it seems to me that the effectual way of checking Chinese immigration is not merely by putting in the prohibition the sum which the hon. gentleman mentions, but it is by enforcing the law against the steamship company. That would be a far more effectual check than the $100 which the hon. gentleman proposes. Certainly there is no steamer on the Pacific at the present time carrying passengers, that can carry more than 100 Chinamen without a violation of the law.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the hon. gentleman has forgotten what I stated in my opening remarks in reference to these certificates. The legal point is this: If a Chinaman has been in Canada, and has paid his $50 entrance fee, and he leaves Canada with a certificate, is he an immigrant when he returns? I do not pretend to give any opinion upon this matter myself. But if the legal interpretation of that clause is that a Chinaman who has been in Canada and has left with his certificate, has a right to return without the payment of the $50 that is provided for in the law, then he is not an immigrant. He presents his certificate in Hong Kong in order to obtain a passage, and when he arrives in this country the steamship company say: He has presented his certificate, and it is not for us to enquire whether it is legal or a forgery. That is the only way I can account for the number to which the hon. member for Vancouver refers. I do not remember the case to which he calls attention, but I know that is the interpretation put upon the law, and I know that is the reason given by the steamship companies for bringing more than they should if they were considered immigrants. The Canadian Pacific Railway vessels that are now running between Victoria and China are permitted to bring 120 only per trip.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see how the certificate can be any protection to the steamship company. If the certificates are granted by somebody at Hong Kong that would be no protection to the vessel. It seems to me that the ship-owner is absolutely bound to assume the risk of the party that he carries. If that certificate were obtained from an officer in Canada, authorized under a statute of Canada to issue such certificates, then I think that would be a protection to the steamship company; but, surely, the Government of Canada has not authorized any person living at Hong Kong or elsewhere to certify that a party has been in Canada; and if the Government of Canada have not appointed an officer to do that I do not see that the certificate would be of any more value than if it was granted by the greatest stranger in the world, or by a person who had never been in the country.

Mr. BOWELL. I am afraid I have not been able to make myself understood. I thought I made the statement clearly that many of the certificates handed to the steamship companies were forgeries, and that the pursers or clerks who admitted the Chinamen on board did not know whether those certificates were forgeries or not. All these papers purport to have been issued either at Vancouver or Victoria, but are forgeries. They purport to be signed by Mr. Milne, comptroller at Victoria, or by the comptroller at Vancouver or Nanaimo, or other ports of the Dominion, and they are accepted in good faith. I am not prepared to say whether the steamship officers do not wink at this violation of the law. These certificates are presented at Hong Kong or some other port, and are forgeries, and it is that fraud we are trying to stop.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is a seal required?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, just the same as other documents. Cases of this kind occur: A Chinaman will leave British Columbia and does not return, but he hands his certificate to another Chinaman who is coming to this country, and until he appears at the port in British Columbia for identification, and is found either too short or too tall, and in some cases there is scarcely any difference between Chinamen, the matter is not investigated.

In the United States they have adopted the system of the thumb mark, and in many cases this is the only way of discovering whether the Chinaman is the individual he claims to be.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This question has been before the courts in South Australia, from which a case was carried to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, where a decision was given on it. Under the South Australian law a steamship is allowed only to carry one Chinaman for every 100 tons register. A ship came into one of the ports, I think Melbourne: she had a registry of 1,400 tons and carried several hundred Chinamen. According to the law she could only carry 14 of such passengers. On the arrival of the vessel in port the Customs Officer refused to allow any Chinaman to land. Fourteen of them tendered the amount required; but he refused to allow any to land, because the ship was not allowed to carry more than one passenger for 100 tons. One of these Chinamen brought an action against the officer. This Chinaman was a returning passenger who had resided in that place, and as the Custom house officer refused to allow any of them to land, the ship was obliged to carry all the Chinamen back to the port of shipment. The Chinaman brought an action against the Government, and I forget whether the case went for the contestant or against him, but the court was divided and it was appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which decided that a foreigner and an alien could not bring an action against any officer of the Government in the United Kingdom or in any one of Her Majesty's dependencies, that his redress was a redress that could only be obtained by diplomacy, and that he had no right of action whatever in the courts. In view of this decision, because it is a decision on all-fours with what is happening in British Columbia just now, it appears to me that the Custom house officer in British Columbia can refuse to permit any Chinaman to land and can compel the vessel to carry them back.

Mr. BOWELL. How would it be in the case of a Chinaman in Hong Kong which is a British dependency? The question has arisen as to whether Chinamen born and residing in Hong Kong, and being British subjects, would not have a right to bring action.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly, but an Indian-Chinaman would not. It was urged by the counsel in the case to which I refer that 14 of the Chinamen had the right to land, and that these were the first 14 who tendered the money; but the Judicial Committee took the ground that as the ship carried more than the number permitted by law there was no one of them could step out and say he had a right to land under the statute.

Mr. CURRAN. No one would have the right under that decision.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is a very recent decision.

Mr. CURRAN. The real difficulty I see rests in the issuing of certificates which can be used in sending different Chinamen over to this country. There is nothing to prevent a Chinaman on obtaining a certificate, sending it over to China, so that another person might come in on it.

Mr. GORDON. The last clause is to do away with this practice, because there can be no fraud, as the certificates would be of no value, because each Chinaman would have to pay $50. It would also do away with the suspicion that officers had been bribed. One of the troubles in San Francisco was the fact that it was well known, or reputed to have been known, that officers were bribed by the Chinese companies, and by means of swearing their way through the ports over 100,000 Chinamen, during ten years, forced their way into San Francisco in violation of the laws of the United States, through perjury and personation. If we want to stop that practice effectually and prevent all chance of Chinamen improperly landing in this country, do away with the certificates and make every Chinaman pay $50. I yet hope the Minister will consent to do away with the certificates. This will be the means of reducing the trouble and difficulties experienced by the Government, and it will destroy altogether the chance of officers being bribed. If we do away with the return certificates, and after giving four months notification to those holding them to avail themselves of them, there can be no reasonable grounds for complaint, and then the matter will be finally settled. On giving this matter due consideration, the Minister will see how the adoption of this system will lessen the difficulties with the department in dealing with this matter, and how it will effectually stop that system of fraud and perjury which prevails among them.

Mr. BOWELL. The Bill as it is proposed to be amended does away with the issuing of certificates altogether. We contemplate that instead of issuing certificates the Chinaman shall register as he does now, that the fullest possible description of the individual shall be entered and that on his return he shall be identified. He must also indicate by what route he is going to China, where he is going, and by what route he intends to return, and be identified when he does return, and that identification must be in accordance with the record kept by the comptroller in the collector's office in the port at which he arrives in this country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How do you propose to make the steamship companies responsible?

Mr. BOWELL. This will prevent the excuse they have now that a forged certificate is presented to them. If they take more Chinamen than their tonnage will entitle them to, they assume the responsibility when they arrive in this country. I know there have been many cases, when I was head of the department, in which Chinamen have been brought before the courts and some of them have been punished and some of them acquitted. My hon. friend (Mr. Gordon) has read extracts from speeches made in the Local Legislature in the Province of British Columbia. We must remember that from the records of this Legislature we might read extracts from speeches which the hon. gentleman has himself delivered to-day, but would they be an indication of the general feeling of the whole House upon this question? I have a resolution here which was moved by Mr. Keith, whom the hon. gentleman probably knows, in the Local Legislature, and it reads as follows:—

"Whereas the 'Chinese Immigration Act of Canada' has proven in a great measure beneficial, but in some respects defective, more especially as the 5th section permits vessels to carry one Chinese immigrant to any part of Canada for every fifty tons of its tonnage; but we are of the opinion that a much larger restriction should be

imposed, and fewer Chinese carried on each vessel, or their importation prohibited;

"And whereas the eighth section imposes only an entrance duty of $50 on every person of Chinese origin entering Canada, when $500 is, in our opinion, the lowest entrance duty that should be charged, if Chinese are allowed to enter Canada at all;

"And whereas the fourth sub-section of the eighth section provides that the entrance duty of $50 shall not apply to any Chinese person who resided or was within Canada on 1st January, 1886, and the thirteenth section authorizes the issuance of a certificate of leave to depart and return, to Chinese who wish to leave and return to Canada; but, in our opinion, the entrance duty should apply to all Chinese other than those mentioned in sub-sections (*a*) and (*b*) of section 8, and the issuance of the above-mentioned certificates should be entirely abolished;

"Be it therefore resolved, That a respectful address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, requesting him to move the Dominion Government to cause the 'Chinese Immigration Act of Canada' to be made more restrictive in the manner indicated."

I have copied this from the Nanaimo *Free Press* of the 29th March, 1892. That resolution was defeated in the Legislature of British Columbia, it is true, by a small majority, but it shows at least that the whole province does not entertain the extreme view of the gentleman who moved that resolution, or if I may be permitted to say so, of my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Gordon).

Mr. GORDON. Perhaps I may be permitted to explain that that motion was voted down the same way as many motions are voted down here, which is moved by an hon. member of the Opposition. It may have many good points in it, but for party reasons it is voted down, and I might say that I have assisted on many occasions to vote down motions which had some good points about them. However, I am not too old to learn. Again, that resolution asked for an imposition of $500 fee, which no reasonable person in the province believed for a moment this Government would assent to. They took what they thought was a reasonable course, but even that was not acted upon by the Federal Government, and I think they were perfectly justified in refraining from further action until something was done by the Government here. The resolution was only lost by one vote. I have never yet seen the Opposition in this House come so near carrying their point on a party question as to reach within one vote. I again call the attention of the Government to the question of quarantine in connection with the Asiatic trade, and I wish to point out that recently 516 Chinese on the *Empress of China* were sent into quarantine. On three different occasions within the last three months, small-pox has been brought into the province. It is circulated from Vancouver, Westminster and Victoria, and recently at Fort Macleod, all traceable to the same source, and our people in Nanaimo are in constant dread, and are taking municipal measures to prevent it being spread to that locality. It was impossible that the number of passengers on the *Empress of China* could have been regulated by the tonnage mentioned in the Act. I protest against the proposition of the Minister that a Chinaman may be permitted to establish his identity, because if he should be unable to establish it, you have either to send him to prison or send him back to China, as the United States have done. In either case we would inflict upon the treasury of this country a very serious burden. It seems to me that a provision should be made that no more certificates should issue, and then we would save all the litigation and the corruption and bribery that otherwise would exist. I trust that the Government will yet see their way to accept the first and second sections of my Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I noticed some statements in the press recently that leprosy had been introduced into the city of New York by Chinamen. I do not know to what extent the disease is prevalent amongst them, but it would be a serious matter if the disease were introduced into British Columbia by Chinese immigration. The Government should pass some legislation on the subject to take care that persons inflicted with diseases of that kind are not permitted to land.

Mr. BOWELL. The law provides for that. There is inspection and quarantine now.

Mr. BERGIN. I would suggest to the hon. Minister who has charge of this Bill, that as we have to-day a very alarming report from Europe that Asiatic cholera broke out in London, that it would be well to adopt the suggestion which I make, that is, to take power under this Bill that, in the event of cholera or any such disease breaking out in China or Japan, this Government should be able to prevent any Chinese or Japanese coming into the country during the existence of this disease.

Mr. BOWELL. The Minister of Agriculture has that power now under the law. It applies to all portions of the Dominion as well as to the St. Lawrence. If any of these Pacific steamers has that dreaded disease on board, the passengers will not be permitted to land, but will be quarantined as they are at Grosse Isle, in the St. Lawrence.

Section 1 dropped, and Bill reported.

Mr. BOWELL moved third reading of the Bill.

Mr. GORDON. I beg to move that this Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to strike out clause 15 and substitute the following therefor:—

All duties, pecuniary penalties and other sources of revenue under this Act shall be paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada in trust for the benefit of the province wherein the same were collected, and shall, at the end of every fiscal year, after deducting the cost of administration, pay the same over to the treasurer of the said province.

I am sure the Government will recognize the injustice inflicted upon us by the exclusion of the better class of people, who would engage in the development of the country and build up homes there and add largely to its revenue. Considering the cost of the administration of justice imposed upon us through the admission of a class of people, who neither the Provincial Legislature nor the people desire to have, we should at least be entitled to the head money collected by the Government who allows these people to enter. I need not dwell on the importance of this clause. I feel pretty sure that this motion will be declared out of order; but I move it to call the attention of the Government to this mater, so that they will take the opportunity of considering it between now and the next session, and see the justice of paying over to the Province of British Columbia the head money collected from that undesirable class, which our people consider so detrimental to the interests of Canada and to our province in particular.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid this motion is hardly in order, as it proposes to appropriate certain sums out of the public treasury.

Mr. BOWELL. I might tell the House that the present law provides for the annual payment to the British Columbia Government of one-fourth of all entry dues paid to the Customs by the Chinese, and that is transmitted to them at the end of every fiscal year.

Mr. DAVIN. As I had something to do with the Act on the Statute-book, I may be permitted to make a suggestion. I think the clause should be so amended as to allow no more money to go into the Consolidated Fund of the Dominion than will reimburse the Dominion Government for the cost of dealing with this immigration. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Vancouver that the whole fund should go to the Provincial Government, but I would ask the Dominion Government to reimburse them the balance after deducting expenses.

Mr. GORDON. That is all I ask for in this particular motion.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 101) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Haggart.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 8th July, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BOUNTY ON BEET-ROOT SUGAR.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 102) respecting the bounty on beet-root sugar.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. LAURIER. I beg to move, in amendment to section 1:

That the premium be paid, not to the producers of sugars, but to the producers of beets.

Amendment negatived, and Bill reported read the third time and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 104) to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Bill (No. 101) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of lines of railway therein mentioned, was considered in committee and reported.

Mr. HAGGART moved third reading of the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER moved in amendment:

That within four days after the opening of each session, the Minister of Railways shall lay upon the Table of the House, copies of all agreements made by any of the companies with the Government, together with a statement of all payments made by the Government up to date, for subsidies earned by any of the said companies, and the Orders in Council authorizing such payments.

That within a month after the payment to any company of any portion of the subsidies, the president and manager of the said company shall furnish to the Auditor General a statement under oath showing if the whole of the subsidies so paid to the company have been applied in the manner herein intended, and that a similar statement shall be supplied by every contractor of the company who is to receive or has received the payment out of any such subsidies or out of the proceeds thereof, and that, within four days after the opening of each session, the Auditor General shall lay all such statements upon the Table of the House.

That all such documents thus laid on the Table of the House shall be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts, to be by them investigated in the same manner as the Public Accounts.

That every officer and director of the said companies, and every person having a contract with any of the companies for the performance of any work, the doing of anything, or the furnishing of any goods, effects, food or materials, and having or expecting to have any claim or demand against the company by reason of such contract, who either directly or indirectly, by himself or by any person on his behalf, subscribes, furnishes or gives, or promises to subscribe, furnish or give, any money or other valuable consideration for the purpose of promoting the election of any candidate, or of any number, class or party of candidates to a Legislature or to Parliament, or with the intent in any way of influencing or affecting the result of a provincial or Dominion election;

Is guilty of a misdemeanour and liable to a fine of not less than one hundred dollars and not exceeding one thousand dollars; unless the value of the amount or thing paid, offered, given, loaned, promised, received or subscribed, as the case may be, shall exceed the last-mentioned sum, in which case the fine may be raised to a sum not exceeding such value, and also to a term not exceeding one year and not less than one month, and in default of payment of such fine, to imprisonment for a further term not exceeding six months.

Amendment negatived on a division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 103) further to amend the Act respecting the Duties of Customs.

(In the Committee.)

On the preamble,

Mr. LAURIER. I will take this opportunity to put a question to the Minister of Finance. I am informed that an article of export from Newfoundland which is known as liquid fish glue, is made subject to a duty of 50 per cent, whereas the interpretation of the importers and the interpretation of the Newfoundland Government is that, under the agreement with that Government, the article should be admitted free.

Mr. FOSTER. That subject has been brought to the attention of the Government and has been settled in the way my hon. friend suggests, that is, that it is free under the agreement with Newfoundland.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to call the attention of the Government to a letter that I have received from the firm of Lightbound, Rolston & Co., who represent to me that when the duties on sugar were removed last year some allowance was made to the refiners who had syrups in bond, but the same allowance was not made to them as

merchants, and they, therefore, complain that there seems to be one law for the refiners and another for the merchants. I am not sure whether the hon. gentleman is in a position to give an answer to this, but I bring it to his attention that the matter may be looked into. It seems to me there should be a uniform law with respect to all those holding syrup at the time the changes in the tariff were made.

Mr. FOSTER. I will call the attention of the Minister of Customs to it.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 100) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1893, and for other purposes relating to the public service.—(Mr. Foster.)

ADJOURNMENT—THE *MODUS VIVENDI*.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. KAULBACH. Before the House adjourns, I would like to bring to the attention of the Government a matter of considerable importance, and I rise with the utmost reluctance at this late stage of the session, knowing how anxious all are for the necessary business to be despatched, and Parliament prorogued as early as possible, but the importance of the subject I feel really demands it, and it is the only apology I have to offer for trespassing upon the indulgence of this House at the present moment. I refer to the *modus vivendi* between Great Britain and the United States as respects our fisheries on the Atlantic coast, feeling constrained to call attention to this matter, lest the Government might, during recess, or before we are again convened for the dispatch of business, be proceeding under the Bills passed during the early stage of this session, and its action might in a measure very seriously affect the interest of our fishermen unless their wishes as respects their position were known and clearly understood. We were told that in consequence of Parliament usually sitting somewhat later in the season than the period when it should be known as to the intention of the Government granting the *modus vivendi* or otherwise, the Governor in Council in the past had been obliged by the nature of things to exercise authority in advance of the sanction of Parliament, the owners of vessels being required to know in the early part of the year, so as to make the necessary arrangements for the season's fishing. We were further advised that it was not from any desire on the part of the Government to deprive Parliament of any right in this connection, but simply for the convenience or benefit of those engaged in the industry of fishing, to place the power in the hands of the Governor in Council, to issue or refuse licenses as they thought proper in the interest of Canada. In this, I in a measure concurred, but felt at the same time that in an important international matter of this sort, Parliament ought not to cease to exercise jurisdiction or authority. However, I was pleased to see that the clauses in the Bill in this connection were so amended as to remove the objection. It was feared we were weakening our claim to our territorial rights, by placing the right to issue or refuse licenses in the hands of the Governor in Council, which appears to me need not be entertained for one moment. The very fact that the payment of the license fee by the United States vessels, under the *modus vivendi*, into the treasury of this Dominion is an unquestionable admission of our right to the control of our fisheries, and to our territorial waters, and I cannot understand how it could be interpreted otherwise. It was feared the Government in this Bill referred to, was granting a *modus vivendi* of a permanent character, but rightly interpreted it is simply a convenience to meet a purpose where diverse interests are involved, without affecting the original Bill. When contrasting the territorial rights of the United States under the various treaties with those of our own, it was considered that if the United States were entitled to the whole of Chesapeake Bay and other bays covering large sheets of water over six miles in width, we, on the same principle, should be entitled to the whole of the waters of the Bay of Fundy. I am not so certain about the United States being entitled to the whole of Chesapeake Bay or any of the other bays over six miles in width, although they profess to claim them, but to my mind there can be no comparison whatever between the two positions, and the reason is obvious. In the case of Chesapeake Bay the territory on both sides is owned by the United States, whilst in the Bay of Fundy, the United States own partly on the one side, and we on the other. Some persons have expressed a desire, who certainly could not be interested in Canada, to continue the *modus vivendi* so as to enable the fishermen of Nova Scotia to go to Gloucester, in the United States, as they were accustomed to do, and prosecute the industry of fishing in American vessels. This really is unfair to Canada, and unjust to the policy we honestly claim to advocate. I can state to such persons that the very object of this Government in 1882 when granting a bounty to fishermen of $150,000, and which last year was supplemented by $10,000 additional, was to prevent an exodus of our fishermen, as it was represented to the Government that many of them were finding their way to the United States to sail in better vessels, and more comfortably equipped than our own. To correct this evil, Sir Leonard Tilley, the then Minister of Finance, in 1882, when introducing the Bill granting the bounty, very clearly and forcibly expressed his views on that point by stating that the intention of the bounty was to encourage ship-building and construct a class of vessels, for safety and comfort, equal to the American vessels in every particular, that our fishermen might be induced to remain at home and sail in them. This, I am happy to state, so far as my county (Lunenburg) is concerned, has been fully realized, and I have the proud satisfaction in stating that we are, so to speak, the Gloucester of America, possessing a fleet second to none in the world, averaging in size from 75 to 100 tons, most of them prosecuting the deep sea fishing in summer, and in winter many of them are occupied in the West Indian trade. Having this fine fleet, and prosecuting a trade with the West Indies, I may here state that I have never considered it just that a subsidy or bonus should be given to a line of steamers from Halifax to the West Indies to compete against us. As we are supplementing the fleet by some 25 or 30 this year, I would say to my

friends to divert the exodus they speak of, and have those fishermen dissatisfied with their homes and seeking employment, come to Lunenburg where they will meet, if they are expert hands, with ready employment. I may here state, Mr. Speaker, that under existing circumstances I am strongly opposed to the granting of the *modus vivendi* to the United States, excluded as we are by a tariff-wall from their market, and in making this statement I feel I am voicing, in very mild terms, the sentiments of our fishermen, who are expressing their denunciations from day to day in no uncertain strains regarding the unfairness of their position in the privileges United States fishermen enjoy under the *modus vivendi* over themselves. Had the Government been aware, when they consented to extend the *modus vivendi*, at the commencement of this year, that they would have failed to negotiate a treaty with the United States, on a fair basis, I feel very certain they would not have granted this concession; and to suddenly have withheld all further licenses for the fishing season, would, I presume, have been considered discourteous, and a violation of the understanding that it should be extended this year. Anyway, I do hope that it will be the last year that Canada will extend such a privilege to them on existing terms, as they (the United States fishermen) by it are getting double advantages over us, inasmuch as they are having their own, ours and the Newfoundland waters for their fishing and bait. Whilst I am aware it is impossible for the House to deal further with the matter this session, it is my intention to bring it more prominently before the House the next meeting of Parliament.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sorry my colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not been able to hear my hon. friend's views as expressed in this House, but I shall have great pleasure in directing his attention to them, as well as the attention of my other colleagues, when the subject of any proposed renewal of the *modus vivendi* comes under consideration.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 9th July, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received the following communication:—

OTTAWA, 9th July, 1892.

SIR,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue the session of the Dominion Parliament on Saturday the 9th inst. at three o'clock.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
C. J. JONES,
Chief Clerk, Governor General's Office.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Townshend and the Hon. Mr. Wallace Graham the two judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act and the amendments thereto, a certified report relating to the election in the electoral district of Shelburne, N.S., by which the election petition was dismissed.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNORSHIP OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the leader of the House, before the Orders of the Day are called, whether it is the intention of the Government to continue Sir Leonard Tilley as Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick for another term, or whether the Government propose to appoint somebody else to that office? It seems somewhat irregular that the Government should continue the Lieutenant Governor in office so long after the period for which he was appointed has expired.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As the hon. gentleman is probably aware, the term of the Lieutenant Governor expired about a year ago, and the matter of his appointment for a further term has not yet been considered, but will be immediately after prorogation.

EXTRA CLERKS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the leader of the House whether the Government propose to deal with the extra clerks as they deal with those permanently on the staff, with regard to allowing them holidays, or whether the holidays have been withdrawn from those not permanent?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Order in Council relating to that subject allows them statutory holidays and Sundays, and the allowance which may be necessary on account of illness depends upon the terms of engagement of these officers. In some departments they are engaged simply by the day, in others they are hired annually, and in others monthly; but I think it is in contemplation to arrange that reasonable allowance should be made for absence in case of actual sickness.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is the system of continuing irregular servants to remain in force, or are they to be regarded generally as employed by the year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They will still be temporarily employed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It puts them on a great unequality in the different departments.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. An attempt will be made to equalize them in all the departments, but there are officers of different grades, some being professional, such as engineers, whose tenure of office is longer than that of those engaged in clerical work; but I presume eventually the only distinction made will be among the various classes.

CRIMINAL CODE.

Amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 7 respecting the Criminal Law, were read the second time and concurred in

PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

Mr. SPEAKER:

His Excellency the GOVERNOR GENERAL desires the immediate presence of this House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in HER MAJESTY'S name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act respecting the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting certain railway works in the City of Toronto.
An Act to incorporate the Victoria Life Insurance Company.
An Act respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.
An Act to incorporate the Canso and Louisbourg Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.
An Act to confirm an agreement between the Tobique Valley Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
An Act for the relief of James Albert Manning Aikins.
An Act for the relief of Herbert Rimmington Mead.
An Act for the relief of Ada Donigan.
An Act respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.
An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Carl Auer Von Welsbach and others.
An Act respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.
An Act respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.
An Act to incorporate the High River and Sheep Creek Irrigation and Water Power Company.
An Act respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Atlantic Railway Company.
An Act respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Buckingham and Lièvre River Railway Company.
An Act to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Brockville and New York Bridge Company.
An Act to incorporate the Dominion Millers' Association.
An Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Montreal and Western Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited.
An Act for the relief of Hattie Adele Harrison.
An Act for the relief of James Wright.
An Act respecting the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Railway Company.
An Act to revive and amend the Acts respecting the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company.
An Act further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.
An Act respecting the Midland Railway of Canada.
An Act further to amend the Patent Act.
An Act to make further provision respecting Grants of Land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-West.
An Act to incorporate the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Voters' Lists of 1891.
An Act further to amend the General Inspection Act.
An Act further to amend "The Winding-up Act."
An Act to incorporate the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.
An Act further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.
An Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.
An Act respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers.
An Act further to amend the Railway Act.
An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Civil Service.
An Act further to amend the Chinese Immigration Act.
An Act to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.
An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.
An Act respecting the bounty on Beet-Root Sugar.
An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.
An Act respecting the Criminal Law.
An Act to amend the Act relating to the Harbour of St. John, in the Province of New Brunswick.

Then the Honourable the SPEAKER of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

The Commons of Canada have voted certain Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill:—

"An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1893, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service," to which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words:—

IN HER MAJESTY'S name, His Excellency the GOVERNOR GENERAL thanks Her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Second Session of the Seventh Parliament of the Dominion with the following speech:—

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate,
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In relieving you from further attendance in Parliament I congratulate you on the useful legislation which has resulted from your deliberations during this long and arduous session.

The adoption of the Code of Criminal Law will confer a great benefit on all the classes who are concerned in the administration of that branch of jurisprudence, and is an achievement which will reflect credit on the Parliament of Canada.

The difficult task of readjusting the representation of the people in the House of Commons, in accordance with the Census Returns, has been accomplished with comparatively little disturbance of existing electoral divisions and in a manner that I hope will prove to be satisfactory in its operation.

The legislation relating to the North-West Territories, Dominion Lands, Railways, Patents, and to the Inspection of Provisions, and the various other measures which have been completed, are calculated to benefit the industrial and commercial interests of the country, and to promote its general welfare.

You have been doubtless gratified by the announcement that the Government of Newfoundland is likely to hold a friendly conference with my Government upon the differences which had arisen between Canada and that Colony, and that in the meantime all causes of further dispute, or irritation, have been removed.

A representation has been made by the Administration of the United States that the schedule of tolls, which has been in force upon the Canadian canals for some years past, operates to the disadvantage of the shipping and products of United States citizens on the Great Lakes. This complaint has been examined and discussed with the authorities of the United States, and a proposal has been submitted on behalf of my Government that the United

States will restore the concessions that were made on the part of that country by the Treaty of Washington, as an equivalent for concessions on the part of Canada as to the canals, but which were withdrawn by the United States without cause, so far as Canada is concerned. This proposal has not yet been replied to, but it is hoped that the fairness of the position taken by my Government will be duly appreciated by the Government of the United States, so that all further misunderstanding on the question may be avoided.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I trust that the provisions which you have made for the public service will be found ample for its demands.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

At the close of this session I take leave of you with the hope that the sacrifices which you have been called on to make by so protracted an attendance may be rewarded by proof that your labours have been fruitful of benefits to the Dominion, and that our people in every part of Canada may likewise be blessed with prosperity in the harvest season which approaches.

The SPEAKER of the Senate then said:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate, and

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is His Excellency the GOVERNOR GENERAL'S will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Thursday, the eighteenth day of August next, to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until Thursday, the eighteenth day of August next.

The PARLIAMENT of the DOMINION of CANADA was then prorogued to the 18th day of August next.

INDEX.

SECOND SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1892.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C. P. R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur., Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Withdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italic and parentheses are those of the mover.

Adams, Mr. M., *Northumberland, N.B.*

SUPPLY:

Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (St. John, accommodation) 2598 (ii).

Allan, Mr. H. W., *South Essex.*

Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2862 (ii).

Prosser, Wm., Fishery Overseer, Dismissal (Ques.) 2490 (ii).

——— (M. for Cor., &c.) 3114 (ii).

Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4580 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to M. for 2°, 3665 (ii).

Saw Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1279 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia (Clothing) 1341 (i).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2862 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechasse.*

Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4700.

Budget, on the, 564 (i).

Compulsory Voting (B. 46, 1°*) 578; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1083 (i).

Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2702 (ii).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3097, 3368, 3381 (ii).

Militia, Active, on M. for Ret., 676 (i).

Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4533 (ii).

Trudel, Edmond, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques. 3237 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J., *South Middlesex.*

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to conc., 4600 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys., Man. and N.W.T., on M. for Ret., 2280 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1080 (i); in Com., 3393 (ii).

N. W.T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2485 (ii).

——— Education and Dual Languages (prop. Res.) 3062 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3160; in Com., 3937, 3957, 4123, 4326 (ii).

Saw Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1276 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1438.

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 2248 (i).

Civil Government (Interior) 851 (i).

Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1842 (i).

Miscellaneous (C. S. Commissioners) 1095 (1).

Voters' List, 1891, B. 67 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4501; neg. (Y. 30, N. 63) 4505 (ii).

Wilson, Convict Ed., Release (M. for Ret.) 2642.

Bain, Mr. J. W., *Soulanges.*

Address, The, in Answer to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 18 (i).

Soulanges and Beauharnois Canals, Engineers' Reps., &c., on M. for copies, 19, 209, 224 (i).

Bain, Mr. T., *North Wentworth.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1709 (i).
Milk Cans, Inspection under Act (Ques.) 4262.
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3577; in Com., 3912, 3934, 3957 (ii).
Saw Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1269 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census) 983 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 904 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1019 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1526, 1836, 1909 (i).

Baker, Mr. G. B., *Missisquoi.*
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4522 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4095; on Amt. (Mr. *Béchard*) to M. for 3°, 4339 (ii).

Barnard, Mr. F. S., *Cariboo.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1871 (i).
Indian Reserves, B.C. (M. for Ret.) 511 (i).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., *Berthier.*
Beet Root Sugar Bounty (Ques.) 751 (i).
——— Bounty for Manufacture (M. for Cor.) 1373 (i).
——— Cultivation, French Reps. (Ques.) 750 (i).
——— Prof. Saunders' Rep. (M. for copies) 1373.
——— Manufacture, &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 1366 (i).
Fishing License, on St. Lawrence (Ques.) 2641.
Lake St. Peter, Fishing Privileges, (Ques.) 2955.
Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Ry. Co.'s (B. 87, 1° *) 2700 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 3556; neg. (Y. 53, N. 96) 3563 (ii).

Béchard, Mr. F., *Iberville.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4702.
Budget, on the, 423 (i).
Eatonville Harbour (N.S.) Expenditure (Ques.) 2641 (ii).
Fishing Licenses on St. Lawrence (Ques.) 2641.
Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Ry. Co. Pet. (M.) 2482 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2484 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4532 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3174; in Com., 3992, 4042, 4046, 4093; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4336; neg. (Y. 54, N. 89) 4342 (ii).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) 4646.
Three Sisters' Harbour, N.S., Expenditure (Ques.) 2489 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3459; in Com., 3965, 4324 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 423 (i).
Canals—Capital (Trent) 2061 (i).
Militia (Drill Sheds, &c., 1375 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
Coteau, Water Overflow (remarks) 914 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to conc., 4599 (ii).
De LaRonde, late Pierre A. Denis (M. for Ret.) 2286 (i).
Employés in Customs Department, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2506 (ii).
Soulanges and Beauharnois Canals, Engineers' Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 191, 229 (i).

Bergin, Mr. D., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4726 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2977 (ii).
Ont. and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 50 1°*) 823 (i).
Printing Com. (Joint) 5th Rep. conc., (M.) 2171.
——— 8th Rep., conc. (M.) 3643 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 144 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res. 4682 (ii).

Bernier, Mr. M. E., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Cap St. Ignace Station P. O. (Ques.) 290 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4527 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4056, 4066, 4101 (ii).

Borden, Mr. F. W., *King's, N.S.*
C. P. R., P. O. and Militia Services, Payments (Ques.) 3331 (ii).
Dodwell, C. E. W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1715 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 4135 (ii).
I. C. R., Passenger Cars, Amount paid C. P. R. (Ques.) 399 (i).
Kentville Postmaster, Suspension (Ques.) 1088 (i), 3752 (ii).
Montreal Cadets, Duty on Presentation Flag (Ques.) 509 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2750, 2769 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3838, 4082 (ii).
Sheet Harbour Wharves, Dues collected, &c. (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Spanish West Indies, Exports (Ques.) 509 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 843 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1893 (i).

Borden, Mr. F. W.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 764, 770, 782 (i).
Public Works—Consolidated Fund: Buildings (N.B.) 989 (i).
Income: Buildings (N.S.) 2750 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2389 (i).
West Indian Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1877 (i).

Bowell, Hon. M., *North Hastings.*
American Cattle in Bond (Ans.) 400 (i).
Beef and Pork (American) Lumbermen's Imports (Ans.) 291 (i).
——— on M. for Ret., 294 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, Sums paid (Ans.) 41 (i).
——— Manufactured, &c., on M. for Sumnt., 1366.
Bridges, St. Lawrence River (Ans.) 1549 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Terminal accommodation (Ans.) 1549 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Amt.) 2068; agreed to (Y. 125, N. 63) 2169 (i).
Chatham Customs Collector (Ans.) 1391 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4716 (ii).
Civil Servants, Permanent Clerks, Extra Pay, on M. for Ret., 1718 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., Select Com. (M.) 34 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4586 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4598 (ii).
Dods, P. B., case of, *re* Loss of Diamonds, on M. for Ret., 2289 (i).
Esquimalt, Defence of, Imp. and Can. Govts., on M. for Cor., 222, 244 (ii).
Drill Hall, Ottawa, Contract for Roofing (Ans.) 4602 (ii).
Exports and Imports, on M. for Ret., 100 (i).
——— (remarks) 111 (i).
Farm Produce, Exports, on M. (Mr. *McMullen*) for Ret., 292 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports, on M. for Ret., 528 (i).
Fortifications at Esquimalt, Imp. and Can. Govts. (Ans.) 222 (i).
——— on M. for Cor., 244 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4489 (ii).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 31 (Mr. *Innes*) in Com., 1229 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List (remarks) 1203, 1219; on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1333 (i).
Granite, Manufactured, Imports and Exports, (Ans.) 509 (i).
Hammond, E., Seizures (Ans.) 2782 (ii).
Inland Revenue Officer at Quebec (Ans.) 2639.
I.C.R., Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 3897.
Lake St. John and Chicoutimi Ry. (Ans.) 1549.
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliott, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2349 (i).

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2298 (i), 3103, 3366 (ii).
Military District No. 9, Suspension of Officers (Ans.) 3332, 3643 (ii).
Militia, Active, on M. for Ret., 680 (i).
Militia and Defence Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1153 (i).
——— 60th Battalion, Annual Drill (Ans.) 4500.
Montreal Cadets, Duty on Presentation Flag (Ans.) 509 (i).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2689 (ii).
Newfoundland and Canada, Bonding Privileges (Ans.) 189 (i).
——— Duty collected on Fishing Outfits (Ans.) 189 (i).
——— Discriminating Tariff (Ans.) 454 (i).
——— Papers, &c., *re* Trade, on M. for copies, 687 (i).
Ordnance Lands, Annapolis (Ans.) 1364 (i).
Pontiac County Ry. Debt, on M. for Cor., 1994.
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup. 2764, 2892 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., Despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2495 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4535 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir John *Thompson*) in Com., 3908, 3924, 3961 (ii).
Rhéaume, Antoine, Land Grant (Ans.) 2490 (ii).
Saw Logs, &c., Export Duty, Removal (Ans.) 1032.
Standing Coms., Rep. of Sel. Com. (Lists presented) 101; conc., 106 (i).
——— additional Names (M.) 217, 563 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Jamaica Exhibition) 977 (i).
Civil Government (Customs) 268; (High Commissioner) 277; (Interior) 869 (i), conc., 4208 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Craven, Geo., Gratuity) 1007; (Detective Service, &c.) 1018; (Inspectors' Travelling Expenses) 821; (B. C.) 829; (N. S.) 811; (Ont.) 812. Excise (Customs Officers' Commissions) 1016 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1538, 1833 1912; (Printing Pamphlets) 2014, 2023 (i).
Justice (Exchequer Court) conc., 1086 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing Voters' Lists) 976 (i); (Publishing Debates) conc., 4205 (ii). Senate, 974 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4301 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition) 1161 (i), conc., 4209 (ii); (Armouries, &c.) 1351, 1415; (Clothing) 1340; (District Staff) 1161; (Drill Pay) 1354 (i), conc., 4209 (ii); (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1374; (Military College) 1376 (i); (Monuments) conc., 4210 (ii); (Permanent Forces) 1419; (Rifled Ordnance) 1363 (i), conc., 4210 (ii); (Stores) 1353 (i).
Miscellaneous (International Customs Bureau) 1006; (International Educational Association) 1006 (i).
Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1018 (i).

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2626. *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 2951; (N.S.) 2764: (Que.) 2914; (Gas and Electric Light) 4243: (Telephone Service) 4246 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2040 (i).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2267 (i); (St. John, accommodation) 2577, 2606 (ii).
Superannuation (W. Wallace) 797 (i).
Territorial Account (N. W. Rebellion) 1018 (i); conc., 1087 (i).
SUPPLY (B. 62) Res. in Com. and 1°*, 1087; 2° m., 1090 (i).
Trade and Navigation Rets. (presented) 37 (i).
U. S. Newspapers, Free Admission (Ans.) 1231.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. for Com., 4673; in Com. on Res., 4680 (ii).
Worsley, Lieut. Col. and Lieut. Col. Murray (Ans.) 3332, 3643 (ii).
Wrecking in Can. Waters (B. 8, 1°) 106; 2° m., 173; 2° m., 970; in Com., 1091 (i).

Bowers, Mr. E. C., *Digby.*
Bear River Railway Bridge (Ques.) 398 (i).
Bounties to Fishermen, Distribution (Ques.) 190.
——— Applications Granted, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 417 (i).
Canvas Coal Bags, Tenders for making (Ques.) 2954 (ii).
Church Point Wharf, Expenditure for Repairs (Ques.) 398 (i).
Copyright, Reciprocity with U. S. (Ques.) 137 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2213; in Com., 2220 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2751, 2769.
Raquette Pier, completion (Ques.) 398 (i).
St. Mary's Bay, Hatcheries (Ques.) 398 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service, conc., 4471 (ii).
Fisheries: (Fish-Breeding) 4318; P.E.I. (Salaries) 4316 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 4305 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax and St. John (4304 (ii).
Marine Hospitals, 4310 (ii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 741 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) 4441; (N.S.) 2751; (Telephone Service) 4246. Harbours and Rivers (Raquette Pier) 4247, 4448. Telegraphs (Nanaimo, &c.) 4259 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (St. John, accommodation 2599 (ii).
Superannuation (W. Wallace) 798 (i).
Westport Harbour, Can Buoys (Ques.) 399 (i).
West Indian Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1880 (i).

Bowman, Mr. I. E., *North Waterloo.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com. 3869 (ii).

Boyle, Mr. A., *Monck.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3566; in Com., 3780, 3347, 3882, 3914; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 3°, 4333 (ii).

Brodeur, Mr. L. P., *Rouville.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4707 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2101 (i).
——— Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3040 (ii).
Fishing Rights on Richelieu River (Ques.) 35 (i).
Judiciary of Prov. of Quebec (Ques.) 2639 (ii).
Mail Conductors, Superannuation (M. for Ret.) 2699 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection (West Farnham) in Com. of Sup., 2902 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1861 (i); on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3164; in Com., 3978, 4025, 4044, 4053 (ii).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for Pets., &c.*) 100 (i).
——— (remarks) 4645 (ii).
St. Césaire Postmaster, Money Deposits (M. for Cor.) 400 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) conc., 4474 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2902. Dredging (Que., &c.) 4456 (ii).

Brown, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
Post Offices, Erection (Laprairie) in Com. of Sup., 2866 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4032, 4092 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2866 (ii)

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*
Lavalliere Bay, Dredging (M. for Ret.*) 2457 (ii).
McCarthy, Messrs., Lease of Land in Sorel (Ques.) 3184 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4102 (ii).
Richelieu River, Subsidy for Bridge (M. for Ret.) 2453 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: H. of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 775 (i).

Burns, Mr. K. F., *Gloucester.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2202 (i).

Calvin, Mr. H. A., *Frontenac.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 3°, 4330 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. H., *Inverness.*
Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. (M. to introd.) 666.
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4520 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 567 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1521, 1919 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2901 (ii).
West Bay, Customs Inspectors' Rep. (M. for copy*) 2287 (i).
Whycocomagh, Port of Entry (M. for Ret.*) 2287 (i).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ont.*
Binding Twine, Imports (M. for Ret.) 537 (i).
Budget, on the, 482 (i).
Coal Oil and Kerosene, Imports, on M. for Ret., 3059 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 4140 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List (remarks) 1201 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to prop. Res., 3342 (ii).
Lepage, J. B., Employmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1392 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2869, 2891, 2915 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3286 (i); in Com., 3882 (ii).
Rhéaume, Antoine, Land Grant (Ques.) 2490 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 482 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Criminal Statistics) 1160.
Canals—Capital (Trent) 2058. *Income* (Carillon and Grenville) 2261; (Chambly) 2257 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1021 (i). (Excise) 4430 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1837; (Expenses) 1910, 1945 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4299 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition) 1186; (Drill Pay) 1361 (i).
Miscellaneous (Clerical Assistance) 4460; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 4430 (ii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 740 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2624. *Income*—Buildings (Que.) 2869, 2915; (Gas and Electric Light) 4244; (Heating Ottawa Buildings) 4242. Harbours and Rivers (Ont., Kingston Harbour) 4257 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (Expenses) 2427; (Flour Rates) 2559 (ii).
Superannuation, 802 (i).
Sydenham River, Obstructions, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4453 (ii).
West Indian Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1886 (i).

Carling, Hon. J., *London.*
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1062 (i).
——— Letter of Dep. Minister (Ans.) 1947 (i).
Archives of Canada (presented) 1153 (i).
Butter and Cheese Industry (Ques.) 3331 (ii).
Canada Illustrated, Purchase of Volumes (Ans.) 397 (i).

Carling, Hon. J.—*Continued.*
Census and Statistics, Maps (Ans.) 824 (i).
——— Origins and Religions (Ans.) 190 (i), 2491, 3566 (ii).
Dairies and Cheese Factories, Prov. of Que. (Ans.) 2781 (ii).
Experimental Farm (Central) Dairy, on M. for Ret., 402 (i).
——— French Ed. of Reps. (Ans.) 397 (i).
——— Papers respecting (remarks) 3185 (ii).
High Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 1062 (ii).
London Election on B. 76 on M. for 2°, (remarks) 3249 (ii).
Mennonite Settlers and Census Returns (remarks) 4264 (ii).
Nationalities, &c., of the Population (Ans.) 824 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. (90, 1°), 3300; 2° m., 3729; in Com., 4215 (ii).
Payne, J. L., Payments for Services (Ans.) 1548 (i).
Quarantine in B. C. (remarks) 1548 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census) 983; (Columbian Exhibition) 983 (i), 4433 (ii); (Criminal Statistics) 1160; (Dairy Industry) 1464; (Experimental Farms) 1424; (Jamaica Exhibition) 976; (*Patent Record*) 1159 (i).
Civil Government (Printing and Stationery) conc., 4204 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1492, 1828, 1852; (Expenses) 1889; (Printing Pamphlets) 2009 (i).
Public Works—Income: (Experimental Farms) 4448 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 987, 2033; (Grosse Isle) 2026, 2033; (St. John, Halifax and Victoria) 2032 (i); (Tracadie Lazaretto) conc., 4212 (ii); (Unorganized Service) 2049 (i).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Reps. (Ans.) 1638 (i).
——— on M. for copy, 2452 (ii).
——— Visit, C. H. Cahan's Services (Ans.) 2432.

Caron, Hon. Sir A., K.C.M.G., *Rimouski.*
Atlantic Mail Service (Ans.) 1231 (i).
Berthier (Montmagny) P. O., Management (Ans.) 2638 (ii).
Cap St. Ignace Station, Appmnt. of Postmaster (Ans.) 223 (i).
——— Opening (Ans.) 290, 751 (i).
C. P. R., P. O. and Militia Services, Payments (Ans.) 3331 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 1467 (i)
Des Aulnets P. O., Management (Ans.) 750 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List, 1197 (i).
Hull P. O., Sunday Opening (Ans.) 3184 (ii).
Kentville Postmaster, Suspension (Ans.) 1088 (i), 3752 (ii).
Letter Postage, Reduction (Ans.) 190 (i).
L'Islet, Appmnt. of Postmaster (Ans.) 750 (i).
Lotbinière County, Mail Service (Ans.) 4585 (ii).
Mail Service, Imperfect (remarks) 4399 (ii).
Montmagny Postmaster (Ans.) 2638 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A.—*Continued.*
Ocean Mails, Train Service (Ans.) 3185 (ii).
Point Tupper and Sydney Mail Service (Ans.) 2641 (ii).
Postmaster Gen.'s Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1364 (i)
Quebec and Pointe aux Trembles Mail Contract (Ans.) 1366 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4524 (ii).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Mail Service (Ans.) 2954 (ii).
Ste. Louise Postmaster, Rep. of Enquiry (Ans.) 2431 (ii).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) 4646 (ii).
St. Césaire Postmaster, Money Deposits, on M. for Cor., 400 (i).
Savings Bank, Interest on Deposits (Ans.) 916.
Stadacona P.O., Opening (Ans.) 222 (i).
Summerstown P.O., Receipts (Ans.) 1365 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Ammunition) 1197 (i), conc., 4209 (ii); (Clothing) 1341 (i).
Public Works—Consolidated Fund: Buildings (Ont.) 990 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 4445 (ii).

Carpenter, Mr. F. M., *South Wentworth.*
St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 40, 1°*) 315 (i).

Carroll, Mr. H. G., *Kamouraska.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res., 2124 (i).
I. C. R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (M. for Cor., &c.*) 292 (i).
Kamouraska Wharf, Construction (M. for Ret.) 510 (i).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Mail Service (Ques.) 2954 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R., K.C.M.G., *South Oxford.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4697.
BUDGET, The (Ques.) 161: (Reply) 335 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 4714 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1060, 1741 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2144: Amt. to Amt., 2147 (i); neg. (Y. 63, N. 125) 2169 (i).
Census and Statistics (remarks) 824 (i).
——— Origins and Religions (Ques.) 824 (i), 2491, 3566 (ii).
Civil Service Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 751 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2783, 3330 (ii).
Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1817 (i).
Election Expenses, Publications in Toronto *Globe* (Ques.) 3734 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4348 (ii).
Estimates, Suppl., 1892 (remarks) 822 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Continued.*
Exports and Imports (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).
——— (remarks) 111 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on presentation (remarks) 34 (i).
——— ref. to Pub. Acts. Com. (M.) 50 (i).
Govt Short Loans (Ques.) 137 (i).
I.C.R., Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 41 (i), 4392 (ii).
——— Running Privileges, &c., granted C.P.R., on M. for Ret., 562 (i).
Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 2739.
——— Penitentiary, Coal Contract (Ques.) 4393.
Lieut. Gov.'s Assent, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2241 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Dept. Amalgamation B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 183 (i).
National Mutual Loan and Building Societys' B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3561 (ii).
Nationalities, &c., of the Population (Ques.) 824 (i), 2491, 3566 (ii).
Newfoundland, Papers, &c., *re* Trade, on M. for copies, 688 (i).
Order, Ques. of, 2823 (ii).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 174 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 2°, 3730: in Com., 4215 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2798, 2802, 2890, 2894, 2905 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2496 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4576 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1863 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3445 (ii).
——— in Com., 3836, 3929, 3949, 4125, 4322 (ii).
——— on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4329; neg. (Y. 51, N. 90) 4334 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 983; (Experimental Farm) 1439; (Jamaica Exhibition) 979 (i).
Canals—Capital (Carillon and Grenville) conc., 4233 (ii): (Cornwall) 2053; (Lachine) 2049 (i), conc., 4212 (ii): (Murray) 2054; (St. Lawrence River, &c.) 2054; (Trent) 2055; Sault Ste. Marie) 2241. *Income* (Carillon and Grenville) 2261; (Chambly) 2258: (Rideau) 988; (St.Peter's) 2263; (Trent Valley) 2262; (Welland) 2252 (i).
Charges of Management (Brokerage, &c.) 254; (Public Debt,Commission) 253: (Dominion Notes) Printing) 255; (Inspector, &c.) 250 (i).
Geological Survey, 4386 (ii).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 994 (i).
Civil Government (Auditor General's Office) 257; (High Commissioner) contingencies, 896, conc., 1085; (Interior) 257, 825, 844, 867 (i), conc., 4206 (ii); (Mounted Police) 265; (Printing and Stationery) 256 (i), conc., 4204 (ii); (Privy Council Office) 255; (Railways and Canals) 274 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 4430 (ii). Canals (Lachine) 1017. Excise (Tobacco Stamps, &c.) 1010; (General Vote) 811; (Detective Service) 1019, conc., 4205 (ii): (N.S.) 811: (Ont.) 818 (i). Railways (Windsor Branch) 2629 (ii).
Fisheries (Commissioners' Expenses) 993 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1491, 1540, 1846, conc., 4210 (ii); (Expenses) 1899, 1918; (Printing Pamphlets) 2008 (i).
Legislation: H. of Commons (Printing Paper, &c.) 794; (Salaries, &c.) 763; (Printing Voters' Lists) conc., 1086. Library (Salaries, &c.) 789. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 754 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 4308 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c. and West Indies) 4293 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition) conc., 4209 (ii): (Military College) 1385 (i); (Rifled Ordnance) conc., 4210.
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., Salary) 4424: (Old Records' Classification) 4429 (ii).
Mounted Police (Pay of Force) 4423 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 4305 (ii).
Pensions (Fraser, H. & R.) 1918 (i).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) conc. 4205; suppl., 4433 (ii): (St. Vincent de Paul) 972 (i).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 2739 (ii). *Consolidated Fund:* Buildings (N.B.) 988, conc., 1086: (Ont.) 990. Dredging (Man.) 992: (Que.) 989 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 2952; (N.B.) 2798: (N.S.) 2767: (N.W.T.) 2936, 2941; (Ont.) 2918, 2929: (Que.) 2802, 2805: (Repairs, &c.) 4240: (Gas and Electric Light) 4243. Harbours and Rivers (Kingston Harbour) 4257 (ii).
Quarantine (Grosse Isle) 2027 (i): (Tracadie Lazaretto) conc., 4212 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (construction) 987 (i). I.C.R. (Expenses) 2509 (ii); (Halifax, accomodation) 2264 (i); (St. John accommodation) 2616 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Service) 4309 (ii).
Superannuation (W. Wallace) 796 (i).
Territorial Accounts (N. W. Rebellion) 1017; conc., 1087 (i).
Supply B. 62 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1091 (i).
—— B 100 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 4715 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Reps. (Ques.) 1638 (i).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners B. (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1874; in Com., 1875 (i).
Trade Relations with Spain (remarks) 4602 (ii).
Treaty Negotiations with Germany (remarks) 1363.
—— Despatch to London *Times* (remarks) 110.
Unparliamentary Language, on withdrawal (remarks) 69 (i).
Voters' Lists, 1891, B. 67 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 3301 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. for Com., 4672; in Com. on Res., 4677 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1693 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1960 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to prop. Res. 2162 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3643 (ii).
Dom. Cotton Mills Co., Letters Patent, on M. for Ret., 924 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 955 (i).
Geological Survey Dept. B. 43 (Mr. *Deadacy*) on M. for 2°, 1653 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1332 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2760, 2768, 2806, 2888, 2911 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2500 (ii).
Procedure (Ques. of) on Notices of Motion, 1550.
Prohibition, Plebiscite on, prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2657 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3441 (ii).
St. Thomas, Appmnt. of Customs Collector (M. for Cor.) 1998, 2003 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census) 983: (Columbian Exhibition) 984; (Experimental Farms) 1455; (Jamaica Exhibition) 978 (i).
Canals—Income (Lachine) 2250 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1514, 1839 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salary, Dep. Speaker) 975. Senate (Debates) 974 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1164; (Armouries, &c.) 1359; (Contingencies, &c.) 1363; (Clothing) 1340: (Drill Pay) 1353: (Military College) 1383: (Permanent Forces) 1415: (Rifled Ordnance) 1363; (Stores) 1353 (i).
Miscellaneous (C. S. Commissioners) 1004 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 2951; (N.S.) 2760: (Que.) 2806, 2884, 2911 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Reps., on M. for copy, 2435 (ii).
U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1478 (i).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A., *Terrebonne.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2091 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Gordon*) 2° m., 4631 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2977, 3324, 4233 (ii).
Customs Seizures, Commissions Paid (Ans.) 3238.
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3107 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4525 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4034, 4093 (ii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. *Béchard*) to M. for 3°, 4341.

Chapleau, Hon. J. A.—*Continued.*

Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) 4646.

SUPPLY :

Civil Government (Customs) 4433 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service, &c.) conc., 4205 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., Salary) 4426 (ii).

Trudel, Edmond, Emplmnt. by Customs (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*

Adjmnt., Ascension and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 2781 (ii).

Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Observance (prop. Res.) 1037 (i).

Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3320 (ii).

Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1822 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3313 (ii).

Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 935 (i).

Geological Survey Dept. B. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1655 (i).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesdays, 2490 (ii).

Labrador, reported Distress (Ques) 4263 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys., Man. and N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 2269, 2283 (i).

Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. *Fairbairn*) in Com., 1228 (i).

Liquor Traffic, Members of Royal Commission (Ques.) 2172 (i).

Lord's Day Observance (B. 2, 1ˢᵗ) 40; 2ᵈ m., 1062.

——— (M.) to place B. on Order Paper, 2431 (ii).

——— on M. that Com. rise, 2294, 2302 (i).

——— M. for Com. agreed to (Y. 77, N. 40) 3090; in Com., 3091, 3363, 3374 (ii).

Obscene Literature, &c., Suppression (B. 21) 2ᵈ m., 2457 (ii).

Ocean Mails, Train Service (Ques.) 3184 (ii).

Preferential Trade with G. B. on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1629 (i).

——— Despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2507 (ii).

Prohibition, Plebiscite (prop. Res.) 2646, 2664.

Representation in H. of C. B. 75 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1ˢᵗ, 1864 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2ᵈ, 3136.

——— in Com., 3820, 3849, 4121, 4172 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 155 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Tenders for Deepening (Ques.) 3184 (ii).

Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1240, 1271 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1395 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census) 983; (Columbian Exhibition) 984: (Experimental Farms) 1443 (i).

Civil Government (Interior) 1158 (i).

Government of N.W.T. (Schools) 1001 (i).

Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1495, 1830 (i).

Militia (Ammunition) 1161 (i).

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Ont) 2622; (Que.) 2619.

Tenant Farmers' Delegates Reps., on M. for copy, 2437 (ii).

U. S. Vessels in Hudson Bay (Ques.) 4262 (ii).

Wrecking in Can. Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2ᵈ, 173; on M. for 2ᵈ, 970; in Com., 1091 (i).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., *Montmagny.*

Alert, Str., Accident (Ques.) 750, 917 (i).

Berthier (Montmagny) P.O., Management (Ques.) 2638 (ii).

Butter and Cheese Industry (Ques.) 3331 (ii).

Cap. St. Ignace Station, Appmnt. of Postmaster (Ques.) 223 (i).

——— Opening (Ques.) 290, 751 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* 1555 (i).

——— M. for Cor., 2667 (ii).

Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2116 (i).

Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4229 (i).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 1469 (ii).

Des Aulnets P.O., Management (Ques.) 750 (i).

Experimental Farms, Papers respecting (remarks) 3114, 3185 (ii).

Franchise Act, Legislation (Ans.) 916 (i).

Hammond, E., Seizures (Ques.) 2782 (ii).

Inland Revenue Officer at Quebec (Ques.) 2639.

La Rivière du Sud, Works (M. for Cor.*) 2695.

——— (remarks) 4656 (ii).

L'Islet, Appmnt. of Postmaster (Ques.) 750 (i).

Montmagny Postmaster (Ques.) 2638 (ii).

Post Offices, Erection (Laprairie) in Com. of Sup., 2803, 2853 (ii).

Quebec Legislature, Sessions (Ques.) 3644 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2ᵈ, 3186 (ii).

——— in Com., 4001, 4049 (ii).

Rivière du Loup P. O., Workmen's Claims (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

Ste. Louise Postmaster, Rep. of Enquiry (Ques.) 2431 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2801, 2853, 2880 (ii).

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*

Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).

Christie, Mr. T.—*Continued.*
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2°, 4637 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1079; in Com., 2390 (i).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2660 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3634 (ii).

Coatsworth, Mr. E., jun., *East Toronto.*
Boiler Inspection and Ins. Co. of Canada (B. 19, 1°*) 129 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1323 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3105, 3391 (ii).
Man. and North-Western Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 80, 1°*) 2006 (i).
Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 29, 1°*) 245 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance, B. 58 (Mr *Dewdney*) in Com., 1640 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 2°, 3730; in Com., 4222 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3545 (ii).
——— in Com., 4073 (ii).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R., *Centre Toronto.*
Baie de Chaleurs Ry., Workmen's Claims, &c. (M. for Sel. Com.) 42 (i).
Canadian Representatives at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1962 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2139 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr *Denison*) 1330 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, East York*) to M. for 3°, 4622 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3590 (ii).
——— in Com., 4070, 4143 (ii).
Victoria Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 47, 1°*) 749 (i).

Colter, Mr. N. R., *Carleton, N.B.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1858 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 4256 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4404 (ii).
Woodstock Public Building, Caretaker (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

Corbould, Mr. G. E., *New Westminster.*
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 65, 1°*) 1153 (i).
Lobsters and Whitefish for B.C. (Ques.) 751 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3727, 4090 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1239 (i).

Corby, Mr. H., *West Hastings.*
Belleville and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co.'s (B. 28, 1°) 245 (i).
Post Offices, Erection (St. Henri) in Com. of Sup., 2880 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, East York*) to M. for 3°, 4616 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*
Apples, Export, under Inspection Act (Ans.) 3238 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 95) in Com., 4482 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to prop. Res., 3361 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 71, 1°) 1469: 2° m., 2007 (i).
Inland Revenue Deptl. Rep. (presented) 751 (i).
Milk Cans, Inspection under Act (Ans.) 4262, 4647 (ii)
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4553; conc., 4662 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenue (Adulteration of Food) 4430 (ii). Excise (Customs Officers' Commissions) 1015; (Preventive Service) 1014: (Tobacco Stamps) 1007: (Weights and Masures) contingencies, 1016 (i).
Tobacco, &c., Law respecting (Ans.) 750 (i).

Craig, Mr. T. D., *East Durham.*
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 465 (i).

Curran, Mr. J. J., *Centre Montreal.*
Adjmnt., Ascension and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 2781 (ii).
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 39, 1°*) 315 (i).
Bell Telephone Co. of Can. (B. 41, 1°*) 315 (i).
Buckingham and Liévre River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 86, 1°*) 2699 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1770 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4723 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) on M. for 1°, 1636 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2704, 2968, 3648, 4225 (ii).
Dods, P. B., case of, *re* Loss of Diamonds (M. for Ret.) 2287 (i).
Gear and Tackle Inspector, Appmnt. (Ques.) 224.

Curran, Mr. J. J.—*Continued.*
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to prop. Res., 3349 (ii).
Lachine Canal, New Bridge at Montreal (M. for Ret.) 524 (i).
Montreal Board of Trade (B. 25, 1st) 161 (i).
Montreal Island Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73, 1st) 1636 (i).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2655 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4030 (ii).

Daly, Mr. T. M., *Selkirk.*
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3305 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List (remarks) 1212 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 986 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1853, 1938 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1212 (i).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2048 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 553 (i).
Budget, on the, 629 (i).
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1974 (i).
Canals, Contracts for Enlargement, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 417 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2156 (i).
Approval of Commissioners on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3027 (ii).
Commercial Relations with U.S., Sir C. Tupper's Speech (remarks) 224 (i).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits, on prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1303 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2702, 2786, 2827, 2958, 3637, 3644, 4225 (ii).
Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1809 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 960 (i).
Electric Lighting, Public Buildings in Can. (M. for Ret.*) 417 (i).
Fisheries (Lobster) Act Amt. B. 9 (remarks) 160.
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1655 (i).
——— on M. for Com., 2190; in Com., 2225, 2230
Fishing Vessels (*Modus Vivendi*) of U.S. B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2nd, 177; in Com., 1472.
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List (remarks) 1217 (i).
Govt. Rys., Employés, on M. for Ret., 694 (i).
Indian Reserves, B.C., on M. for Ret., 523 (i).
I. C. R., Arrangements with C. P. R. (Ques.) 667 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
I. C. R., Employés, Salaries and Dismissals (M. for O.C.'s) 293 (i).
——— Running Privileges, &c., Amount paid by C. P. R. (Ques.) 510 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.) 556 (i).
——— St. John, Expropriation of Property (Ques.) 1031 (i).
Lieut. Gov.'s Assent, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2238 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2457, 2491, 3089 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 2957 (ii).
London Election, on Ques. of Priv. (remarks) 246.
——— Charges against Judge Elliott, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2354 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3094 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Dept. amalgamation B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 181 (i).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3557 (ii).
Newfoundland, Admission into Can. (M. for Cor., &c.*) 695 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Settlement of difficulties (Ques.) 825 (i), 2956 (ii).
——— Despatch *re* complications (remarks) 1638.
——— Papers respecting (Ques.) 508, 684, 914, 1088, 1227, 1491 (i).
——— Discriminating Tariff (Ques.) 454 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2nd, 2486 (ii).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1640 (i).
Piers, Breakwaters, &c. (P. E. I.) Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 237 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1614; (Amt.) 1623; neg. (Y. 64, N. 98) 1634 (i).
———Despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2492 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Dismissal of Employés, on M. for Ret., 2005 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1st, 1858 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2nd, 3239.
——— in Com., 3725, 3753, 4109, 4146, 4184 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3697 (ii).
Robertson, J. F., Claim *re* Ry. Accident (M. for Ret.) 1367 (i).
Sea Fisheries Development B. 5 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2nd, 162; in Com., 166 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) on Res., 752; in Com., 1402 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 629 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Criminal Statistics) 1160; (Experimental Farms) 1425 (i).
Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners) 283; (High Commissioner) 277, contingencies, 909; (Interior) 258, 832, 848, 1155: (Justice) 913; (Marine) 270: (Public Works) 271; (Railways and Canals) 273 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues: Railways (P.E.I.) 2635.
Dominion Police, 313 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1517: (Expenses) 1896 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Circuit Allowances, B.C.) 311: (Exchequer Court) 971: (Registrar in Admiralty, Que.) 313: (Supreme Court, Reporter) 312 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 794: Library (Purchase of Books) 792: (Salaries, &c.) 789. Senate (Salaries, &c. 753, 59 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1167, 1217: (Brigade Majors) 1161: (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1374 (i).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 973 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 2618. *Income:* Buildings (N.W.T.) 2943: (Gas and Electric Light) 4242. (Ottawa Grounds) 4240. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4251: (P.E.I.) 4252 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2264, 2530: (St. John, accommodation) 2563 (ii).
Superannuation (W. Wallace) 796 (i).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners B. (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1876 (i).
Tunnel (Submarine) P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 413 (i).
U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 177; in Com., 1472 (i).
Winter Communication with P. E. I. (remarks) 187 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F., *West Assiniboia.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4708.
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 544 (i).
Blue-Books, &c., Throwing, on Adjmnt. (remarks) 1636 (i).
Budget, on the, 648 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2089 (i).
——— Approval of Commssioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3001 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4727 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3322 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4588.
Dom. Lands Act.: prop. Amt. (wthdn.) 3183 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act. Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3307; on M. for 3°, 3815; (Amt.) 3818, 4204 (ii).
Gov. Gen's Body Guard, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1338 (i).
Land Grants to Militia B. 96 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4264 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3092, 3397 (ii).
Man. and Assiniboia Grand Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 88, 1°) 3183 (ii).
North-West Assembly Resolutions (M. for copies) 1551 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*
Preferential Trade with G.B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1604 (i).
——— Despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2498 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3279 (ii).
——— in Com., 4011, 4153 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn. deb. (personal explanation) 3472 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 151 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 648 (i).
Civil Government (Mounted Police) 286 (i).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 999 (i).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2036 (i).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2452 (ii).

Davis, Mr. D. W., *Alberta.*
High Creek and Sheep Creek Irrigation and Water Power Co.'s (B. 23, 1°) 161 (i).

Dawson, Mr. G. W. W., *Addington.*
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 965 (i).
Representation in H of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to M. for 2°, 3675 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 456 (i).
Canals—Capital (Trent) 2055 (i).

Delisle, Mr. A., *Portneuf.*
Judges on Commissions (Ques.) 37 (i).
Post Offices, Erection (Laprairie) in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).
St. Raymond P. O. (Ques.) 37 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ques.) 2814 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C., C.M.G., *West Toronto.*
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4590 (ii): on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to conc., 4600.
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3315 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (denial) 1192 (i); on M. for Com. of Sup. (Ques. of Priv.) 1319 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3100 (ii).
Militia, Active, on M. for Ret., 678 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2483 (ii).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 175; in Com. on B., 1639 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., Despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2505 (ii).
Private Bills, Reps. from Com., extension of time (M.) 3564 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C.—*Continued.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3962, 4070, 4121 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening (prop. Res.) 138 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenue: Customs (Ont.) 819 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1161, 1188; (Military College) 1379 (i).
Toronto Ry. Works (B. 18, 1°*) 129 (i).

Desaulniers, Mr. F. S. L., *St. Maurice.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2128 (i).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 1467 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4104 (ii).

Desjardins, Mr. A., *Hochelaga.*
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 1153 (i).
——— conc. (M.) 1465 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 4585 (ii).
Montreal and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 82, 1°*) 2171.
School Savings Bank incorp. Act Amt. (B. 36, 1°*) 314 (i); in Com., 4638 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: Senate (Salaries, &c.) 755 (i).

Desjardins, Mr. L. G., *L'Islet.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2107 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1571 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4516 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3205 ii).
SUPPPLY:
Militia—(Drill Pay) 1357 (i).

Devlin, Mr. C. R., *Ottawa County.*
Budget, on the, 498 (i).
Civil Service Employés, Stoppage of Pay, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2238 (i).
Commercial Treaties, on prop. Res (Mr. *Mills*, Bothwell) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
Culbute Canal, Cost of Construction, on M. for Stmnt. 929 (i).
Experimental Farm Reps., French Ed. (Ques) 397 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. to take Mondays, 3565 (ii)
N. W. T., Education and Dual Languages, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3072 (ii).
Ottawa Ship Canal, prop. Construction (M. for Cor.*) 1719 (i).
Pontiac County Ry. Debt., on M. for Cor., 1991.
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2749, 2816, 2879, 2892, 2899 (ii).

Devlin, Mr. C. R.—*Continued.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3147 (ii).
——— in Com., 4018 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland (prop. Res.) 3335 (ii).
——— despatch in London *Times* (Ques. of Priv.) 3815 (ii).
Hull P. O., Sunday Opening (Ques.) 3184 (ii).
Ottawa City Passenger Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. *Robillard*) in Com., 2939 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1267 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 498 (i).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 2247. *Income* (Carillon and Grenville) 2260; (Culbute) 2263; (Welland) 2252 (i).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 1000 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Judges Queen's Bench, Man.) 312 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.,) 765 (i).
Public Works—Consolidated Fund: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 991 (i). *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 2749; (Que.) 2879, 2899 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (Halifax, accomodation) 2542.

Dewdney, Hon. E., East Assiniboia.
Boundaries of Prov. of Que., on M. for Cor., &c., 119 (i).
Cockburn Island, Location Tickets, on M. for copies, 1981 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 89, 1°) 2979; in Com., 3302, 3733; on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for 3°, 3819, 4204 (ii).
Geological Survey Dept. Act Amt. (B. 43, 1°*) 578; 2° m., 1648; in Com., 1655 (i).
Geological Survey, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2172.
Govt. Land Sale in Quebec City (Ans.) 1089 (i).
Indian Affairs Deptl. Rep. (presented) 112 (i).
——— Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4414 (ii).
——— Reserves, B.C., on M. for Ret. 513 (i).
Indians, B.C. and Proclamation (Ans.) 289 (i).
Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 3300 (ii).
Land Grants to Militia (B. 96, 1°*) 4203; 2 and in Com., 4264; 3° m., 4399 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. (Man. and N.W.T.) on M. for Ret., 2273 (i).
Land Office, Edmonton, Removal (remarks) 4392
Lands Sold or Leased in Man. and N.W.T., on M. for Ret., 242 (i).
Lapage, J. B., Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1392.
Man. North-Western Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2638 (ii).
Morton Dairy Co.'s Claims (Ans.) 916 (i).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2673, 2698 (ii).
——— Rep. (presented) 4320 (ii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. (B. 61, 1°*) 1062 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance (prop. Res.) 129; (M. for Com. on Res.) 174; in Com., 1639; (B. 58, 1°*) 825 (i).

Dewdney, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
Ranching Companies, N.W.T. (Ans.) 1946 (i).
Settlers' Claims (Ans.) 223 (i).
——— Grievances, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4408 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 258, 825, 845, 1154 (i); conc., 4206, 4472 (ii).
Collection of Revenue: Dom. Lands, 4431 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveys, &c.) 4431 (ii).
Geological Survey, 4386 (ii).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 993 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1846, 1899 (i); conc., 4210.
Indians, 4460; (B.C.) conc., 4479; (D. Chisholm's Claim) conc., 4479; (Reserve Commission) 4423; (Schools) 4421 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Springs) 4428; (Bulmer *vs.* Queen, Expenses) 4461 (ii); (Jukes, Dr. A., medical Services) 1003 (i); (Refunds) 4462 (ii); (Ross, Hon. J. G., Refund) 1002 (i).
Mounted Police (Pay of Force) 4423 (ii).
Pensions (Fraser, H. & R.) 1018 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 2942; conc., 4468 (ii).
Temperance Colonization Society, on M. for Ret., 930 (i).
Waldron Co.'s Ranche, Settlers' Claims (Ans.) 223 (i).
White Pine Timber Areas, on M. for Map, 293 (i).

Dickey, Mr. A. R., *Cumberland.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1750 (i).
Chignecto Transport Ry. Co.'s (B. 831,**) 2361 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2829, 3320, 4268 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3384 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3563 (ii).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2654 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3414 (ii).
——— in Com., 4191 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Railways: I.C.R. (Coal Tariff) 2548 (ii).

Dugas, Mr. L. E., *Montcalm.*
Dairies and Cheese Factories, Prov. of Quebec (Ques.) 2781 (ii).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2122 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2857 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4526 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3192 (ii).
——— in Com. 4054, 4061 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2857 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., *West Ontario.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 39 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 2254 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 306 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, Sums Paid (Ques.) 41 (i).
Canal Tolls and U. S. (remarks) 4643 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against (Stmnt. read) 1032 (i).
——— (prop. Res.) 1038, 1760 (i).
——— on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2147 (i).
Copyright Laws, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2233 (i).
Dom. Cotton Mills Co., Letters Patent (M. for copies) 920; (enquiry) 2172 (i).
Elliott, Judge, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) *re* Pet., 666 (i).
Favoured Nations Clause (Ques.) 34 (i).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 31 (Mr. *Innes*) in Com., 1230 (i).
Lands Sold or Leased in Man. and N. W. T. (M. for Ret.) 241 (i).
Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet. (objection) 667 (i).
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 1502 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, York*) to M. for 3°, 4614 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4506; on conc. (Amt.) 4657; neg. (Y. 45, N. 92) 4667 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3857 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: Senate (Salaries, &c.) 758 (i).
Wrecking in Canadian Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1093 (i).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3234 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3630 (ii).
——— in Com., 3780 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1451 (i).

Fairbairn, Mr. C., *South Victoria.*
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 550 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1672 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4487 (ii).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 45, 1°*) 578 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2898 (ii).

Fauvel, Mr. O. Le B., *Bonaventure.*
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2824, 2898 (ii).

Fauvel, Mr. O. Le B.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 742 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2824 (ii).

Featherston, Mr. J., *Peel.*
Milk Cans, Inspection under Act (Ques.) 4262, 4647 (ii).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1642 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 985; (Experimental Farms) 1458; (Haras National Co.) 1465 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures (contingencies) 1016 (i).
Quarantine (Cattle) 987, 2033 (i).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., *Leeds and Grenville.*
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 548 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth.*
Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 6, 1°) 98; 2° n., 418; in Com., 455 (i).
C. P. R., P. O. and Militia Services, Payments (Ques.) 3331 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2074 (i).
——— Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2995 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2785, 2837, 2967, 3320, 4346 (ii).
Dom. Millers' Association B. 70 (Mr. *Stevenson*) on M. for 3°, 2940 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c. (M. for Ret.) 930, 962 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2216, 2230 (i).
Fishing Bounty, Ret. (Enquiry) 914 (i).
Judges, Prov. of Que., Travelling Expenses (Enquiry for Ret.) 3115 (ii).
Kentville Postmaster, Suspension (Ques.) 1088 (i).
Point Tupper and Sydney Mail Service (Ques.) 2641 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection in Com. of Sup., 2747, 2770, 2845, 2890 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3481 (ii).
Sandford Breakwater (Ques.) 398 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1414 (i).
Superior Court Judges, Que., Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 695 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Criminal Statistics) 1160 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 910 (i).
Geological Survey, 4388 (ii).
Immigration (Expenses) 1889, 1915 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 774, 781 (i).
Militia (Military College) 1382 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 664 (i), 4441 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 741 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 4441; (N.S.) 2747; (N.W.T.) 2937; (Ont.) 2926; (Que.) 2845. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4448 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2044 (i).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2552; (St. John, accommodation) 2600.
Superannuation, 807 (i).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Reps., on M. for copy, 2444 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4681 (ii).
West Indian Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1882 (i).
Worsley, Lieut. Col., and Lieut. Col. Murray (Ques.) 3643 (ii).

Forbes, Mr. F. G., *Queen's, N.S.*
Annapolis and Atlantic Ry. Co. (M. for Cor., &c.) 688 (i).
Beef and Pork (American) Lumbermen's Imports (Ques.) 291 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.) 294 (i).
Election Pets., Decisions, on M. for Ret., 1554.
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2206; in Com., 2219 (i).
Ordnance Lands, Annapolis (Ques.) 1364 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Sale of Type (Ques.) 2954 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4542 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4075 (ii).
Spanish West Indies, Exports (Ques.), 4499 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) conc., 4471 (ii).
Fisheries (Ont.) 4310; (P.E.I.) 4315 (ii).
Immigration (Expenses) 1893 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 772 (i).
Mail Subsidies (San Francisco and Victoria, B.C.) 4281 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 2773. Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 4455. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4252 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2266, 2543 (ii).
Treaty with Spain (remarks) 4474 (ii).
West Indian Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1884.

Foster, Hon. G. E., *King's, N.B.*
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 4260 (ii).
Auditor Gen.'s Rep. (Ans.) 36 (i).
——— (presented) 188 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty (prop. Res.) 4697; in Com., 4698; (B. 102, 1°*) 4715 (ii).
——— Bounty (Ans.) 751 (i).
——— Cultivation, French Reps. (Ans.) 750 (i).
——— Prof. Saunders' Rep. (presented) 71 (i).
BUDGET, THE (Ans.) 161, 663 (i).
——— (Annual Stmnt.) 315 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1953 (i).
Canal Tolls and U. S. (remarks) 4642 (ii).
Civil Service, Rep. of Privy Council (presented) 751 (i).
Commercial Treaties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup. 1124 (i).
Crude Petroleum, Duty (Ans.) 1946 (i).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 103, 1ᵒ*) 4715; in Com., 4728 (ii).
ESTIMATES, THE (presented) 138 (i).
——— Suppl., 1892 (remarks) 822 (i).
——— Suppl., 1893, (presented) 4265 (ii).
Favoured Nations Clause (Ans.) 35 (i).
——— Despatch *re* Treaties, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1470 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants (presented) 34 (i).
——— on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to ref. to Pub. Acts. Com., 50 (i).
Govt. Short Loans (Ans.) 137 (i).
High Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 665 (i).
I. C. R. Audit of Accts., on M. for Com of Sup., 4276 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, Coal Contract (Ans.) 4393 (ii).
Lieut. Gov.'s Assent (remarks) 2457 (ii).
Liquor Traffic, Members of Royal Commission (Ans.) 2172 (i).
Members' Indemnity (Res. and 1ᵒ of B. 104) 4715 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3557 (ii).
Newfoundland and Canada, negotiations (Ans.) 2957 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 1499 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2818, 2895, 2905 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (M. *McNeill*) 1608 (i).
Prohibition (Plebiscite) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2661 (ii).
Public Accounts. (presented) 37 (i).
Quebec Harbour Police B. (wthdn.) 4482 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4514, 4536 (ii).
St. John Harbour Commission (prop. Res.) 4398.
——— (M. for Com.) 4493 (ii).
St. John Harbour Commission (B. 99) Res. conc. in and 1ᵒ* of B., 4506; in Com., 4649 (ii).
Savings Bank at St. John, Mr. McLeod's appointment (Ans.) 3644 (ii).
Savings Banks, Superannuation of Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4274 (ii).
Saw-logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1281 (i).
Spanish West Indies, Exports (Ans.) 509 (i), 4500 (ii).
Superannuation of Civil Servants (Ans.) 1637 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—Res. for Com., 33 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) conc., 4474 (ii); (Experimental Farms) 1429 (i).
Charges of Management (Brokerage, &c.) 254; (Dom. Notes, Printing) 255; (Inspector) 250; (Pub. Debt, Commission) 253 (i).
Civil Government (Auditor Gen.'s Office) 267; (Civil Service Examiners) 283; (Customs) 267; (Deptl. Buildings, care, &c.) contingencies, 286; (Finance and Treasury Board) contingencies, 285; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 255, contingencies, 284; (High Commissioner) 275, contingencies, 282, 896; (Interior) 257, 826, 844, 1154 (i), 4432; (Marine and Fisheries) 4432 (ii); (Militia and Defence) 256; (Mounted Police) 265; (Printing and Stationery) 256; (Public Works) 271; (Privy Council) 255 (i), 4453, 4440 (ii); (Railways and Canals) contingencies, 286 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food. 4430 (ii). Customs (General Vote) 811; (Ont.) 820 (i). Post Office (Mail Service) conc., 4471 (ii).
Dominion Police, 314 (i).
Fisheries (Behring Sea Arbitration) 4460; (Fish-Breeding) 4317, conc., 4479; (B.C., Salaries) 4317; (N.S.) 4311; (Ont.) 4310; (P.E.I.) 4312; (Protection Steamers) 4339 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1842 (i); conc., 4467 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 794; (Salaries, &c.) 777. Library (Purchase of Books) 794; (Salaries, &c.) 791. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 752 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 4308; (Salaries, &c.) 4305 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Can. and Liverpool) conc., 4478; (Canso, Arichat, &c.) 4277; (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4282, conc., 4469; (Magdalen Islands) 4277; (San Francisco and Victoria, B.C.) 4279 (ii).
Marine Hospitals, 4310 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Arbitration, Costs) 4430, conc., 4470; (Str. *Bayfield*, Supplies) 4461; (Clerical assistance) 4457; (Commercial Agencies) 4427; (Georgian Bay Survey) conc., 4479; (International Customs Bureau) 4463; (Litigated matters) 4426; (Mr. Fabre's Salary) 4424; (Monument, late Sir John Macdonald) 4458; (Old Records, classification) 4429; (Survey, P.E.I. and Mainland) 4463 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Tidal Observations) 4305.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 4433, 4440 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B. C.) 4442; (Que.) 2818, 2898. Harbours and Rivers (Ship Channel) 4439. (Major's Hill Park) conc., 4468.
Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Service) 4309 (ii).
Superannuation (W. Wallace) 796 (i).
Supply B. 62 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2ᵒ, 1090 (i).
——— (B. 100) Res. in Com., 4506; 1ᵒ, 4603; 2ᵒ m., 4655; 3ᵒ m., 4715 (ii).
Sydenham River Floods (remarks) 4465, 4500 (ii).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners (prop. Res.) 1788 (i).
——— (M.) for Com., 1874; in Com., 1875.
——— Res. conc. in, 4265 (ii).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners (B. 98, 1ᵒ*) 4265 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Trade Relations with Spain, &c. (remarks) 4602.
Treaty with Spain (remarks) 4474 (ii).
Treaty with Germany, Despatch to London *Times* (remarks) 110 (i).
Tunnel (Submarine) P.E. I. and Mainland (Ans.) 98 (i).
——— on M. for Cor., 417 (i).
Ways and Means—prop. Res. for Com., 34 (i).
——— The Tariff (M. for Com.) 4668 (ii).
——— in Com. on Res., 4677 (ii).
West India Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1880 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 4261 (ii).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 297 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2130.
——— Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3007 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2840, 2976, 3321, 4269 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2218, 2231 (i).
Fishery Regulations, Mackerel (Ques.) 3054 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to prop. Res., 3362 (ii).
I. C. R., Accident at New Glasgow (remarks) 3088 (ii).
——— Passenger Cars, Amount Paid C. P. R. (Ques.) 399 (i).
——— Traffic at Mulgrave Station (M. for Stmnt.) 35 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 3896.
Liabilities of the Dom., Amount (M. for Ret.*) 969 (i).
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliot, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2329 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3100 (ii).
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 3775 (ii).
Military District No. 9, Suspension of Officers (Ques.) 3332 (ii).
Nova Scotia Steel and Forge Co.'s (B. 30, 1°*) 245 (i).
Point Tupper and Sydney Mail Service (Ques.) 2641 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2913 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Sale of Type (Ques.) 2954 (ii).
Prohibition, Pets. presented to H. of C. (M. for Stmnt.*) 100 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4522 (ii).
Rimouski, Change of Route (Ques.) 3183 (ii).
Sea Fisheries Development B. 5 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 170 (i).
Telegraph Line in Victoria, N.S. (Ques.) 3897.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 264 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1039 (i). P. O. (Mail Service) conc., 4471.
Fisheries (Fish-Breeding) 4317: (N. S. Salaries) 4310: (P.E.I.) 4312; (Protection Vessels) 4319.
Indians (D. Chisholm's Claim) conc., 4479 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c., 783 (i).
Mail Subsidies (Cango, Arichat, &c.) 4277; (San Francisco and Victoria, B.C.) 4279 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition) 1163, 1210 (i).
Public Works Consolidated Fund: Buildings (N.B.) 989 (i). *Income:* Buildings (N.W.T.) 2946; (Que.) 2914. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) conc. 4477 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2398 (ii).

Frémont, Mr. J. J. T., *Quebec County.*
Bridges, St. Lawrence River (Ques.) 291, 1549 (i).
C. P. R., North Shore Section (Ques.) 3480 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Location &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 682 (i).
——— Papers respecting (remarks) 3114 (ii).
Govt. Land Sale in Quebec City (Ques.) 1089 (i).
Grain Shipments *viâ* New York &c. (Ques.) 291.
I. C. R., Transfer to a Company (Ques.) 3055 (ii).
Lake St. John and Chicoutimi Ry. (Ques.) 1549.
Railway Bridge at Quebec, construction (Ques.) 291 (i).
Stadacona P.O., Opening (Ques.) 222 (i).

Gauthier, Mr. J., *L'Assomption.*
Great Northern Ry. Engineer's Rep. (Ques.) 915.
Tobacco, &c., Law respecting (Ques.) 750 (i).

Geoffrion, Hon. F., *Verchères.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4044, 4052 (ii).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*
Welland Election, on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) declaring Seat vacant, 578 (i).

Gibson, Mr. W., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Kingston Graving Dock, Payments to Bancroft, Connolly & Co. (M. for Ret.*) 2006 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 2716 (ii).
Post Offices, in Com. of Sup., 2883 (ii).
Seditious, &c., Associations and Oaths B. 85 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2489 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Soulanges) 2050; (Trent) 2056 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1022 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1829, 1849 (i).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 2716. *Income:* Buildings (Que.) 2883 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2038 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A., *Richmond, N.S.*
Canadian Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 51, 1°*) 823 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc. (Amt.) 4601.
Election Pets., Decisions (M. for copies) 1553 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4079 (ii).

Gillies, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Fish-Breeding) conc., 4478 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 4454 (ii).
Railways : I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2537.

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., *Charlotte.*
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 554 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 957 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2221 (i).
Granite, Manufactnred, Imports and Exports (Ques.) 509 (i).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1264 (i).
SUPPLY :
Railways : I.C.R. (Expenses) 2527 (ii).
Superannuation, 804 (i).

Gordon, Mr. D. W., *Vancouver Island.*
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2°, 4631 ; in Com., 4717 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3728 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (B. C., Salaries) 4317 ; (Fish-Breeding) 4218 ; (Protection Vessels) 4320 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 4306 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (San Francisco and Victoria, B.C.) 4281 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Dredging (B.C.) 4456 (ii).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis.*
Alert, Str., Accident (Ques.) 917 (i).
Butter and Cheese Industry (Ques.) 3331 (ii).
Franchise Act, Legislation (Ques.) 916 (i).
Great Northern Ry. Co., Engineer's Rep. (Ques.) 915 (i).
I. C. R., Drake, Alfred, Dismissal (Ques.) 2490 (ii).
——— Quinn, Michael, Dismissal (M. for Ret.) 401 (i).
——— (M. for Cor.) 3332 (ii).
Judiciary of Prov. of Quebec (Ques.) 2639 (ii).
Longueuil Wharf, Expenditure (Ques.) 1231 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2815 (ii).
Summerstown P. O., Receipts (Ques.) 1365 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Que.) 2815 (i).

Guillet, Mr. G., *West Northumberland.*
Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 49, 1°*) 823 (i).
Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. (M. to receive Pet.) 667 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Northumberland Election, 3058 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4517 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Coteau, Water Overflow (remarks) 915 (i).
Culbute Canal, Cost of Construction, on M. for Stmnt., 928 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports, on M. for Ret., 535 (i).
Galops Rapids, Str. *Traveller,* on M. for Ret., 132 (i).
Govt. Rys., Employés, on M. for Ret., 41, 694 (i).
——— Property accommodation, on M. for copies, 1984 (i).
Great Northern Ry., Engineer's Rep. (Ans.) 916.
I. C. R., Arrangements with C. P. R. (Ans.) 667.
——— Drake, Alfred, Dismissal (Ans.) 2490 (ii).
——— Employés, Salaries and Dismissals, on M. for O. C.'s, 293 (i).
——— Live Stock Tariff (Ans.) 1365 (i).
——— Passenger Cars, Amount paid C. P. R. (Ans.) 399 (i).
——— Quinn, Michael, Dismissal on M. for Ret., 491 (i) ; on M. for Cor., 3335 (ii).
——— Receipts and Expenses (Ans.) 41 (i), 4393.
——— Running Privileges, &c., Amount Paid by C.P.R. (Ans.) 510 (i).
——— Running Privileges, &c., granted C.P.R., on M. for Ret., 561 (i).
——— St. John, Expropriation of Property (Ans) 1031 (i).
——— Shipment of Hay (Ans.) 4644 (ii).
——— Stationery Supplies (Ans.) 1032 (i).
——— Transfer to a Company (Ans.) 3055 (ii).
Lachine Canal, New Bridge at Montreal, on M. for Ret., 526 (i).
Lake St. John Ry., Gross Traffic Earnings (Ans.) 4262 (ii).
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 3774 (ii).
Miscouche Station, Closing (Ans.) 2563 (ii).
Pontiac and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 919 (i).
Pontiac County Ry. Debt, on M. for Cor., 1989 (i).
Pridham, Mr., Salary Paid, in Com. of Sup., 4213 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Employés dismissed, on M. for Ret., 2006 (i).
Railway Act Amt. (B. 84, 1°) 2488 ; in Com., 4481 (ii).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1052 (i).
Railway Bridge at Quebec, Construction (Ans.) 291 (i).
Railway Com. of Privy Council, Applications or Complaints, on M. for Stmnt., 1949 (i).
Railway Statistics (Ans.) 3398 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, prop. Res. (1st) 4394 ; (2nd 4466 ; (3rd) 4644 (ii).
——— in Com., 4506, 4629, 4644, 4662 (ii).
——— (B. 101, 1°*) 4669 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3436 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*
Representation in H. of C., in Com., 3787, 3949 (ii).
Richelieu River, Subsidy for Bridge, on M. for Ret., 2456 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 153 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Contract for Deepening, &c. (Ans.) 2954, 3184, 4261 (ii).
Soulanges and Beauharnois Canals, Engineers' Reps., &c., on M. for copies, 227 (i).
Summerside and Richmond Branch Ry. (Ans.) 40 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Carillon and Grenville) conc., 4213(ii): (Cornwall) 2053: (Lachine) 2049: (Murray) 2054: (Rapide Plat) 2054: (St. Lawrence River, &c.) 2054: (Sault Ste. Marie) 2241: (Soulanges) 2050: (Trent) 2055 (i); conc., 4476 (ii). *Income:* (Carillon and Grenville) 2260: (Chambly) 2257; (Culbute) 2263: (Lachine) 2250; (Miscellaneous) 2264 (i), 4439 (ii): (Rideau) 988: (Ste. Anne's Lock) 2260; (St. Peter's) 2263: (Trent Valley) 2262: (Welland) 2252 (i).
Civil Government (Railways and Canals) 273 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Lachine) 1017 (i). Railways (I.C.R.) 2628 (ii): (P.E.I.) 1017 (i), 2632; (Windsor Branch) 2629 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4302 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2625 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C. B. Ry. (Train Ferry) conc., 4475. C. P. R., 4438: (Arbitrators' Award) 4438 (ii); (Construction) 987, 2264 (i). I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2563; (Expenses) 2361, 2379, 2516, 2524. Oxford and New Glasgow (Construction) conc., 4475 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, Commissioner's Rep. (Ans.) 397 (i).

Hazen, Mr. J. D., *St. John, N.B., City and County.*
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4594 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (remarks) 1214 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3388 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Dept. Amalgamation B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 185 (i).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 173 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1578 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4561 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson* in Com., 4199 (ii).
St. John Harbour Commissioners B. 99 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4651 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1397, 1645 (i).
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 4306, 4366 (ii).

Hazen, Mr. J. D.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4283 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition) 1168 (i).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (St. John, accommodation) 2581; (Expenses) 2418 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1684 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures (contingencies) 1017 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S., *North Victoria, Ont.*
Budget, on the, 443 (i).
Exports (Can.) to Nfld. (M. for Ret.*) 113 (i).
Fenelon Falls Ry. Bridge, Govt. and G. T. R. Agreement (M. for Ret.*) 133 (i).
Flour (Can.) admitted into Nfld. (M. for Ret.) 112.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4489 (ii).
Meat and Farm Products (American) Imports (M. for Ret.*) 291 (i).
Militia, Active (M. for Ret.) 667, 681 (i).
Pork and Hog Products, Imports from U. S. (M. for Ret.*) 292 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3493 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn. Hse. (personal explanation) 3541 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 443 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 4437 (ii): (Experimental Farms) 1447 (i).
Canals—Capital (Trent) 2059 (i), 4438 (ii). *Income* (Trent) conc., 4475 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) conc., 4470 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition) 1163 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 309 (i).
Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 34, 1°*) 245 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 955 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).
St. Thomas, appointment of Collector of Customs, on M. for Cor., 2001 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1375 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 2762; (Que.) 2912 (ii).

Innes, Mr. J., *South Wellington.*
Crude Petroleum, Duty (Ques.) 1946 (i).
Globe Printing Co.'s (B. 31, 1°*) 245 (i).
U. S. Newspapers, Free Admission (Ques.) 1230.

Ives, Mr. W. B., *Sherbrooke.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 307 (i).
Canadian White Pine Areas (M. for Map) 217 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports, on M. for Ret., 530 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2487 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty (prop. Res.) 1231, 1270 (i).
Transfer of Shares in Corporations (B. 48, 1°) 749 (i).
White Pine Timber Areas (M. for Map) 293 (i).

Jeannotte, Mr. H., *L'Assomption.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3999, 4027 (ii).

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., *Gaspé.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2218 (i).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Dominion Day (remarks) 4320 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4399 (ii).
License Fees, Refund by Nfld. (Ques.) 190 (i).
Modus Vivendi, on Prorogation (remarks) 4729.
Newfoundland Bait Act, Cor., &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).
——— and Canada, Bait Sales to St. Pierre Fishermen (Ques.) 189 (i).
——— Bonding Privileges (Ques.) 189 (i).
——— Duty collected on Fishing Outfits (Ques.) 189 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2770.
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Fish-Breeding) 4318; (P.E.I., Salaries, &c.) 4314 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 2770 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., *Halifax.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2195 (i).
Preferential Trade with G.B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1606 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4522 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4302 (ii).
Railways—Capital (Expenses) 2381 (i); (Halifax, accommodation) 2533 (ii).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., *Frontenac.*
C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 38, 1°*) 315 (i).
Library of Parlt., 1st Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 2826 (ii).
London Election, Original Voters' Lists, on M. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to lay on Table, 38 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 174 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s (B. 53, 1°*) 823 (i).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A.—*Continued.*
Seditions, &c., Associations and Oaths (B. 85, 1°) 2488 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 765, 784 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1162; (Brigade Majors) 1161; (Military College) 1387 (i).
U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1482 (i).
Wrecking in Canadian Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1094 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*
Budget, on the, 725 (i).
Canadian Cattle scheduled in England (remarks) 249 (i).
Charges against a Member (Ques.) 4499 (ii).
Civil Servants, Permanent Clerks Extra Pay, on M. for Ret., 1719 (i).
Cobourg Customs Buildings, Lease (Ques.) 1366.
Controverted Election Act, Legislation (Ques.) 134 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2828 (i).
Dodwell, C. E. W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1715 (i).
Election Statistics (remarks) 3185 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 931 (i).
Eugenia, Dismissal and Appmnt of Postmaster (M. for Ret.) 1985 (i).
Finkle, Roland, Appmnt. as Fishery Inspector (Ques.) 1365 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4490 (ii).
Govt. Rys., Employés (M. for Ret.) 41 (i).
Land Grants to Militia B. 96 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4265 (ii).
McIntyre, Dismissal and Appmnt. of Postmaster (M. for Ret.) 1985 (i).
Mennonite Settlers and Census Returns (remarks) 4263 (ii).
Montreal Cadets, Duty on Presentation Flag (Ques.) 509 (i).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2694 (ii).
Population of Electoral Districts, Ret. (enquiry) 2700 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2752, 2798, 2812, 2870 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., despatch to London *imes re* Deb. (remarks) 2498 (ii).
Pub. Works, Return *re* Expenditure (Ques.) 1090.
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4519, 4562.
Ranching Companies, N.W.T. (Ques.) 1946 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3247 (ii).
——— in Com., 3808, 3956 (ii).
Rets. (enquiry) 100 (i), 2700 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Royal Commissions since Confederation (M. for Ret.*) 39 (i).
——— enquiry for Ret., 2089, 2172 (i), 2700, 3239 (ii).
St. Maurice Public Words (Ques.) 3564 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 725 (1).
Canals—Capital (Trent) 2063 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 902: (Interior) 853 (i).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 994 (i).
Immigration (Printing Pamphlets) 2025 (i).
Legislation: Senate (Salaries, &c.) 753 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4284: (San Francisco and Vic., B.C.) 4279 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Ross, Hon. J. G., Refund) 1003 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 2798: (N.S.) 2752: (Que.) 2802, 2870, 2889: (Heating, &c.) 4246: (Major's Hill Park) conc., 4468 (ii).
Quarantine (Grosse Isle) 2028; (Unorganized Service) 2049 (i).
Voters' Lists, 1891, B. 67 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. to M. for 3°, 4504 (ii).
Voters' Lists (Ques.) 1637 (i).
——— Cost of Revision (M. for Ret.) 683 (i).

Langelier, Mr. F., *Centre Quebec.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty (Ques.) 751 (i).
——— Cultivation, French Reps. (Ques.) 750 (i).
Bic Wharf, Collector (Ques.) 2638 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2701 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 1465 (i).
Divorce, Mead, H. R., Relief B. 81 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 3°, 2636 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's (B. 55, 1°*) 823 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. ofSup., 2816 (ii).
Quebec and Pointe aux Trembles Mail Service (Ques.) 1366 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Jamaica Exhibition) 977.
Canals—Income (Chambly) 2259 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 775.
Quarantine (Cattle) 2033 (i).
U. S. Alien Labour Law (remarks) 1548 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H., K.C.M.G., *Three Rivers.*
Boundaries of Prov. of Que. (M. for Cor., &c.) 115 (i).
——— (remarks) 99 (i).
Census, Origin and Religious Creeds (Ques.) 190.
Divorce, H. R. Mead Relief B. 81 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 2093 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1862 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*
Barret *vs.* City of Winnipeg, Supreme Court Judgt. (M. for copy) 158 (i).
Man. and South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 35, 1°*) 245.
N. W. T. Act. Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 1°, 221 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W., *East Quebec.*
Address, on the, 23 (i).
Adjmnt., Ascension Day and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 2700, 2781 (ii).
——— Easter (remarks) 1311 (i).
Agriculture, Letter of Dep. Minister (Ques.) 1947 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 304 (i).
Allan, Messrs., &c., Duties on Iron (M. for Pets.*) 159 (i).
Baie de Chaleurs Ry., Workmen's Claims, on M. (Mr. *Cockburn*) for Sel. Com., 50 (i).
Beef and Pork, American Imports, on M. for Ret., 295 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4709, 4714 (ii).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, Press despatch re Treaty (read) 36 (i).
Cacouna Pier, Expenditure (Ques.) 137 (i).
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1956, 1976 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2467 (ii).
Canadian White Pine Areas, on M. for Map (objection) 217 (i).
Canal Tolls in U. S. (remarks) 4642 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Mr. *Edgar's* Stmnt. (remarks) 1035 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1047 (i).
——— Approval of Commissioners (Amt.) 2981; neg. (Y. 32, N. 79) 3053 (ii).
Charlebois, F., Claim against Fisheries Dept. (M. for Cor.) 1036 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) on M. for 1°, 1636 (i); in Com., 4639 (ii).
Civil Servants, Permanent Clerks Extra Pay, on M. for Ret., 1718 (i).
Cockburn Island, Location Tickets, on M. for copies, 1984 (i).
Commercial Treaties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1136 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 46 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1083 (i).
Criminal Law B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1316 (i); in Com., 2709, 2966, 2782, 3322, 3646, 4228 (ii).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits, on prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1307 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4728 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 1468 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4601 (ii).
Diplomatic Papers (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1789; neg. (Y. 57, N. 98) 1827 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Edmonton Land Office, Removal (remarks) 4043, 4392 (ii).
Election Expenses, Publications in Toronto *Globe*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4377 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 930 (i).
Elliott, Judge, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) *re* Hobbs', &c., Pet., 666 (i).
Esquimalt, Defences of, Imp. and Can. Govts. (M. for Cor.) 244 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports, on M. for Ret., 536 (i).
Fishing Rights on Richelieu River (Ques.) 35 (i).
Fishing Vessels (*Modus Vivendi*) of U.S. B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 176; in Com., 1475, 1639 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4485 (ii).
Geological Survey Dept. B. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 1648 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to take in Thursdays, 699 (i).
——— Wednesdays, 2491 (ii).
——— Mondays, 3565 (ii).
Govt. Rys., Employés, on M. for Ret., 41, 694 (i).
Govt. Measures (remarks) 1153 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List (remarks) 1215 (i).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1329 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2° (objection) 1648; on M. for 2°, 2007.
Land Office, Edmonton, Removal (remarks) 4043, 4392 (ii).
L'Assomption and Pontiac Writs (Ques.) 2700.
Lieut. Gov.'s Assent, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2241 (i).
Lieut. Gov.'s Instructions (M. for copy) 2268 (i).
London Election, Original Voters' Lists, on M. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) to lay on Table, 38, 64 (i).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (remarks) 248 (i).
Mackenzie, late Hon. Alex. (remarks) 1389 (i).
Ministers' Visit to Washington, Papers respecting (remarks) 333 (i), 3239, 3398 (ii).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2684 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3558 (ii).
Newfoundland Bait Act, Cor., &c. (remarks) 98.
——— Fishing Licenses (remarks) 135 (i).
——— Papers respecting (Ques.) 315 (i).
——— on M. for copies, 686 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2484 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, in Com. of Sup., 1502 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance, B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 174 (i).
Perth, North Riding, Issue of Writ (Ques.) 1639.
Pontiac Electoral District, Issue of Writ (Ques.) 2700, 2980, 3054 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2820 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., despatch to London *Times re* deb. (remarks) 2499 (ii).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2652 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 4481; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4728 (ii).
Railway Com. of Privy Council, Applications or Complaints, on M. for Statmt., 1949 (i).
Railway Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4398 (ii).
——— on 2nd prop. Res., 4467 (ii).
——— in Com. on Res., 4510, 4629 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1866 (i).
——— on M for 2° (Amt.) 3116; (Y. 58, N. 100) 3299 (ii).
——— in Com., 3727, 3782, 3912, 3966, 4022, 4026, 4037, 4047, 4098, 4187, 4321 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Béchard*) to M. for 3°, 4340.
Returning Officers, &c., Duties, on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res., 90 (i).
St. Césaire Postmaster, Money Deposits, on M. for Cor., 401 (i).
St. John Harbour Commission, on M. for Com. on Res., 4494; in Com., 4498 (ii).
——— B. 99 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4647; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 53, N. 93) 4654 (ii).
Sick Mariners' Dues, Circular issued by Marine Dept. (M. for copies*) 159 (i).
Sittings of the Hse., on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3897 (ii).
Soulanges and Beauharnois Canals, Engineers' Reps., &c., on M. for copies, 232 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 277: (Interior) 837, 884 (i), conc., 4207 4472 (ii); (Printing and Stationery) 912: (Public Works) 272 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) conc., 4471. Railways (I. C. R.) 2628 (ii).
Dominion Police, 314 (i).
Fisheries (Behring Sea Arbitration) conc., 4478.
Indians (Reserve Commission) 4422 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 779 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Can. and Liverpool) conc., 4478: (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4233; conc., 4469 (ii).
Marine Hospitals, 4310 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Monument, late Sir John Macdonald) 4458 (ii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 736 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 2950, conc. 4467; (Que.) 2393. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4251; (Que.) 4257, 4449. Slides and Booms, 4457 (ii).
Supply B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 4603; on M. for 2°, 4655; on M. for 3°, 4715 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2435, 2444 (ii).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners B. 98 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com on Res., 1874.

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Trade Relations with G. B. (Ques.) 1979 (i).
——— with Spain (remarks) 4602 (ii).
U.S. Fishing Vessels B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 176; in Com., 1475, 1639 (ii),
Voters' Lists, 1891. B. 67 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 3300; in Com., 4480; on Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) on M. for 3°, 4503 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4687 (ii).
Welland Election, on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) declaring Seat vacant, 396, 583; (Amt.) 584 (i).
Wrecking in Can. Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 1°, 106 (i).
Writs for Elections, on enquiry for Ret., 3115 (ii).
——— Ques., 2700, 2980, 3054 (ii).
Yamaska River, Damages through Dam (M. for Ret.) 1985 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. J., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
I. C. R., Shipment of Hay (Ques.) 4643 (ii).
Pinsonneault, Alfred, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 749 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3151 (ii).
——— in Com., 4102 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1264 (i).

Leduc, Mr. J. H., *Nicolet.*
Drummond County Postal Service (Ques.) 289 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2850, 2861 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3229 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2850, 2861 (ii).

Legris, Mr. J. H., *Maskinongé.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4711.
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2861 (ii).

Lépine, A. T., *East Montreal.*
Gear and Tackle Inspector, Appmnt. (Ques.) 224.

Lippé, Mr. U., *Joliette.*
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4574 (ii).

Lister, Mr. J. F., *West Lambton.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1698 (i).
Cockburn Island, Location Tickets (M. for copies) 1980, 2006 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2704, 4267 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4593 (ii).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
Drill Hall, Ottawa, Contract for Roofing (Ques.) 4601 (ii).
Elliott, Judge, Charges against (M. *re* Pet.) 665.
Granite, Manufactured, Exports and Imports (Ques.) 509 (i).
Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 2723 (ii)
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliott (prop. Res.) 1719 (i).
——— Res., 2344 (i); neg. (Y. 50, N. 93) 2361 (i).
——— Papers respecting (remarks) 1089 (i).
——— Ret. of last Election (M.) 245 (i).
——— Voters' Lists, &c. (M.) 245 (i).
——— (M. for copies) 292 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2722, 2756, 2879, 2894 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G.B., despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2505 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) North Perth Election (remarks) 3056 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4554 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3612 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 4437 (ii).
Canals—Income (Chambly) 2257 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1900: (Printing Pamphlets) 2013 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2629: (Kingston Graving Dock) 2722. *Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 2756; (Ont.) 2863; (Que.) 2994 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2033 (i).
Railways: I.C.R. (St. John, accommodation) 2004.
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2441 (ii).

Lowell, Mr. J. A., *South Waterloo.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3889 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2865 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., *King's, P.E.I.*
Adjmt., Ascension Day and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 2781 (ii).
Fisheries Act, Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2209; in Com., 2224 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to M. for 2°, 3705 (ii).
——— in Com., 4127, 3754, 4189 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (P.E.I., Salaries) 4312 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 4449 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. H. J., *Winnipeg.*
Preferential Trade with G.B. on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1594 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. H. J.—*Continued.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3914 (ii).
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s (B. 33, 1°*) 245 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., *East Huron.*
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 546; Budget on, the, 469 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to prop. Res., 2152 (i).
Coal Oil and Kerosene, Imports, (M. for Ret.) 3059 (ii).
Contracts (Govt.) since Confedn. (M. for Stmnt.) 99; Wthdn., 110 (i).
Contracts (Govt.) 1887 to 1891 (M. for Stmnt.*) 110 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 951 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports, on M. for Ret., 532, (i).
N.W.T., Education and Dual Languages, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3075 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4572 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3528 (ii).
——— in Com., 3811, 3837, 3916, 4326 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2438 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 469 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Criminal Statistics) 1161 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1924, 1943 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 767. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 753 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 2921. Slides and Booms, 4457 (ii).
Quarantine (Grosse Isle) 2029 (i).

Macdonell, Mr. G. H., *Algoma.*
Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 2727.
Niagara Falls and Queenston Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 54, 1°*) 823 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2776, 2884 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 149 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Lachine) 2251 (i).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 2727. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2625. *Income:* Buildings (Que.) 2884 (ii).

Mackintosh, Mr. C. H., *Ottawa City.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3620 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *East York.*
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com. (Amt.) 3771 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Continued.*
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4603; neg. (Y. 20, N. 128) 4628.
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4074 (ii).

McAlister, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2231 (i).
SUPPLY:
Railways: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2377 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*
Canadian Representative at Washington (prop. Res.) 1950, 1977 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) 2480 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, Approval of Commissioners (M.) 2170 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2705, 2788, 3324 (ii).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 31 (Mr. *Innes*) in Com., 1230 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on prop. Res. (Amt. to Amt.) 3357 (ii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. (B. 27, 1°) 217; 2°, neg. (Y. 33, N. 132) 241 (i); Day for 2° (M.) 2483.
N. W. T. Education and Dual Languages, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3076 (ii).
Railway Com. of Privy Council, Applications or Complaints (M. for Stmnt.) 1937, 1950 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3399; (Amt.) 3414; neg. (Y. 62, N. 109) 3636 (ii).
——— in Com., 3785 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn. Deb., (personal explanation) 3472 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 848 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 784 (i).
Welland Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 588 (i).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., *Victoria, N.S.*
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliott, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2335 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 847 (i).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*
Mail Service, Imperfect (remarks) 4398 (ii).

McDougald, Mr. J., *Pictou.*
I.C.R., Accident at New Glasgow (remarks) 3088.
——— Expenditure out of Income (M. for Ret.) 1371 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Railways: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2410 (ii).

McGregor, Mr. W., *North Essex.*
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2697 (ii).

McGregor, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2485 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4580 (ii).
Saw Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1262 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1646 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 2246 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1026 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1183 (i).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2039 (i).
Superannuation, 804 (i).
Wilson, Convict, Ed., Release, on M. for Pet., &c., 2645 (ii).
Wrecking in Canadian Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1096 (i).

McKay, Mr. A., *Hamilton.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 306 (i).
Cotton Seed Oil, Imports (M. for Ret.*) 1555 (i).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3559 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3911, 3945 (ii).

McLean, Mr. J., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2185; in Com., 2231 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to M. for 2°, 3711 (ii).
——— B. 76 in Com., 4132, 4181 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Railways (P.E.I.) 2634 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 4448 (ii).

McLeod, Mr. E., *St. John, N.B.*
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4226, 4347 (ii).
St. John Harbour B. 99 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4648 (ii).
——— Commission, on M. for Com. on Res., 4495; in Com., 4498 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3103 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 4441 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (St. John, Accommodation) 2572 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. H., *Vaudreuil.*
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 59, 1°*) 970.

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4702, 4713 (ii).
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 543 (i).

McMillan, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1679 (i).
Budget, on the, 701 (i).
Dom. Millers' Association incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Stevenson*) on M. for 3°, 2940 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 954 (i).
Experimental Farm (Central) Dairy (M. for Ret.) 402 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports (M. for Ret.) 526.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 4140; in Com., 4483.
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 4224 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2877 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4557 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3595 (ii).
——— in Com., 3864 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 701 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairy Industry) 1454; (Experimental Farms) 1425; (Haras National Co.) 1465 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1941 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Cattle Inspection) 992.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 4441 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2877. Experimental Farms, 4448. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4451 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep. (M. for copy) 2432 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 3116, 3566, 3637 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4401.

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*
Adjmt. for Holidays (remarks) 4260 (ii).
Auditor Gen.'s Rep. (Ques.) 36 (i).
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1668 (i).
Budget, on the, 4 9 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Terminal Accommodation (Ques.) 1549 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2167 (i).
——— Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3047 (ii).
Chatham, Customs Collector (Ques.) 1391 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74, in Com., 4641 (ii).
——— Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 1547 (i).
Customs Seizures, Commissions Paid (Ques.) 3238 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4591 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3306; on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for 3°, 3819 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 940 (i).
Farm Produce, Exports (M. for Ret.) 292 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Fisheries Dept., Irregularities by Dep. Min. (M. for Ret.*) 418 (i).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4487 (ii).

Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List (remarks) 1223 (i).

Govt. Rys., Employés (M. for Ret.) 41; Deb. rsmd., 692, 699 (i).

——— Property accommodation (M. for Ret.) 1984 (i).

I. C. R., Employés, Number, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 969 (i).

——— Stationery Supplies, value (Ques.) 1032.

Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 2715.

Labrador, reported Distress (Ques.) 4263 (ii).

Land Grants to Militia B. 96 (*Mr. Deadney*) in Com., 4264 (ii).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1078 (i); in Com., 3069 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Dept. Amalgamation B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 183 (i).

Morton Dairy Co.'s Claims (Ques.) 916 (i).

Mounted Police, Reduction of Force (prop. Res.) 2668, 2699 (ii).

N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2483 (ii).

——— Education and Dual Languages, on prop Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3069 (ii).

Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 4216 (ii).

Payne, J. L., Payments for Services (Ques.) 1548 (i).

Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2742, 2768 (ii).

Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2660 (ii).

Railway Statistics (Ques.) 3398; (remarks) 3185.

Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4506 (ii).

Ranching Companies, N.W.T. (Ques.) 1946 (i).

Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3499 (ii).

——— in Com., 3762, 3778, 3878, 3906, 3933, 4332 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 3°, 4332 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 3545 (ii).

St. John Harbour Commission, on M. for Com. on Res., 4498 (ii).

Savings Banks, Superannuation of Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4272 (ii).

Settlers' Grievances, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4407 (ii).

SUPPLY—on the Budget, 429 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census) 4437: (Columbian Exhibition) 986 (i), 4435, conc., 4475 (ii); (Criminal Statistics) 1160; (Experimental Farms) 1424; (Jamaica Exhibition) 976; (*Patent Record*) 1159 (i).

Canals—Capital (Soulanges) 2051; (Trent) 2066 (i), 4438 (ii). *Income* (Rideau) 988 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Charges of Management (Public Debt, Commission) 253; (Country Savings Banks) 259 (i).

Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 286; (Civil Service Examiners) 285; (Customs) 269; (Deptl. Buildings, care, &c.) contingencies 286; (Finance and Treasury Board) contingencies, 285; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 284; (High Commissioner) 275, contingencies, 282, 898; (Interior) 261, 847, 895, 1154; (Printing and Stationery) 912; (Public Works) 271; (Railways and Canals) 273 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1031; (B.C.) 821; (N.S.) 811; (Ont.) 817; (Craven, Geo., Gratuity) 1007. Excise (Customs Officers' Commissions) 1015; (Tobacco Stamps) 1009 (i).

Fisheries (N. S., Salaries) 4311; (Ont.) 4310; (P.E.I.) 4312 (ii).

Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 995 (i).

Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1510, 1828; (Expenses) 1908, 1932; (Printing Pamphlets) 2029.

Justice, Administration of (Circuit Allowances, B.C.) 311; (Judges, Queen's Bench, &c., Man.) 312; (Judges' Travelling Expenses, N.W.T.) 310 (i).

Legislation: House of Commons (Committees, &c.) 788; (Salaries, &c.) 762; (Salary, Dep. Speaker) 974. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 752 (i).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4284; conc., 4469 (ii).

Militia (Ammunition) 1185; (Clothing) 1346; (District Staff) 1161; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1373; (Military College) 1380; (Permanent Forces) 1421; (Stores) 1953 (i).

Miscellaneous (Clerical Assistance) 4457 (ii); (Jukes, Dr. A., Medical Services) 1003 (i); Monument, late Sir John A. Macdonald) 4458 (ii); (Ross, Hon. J. G., Refund) 1003 (i).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 4449 (ii); (Man.) 744, 973; (Regina Gaol) 748; (St. Vincent de Paul) 736, 972 (i).

Public Works—Capital: (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 4439; (Kingston Graving Dock) 2715, 2741. *Income:* Buildings (Hearing) conc., 4477; (N. S.) 2742; (Major's Hill Park) conc., 4493 (ii).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle) 2025; (St. John and Halifax) 2032 (i).

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Accomodation, St. John) 988 (i); (Expenses) 2367, 2515 (ii). Oxford and New Glasgow (Construction) conc., 4475 (ii).

Superannuation (W. Wallace) 798 (i).

Unprovided Items, 1018 (i).

Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2450 (ii).

U. S. Vessels in Hudson Bay (Ques.) 4262 (ii).

Voters' Lists, 1891, B. 67 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) to M. for 3°, 4503 (ii).

Waldron Ranch Co., Settlers' Claims (M. for Cor., &c.*) 292 (i).

——— Settlers' Claims (Ques.) 223 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*

Atlantic Mail Service (Ques.) 1231 (i).

Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1967 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A.—*Continued.*
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4595 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G.B. (prop. Res.) 1555 (i); agreed to (Y. 97, N. 63) 1635 (i).
——— despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2497 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3295.
——— on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3603 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 876 (i).

Madill, Mr. F., *North Ontario.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4327 (ii).

Mara, Mr. J. A., *Yale.*
B. C. and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 20, 1°*) 129 (i).
Electoral Districts in B.C. (M. for Ret.) 2287 (i).
Indian Reserves, B.C., on M. for Ret., 519 (i).
Nelson and Fort Sheppard Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 26, 1°*) 189 (i).
Nicola Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 24, 1°*) 161 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4511 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3725, 4091 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4690 (ii).

Masson, Mr. J., *North Argenteuil.*
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2845, 2960, 3326, 3638, 4225, 4267 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3304 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 4481 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3449 (ii).
——— in Com., 4169 (ii).
Welland Election, on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) declaring Seat vacant, 580 (i).
Winnipeg and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 72, 1°*) 1636 (i).

Mignault, Mr. R. M. S., *Yamaska.*
Yamaska River Lock, Navigation, &c. (Ques.) 2171 (i).
——— Works, Total Cost (Ques.) 1714 (i).

Mills, Hon. D., *Bothwell.*
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 4260 (ii).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 307 (i).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, Seizure of *Sayward* (remarks) 36 (i).
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1704 (i).
Boundaries of Prov. of Que., on M. for Cor., &c., 121 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Budget, on the, 589 (i).
Bye Elections, Enquiry for Rets., 1491 (i).
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1964 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) 2479 (ii).
Canal Tolls and U. S. (remarks) 4643 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1052 (i).
——— Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2984 (ii).
Census and Statistics, Maps respecting (Ques.) 824 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Gordon*) in Com., 4721 (ii).
Civil Servants, Permanent Clerks Extra Pay, on M. for Ret., 1717 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74, in Com., 4641 (ii).
Commercial Treaties (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1104; neg. (Y. 62, N. 106) 1151 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1317 (i).
——— in Com., 2702 2785, 2828, 2959, 3641, 3645, 4228, 4265, 4345 (ii).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits, on prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1295 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4594 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4598 (ii).
Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1802 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3302 (ii).
Elections, General, 1891-92, Ret. *re* Returning Officers (remarks) 2491 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 932 (i).
Extra Clerks' Pay, Reduction, 4732 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2228 (i).
Fishing Vessels (*Modus Vivendi*) of U.S. B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 178; in Com., 1483.
Flour (Can.) admitted into Nfld., on M. for Ret., 112 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 4140 (ii).
Geological Survey Dept. B. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 1649; in Com., 1654 (i).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 31 (Mr. *Innes*) in Com., 1230 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to take in Thursdays, 700 (i).
Govt. Rys., Employés, on M. for Ret., 696 (i).
Incomes of the People (remarks) 456 (i).
Indian Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4408 (ii).
——— Reserves, B.C., on M. for Ret., 515 (i).
——— School Fund, Expenditure (remarks) 4214.
Land Grants to Rys., Man. and N.W.T., on M. for Ret., 2275 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Lieut. Gov., N.B. (remarks) 4732 (ii).
London Election, Original Voters' Lists (M. to lay on Table) 37, 52, 72 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3094 (ii).
Mackenzie, late Hon. Alex. (remarks) 1390 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Dept. Amalgamation B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 186 (i).
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 3776 (ii).
Minister's Visit to Washington, Rep. respecting (Ques.) 332 (i).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2686 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3559 (ii).
Newfoundland, Papers, &c., *re* Trade, on M. for copies, 684 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2484 (ii).
——— Education and Dual Languages, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3082 (ii).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1641 (ii).
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 2°, 3730; in Com., 4218 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2743, 2775 (ii).
Polling Rets. at General Elections (M. for Map, &c.) 112 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., despatch to London *Times*, *re* Deb. (remarks) 2496 (ii).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2656 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4275 (ii).
——— in Com. on Res., 4512; conc., 4664 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1858, 1871 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3262.
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3682 (ii).
——— in Com., 3720, 3756, 3781, 3839, 3878, 3913, 3920, 3940, 4007, 4023, 4051, 4089, 4149, 4186, 4197, 4221 (ii).
Returning Officers, &c., Duties at Elections (prop. Res.) 73 (i).
St. John Harbour Commission, on M. for Com. on Res., 4493 (ii).
——— B. 99 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4651 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 156 (i).
Speaker's Warrants, &c., Issued since last Session (M. for Ret.*) 71 (i).
——— incomplete Ret. (remarks) 100 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1399, 1643 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 589 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbia Exhibition) 4436 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Canals—Capital (Soulanges) 2051 (i).
Civil Government (Customs) 268; (High Commissioner) contingencies, 896; (Interior) 259, 827, 864, 1154 (i), suppl., 4432, conc., 4432, 4206 (ii); (Printing and Stationery) 913 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Railways (I.C.R.) 2628 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveys, &c.) 4431 (ii).
Fisheries (Fish-Breeding) 4318 (ii).
Geological Survey, 4390 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1536; (Expenses) 1897, 1936 (i); conc., 4212 (ii).
Legislation: Library (Salaries, &c.) 790. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 759 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax and West Indies) 4282; (San Francisco and Vic., B.C.) 4279 (ii).
Militia (Military College) 1387 (i).
Miscellaneous (Clerical Assistance) 4459; (Bulmer *vs.* The Queen, Expenses) 4461; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 4430; (Survey, P.E.I. and Mainland) 4463 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 664 (i), 4440 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 743 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2622 (ii).
Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4444; (N. S.) 2743; (N. W. T.) 2938, 2942. Harbours and Rivers (Ont., Kingston Harbour) 4258; (Que.) 4451. Miscellaneous, 4259 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2041 (i).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2521 (ii); (Halifax, accommodation) 2267 (i); (St. John, accommodation) 2588 (ii).
Sydenham River, Obstructions, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4451, 4464, 4500 (ii).
Voters' Lists, 1891, B. 67 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 3300; on Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) to M. for 3°, 4501 (ii).
Washington Conference (remarks) 1228 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. for Com., 4675; in Com., 4686 (ii).
Welland Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 587 (i).
West Indian Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1887 (i).
West Indies, Minister's Visit (remarks) 1224, 1228 (i).
——— Reps., &c. (M. for copy) 1372 (i).
Wrecking in Canadian Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1096 (i).
Writs for Bye-Elections (remarks) 3186 (ii).
Writs of Election, delay in Issuing (remarks) 1089 (i), 3115 (ii).

Mills, Mr. J. B., *Annapolis.*
Apples, Export, under Inspection Act (Ques.) 3238 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 4137 (ii).
Militia, 60th Battalion, Annual Drill (Ques.) 4500 (ii).
Private Bills, Pets., Extension of Time (M.) 454, 970 (i).
——— Presentation, Extension of Time (M.) 823.

Mills, Mr. J. B.—*Continued.*
Round Hill Shear Dam, Tenders (Ques.) 2171 (i).
SUPPLY :
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 769 (i).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., *East Lambton.*
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s (B. 22, 1ᵒ*) 161 (i).
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliot, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 1728 (i).
——— Original Voters' Lists, on M. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to lay on Table, 64 (i).
Returning Officers, &c., Duties at Elections, on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res., 92 (i).
Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 94, 1ᵒ) 3479 (ii).

Monet, Mr. D., *Napierville.*
Post Office, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2806 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4582 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2ᵒ, 3223 (ii)
——— in Com., 4039, 4093 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2806 (ii).
Yamaska River Lock, Navigation, &c. (Ques.) 2171 (i).
——— Works, Total Cost (Ques.) 1714 (i).

Montague, Mr. W. H., *Haldimand.*
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4592 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4597 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2ᵒ, 3618 (ii).
——— in Com., 3910, 3919, 3939 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W., *North York, Ont.*
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 4260 (ii).
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 550 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1661 (i).
Can. Temp Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 455 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1780 (i).
Civil Service List, Number of Employés (Ques.) 917 (i).
Copyright Act, Proclamation (Ques.) 1366 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2701, 2784, 2826, 2964, 3639, 4265, 4272, 4345 (ii).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits, on prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1309 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports, on M. for Ret., 528 (i).
Geological Survey Dept. B. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2ᵒ, 1651 (i).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 31 (Mr. *Innes*) in Com., 1229 (i).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1335 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants issued since Recess (M. for Ret.*) 111 (i).
——— on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 51 (i).
Indian Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. 4419 (ii).
I. C. R., Audit of Accounts, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4276 (ii).
——— Running Privileges, &c., granted C. P. R., on M. for Ret., 560 (i).
Lake St. John Ry., Gross Traffic Earnings (Ques.) 4261 (ii).
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliott, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2305 (i).
——— Original Voters' Lists, &c., on M. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to lay on Table, 67 (i).
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 3777 (ii).
Newfoundland, Papers, &c., *re* Trade, on M. for copies, 687 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1639 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 2ᵒ, 3729, 3731; in Com., 4216 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2759, 2799, 2810, 2871, 2890, 2896 (ii).
Pontiac County Ry. Debt, on M. for Cor., 1993.
Procedure, Notices of Motion (remarks) 1551 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3806, 4048, 4178 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Deepening, Tenders (Ques.) 2954, 3184, 4261 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1406, 1644 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1459 (i).
Civil Government (Interior) 849, 877 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Ont.) 813 (i).
Immigration (Printing Pamphlets) 2020 (i).
Justice (Exchequer Court) conc., 1085 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 795: (Printing Voters' Lists) conc., 1086; Library (Purchase of Books) 793. (Senate, Salaries, &c.) 754 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4300 (ii).
Militia (Clothing) 1348; (Military College, 1375 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 2799; (N.S.) 2762; (N.W.T.) 2936; (Ont.) 2918; (Que.) 2802, 2810, 2896 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2379 (ii).
Superannuation, 799 (i).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2440 (ii).

Murray, Mr. T., *Pontiac.*
Culbute Canal, Cost of Construction (M. for Stmnt.) 927 (i).
Dredging, Ottawa River (M. for Stmnt.) 926 (i).

Murray, Mr. T.—*Continued.*
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 958 (i).
Pontiac and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 63, 1°*) 1153 (i).
—— Subsidy (M. for Ret.) 917 (i).
Pontiac County Ry. Debt (M. for Cor., &c.) 1986, 1997 (i).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 7 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., *Muskoka.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1058 (i).
Commercial Treaties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills*, Bothwell) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3328 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2300 (i), 3092 (ii).
Militia, Active, on M. for Ret., 673 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2856 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4507 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3233 (ii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3442 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1254 (i).
Treaty with Germany, despatch to London *Times* (remarks) 109 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Inspectors' Travelling Expenses) 821 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1936 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c) 767 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1162; (Armouries, &c.) 1349; (District Staff) 1161; (Drill Pay) 1354; (Permanent Forces) 1423 (i).
Miscellaneous (Georgian Bay Survey) conc., 4470.
Public Works—Income (Que.) 2856 (ii).
U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1473 (i).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., *Laval.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4703.
Dodwell, C. E. W., Emplymt by Govt. (Ans.) 1715 (i).
Eatonville Harbour (N.S.) Expenditure (Ans.) 2641 (ii).
Election Expenses, Publications in Toronto *Globe*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4381 (ii).
Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 2715.
Cacouna Pier, Expenditure (Ans.) 137 (i).
C. P. R., North Shore Section (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A.—*Continued.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1056 (i).
Church Point Wharf, Expenditure for Repairs (Ans.) 399 (i).
Cobourg Customs Buildings, Lease (Ans.) 1366.
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4233, 4348 (ii).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits, on prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1308 (i).
Little Miminegash Breakwater (Ans.) 190 (i).
Longueuil Wharf, Expenditure (Ans.) 1231 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3372 (ii).
McCarthy, Messrs., Lease of Land in Sorel (Ans.) 3184 (ii).
Miminegash Breakwater, Contract (Ans.) 40 (i), 2431 (ii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2487 (ii).
Piers, Breakwaters, &c., P. E. I., Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 239 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2743, 2768, 2798, 2802, 2859, 2868, 2890, 2894 (ii).
Public Works Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1393 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4533 (ii).
Raquette Pier, Completion (Ans.) 398 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1867 (i).
—— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3130.
—— in Com., 3766, 3826, 3973, 4021, 4037, 4044, 4103 (ii).
Rivière du Loup P. O., Workmen's Claims (Ans.) 3238 (ii).
Rivière du Sud Works (remarks) 4656 (ii).
Round Hill Shear Dam (Ans.) 2171 (i).
St. Maurice Public Works (Ans.) 3564 (ii).
Sandford Breakwater (Ans.) 398 (i).
Sheet Harbour, Wharves, &c. (Ans.) 1032 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1017 (i).
Civil Government: (Public Works) 271 (i).
Legislation House of Commons (contingencies) 788: (Salaries, &c.) 780 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: (Maintenance, &c.) 4308 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Clerical Assistance) 4457 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 4439 (ii); (N.B.) 2617; (Ont.) 2619; (Que.) 2619; (Kingston Graving Dock) 2715 (ii). *Consolidated Fund:* Buildings (N.B.) 988, conc., 1086; (Ont.) 990; (Que.) 989. Dredging (Man.) 992. Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 990 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 2951, 4442; (Gas and Electric Light) 4242; (Heating Public Buildings) 4241, conc., 4477; (Man.) 2936; (N. B.) 2798, 4441; (N.S.) 2742, 4441; (N.W.T.) 2936, 2941; (Ont.) 2918, 2929; (Que.) 2801, 2860; (Repairs, &c.) 4240. Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 4455; (N.S.) 4458. Harbours and Rivers (N. B.) 4256; (N.S.) 4247, 4258, 4448; (Ont., Kingston

Ouimet, Hon. J. A.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Income—Continued.
Harbour) 4257; (P.E.I.) 4252: (Que.) 4449. Miscellaneous, 4259: (Ottawa Grounds) 4240). Slides and Booms, 4457. Telegraphs (Nanaimo, &c.) 4259: (Telephone Service) 4245 (ii).
Unprovided Items, 1018 (i).
Sydenham River, Obstructions, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4453 (ii).
Three Sisters Harbour, N.S., Expenditure (Ans.) 2490 (ii).
Woodstock Public Building, Caretaker (Ans.) 3480 (ii).
Yamaska River, Damages through Dam, on M. for Ret., 1986 (i).
——— Lock, Navigation, &c. (Ans.) 2172 (i).
——— Works, Total Cost (Ans.) 1715 (i).

Paterson, Mr. W., *South Brant.*
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 4260 (ii).
B.C. Indians and Proclamation (Ques.) 289 (i).
Budget, on the, 381 (i).
Indian Reserves, B.C., on M. for Ret., 520 (i).
Order, Ques. of, in Com. of Sup., 1503 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 2ª, 3733 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2876 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G.B., despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2508 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2ª, 3454 (ii).
——— in Com., 3796, 3876, 3911, 3937, 4159, 4323.
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 381 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 986 (i), 4433 (ii); (Experimental Farms) 1429 (i).
Canals—Capital: (Trent) 2057, 2066 (i).
Civil Government: (Customs) 267 (i); (Finance and Treasury Board) contingencies, 285; (High Commissioner) 279, contingencies, 897; (Interior) 262, 880; (Marine) 271; (Militia and Defence) 256; (Public Works) 272 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1019 (i). Dom. Lands, 4431 (ii). Customs (Inspectors' Travelling Expenses) 821; (Ont.) 818. Excise (Customs Officers' Commissions) 1015; (Preventive Service) 1015; (Tobacco Stamps) 1008 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1530; (Expenses) 1850, 1923, 1934; (Printing Pamphlets) 2017 (i).
Indians (Schools) 4421 (ii).
Legislation: Senate (Salaries, &c.) 757 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c. and West Indies) 4300 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Springs) 4428; (Commercial Agencies) 4426; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 4429; (Str. *Bayfield*, Supplies) 4461 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 664; (St. Vincent de Paul) 740 (i).
Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1018 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B. C.) 4442; (N.S.) 4441; (Ont.) 2931; (Que.) 2876; (Heating) 4241, conc., 4477; (Telephone Service) 4245 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. for Com., 4675; in Com., 4678 (ii).

Patterson, Hon. J. C., *West Huron.*
Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 74, 1ª) 1636 (i).
Civil Service List, Number of Employés (Ans.) 917 (i).
Election Statistics (remarks) 3185 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 930 (i).
Franchise Act, Legislation (Ans.) 916 (i).
London Election, Papers, &c. (Ans.) 914 (i).
Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 3734 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Sale of Type (Ans.) 2954 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) North Perth Election, 3055.
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4573 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Printing and Stationery) 912 (i.)
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 795: (Printing Voters' Lists) conc., 1086 (i).
Miscellaneous (Old Records, Classification) 4429: (Printing Bureau, Plant) 4429 (ii).
Voters' Lists (Ans.) 1637 (i).
Voters' Lists, 1891 (B. 67, 1ª) 1227 (i): 2ª m., 3300; in Com., 4480 (ii).
Writs for Bye-Elections (remarks) 3186 (ii).

Patterson, Mr. W. A., *Colchester.*
I. C. R., Accident at Truro (M. for Ret.*) 969 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. L. C., *Laprairie.*
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2851 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3ª (Amt.) 4342 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2851 (ii).

Perry, Mr. S. F., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Cascumpeque Harbour, Engineers' Rep. (M. for copy) 2268 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2197; in Com., 2227 (i).
Little Miminegash Breakwater (Ques.) 190 (i).
Miminegash Breakwater, Contract (Ques.) 40 (i), 2431 (ii).
Miscouche Station, Closing (Ques.) 2563 (ii).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2681 (ii).
Piers, Breakwaters, &c., P.E.I., Expenditure (M. for Stmnt.) 233, 241 (i).
P. E. I. Ry., Employés Dismissed (M. for Ret.) 2004 (i).
Pontiac County Ry., Debt, on M. for Cor., 1992.
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2825 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to M. for 2ª, 3713 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2ª, 3157.
——— in Com., 4129, 4195 (ii).
Summerside and Richmond Bay Branch Ry. (Ques.) 40 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 504 (i).
Canals—Income (Chambly) 2260 (i).

Perry, Mr. S. F.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Civil Government (Interior) 866 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Railways (P.E.I.) 2629.
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1524, 1832 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 768 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 2619 (ii). *Consolidated Fund:* Dredging (N.S.) 991. Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 990 (i). *Income:* Buildings (Que.) 2825. Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I. 4254 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2373; (St. John, accommodation) 2613 (ii).
Superannuation, 806 (i).
Tignish Wharfinger, Fees Collected (Ques.) 98 (i).
Tunnel (Submarine) P. E. I. and Mainland (Ques.) 98 (i).
—— (M. for Cor., &c.) 403 (i).
—— Papers respecting (remarks) 1471 (i).

Préfontaine, Mr. R., *Chambly.*
Longueuil Wharf, Expenditure (Ques.) 1231 (i).

Prior, Mr. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*
Fortifications at Esquimalt and Imp. H. of C (Ques.) 222 (i).
Quarantine in B. C. (remarks) 1547 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Ammunition) 1167; (Clothing) 1341; Drill Pay) 1359; (Dom. Artillery Asson.) 1363 (i).
Victoria, B.C., Public Buildings (M. for Cor.) 1550 (i).

Putnam, Mr. A., *Hants.*
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4522 (ii).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*
Galops Rapids, Str. *Traveller* (M. for Ret.) 130.
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 148 (i).

Rider, Mr. T. B., *Stanstead.*
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2893 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, Removal (Ques.) 1032.
—— (M. for Cor.) 1715 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2893 (ii).
Vote (explanation) 1828 (i).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., *Lotbinière.*
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4484 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. of Sup., 4583 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3201 (ii).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Mail Service (Ques.) 2954 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4453 (ii).

Robillard, Mr. H., *Ottawa City.*
McKay Milling Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 15, 1°*) 129 (i).
Ottawa City Passenger Ry. Co.'s (B. 16, 1°*) 129.

Ross, Mr. A. W., *Lisgar.*
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3312 (ii).
Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co. (B. 37, 1°*) 315 (i).
SUPPLY:
Penitentiaries (Man.) 746 (i).

Ross, Mr. H. H., *Dundas.*
Ottawa, Waddington and New York Ry. and Bridge Co.'s (B. 68, 1°*) 1364 (i).

Rowand, Mr. J., *West Bruce.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1450.

Ryckman, Mr. S. S., *Hamilton.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 305 (i).

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4701.
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc. 4592 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3108 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3563 (ii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2487 (ii).
——Education and Dual Language, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3075 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2803 (ii).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2666 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4579 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4034, 4041, 4043, 4092, 4100.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Soulanges) 2052 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1024 (i).
Legislation: Library (Purchase of Books) 793; (Salaries, &c.) 789 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2803 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4691 (ii).

Semple, Mr. A., *Centre Wellington.*
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 553 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3550 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms 1454 (i).
Superannuation, 805 (i).

Skinner, Mr. C. N., *St. John, N.B., City and Co.*
Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1585 (i).
St. John and Maine Ry. Co., &c. (B. 57, 1°*) 823 (i).
St. John Harbour Commission, on M. for Com. on Res., 4496 (ii).
Tobique Ry. Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s (B. 56, 1°*) 823 (i).

Smith, Mr. W., *South Ontario.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) on Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1683 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 446 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Brant.*
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4587 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4597 (ii).
Dominion Illustrated, Purchase of Volumes (Ques.) 397 (i).
Engraving and Printing since 1882, Tenders and Contracts (M. for Ret.*) 159 (i).
Galops Rapids, Work done by Tug *Iroquois* (M. for Ret.*) 159 (i).
Gov. Gen's. Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (read) 1189 (i).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1324, 1339.
Letter Postage, Reduction (Ques.) 190 (i).
Live Cattle admitted from U.S. (M. for Cor.*) 159 (i).
Post Office, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2804 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3649; (Amt.) 3665; neg. (Y. 60, N. 95) 3717 (ii).
——— in Com., 3879, 3912, 3936 (ii).
Returns (Enquiry) 1637 (i).
Savings Bank at St. John, Mr. McLeod's Appmnt. (Ques.) 3644 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 984; (Jamaica Exhibition) 977 (i).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes, Printing) 255 (i).
Civil Government (Customs) 267; (High Commissioner) 276, contingencies, 282, 898; (Interior) 257, 828, 846, 851 (i), conc., 4472 (ii); (Printing and Stationery) 256; (Public Works) 271; (Railways and Canals) 273, contingencies, 286 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Excise (Customs Officers' Commissions) 1016; (Tobacco Stamps) 1008 (i).
Government of N.W.T. (Schools) 1002 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1839; (Expenses) 1848, 1901; (Printing Pamphlets) 2011 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing Voters' Lists) 976. Senate (Debates) 974 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1189; (Clothing) 1343 (i).
Miscellaneous (Jukes, Dr. A., Medical Services) 1003 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2804 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2034; (Grosse Isle) 2027, 2033; (Unorganized Service) 2049 (i).
Voters' Lists, Revised, Printing (Ques.) 2641 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (HON. PETER WHITE) *North Renfrew.*
Address, The, His Ex.'s Reply (read) 129 (i).
Canada and Nfld., Recognition of Licenses, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 245 (i).
Can. White Pine Areas, on M. for Map (remarks) 217 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against (ruling) 1035 (i).
Charges against a Member, Ques. ruled out of Order, 4499 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74, in Com., 4639 (ii).
Civil Service Commissioners' Rep., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2917 (ii).
Controverted Elections, 1, 6, 39, 96, 1062, 1152, 1391 (i), 2461, 2714, 2979, 3681, 4731 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3329 (ii).
Coal Oil and Kerosene, Imports, on M. for Ret., 3059 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to conc., 4598 (ii).
Duke of Clarence and Avondale, Address of Condolence, Mess. from Sen. (read) 71, 96 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1393 (i).
——— Reply, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2170 (i).
Elliott, Judge, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) *re* Hobbs' Pet., 665 (i).
Estimates, The, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 138, 822, (i), 4265 (ii).
Favoured Nation Clauses, despatch *re* Treaties, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1470 (i).
Fisheries, Pacific and Atlantic Coasts, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 667 (i).
Frontenac Electoral District, Issue of Writ, 3055.
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 71 (i).
L'Assomption and Pontiac, Writs (remarks) 2700 (ii).
Lennox Electoral Lists, notification of production, 287 (i).
Lieut. Gov.'s., Instructions, on presentation of Documents, 2268 (i).
London Election, on Ques. of Priv. (remarks) 246, 248, 287 (i).
——— Original Voters' Lists, Clerk of Crown in attendance, 72 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for copies (remarks) 292 (i).
——— Returns, attendance of Clerk of Crown, notification, 287 (i).
——— Pet. of T. S. Hobbs, &c., M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) ruled out of Order, 824 (i).
Marquette Electoral District, Issue of Writ, 4393.
Members, New, notification of Return, 3, 6, 40, 97, 111, 114, 133, 138, 453, 1364, 1391 (i); 2431, 3183, 3649, 3770, 3815, 4715 (ii).
Member's remarks checked, 1833, 2000, 2004 (i); 3185, 4321, 4628, 4645, 4657 (ii).
Member's Resignation (notification) 4393 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 71, 129, 138, 216, 245, 667, 822, 1088, 1393, 1470, 2170 (i), 2461, 2917, 4265 (ii).
Ministers' Visit to Washington (ruling) 334 (i).
Newfoundland and Canada, Papers respecting, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1088 (i), 2917 (ii).
——— Sale of Bait, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2461 (ii).
Newspaper Paragraphs, Reading checked, 2561.
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2485 (ii).
Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B., on M. (Mr. *Cameron*) to introd., 667 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) North Perth Election, 3056 (ii).
Prorogation, Communication from Gov. Gen.'s Acting Sec., 4731 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4537, 4629; conc., 4660 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3908, 3962 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, 3542, 3615, 3664 (ii).
Serjeant-at-Arms, Deputy, Appmnt. (notification) 749 (i).
Speech from the Throne (Rep.) 4 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Chambly) 2258 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Ont.) 817 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Committees, &c.) 788; (Salaries, &c.) 763; (Salary, Dep. Speaker) 975; (Serjeant-at-Arms) 789 (i). Library (Sessional Messengers) 976. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 755, 974 (i).
Public Works—Income (Gas and Electric Light, 4244 (ii).
Superannuation, 808 (i).
Trade Extension, Canada and U.S., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 216 (i).
Vacancies, 2, 1547 (i), 4393 (ii).
York, East Riding, Ret. of Member (notification) 2917 (ii).
——— Vacancy in Representation, Issue of Writ, 1547 (i).
Unparliamentary Language, 69 (i).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON) *Beauharnois.*
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (ruling) 3374 (ii).
Members called to Order, 774, 904 (i), 3754, 3767.
Member's Remarks checked, 1833 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4689 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 299 (i).
American Cattle in Bond (Ques.) 399 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4589 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4598 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 947 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3371 (ii).
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 3774 (ii).
Obscene Literature, &c., Suppression B. 21 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2460 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2748, 2881 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, East York*) to M. for 3°, 4617 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3516 (ii).
——— in Com., 3781, 3804, 3838, 4193 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1250 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 715 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairy Industry) 1464; (Experimental Farms) 1435 (i).
Civil Government (Interior) 858 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1206 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 2748; (Que.) 2881 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2037 (i).
Railways: I.C.R. (Expenses) 2396 (i).
Temperance Colonization Society (M for Ret.) 929 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4670 (ii).

Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-Wm., *Halifax.*
Carl Auer Von Welsbach Patent Relief (B. 75, 1°*) 1714 (i).
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 553 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2221, 2231 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2746 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act. Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1644 (i).
SUPPLY:
Geological Survey, 4390 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c. and West Indies) 4284 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 2746; (Gas and Electric Light) 4244. Dredging (N.S.) 4258 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2557 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4682 (ii).
Women's Baptist Missionary Union of Maritime Provs. incorp. (B. 32, 1°*) 245 (i).

Stevenson, Mr. J., *West Peterborough.*
Dominion Millers' Association (B. 70, 1°*) 1465.
Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 397 (i).

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*
Adjmnt., Easter (remarks) 1311 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, Sums Paid (Ques.) 41.
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1663 (i).
Civil Service List, Number of Employés (Ques.) 917 (i).
Elliott, Judge, Charges against, Printing Pet. in Votes and Proceedings (M.) 823 (i).
Exports and Imports (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).
Govt. Short Loans (Ques.) 137 (i).
Lepage, J. B., Employment by Govt. (Ques.) 1392 (i).
London Election Returns (M.) to lay on Table, 287 (i).
——— Papers respecting (Ques.) 824, 914 (i).
——— Pet. of T. S. Hobbs and others (M.) 1037.
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 3775 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3560 (ii).
Ordnance Lands, Annapolis (Ques.) 1364 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 2°, 3731 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3946 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).
Returning Officers and General Election (M. for Cor.*) 969 (i).
Soulanges Canal, Tenders, &c. (M. for Ret.) 128.
Summerstown P. O., Receipts (Ques.) 1365 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1027; (Ont.) 815 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 786 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1174: (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1375 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2821 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*
Adjmnt., Easter (remarks) 1311 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition (B. 4, 1°*) 40; 2° m., 295 (i).
Brockville and New York Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 42, 1°*) 454 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 64, 1°*) 1153 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4593 (ii).
Divorce, Aikins, J. A. M., Relief (B. 78, 1°*) 2006 (i).
——— Donigan, Ada, Relief (B. 79, 1°*) 2006.
——— Mead, H. R., Relief (B. 81, 1°*) 2068; 2° on a div., 2093 (i); 3° agreed to (Y. 63, N. 31) 2636.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 4141; in Com., 4485.
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 3565.
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 60, 1°*) 1031 (i).
Macdonald, Sir John, Erection of Monument (Ques.) 917 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 77, 1°*) 1946 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2824 (ii).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2654 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3922 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 891, 1157 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2824. 2887, 2897 (ii).

Temple, Mr. T., *York, N.R.*
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1410 (i).
SUPPLY:
Railways: I. C. R. (St. John, accommodation) 2596 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J., K.C.M.G., *Antigonish.*
Address, on the, 30 (i).
——— Com. to draft Ans. (M.) 33 (i).
——— His Ex.'s Reply (presented) 129 (i).
Adjmnt., Absence of Leader of Opposition (M.) 6.
——— Ascension Day and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 2700; (M.) 2780 (ii).
——— Annunciation Day (M.) 392 (i).
——— Ash Wednesday (M.) 35 (i).
——— Corpus Christi (M.) 3752 (ii).
——— Dom. Day, &c. (remarks) 4214 (ii).
——— Easter (M.) 1088, 1364; (remarks) 1311 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 39 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 2256 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 299 (i).
Annapolis and Atlantic Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 690 (i).
Baie de Chaleurs Ry., Workmen's Claims, on M. (Mr. *Cockburn*) for Sel. Com., 48 (i).
Bear River Railway Bridge (Ans.) 398 (i).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, Press despatch *re* Treaty (remarks) 36 (i).
Boundaries of Prov. of Que., on M. for Cor., &c., 120 (i).
Budget, on the, 614 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 7 (i).
——— Adjmnt. for Holidays (M.) 4259 (ii).
——— Adjmnt (M.) 4697 (ii).
——— *See* "GOVT. BUSINESS."
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1970 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2477 (ii).
Canal Tolls, U. S. and Canada (M. for Address to His Ex.) 4644 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Mr. Edgar's Stmnt. (objection) 1035 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1040; M. to set Day for Deb., 1788 (i).
——— Approval of Commissioners (M.) 2980; M. agreed to (Y. 79, N. 32) 3053 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Census and Statistics, Maps respecting (Ans.) 824 (i).
Chicoutimi and Saguenay Election, Judges' Rep. (remarks) 3733 (ii).
——— Issue of Writ (M.) 3896 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Gordon*) M. to transfer to Govt. Orders, 4263; on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3015 (ii).
Civil Servants, Permanent Clerks' Extra Pay, on M. for Ret., 1719 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) on M. for 1°, 1636 (i); in Com., 4639.
Civil Service Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 751, 1547 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2917 (ii).
Civil Service Employés, Deduction of Pay, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2238 (i).
Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Observance, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1038 (i).
Commercial Relations with U. S., Sir Charles Tupper's Speech (remarks) 224 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 46 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1083 (i).
Contracts (Govt.) since Confedn., on M. for Stmnt., 99 (i).
Controverted Elections Act, Legislation (Ans.) 134 (i).
Copyright Act, Proclamation (Ans.) 1366 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2235 (i).
——— Reciprocity with U. S. (Ans.) 137 (i).
Criminal Code (B. 7, 1°) 106 (i).
——— 2° m., 1312; 2° and ref. to Sel. Joint Com., 1319 (i).
——— in Com., 2701, 2783, 2958, 3320, 3638, 3645, 4225, 4266, 4272, 4343 (ii).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits (prop. Res.) 1283.
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4586 (ii).
De la Ronde, late Pierre A., on M. for Ret., 2287.
Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1795 (i).
Divorce, Mead, H. R., Relief B. 81 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 2094 (i).
Dom. Cotton Mills Co., Letters Patent, on M. for Ret., 923 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3301 (ii).
Drummond County Postal Service (Ans.) 289 (i).
Duke of Clarence and Avondale, Joint Address of Condolence to Her Maj. (M.) 72 (i).
——— Prince and Princess of Wales, (M.) 73 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1393 (i).
——— Reply, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2170 (i).
Edmonton Land Office, Removal (remarks) 4043.
Election Expenses, Publications in Toronto *Globe* (Ans.) 3735, 3750 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4368 (ii).
Elections, General, 1891, Ret. *re* Returning Officers (remarks) 2491 (ii).
Election Pets., Decisions, on M. for Ret., 1554 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 961 (i).
Elliott, Judge, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) *re* Hobbs' Pet., 665 (i).
Experimental Farms, Location, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 683 (i).
——— Papers respecting (remarks) 3114 (ii).
Estimates, Suppl., 1892, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 822 (i).
Extra Clerks, Reduction of Pay (remarks) 4732.
Fishing Vessels (*Modus Vivendi*) of U. S., B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 179; in Com., 1475 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 95, 1°*) 3896; 2° m., 4135 (ii).
Geological Survey Dept. B. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 1650; in Com., 1655 (i).
Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays (M.) 3564 (ii).
——— Wednesdays (M.) 2490, 2980 (ii).
——— Thursdays (M.) 699 (i).
——— Sittings of the Hse. (M.) 3897 (ii).
Govt. Employés, on M. for Ret., 697 (i).
Govt. Measures (remarks) 1153 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (remarks) 1216 (i).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1329 (i).
Grain Shipments *viâ* New York, &c. (Ans.) 291.
Incomes of the People (Ans.) 456 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 71 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1648, 2008 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 71 (i).
I.C.R., Accident at New Glasgow (remarks) 2089.
Judges on Commissions (Ans.) 37 (i).
——— Prov. of Que., Travelling Expenses (Ans.) 3115 (ii).
——— Salaries, Increase (prop. Res.) 1392 (i).
Judiciary of Prov. of Que. (Ans.) 2640 (ii).
Labrador, Reported Distress (Ans.) 4263 (ii).
L'Assomption and Pontiac Writs (Ans.) 2700 (ii).
Library of Parlt., Joint Com. (M.) 112 (i).
——— 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 2826 (ii).
Lieut. Gov.'s Assent (remarks) 2492, 2957, 3089.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2240 (i).
——— Instructions (presented) 2268 (i).
Lieut. Gov. of N.B. (remarks) 4732 (ii).
Lobster Packing Fee (prop. Res.) 699 (i).
London Election, Original Voters' Lists, on M. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to lay on Table, 3756 (i).
——— Pet. of T. S. Hobbs, &c., M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) objected to, 823 (i).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (remarks) 247 (i).
——— Papers respecting (remarks) 1089 (i).
——— Charges against Judge Elliott, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 665, 2349 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1076; in Com., 2296 (i), 3091, 3364 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Macdonald, Sir John, Erection of Monument (Ans.) 917 (i).
Mackenzie, late Hon. Alex. (remarks and M. to adjn. Hse.) 1388 (i).
Man. School Act, Legal Expenses (Ans.) 2068 (i).
Ministers' Visit to Washington, Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) objected to, 333 (i).
——— (remarks) 3239, 3398 (ii).
Modus Vivendi, on Prorogation (remarks) 4731.
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2685 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3559 (ii).
Newfoundland and Canada, Duties on Can. products (remarks) 3054 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re* Settlement of difficulties (Ans.) 825 (i), 2957 (ii).
——— Papers *re* Fishing Vessels, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2917 (ii).
——— *re* Trade, on M. for copies, 685 (i).
——— Sale of Bait, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2461 (ii).
——— Recognition of Licenses, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 245 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to set Day for 2°, 2483 (ii).
Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°*) 4 (i).
Obscene Literature, &c., Suppression B. 21 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2460 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, in Com. of Sup., 1502 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 176; in Com. on B., 1640 (i).
Ottawa City Passenger Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. *Robillard*) in Com., 2939 (ii).
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 4217 (ii).
Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 397 (i).
Perth, North Riding, Issue of Writ (Ans.) 1639.
Polling Rets. at General Election, on M. for Map of Dom., 113 (i).
Population of Electoral Districts (remarks) 2700, 2827 (ii).
Preferential Trade with Great Britain, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1623 (i).
——— despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2495 (ii).
Printing, Joint Com. (M.) 112 (i).
——— 8th Rep. of Com., on conc., 3643 (ii).
Private Bills Pets., Extension of Time (M.) 72.
Procedure, Ques. of (Mr. *Casey*) on Notices of Motion (remarks) 1550 (i).
Quebec Legislature, Sessions (Ans.) 3644 (ii).
Railway Com. of Privy Council, Applications or Complaints, on M. for Stmnt., 1950 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4511, 4631; conc., 4660 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4276 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Representation in H. of C. (B. 76, 1°) 1855 (i).
——— 2° m., 3116, 3254; agreed to (Y. 97, N. 60) 3719 (ii).
——— in Com., 3721, 3755, 3781, 3790, 3910, 4002, 4048, 4073, 4084, 4114, 4148, 4193, 4321 (ii).
——— 3° m., 4329; on Amt. (Mr. *Pelletier*) 4343 (ii).
Returning Officers, &c., Duties at Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 85; (Amt.) 89.
Returns, on Enquiry for (remarks) 2172 (i).
Rimouski, Change of Route (Ans.) 3183 (ii).
Robertson, J. F., Claim *re* Ry. Accident, on M. for Stmnt., 1369 (i).
Royal Commissions, Ret., on Enquiry, 2700, 3090, 3239 (ii).
St. Raymond Post Office (Ans.) 37 (i).
Sittings of the Hse. (M.) 3897 (ii).
Soulanges Canal, Tenders, &c., on M. for Ret., 128 (i).
Speaker's Warrants, on incomplete Ret. (remarks) 101 (i).
Speech from the Throne, consdn. (M.) 5 (i).
Standing Committees (M.) 5 (i).
——— Com. to prepare Lists (M.) 34 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 614 (i).
Canals—Capital (Lachine) conc., 4213 (ii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 278, contingencies, conc., 1085: (Interior) 260, 830, 862, (i), conc., 4208 (ii); (Justice) 913; (Mounted Police) 266; (Public Works) 272 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Excise (Tobacco Stamps) 1011 (i).
Dominion Police, 313 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1895 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Circuit Allowances, B.C.) 311; (Exchequer Court, Publishing Reports) 313, conc., 1085; (Judges, Queen's Bench, &c., Man.) 311; (Judges, Travelling Expenses, N.W.T.) 311; (Registrar in Admiralty, Que.) 313; (Supreme Court) 312, 971 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 795; (Salaries, &c.) 772; (Printing Voters' Lists) conc., 1086. Library (Purchase of Books) 793; (Salaries, &c.) 789. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 754 (i).
Miscellaneous (C. S. Commissioners) 1004 (i).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 748; (Dorchester) 972; (Kingston) 664 (i), conc., 4205 (ii); (Man.) 744, 973; (Regina Gaol) 748, 973; (St. Vincent de Paul) 736, 972 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 2937, 2944; (Ont.) 2923 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2267; (St. John, accommodation) 988 (i), 2571 (ii).
Superannuation, 803 (i).
Territorial Accounts (Rebellion, N.W.T.) conc., 1087 (i).
Supply B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 4603; on M. for 2°, 4655 (ii).
Telegraph Line, Victoria, N.S. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2435, 2443 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3116, 3566 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Trade Extension, Canada and U.S., Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 216 (i).
Trade Relations with Great Britain (Ans.) 1980.
U. S. Alien Labour Law (remarks) 1548 (i).
U. S. Vessels in Hudson Bay (Ans.) 4263 (ii).
Voters' Lists, 1891, B. 67 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) 3° m., 4500 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Revised, Printing (Ans.) 2641 (ii).
West Indies, Minister's Visit (remarks) 1224 (i).
——— Reps., &c., on M. for copy, 1372 (i).
Welland Election, on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) declaring Seat Vacant, 396 (i).
——— Day suggested for Deb., 454 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 584 (i).
Wilson, Convict Ed., Release, on M. for Pet., &c., 2642 (ii).
Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 97, 1°*) 4204 (ii).
Witnesses and Evidence (B. 69, 1°) 1391 ; 2°* and ref. to Com. on B. 7, 2008 (i).
Wrecking in Can. Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 1°, 107 (i).
Writs for Elections, on enquiry for Ret., 3115.

Tisdale, Mr. D., *South Norfolk.*
Civil Servants, Permanent Clerks Extra Pay (M. for Ret.) 1715 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) in Com., 4639 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4232 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to conc., 4597 (ii).
Divorce, Hattie Adele Harrison, Relief (B. 92,1°) 3300 (ii).
——— Wright, James, Relief (B. 91, 1°) 3300 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3317 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on prop. Res. (Amt.) 3340 (ii).
Kingston Belt Line Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 52, 1°*) 823 (i).
G. T. R. Co. of Can. (B. 14, 1°*) 129 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (remarks) 1199 (i).
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliott, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2315 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) M. that Com. rise, 2293 (i) ; in Com., 3364, 3386.
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 93, 1°*) 3300 (ii).
P. O. Savings Banks, Interest on Deposits (Ques.) 916 (i).
Privilege (Ques of) par. in *Free Press re* Trades and Labour Council, 2561 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4481 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, East York*) to M. for 3°, 4624 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4549 (ii).
Representation in H.of C. B. 76 (Sir John *Thompson*) 3915 (ii).

Tisdale, Mr. D.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 4436.
Militia (Ammunition) 1199 (i).
Voters' Lists, 1891, B. 67 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) to M. for 3°, 4502 (ii).
Welland County Election, Proceedings at Trial, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 244 (i).
——— (M.) declaring Seat Vacant, 392 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 588 (i).

Tupper, Hon. C. H., *Pictou.*
Alert, Str., Accident to (Ans.) 750, 917 (i).
Bic Wharf, Collector (Ans.) 2638 (ii).
Bounties to Fishermen, Distribution (Ans.) 190.
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2463 ; (Amt.) 2467.
Canadian Cattle scheduled in England (remarks) 249 (i).
Canvas Coal Bags, Tenders for Making (Ans.) 2954 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1049 (i).
Charlebois, F., Claim against Fisheries Dept., on M. for Cor., 1036 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2841 (ii).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits, on prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1302 (i).
Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1813 (i).
Finkle, Roland, Appmnt. as Fishery Inspector (Ans.) 1365 (i).
Fisheries, Lobster (prop. Res.) 130 ; (remarks) 160 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 9, 1°) 107 ; 2° m., 1655 in Com. on Res., 1656 ; M. for Com. on B., 2173 ; in Com., 2216, 2230 (i).
Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 3237 (ii).
Fisheries, Pacific and Atlantic Coasts, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 667 (i).
Fishery Regulations, Mackerel (Ans.) 3055 (ii).
Fishing Rights on Richelieu River (Ans.) 35 (i).
Fishing Vessels (*Modus Vivendi*) of the U. S. (B. 11, 1°) 109 ; 2° m., 176 ; in Com., 1474, 1639 (i).
Gear and Tackle Inspector, Appmnt. (Ans.) 224.
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (remarks) 1222 (i).
Harbour and River Police (Que.) Repeal (B. 66, 1°) 1225 (i).
Flour (Can.) admitted into Nfld., on M. for Ret., 112 (i).
Lake St. Peter, Fishing Privileges (Ans.) 2956.
License Fees, Refund by Nfld. (Ans.) 190 (i).
Lobsters and Whitefish for B.C. (Ans.) 751 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Dept. Amalgamation (B. 12, 1°) 109 ; in Com., 181 (i).
Marine, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 913 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act, Cor., &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).

Tupper, Hon. C. H.—*Continued.*
Newfoundland Bait Act, Bait Sales to St. Pierre Fishermen (Ans.) 189 (i).
——— Fishing Regulations, enforcing (Ans.) 134.
——— Imperial Assent (Ans.) 136 (i).
——— Papers respecting (Ans.) 315, 508, 914, 1228, 1491 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1088 (i).
Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 10, 1°) 108; 2° m., 173 (i).
Pinsonneault, Alfred, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 749 (i).
Prosser, Wm., Fishery Overseer, Dismissal (Ans.) 2490 (ii).
St. Mary's Bay Hatcheries (Ans.) 398 (i).
Sea Fisheries Development Act Amt. (B. 5, 1°) 97; 2° m., 161; in Com., 167 (i).
Sheet Harbour, Dues Collected (Ans.) 1032 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (prop. Res.) 129; on Res., 752 (i).
——— (B. 13, 1°) 114; in Com., 1394, 1642 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 358; (remarks) 386, 577, 630 (i).
Civil Government (Marine) 270 (i).
Fisheries (Commissioners' Expenses) 993; (Intelligence Bureau) 992 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1891 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1222 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Cattle Inspection) 992.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2265 (i).
Tignish Wharfinger, Fees Collected (Ans.) 98 (i).
Westport Harbour, Can Buoys (Ans.) 399 (i).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe.*
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (remarks) 1208 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1441.
Militia (Ammunition) 1208 (i).

Vaillancourt, Mr. C. E., *Dorchester.*
Judges on Commissions (Ques.) 37 (i).
St. Raymond Post Office (Ques.) 37 (i).

Wallace, Mr. N. C., *West York, Ont.*
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc. (Amt.) 4597 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 938 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to prop. Res., 3345 (ii).
N.W.T., Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2486 (ii).
——— Education and Dual Language, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3067 (ii).
Preferential Trade with Great Britain, despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2500 (ii).
Pub. Accounts and Auditor Gen.'s Rep., ref. to Standing Com. (M.) 188 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3836, 3951, 3842, 3893 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1442 (i).

Watson, Mr. R., *Marquette.*
Binding Twine, on M. for Ret., 540 (i).
——— (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1656; neg. (Y. 63, N. 107) 1713 (i).
Budget, on the, 656 (i).
Land Grants to Rys., Man. and N. W. T., on M. for Ret., 2277 (i).
Man. School Act (M. for Ret.*) 2287 (i).
——— Legal Expenses (Ques.) 2068 (i).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2678 (ii).
Preferential Trade with Great Britain, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1600 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1865 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 656 (i).
Canals—Income (Chambly) 2259 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1834, 1851; (Expenses) 1931, 1943 (i).
Militia (Drill Pay) 1355 (i).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 745 (i).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2043 (i).
Superannuation, 800 (i).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2449 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C., *Albert.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4707.
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1959, 1973 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3034 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2705, 3324 (ii).
Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1807 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4592 (ii).
I. C. R. Running Privileges, &c., granted C.P.R., on M. for Ret., 559 (i).
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliott, on Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2339 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2759 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, on conc., 4660 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3464 (ii).
——— in Com., 3872, 3912, 3918, 4177 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S) 2759 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2547.

Welsh, Mr. W., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2196, 2231 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3755, 4106 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1395 (i).
SUPPLY:
Railways: I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2513.

White, Mr. N. W., *Shelburne.*
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2829 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 964 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2204; in Com., 2232 (i).
Fish, Fish Oil, &c., Imports from Nfld. (M. for Ret.*) 159 (i).
Fishing Vessels (*Modus Vivendi*) U.S. B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1479 (i).
Nfld. Bait Act, Imperial Assent (Ques.) 136 (i).
——— Fishing Regulations, enforcing (Ques.) 134 (i).
Newfoundlanders in Labrador, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 159 (i).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Visit, C. H. Cahan's Services (Ques.) 2432 (ii).

White, Mr. R. S., *Cardwell.*
Insurance Act Amt. (B. 3, 1°) 40; 2° m., 456 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3101 (ii).
Preferential Trade with Great Britain, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1632 (i).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*
Lennox Voters' List (M. for Ret.*) 159 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 3°, 4330 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Superannuation (W. Wallace) 798 (i).

Wood, Mr. J. F., *Brockville.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 39 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 2255 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2712 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4593 (ii).
Edwards, W. C., Co.'s incorp. (B. 17, 1°*) 129 (i).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3561 (ii).

Wood, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) M. to place on Order Paper, 4214 (ii).
Private Bills, Reps. from Com., Extension of Time (M.) 4214 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, East York*) to M. for 3°, 4610.
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 771. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 755 (i).

Wood, Mr. J., *Westmoreland.*
Live Stock, Tariff (Ques.) 1365 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.) 2285 (i).
I. C. R., Expenditure out of Income (M. for Ret.) 1371 (i).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3558 (ii).
Private Bills, Reps. from Com. Extension of Time (M.) 3815 (ii).
School Savings Bank B. 36 (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) M. to place on Orders of the Day, 4466 (ii)
SUPPLY:
Railways: I.C.R. (Expenses) 2405 (ii).

Yeo, Mr. J., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2214 (i).
Little Miminegash Breakwater (Ques.) 190 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to M. for 2°, 3707 (ii).
——— in Com. 4164 (ii).
——— on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4335; neg. (Y. 54, N. 87) 4335 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Railways (P.E.I.) 2631 (ii).
Fisheries (P.E.I., Salaries, &c.) 4312 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 4255 (ii).
Tunnel (Submarine) P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 411 (i).

INDEX—PART II.

SUBJECTS.

"A," "B" AND "C" BATTERIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1419 (i).

ACTIVE MILITIA, DRILL, QUALIFIED OFFICERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 667 (i).

ADDINGTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

ADDRESS IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Northrup*) 7; seconded (Mr. *Bain, Soulanges*) 18.

——— His Ex.'s Reply, 129 (i).

ADJOURNMENTS, ANNUNCIATION DAY: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 392 (i).

——— ASH WEDNESDAY: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 35.

——— CORPUS CHRISTI: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3752 (ii).

——— DOMINION DAY, &c.: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 4214 (ii).

——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 4260 (ii).

——— EASTER: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1088, 1364.

——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 1311 (i).

——— QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, &c.: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 2700 (ii).

——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 2780 (ii).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. *See* "JUSTICE."

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°* (*pro forma*) 4 (i).

ADMIRALTY COURT, QUE., REGISTRAR: in Com. of Sup., 313 (i).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).

AGENTS' (DOM. LANDS) SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4431 (ii).

——— *See* "IMMIGRATION."

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION COM.: List of Members, 105 (i).

AGRICULTURE:

BRITISH FARMERS' DELEGATES REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2432, 3637 (ii).

——— *See* "TENANT FARMERS."

BUTTER AND CHEESE INDUSTRY, PAMPHLET: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3331 (ii).

CATTLE SHIPMENTS, INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 992, 2033 (i).

DAIRYING INTERESTS: in Com. of Sup., 1464 (i).

DEPTL. CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 286 (i).

——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Carling*) 1062 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 286 (i).

DEPUTY MINISTER, LETTER *re* PAMPHLETS: in Com. of Sup., Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1947 (i).

EXPERIMENTAL (CENTRAL) FARM, DAIRY STOCK, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 402 (i).

——— FRENCH COR.: Remarks (Mr. *Frémont*) 3114.

AGRICULTURE—*Continued.*

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 1424, 4448.

——— NUMBER, LOCATION, EXPEND., &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Frémont*) 682 (i).

——— REPS., FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 397 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Frémont*) 3185 (ii).

HARAS NATIONAL CO.: in Com. of Sup., 1465 (i).

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 275, 282, 896; conc., 1085 (i).

INTELLIGENCE BUREAU, DAILY REPS.: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).

MORTON DAIRY CO.'S CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 916 (i).

NATIONALITIES OF THE POPULATION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 824 (i).

"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).

SUGAR-BEET CULTIVATION, FRENCH EDITION OF REPS.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 750 (i).

——— *See* "BEET-ROOT."

TENANT FARMERS' DELEGATES REPS.: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 3166, 3566 (ii).

——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1638 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4401 (ii).

——— M. for copies (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2432, 3637 (ii).

——— VISIT, MR. C. CAHAN'S EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2432 (ii).

[*See* "ARTS AND STATISTICS;" "IMMIGRATION;" "SUPPLY."]

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 39 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; M. for Com., 2254; in Com. and 3°*, 2256 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 30.)

Aikins, Jas. A. M. *See* "DIVORCE."

"ALERT," STR., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750, 917 (i).

ALGOMA, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

Alien Contract Labour Prohibition B. No. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 40; 2° m., 295; deb. adjd., 310 (i); Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., agreed to, 2457 (ii).

ALIEN LABOUR LAW (U. S.) PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *Langelier*) 1548 (i).

ALLAN, MESSRS., &c., DECREASE OF CUSTOMS DUTIES: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Laurier*) 159 (i).

AMERICAN CATTLE IN BOND, IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 399 (i).

AMMUNITION, MANUFACTURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 1161 (i); conc., 4209 (ii).

ANNAPOLIS AND ATLANTIC RY., &c., COR., &c., *re* SUBSIDY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Forbes*) 688 (i).
APPLES, EXPORT, INSPECTION UNDER ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 3238 (ii).
ARBITRATION *re* PROVINCIAL ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 4430; conc., 4470 (ii).
ARCHIBALD, H. D., CONDUCTOR ON I. C. R., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Patterson, Colchester*) 969 (i).
ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, &c., PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4259 (ii).
ARMOURIES AND CARE OF ARMS: in Com. of Sup., 1349 (i).
ARPIN, MR., CHARGES FOR DEMURRAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 4643 (ii).
ARTIFICIAL FERTILIZERS, QUANTITY IMPORTED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 526 (i).
ARTS AND STATISTICS:
CENSUS AND STATISTICS, MAP SHOWING BOUNDARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 824 (i).
—— BIRTHPLACES, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3566 (ii).
—— Enquiry (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4135 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 983 (i), 4437 (ii).
—— ORIGIN AND RELIGIOUS CREEDS: Ques. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 190 (i), 2490 (ii).
CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
ELECTION STATISTICS: Remarks (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) 3185 (ii).
JAMAICA EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
MENNONITES, ENUMERATION IN CENSUS: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4263 (ii).
POPULATION OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS: Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2700 (ii).
RAILWAY STATISTICS, DELAY IN PRESENTING: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3185 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3398 (ii).
WORLD'S COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 983 (i), 4433; conc., 4474 (ii).
[*See* "AGRICULTURE;" "IMMIGRATION."]
ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 976, 983, 1159, 1424, 1464 (i), 4433; conc., 4474 (ii).
ASSISTANT RECEIVER GEN., VIC.: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
ATLANTIC COAST FISHERIES AND NEWFOUNDLAND: Mess. from His Ex., 1088 (i).
ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1231.
—— SUNDAY TRAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3184 (ii).
AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 267 (i).
—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 188 (i).
AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4276 (ii).
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 42 (i).
BAIN, JAS. WM., ESQ., MEMBER FOR SOULANGES: Introduced, 3 (i).
BANCROFT & CONNOLLY. *See* "KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK."
BANFF SPRINGS, SURVEY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4428.
BANKING AND COMMERCE COM.: List of Members, 104 (i).
Baptist Missionary Union. *See* "WOMAN'S."
BARRETT *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, SUPREME COURT JDGT.: M. for copy (Mr. *LaRivière*) 158 (i).
—— LEGAL EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 2068.
"BAYFIELD," STR., SUPPLIES, ENQUIRY: in Com. of Sup., 4461 (ii).
BEAR RIVER (N.S.) RAILWAY BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, ENGINEERS' REPS., &c., *re* BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 191, 224 (ii).
BEEF AND PORK, U.S. AND CAN. FISHERMEN: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 294 (i).
—— LUMBERMEN'S IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 291 (i).
BEET-ROOT SUGAR, PROF. SAUNDERS' REP.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 71 (i).
—— INSTRUCTIONS: M. for copies (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 1373 (i).
—— BOUNTY ON MANUFACTURE: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 1366, 1373 (i).
—— BOUNTIES PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 41 (i).
—— *See* "SUGAR BEET."
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty B. No. 102 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop. and in Com., 4697; 1°* and 2°* of B., 4715; in Com. and 3°*, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 8.)
BEHRING'S SEA ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 4460; conc., 4478 (ii).
—— SEAL FISHERIES, PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 36 (i).
Belleville and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co.'s B. No. 28 (Mr. *Corby*). 1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 696 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 31.)
—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4535 (ii).
Bell Telephone Co. of Can. B. No. 41 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 67.)
BENNETT, WM. H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR EAST SIMCOE: Introduced, 129 (i).
BERTHIER (MONTMAGNY) P.O., MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2638 (ii).
BIC, COLLECTOR AT WHARF, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2638 (ii).
BIG FORTUNE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4448.
BIG TRACADIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4252.
BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 4; *pro formâ.*
BILL (No. 2) To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 40; 2° m., 1062; 2°, 1083; in Com., 2293; Com. rose, 2305 (i); Ms. to recom., 2431, 3090; agreed to (Y. 77; N. 50) and in Com., 3091; again in Com., 3363 (ii).
BILL (No. 3) To amend the Insurance Act.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell.*)
1°*, 40; 2°, 456 (i).

BILL (No. 4) To prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 40; 2° m., 295; deb. adjd., 310 (i); Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h. agreed to, 2457 (ii).

BILL (No. 5) To amend Chap. 96 of the Revised Statutes, to encourage the development of the Sea Fisheries and the building of Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 97; 2°*, 130; M. for Com., 161; in Com., 166; 3°*, 249 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

BILL (No. 6) To amend the Canada Temperance Amendment Act of 1888.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°, 98; 2°, 418; in Com., 455; 3°*, 692 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

BILL (No. 7) Respecting the Criminal Law.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 106; 2°, 1312 (i); in Com., 2701, 2782, 2795, 2826, 2958, 3320, 3637, 3640, 3644, 4225, 4230, 4265, 4343; 3°, 4348; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4732 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

BILL (No. 8) Respecting aid by United States Wreckers in Canadian waters.—(Mr. *Bowell.*)
1°, 106; 2° m., 173; 2°, 970; in Com., 1091; 3°*, 1153 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

BILL (No. 9) Further to amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 130; 1°, 107; 2°, 1655; Res. in. Com., 1656; M. for Com. on B., 2173; in Com., 2216, 2230 (i).

BILL (No. 10) To amend the Pilotage Act.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 108; 2°, 173; in Com., 970; 3°*, 1090 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 20.)

BILL (No. 11) Respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States of America.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 109; 2°, 176; in Com., 1472, 1639; 3°*, 1789 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 12) Respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 109; 2° and in Com., 181; 3°*, 249 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 13) To further amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 129; 1°, 114; 2°, 752; Res. in Com., 752; B. in Com., 1394, 1642; 3°*, 1789 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 19.)

BILL (No. 14) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 695 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 39.)

BILL (No. 15) To amend the Act to incorporate the McKay Milling Company.—(Mr. *Robillard.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 855 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 73.)

BILL (No. 16) Respecting the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company.—(Mr. *Robillard.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134 (i); in Com., 2939; 3°*, 2940 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 17) To incorporate W. C. Edwards and Company.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 855 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

BILL (No. 18) Respecting certain Railway Works in the City of Toronto.—(Mr. *Denison.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 19) Respecting the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)

BILL (No. 20) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134 (i).

BILL (No. 21) For the suppression of obscene literature, and to provide for the punishment of certain immoral and criminal practices.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 133 (i); 2° m., 2457; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com. on B. (No. 7) 2461 (ii).

BILL (No. 22) Respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Moncrieff.*)
1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 23) To incorporate the High River and Sheep Creek Irrigation and Water Power Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)

BILL (No. 24) Respecting the Nicola Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 695 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 50.)

BILL (No. 25) Respecting the Montreal Board of Trade.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 189; 2°*, 275 (i).

BILL (No. 27) To further amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 217 (i); 2° m., 2461; neg. (Y. 33, N. 132) 2462; M. to recom., 2483 (ii).

BILL (No. 28) Respecting the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. *Corby.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 696 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 29) Respecting the Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 695 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

BILL (No. 30) Respecting the Nova Scotia Steel and Forge Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Fraser.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 74.)

BILL (No. 31) Respecting the *Globe* Printing Company.—(Mr. *Innes.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com., 1229; 3°*, 1230 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 75.)

BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Women's Baptist Missionary Union of the Maritime Provinces.—(Mr. *Stairs.*)
1°*, 245, 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c 76.)

BILL (No. 33) Respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 63.)

BILL (No. 34) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i) (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 34.)

BILL (No. 35) Respecting the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *LaRivière.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 696 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 46.)

BILL (No. 36) To amend the Act to incorporate the School Savings Bank.—(Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga.*)
1°*, 314; 2°*, 418 (i); M. to transfer to the Orders of the Day, 4466; in Com. and 3°*, 4638 (ii).

BILL (No. 37) Respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. *Ross, Lisgar.*)
1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 41.)

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 35.)

BILL (No. 39) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; M. for Com., 2254; in Com. and 3°*, 2256 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 30.)

BILL (No. 40) Respecting the Saint Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Carpenter.*)
1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 58.)

BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 67.)

BILL (No. 42) To revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Brockville and New York Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 509 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2461 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 64.)

BILL (No. 43) To amend an Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°*, 578; 2°, 1648; in Com., 1654; 3°*, 1789 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 16.)

BILL (No. 44) Further to amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. *Gordon.*)
1°*, 508 (i); M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 4263; 2° m., 4631; in Com., 4637, 4716; Amt. (Mr. *Gordon*) 4726; neg. and 3°, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 25.)

BILL (No. 45) To revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fairbairn.*)
1°*, 578; 2°*, 696; in Com., 1228; 3°*, 1229 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 42.)

BILL (No. 46) To make Voting compulsory.—(Mr. *Amyot.*)
1°*, 578; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1083 (i).

BILL (No. 47) To incorporate the Victoria Life Insurance Company.—(Mr *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 749; 2°*, 855; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 69.)

BILL (No. 48) Respecting the transfer of Shares in Corporations.—(Mr. *Ives.*)
1°, 749 (i).

BILL (No. 49) Respecting the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Guillet.*)
M. to read and receive Pet., 667; 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 38.)

BILL (No. 50) Respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergin.*)
M. to introd., 666; 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 52.)

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Canadian Railway Company (name changed to "Canso and Louisbourg").—(Mr. *Gillies.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 36.)

BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Kingston Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 915 (i).

BILL (No. 53) Respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 57.)

BILL (No. 54) To incorporate the Niagara Falls and Queenston Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 1061 (i).

BILL (No. 55) To amalgamate the National Mutual Loan and Building Society of Montreal and the National Mutual Loan and Building Society of Hamilton under the name of "The National Mutual Loan and Building Society.—(Mr. *Langelier.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 1061 (i); M. to ref. Rep. back to Banking and Commerce Com., 3556; neg. (Y. 53, N. 96) 3563 (ii).

BILL (No. 56) To confirm an agreement between the Tobique Valley Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Skinner.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 60.)

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the St. John and Maine Railway Company and the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Skinner.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 59.)

BILL (No. 58) To authorize the conveyance to the Corporation of the City of Toronto of certain Ordnance Lands in that city.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
Res. prop., 129; in Com., 174; 1°*, 825; 2°*, 1491; in Com., 1639; 3°*, 1642 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 7.)

BILL (No. 59) To incorporate the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *McMillan, Vaudreuil.*)
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1062 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4230 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 54.)

BILL (No. 60) Respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1031; 2°*, 1181 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2594 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 40.)

BILL (No. 61) To amend the North-West Territories Act.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°*, 1062 (i).

BILL (No. 62) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Bowell.*)
Res. in Com. and 1°* of B., 1087; 2°, 1090; 3°*, 1091 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 1.)

BILL (No. 63) Respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Murray.*)
1°*, 1153; 2°*, 1230; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 56.)

BILL (No. 64) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1153; 2°*, 1230; in Com. and 3°*, 2256 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 33.)

BILL (No. 65) To incorporate the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Corbould.*)
1°*, 1153; 2°*, 1230 (i); Com., in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 65.)

BILL (No. 66) To repeal the Act respecting the Harbour and River Police of the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 1225 (i); B. wthdn., 4482 (ii).

BILL (No. 67) Respecting the Voters' Lists of 1891.—(Mr. *Patterson, Huron.*)
1°, 1227; 2° m., 3300; 2°, 3301; in Com., 4480; 3° m., 4500; Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 4501; neg. (Y. 30, N. 63) 4505 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 12.)

BILL (No. 68) To revive and amend the Acts respecting the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Ross, Dundas.*)
1°*, 1364; 2°*, 1497; in Com. and 3°*, 3511 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 55.)

BILL (No. 69) Respecting Witnesses and Evidence.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 1391; 2°* and ref. to Sel. Com. on B. 7, 2008 (i).

BILL (No. 70) To incorporate The Dominion Millers' Association.—(Mr. *Stevenson.*)
1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1548 (i); in Com. and 3°, 2940 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 71.)

BILL (No. 71) Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 1469; 2° objected to, 1648; 2° and in Com., 2007; 3°*, 2172 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 22.)

BILL (No. 72) To incorporate the Winnipeg and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Masson.*)
1°*, 1636; 2°*, 1740 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2461 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 62.)

BILL (No. 73) To amend the Act to incorporate the Montreal Island Railway Company.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 1636; 2°*, 1740 (i).

BILL (No. 74) To amend the Acts respecting the Civil Service.—(Mr. *Patterson, Huron.*)
1°*, 1636 (i); 2°*, 4638; in Com., 4639; 3°*, 4641 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 14.)

BILL (No 75) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Carl Auer Von Welsbach and others.—(Mr. *Stairs.*)
1°*, 1714; 2°*, 1882 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2594 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 77.)

BILL (No. 76) To readjust the representation in the House of Commons.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1° m., 1855 (i); 2° m., 3116; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3129; deb. rsmd., 3186, 3239; neg. (Y. 58, N. 109) 3298; 2° m., 3398; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3414; deb. rsmd., 3480, 3566; neg. (Y. 62, N. 109) 3636; deb. rsmd. on M. for 2°, 3649; Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3665; deb. rsmd., 3682; neg. (Y. 60, N. 95) 3717; 2° agreed to (Y. 97, N. 60) 3718; in Com., 3720, 3753, 3778, 3820, 3898, 3966, 4043, 4143, 4321; 3° m., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4329; neg. (Y. 51, N. 90) 4334; Amt. (Mr. *Yeo*) 4335; neg. (Y. 54, N. 87) 4335; Amt. (Mr. *Béchard*) 4336; neg. (Y. 54, N. 89) 4341; Amt. (Mr. *Pelletier*) neg. and 3° of B., 4343 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 11.)

BILL (No. 77) To revive and amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa, Morrisburgh and New York Railway Company, and to change the name thereof to the Canadian American Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1946; 2°, 2093 (i).

BILL (No. 78) For the relief of James Albert Manning Aikins—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 2006; 2°*, 2093 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2636 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

BILL (No. 79) For the relief of Ada Donigan—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 2006; 2°*, 2093 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2636 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 79.)

BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 2006; 2°*, 2093 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2638 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 45.)

BILL (No. 81) For the relief of Herbert Rimmington Mead—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 2068; 2° on a div., 2093 (i); 3° m., 2636; agreed to (Y. 63, N. 31) 2637 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 81.)

BILL (No. 82) Respecting the Montreal and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga.*)
1°*, 2172; 2°*, 2256 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3321 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 49.)

BILL (No. 83) Respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dickey.*)
1°*, 2361; 2°*, 2461; in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 37.)

BILL (No. 84) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Haggart.*)
1°, 2488; 2°* and in Com., 4481; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4603; neg. (Y. 20, N. 128) and 3° of B., 4628 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 27.)

BILL (No. 85) Further to amend the 10th Chapter of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, respecting seditious and unlawful associations and oaths.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°, 2488 (i).

BILL (No. 86) To incorporate the Buckingham and Lièvre River Railway Company—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 2699; 2°*, 2795; in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 32.)

BILL (No. 87) Respecting the Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Railway Company.—(Mr. *Beausoleil.*)
1°*, 2700; 2°*, 2795; in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 46.)

BILL (No. 88) To amend an Act to incorporate the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 3183; 2°*, 3321; in Com. and 3°*, 3511 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 44.)

BILL (No. 89) To amend the Dominion Lands Act, and amendments thereto.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 2979; 2°* and in Com., 3301, 3733; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 3815; deb. adjd., 3820; deb. rsmd., B. reconsid. and 3°*, 4204 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 15.)

BILL (No. 90) To amend the Patent Act and Acts amending the same.—(Mr. *Carling.*)
1°*, 3300; 2°, 3729; in Com., 4215; 3°*, 4264 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 24.)

BILL (No. 91) For the relief of James Wright—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1° on a div., 3300; 2°*, 3363; in Com. and 3° on a div., 3640 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 82.)

BILL (No. 92) For the relief of Hattie Adele Harrison.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1° on a div., 3300; 2°*, 3363; in Com. and 3° on a div., 3640 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 80.)

BILL (No. 93) Respecting the Midland Railway of Canada.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 3300; 2°*, 3363; in Com., 3771; 3°*, 3778 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 47.)

BILL (No. 94) To amend the Winding-Up Act.—(Mr. *Moncrieff.*)
1°, 3479 (ii).

BILL (No. 95) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 3896; 2° m., 4135; in Com., 4482; 3°*, 4506 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 23.)

BILL (No. 96) To make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia force on Active service in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°*, 4201; 2° and in Com., 4264; 3°, 4399 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 6.)

BILL (No. 97) To amend the Winding-Up Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 4202; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4506 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 28.)

BILL (No. 98) Respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 4265; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4499 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 10.)

BILL (No. 99) To amend the Act relating to the Harbour of St. John, in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 4398; M. for Com., 4493; in Com., 4498, 4603; 1° of B., 4506; 2°*, 4603; in Com., 4647; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) neg. (Y. 53, N. 93) 4654 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 9.)

BILL (No. 100) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1893, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.
Res. in Com., 4506; conc. in and 1° of B., 4603; 2°, 4715; 3°*, 4729 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

BILL (No. 101) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Haggart.*)
Res. prop. (1st) 4394; in Com., 4506; M. for conc. and Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4657; neg. (Y. 45, N. 92) 4667; (2nd Res.) 4466; in Com., 4629; (3rd Res.) 4644; in Com., 4667; 1°* and 2°* of B., 4668; 3°*, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 5.)

BILL (No. 102) Respecting a Bounty on beet-root sugar.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop. and in Com., 4697; 1°* and 2°* of B., 4715; in Com. and 3°*, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 8.)

BILL (No. 103) To amend the Act respecting Customs Duties.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 4670; in Com., 4677; conc. in and 1°* and 2°* of B., 4715; in Com., 4728; 3°*, 4729 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 21.)

BILL (No. 104) To amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 4716; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 13.)

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 1286, 2370 (i), 4732 (ii).

BINDING TWINE, QUANTITY IMPORTED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 537 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Watson*) 540; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 543; (Mr. *Davin*) 544; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 546; (Mr. *Mulock*) 550; (Mr. *Ferguson*) 548; Mr. *Fairbairn*) 550; (Mr. *Semple*) 553; (Mr. *Stairs*) 553; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 553; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 554 (i).

BINDING TWINE, DUTY, REMOVAL: Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1656; neg. (Y. 63, N. 107) 1713 (i).
Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1661; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1663; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1664; (Mr. *Christie*) 1667; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1668; (Mr. *Fairbairn*) 1672; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1679; (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 1683; (Mr. *Henderson*) 1684; (Mr. *Casey*) 1693; (Mr. *Lister*) 1698; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1700; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1704; Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1709 (i).

BOARD OF CUSTOMS AND DETECTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i); conc., 4205 (ii).

Boiler Inspection and Ins. Co. of Can. B. No. 19 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)

BOOKS, PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 792 (i).

BORDEN, W. W., ESQ., MEMBER FOR KING'S, N.S.: Introduced, 36 (i).

BOTHWELL, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

BOUNDARIES OF QUEBEC PROV.: Remarks (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 99 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 115 (i).

BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 190 (i).

——— APPLICATIONS AND REFUSALS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bowers*) 417 (i).

BOWERS, CHAS. ED., ESQ., MEMBER FOR DIGBY: Introduced, 7 (i).

BOYLE, ARTHUR, ESQ., MEMBER FOR MONCK: Introduced, 454 (i).

BRACEBRIDGE AND BAYSVILLE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4575 (ii).

BRANDON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 2936 (ii).

BREAKWATERS, &C., IN PRINCE CO., GOVT. EXPEND.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 233 (i).

BRIDGE OVER RICHELIEU RIVER AT SOREL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2453 (ii).

BRIGADE MAJORS: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

CUSTOMS AND P. O. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 1559 (i).

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS IN B.C., VOTERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 2287 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES, IMP. AND CAN. GOVTS., COR.: M. for copy (Mr. *Laurier*) 244 (i).

——— PROP. FORTIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 222.

GAMBLE AND FLETCHER, COR. *re* PUB. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA: M. for copies (Mr. *Prior*) 1550 (i).

INDIANS, PROCLAMATION OF 1892: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 289 (i).

LOBSTERS AND WHITEFISH FOR B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 751 (i).

MILITARY BUILDINGS, VICTORIA: in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii).

NANAIMO TO COMOX TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 4259 (ii).

NICOLA VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4521 (ii).

PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 748 (i).

REVELSTOKE AND ARROW LAKE (C. P. R.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4510 (ii).

SMALL-POX ON "EMPRESS OF JAPAN": Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1547 (i).

WALLACE, W., EX-POSTMASTER, VICTORIA: in Com. of Sup., 796 (i).

VANCOUVER P. O., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2951, 4442.

VICTORIA DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).

B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 20 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134 (i).

BRITISH FARMERS' DELEGATES REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2432 (i).

——— *See* "TENANT FARMERS."

Brockville and New York Bridge Co.'s (revival) B. No. 42 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 454; 2°*, 509 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2461 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)

BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4539 (ii).

BROME CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.

BRUCE, EAST AND NORTH, CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

BRUNEAU, ARTHUR AIMÉ, ESQ., MEMBER FOR RICHELIEU: Introduced, 3 (i).

BRYSON, JOHN, ESQ., MEMBER FOR PONTIAC: Introduced, 4715 (ii).

Buckingham and Lièvre River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 86 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 2699; 2°*, 2795; in Com and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

BUCTOUCHE AND MONCTON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4516 (ii).

BUDGET, THE, ANNUAL STMNT. (Mr. *Foster*) 315; Reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 335 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Tupper*) 358; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 381; (Mr. *Bennett*) 423; (Mr. *McMullen*) 429; (Mr. *Hughes*) 443; (Mr. *Dawson*) 455; (Mr. *Craig*) 465; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 469; (Mr. *Campbell*) 482; (Mr. *Devlin*) 498; (Mr. *Perry*) 504; (Mr. *Amyot*) 564; (Mr. *Cameron*) 568; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 589; (Sir *John Thompson*) 614; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 629; (Mr. *Davin*) 648; (Mr. *Watson*) 656; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 701; (Mr. *Sproule*) 715; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 725 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 161 (i).

BULMER *vs.* THE QUEEN, LITIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4461 (ii).

BURGESS, A. M.: ref. in Com. of Sup., 825, 1157 (i).

Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 65 (Mr. *Corbould*). 1°*, 1153; 2°*, 1230 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE. *See* "GOVT. BUSINESS."

BUTTER AND CHEESE INDUSTRY, PAMPHLET: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3331 (ii).

BYE-ELECTIONS, ISSUER OF WRITS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1491 (i).

CACOUNA PIER, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 137 (i).

CALGARY P.O., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2938, 2941 (ii).

CAMERON, D. M., EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2639 (ii).

CAN. AND LIVERPOOL MAIL SERVICE: conc., 4478 (ii).

Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1153; 2°*, 1230; in Com. and 3°*, 2256 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)

CAN. COTTON MILLS CO.'S LETTERS PATENT: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 920 (i).

Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34 (Mr. *Ingram*). 1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. *Flint*). 1°*, 98; 2°, 418; in Com., 455; 3°*, 692 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

CANADIAN CATTLE IN ENG.: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 249 (i).

——— REPRESENTATIVE AT WASHINGTON: prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1950 (i); Deb. rsmd., 2463; Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) 2467; agreed to, 2482 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1950, 1977, 2480; (Mr. *Foster*) 1953; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1956, 1976, 2467; (Mr. *Weldon*) 1959, 1973; (Mr. *Casey*) 1960; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1962; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1964, 2470; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1967; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1970, 2477; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1974 (i).

——— IMMIGRATION AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1491 (i), 4431; conc., 4467 (ii).

C. P. R., P. O. AND MILITIA SERVICES, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 3331 (ii).

——— ARRANGEMENTS WITH I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 510, 667 (i).

——— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 987, 2264 (i), 4438 (ii).

——— NORTH SHORE SECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3480 (ii).

C. P. R. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 35.)

CANALS:

CANALS, DEEPENING: prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 138.

CANALS, HARBOURS, DOCKS, &C., CONTRACTS FOR ENLARGEMENT, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 417 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 1017, 2049, 2241 (i).

CANAL TOLLS, DISCRIMINATION AGAINST U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4642 (ii).

——— U. S. AND CANADA, ADDRESS TO HIS EX.: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 4644 (ii).

BEAUHARNOIS, ENGINEERS' REPS., &C., *re* BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 191, 224 (i).

CARILLON AND GRENVILLE: in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i); conc., 4213 (ii).

CORNWALL: in Com. of Sup., 2053 (i).

CHAMBLY: in Com, of Sup., 2257 (i).

CULBUTE, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 927 (i).

GALOPS RAPIDS, SURVEYS, PLANS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Reid*) 130 (i).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).

LACHINE: in Com. of Sup., 1017, 2049 (i); conc., 4212 (ii).

——— NEW BRIDGE AT MONTREAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 524 (i).

LAKE ST. LOUIS: in Com. of Sup., 2050 (i).

MURRAY: in Com. of Sup, 2054 (i).

RAPIDE PLAT: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (i).

RIDEAU, VALUATOR'S EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 988 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (i).

SAULT STE. MARIE: in Com. of Sup., 2241 (i).

——— TENDERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 128.

——— in Com. of Sup., 2050 (i).

——— CONTRACTS FOR DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3184 (ii).

——— LOWEST TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4261 (ii).

SOULANGES, ENGINEERS' REPS., &C., *re* BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 191, 224 (i).

TRENT VALLEY: in Com. of Sup., 2055, 2262 (i), 4438; conc., 4473 (ii).

WELLAND: in Com. of Sup., 2252 (i).

CANNED LOBSTERS, FEE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Tupper*) 699 (i).

——— *See* "FISHERIES B. 9."

Canso and Louisburg Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 51 Mr. (*Gillies*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 36.)

CANSO, ARICHAT, PORT HOOD, &C., STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup., 4277 (ii).

CANVAS COAL BAGS, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 2954 (ii).

CAPE BRETON RY., CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 988 (i).

——— TERMINAL ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 1549 (i).

CAP. ST. IGNACE STATION, POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 223 (i).

——— OPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 290, 751 (i).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1555 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2667 (ii).

CAPE TORMENTE AND MURRAY BAY RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4524 (ii).

CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2617.

CARGILL, H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR EAST BRUCE: Introduced, 36 (i).

CARILLON AND GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i); conc., 4213 (ii).

CARLETON (N.B.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 39, 1391 (i).

CARLING, HON. JOHN, MEMBER FOR LONDON: Introduced, 161 (i).

CARON, SIR ADOLPHE, CHARGES AGAINST: Stmnt. read (Mr. *Edgar*) 1032; M., 1038 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1038; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1040; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1047; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1049; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1052; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1056; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1058; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1060, 1741; (Mr. *Dickey*) 1750; (Mr. *Edgar*) 1760; (Mr. *Curran*) 1770; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1780; (Mr. *Bowell*) 2068; Amt. 2068 (i).

——— Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res., 2068; agreed to (Y. 125, N. 63); Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2144; neg. (Y. 63, N. 125) 2169; prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. Commissioners' Names for approval of Hse., 2170 (i).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Flint*) 2074: (Mr. *Davin*) 2089; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2101; (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) 2107; (Mr. *Choquette*) 2116; (Mr. *Dupont*) 2122; (Mr. *Carroll*) 2124; (Mr. *Desaulniers*) 2128; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2130; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 2139; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Amt. to Amt., 2144 (i).

Deb. on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2147; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2152; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2156; (Mr. *Casey*) 2162; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2167 (i).

——— APPROVAL OF COMMISSIONERS: Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 2980; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2984; neg. (Y. 32, N. 79) 3053 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2981°; Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2984; (Mr. *Chapleau*) 2991; (Mr. *Flint*) 2995; (Mr. *Davin*) 3001; (Mr. *Fraser*) 3007; (Sir *John Thompson*) 3015; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3027; (Mr. *Weldon*) 3034; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3040; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3047 (ii).

——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) setting day for Deb., 1788 (i).

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR, REP. *re* BLASTING: M. for copy (Mr. *Perry*) 2268 (i).
CATTLE DISEASE: in Com. of Sup., 987, 2033 (i).
——— LIVE, ADMISSION FROM U. S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).
——— SHIPMENTS, INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 992, 2033 (i).
CENSUS AND STATISTICS, MAP SHOWING BOUNDARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 824 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 983 (i), 4437 (ii).
——— ORIGIN AND RELIGIOUS CREEDS: Ques. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 190 (i).
——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2491 (ii).
——— BIRTHPLACES, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3566, 4135 (ii).
CHAMBLY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
CHAMPLAIN CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
CHARGES AGAINST A MEMBER: asking Ques. checked (Mr. *Speaker*) 4499 (ii).
CHARLEBOIS, F., CLAIMS AGAINST FISHERIES DEPT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1036 (i).
CHARLEVOIX CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 6 (i).
CHATHAM CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1391 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2798 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 2971, 3733 (ii).
——— EVIDENCE: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 3896 (ii).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. No. 83 (Mr. *Dickey*). 1°*, 2361; 2°*, 2461; in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 37.)

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. No. 44 (Mr. *Gordon*). 1°*, 508 (i); M. to transfer to Govt. Orders, 4263; 2°* m., 4631; in Com., 4637, 4716; Amt. (Mr. *Gordon*) 4726; neg. and 3°, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

CHISHOLM, D., LAND DAMAGES: conc., 4479 (ii).
CHURCH POINT WHARF, DIGBY, N.S., REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
CIRCUIT ALLOWANCES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 311.
CIVIL GOVERNMENT: in Com. of Sup., 255, 267, 825, 896, 1007, 1154 (i), 4205, 4432, 4440, 4472 (ii).
CIVIL SERVANTS AND EXTRA PAY: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2500 (ii).
——— SICK PAY: Remarks (Mr. *Devlin*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2238 (i).
——— SUPERANNUATED, &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. *Foster*) 1637 (i).

Civil Service Acts Amt. B. No. 74 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*). 1°*, 1636 (i); 2°*, 4638; in Com., 4639; 3°*, 4641 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 1004.
——— COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 751 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1547 (i).
——— EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 283 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE, EXTRA CLERKS, PAYMENTS FOR DEDUCTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4732 (ii).
——— EXTRA PAYMENTS, 1874-1878: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1715 (i).
——— LIST, NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 917 (i).
CLAIMS *re* REBELLION, N. W. T. (1885): in Com. of Sup., 1017; conc., 1087 (i).
CLAIMS, &c., SETTLEMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 2259 (i), 4450 (ii).
CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4457 (ii).
CLOTHING AND OVERCOATS: in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
COAL OIL AND KEROSENE, IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3059 (ii).
COBOURG CUSTOMS, &c., BUILDINGS, LEASE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1366 (i).

Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co's B. No. 49 (Mr. *Guillet*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; M. to read and receive Pet., 669; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394, 4396; in Com., 4516, 4546 (ii).
COCKBURN ISLAND, LOCATION TICKET OF PETER MCLENNAN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Lister*) 2006 (i).
——— J. A. MCLENNAN: M. for copy (Mr. *Lister*) 1980 (i).
COLLECTION OF REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 811, 1007 (i), 4430; conc., 4205 (ii).
COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 983 (i), 4433; conc., 4474 (ii).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4426 (ii).
——— RELATIONS, CAN. AND GREAT BRITAIN: prop. M. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1979 (i).
——— TREATIES: Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1104; neg. (Y. 62, N. 106) 1151 (i).
COMMISSIONERS' (FISHERIES) EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).
COMMISSIONS ON CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3238 (ii).
COMMITTEES:
AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: List of Members, 105 (i).
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 42 (i).
BANKING AND COMMERCE: List of Members, 104 (i).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Bowell*) 34 (i).
——— 1ST REP.: Presented (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 1153; conc., 1465 (i).
——— 2ND REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 4585 (ii).
EXPIRING LAWS: List of Members 101 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: List of Members, 104 (i).
——— JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 112 (i).
PRINTING: List of Members, 104 (i).
——— JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 112 (i).
——— 5TH REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Bergin*) 2171 (i).
——— 8TH REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Bergin*) 3643 (ii).
——— 11TH REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Bergin*) 4693 (ii).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: List of Members, 101 (i).
PRIVATE BILLS, MISCELLANEOUS: List of Members, 103 (i).
PUBLIC ACCTS: List of Members, 104 (i).

COMMITTEES—*Continued.*

RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES: List of Members, 102 (i).

SELECT STANDING: prop. M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 5.

—— Special Com. to prepare Lists: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 34 (i).

—— Lists presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 101 (i).

—— ADDITION OF NAMES: M. (Mr. *Bowell*) 217, 563 (i).

STANDING ORDERS: List of Members, 103 (i).

COMMITTEES, SESSIONAL CLERKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).

COMPANIES. *See*

BELL TELEPHONE CO.
BOILER INSPECTION AND INSURANCE CO.
BROCKVILLE AND NEW YORK BRIDGE CO.
BURRARD INLET TUNNEL AND BRIDGE CO.
EDWARDS, W. C., CO.
HIGH RIVER, &c., IRRIGATION AND WATER POWER CO.
MCKAY MILLING CO.
NATIONAL MUTUAL LOAN AND BUILDING SOCIETY.
NOVA SCOTIA STEEL AND FORGE CO.
OTTAWA CITY PASSENGER RY. CO.
VICTORIA LIFE INSURANCE CO.

[*See* "RAILWAYS;" "SUBSIDIES;" &c.]

Compulsory Voting B. No. 46 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°*, 578; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1083 (i).

CONCURRENCE, 1084 (i), 4204, 4463 (ii).

CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 282, 788, 1007, 1363 (i), 4433 (ii).

CONTRACTS. *See* "GOVT."

Contract Labour. *See* "ALIEN."

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, 1, 6, 39, 96, 1062, 1152, 1391 (i), 2461, 2714, 2979, 3681, 4731 (ii).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 134 (i).

COPYRIGHT ACT, PROCLAMATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1366 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2233 (i).

——— RECIPROCITY WITH U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 137 (i).

CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2053 (i).

COTEAU, OVERFLOW OF LAND: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 914 (i).

COTTON-SEED OIL, CRUDE, IMPORTS FOR 1891: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McKay*) 1555 (i).

COULTER, N. R., ESQ., MEMBER FOR CARLETON, N.B.: Introduced, 1391 (i).

COURT HOUSE AND LOCK-UPS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).

CRAVEN, GEORGE, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 1007.

Criminal Law Amt. (Witnesses and Evidence) B. No. 69 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 1391; 2°* and ref. to Sel. Com. on B. 7, 2008 (i).

Criminal Law (Codification) B. No. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 106; 2°, 1312 (i); in Com., 2701, 2782, 2795, 2826, 2958, 3320, 3637, 3640, 3644, 4225, 4260, 4265, 4343; 3°, 4338; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4732 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).

CROWN PROSECUTIONS AND SUITS: prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1283 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 1295; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1302; (Mr. *Davies*, *P. E. I.*) 1303; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1307; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1308; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1309 (i).

CULBUTE CANAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 927 (i).

CUMBERLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

CUSTOMS:

ALLAN, MESSRS., DECREASE OF CUSTOMS DUTIES: M. for Pets.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 159 (i).

APPLES, EXPORT, INSPECTION UNDER ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*, *Annapolis*) 3238 (ii).

BEEF AND PORK (AMERICAN) LUMBERMEN'S IMPORTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 291 (i).

—— U. S. AND CAN. FISHERMEN: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 294 (i).

BINDING TWINE, IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 537 (i).

—— DUTY, REMOVAL: Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1656; neg. (Y. 63, N. 107) 1713 (i).

BOARD OF CUSTOMS AND DETECTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i); conc., 4205 (ii).

BONDING PRIVILEGES, NEWFOUNDLAND AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 189 (i).

CATTLE (AMERICAN) IN BOND, IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 399 (i).

COAL OIL AND KEROSENE, IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3059 (ii).

COMMISSIONS ON CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3238 (ii).

COTTON-SEED OIL, CRUDE, IMPORTS FOR 1891: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McKay*) 1555 (i).

CRAVEN, GEORGE, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 1007.

CUSTOMS AND P. O. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 1550 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 267, 1007, 1018 (i); conc., 4205; suppl., 4433 (ii).

CUSTOMS OFFICERS' COMMISSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).

CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 811, 1007 (i), 4431; conc., 4205 (ii).

DODS, P. D., CASE *re* LOSS OF DIAMONDS: M. for Papers (Mr. *Curran*) 2287 (i).

EGGS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4677 (ii).

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 100 (i).

—— CAN. PRODUCE TO NEWFOUNDLAND; M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 113 (i).

—— FREE PRODUCE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 292 (i).

FERTILIZERS, ARTIFICIAL, IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) 526 (i).

FLOUR (CAN.) TRADE AND NEWFOUNDLAND: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Hughes*) 112 (i).

GRAIN SHIPMENTS *viâ* NEW YORK: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 291 (i).

GRANITE, EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 509 (i).

HAMMOND, E., SEIZURES AND SHARE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2782 (ii).

INGRAM, W. H., APPMNT. AS COL. OF CUSTOMS, ST. THOMAS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casey*) 1998 (i).

INSPECTORS OF PORTS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 821 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i), 4463 (ii).

MEAT AND FARM PRODUCE, IMPORTS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Hughes*) 291 (i).

MOLASSES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4678 (ii).

PETROLEUM, CRUDE, REDUCTION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1946 (i).

PORK IMPORTS FROM U. S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 292 (i).

PRESENTATION FLAG, REMISSION OF DUTY: (Mr. *Landerkin*) 509 (i).

ST. THOMAS, COL. OF CUSTOMS, APPMNT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casey*) 1998 (i).

SAW-LOGS, EXPORT DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1231.

——— Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1032 (i).

——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Rider*) 1705 (i).

SPANISH WEST INDIES, EXPORTS TO: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 4499 (ii).

TRUDEL, EDMOND, SEIZURES AND SHARES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3237 (ii).

U. S. NEWSPAPERS, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1230 (i).

WEST BAY AS A PORT OF ENTRY, INSPECTOR'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Cameron*) 2287 (i).

WHYCOCOMAGH AS A PORT OF ENTRY, INSPECTOR'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Cameron*) 2287 (i).

Customs (Duties) Act Amt. B. No. 103 (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. prop., 4670; in Com., 4677; conc. in and 1°* and 2°* of B., 4715; in Com., 4728; 3°*, 4729 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 21.)

DAIRIES AND CHEESE FACTORIES, PROV. OF QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 2781 (ii).

DAIRYING INTERESTS: in Com. of Sup., 1464 (i).

DARTMOUTH POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).

DEBATES (H. OF C.) OFFICIAL REP.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Bowell*) 34 (i).

——— 1ST REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 1153 (i).

——— conc., M. (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 1465 (i).

——— 2ND REP. OF COM.: conc., M. (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 4585 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 974 (i); conc., 4205 (ii).

DE LA RONDE, LATE PIERRE A. DENIS, PAPERS, &c., *re* SUCCESSION: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2286 (ii).

DEPARTMENTAL BUILDINGS, CARE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 286 (i).

DEPOSITS IN PEEL SAVINGS BANK, INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 916 (i).

DES AULNETS, P.O., MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750 (i).

PEEL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

DETECTIVE SERVICE, CUSTOMS: conc., 4205 (ii).

DICKEY, ARTHUR R., ESQ., MEMBER FOR CUMBERLAND: Introduced, 6 (i).

DIGBY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

DIPLOMATIC PAPERS: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1789; neg. (Y. 57, N. 98) 1827 (i).

Deb. on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1795; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1802; (Mr. *Weldon*) 1807; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1809; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1813; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1817; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1822 (i).

DIVISIONS:

BINDING TWINE, REMOVAL OF DUTY: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) 1656; neg. (Y. 63, N. 107) 1713 (i).

CARON, SIR ADOLPHE, CHARGES AGAINST: prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) to ref. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 1032; Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) 2068; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 63, N. 125) 2169; Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) agreed to (Y. 125, N. 63) 2170 (i).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) approving appointment of Commissioners, agreed to (Y. 125, N. 63) 2170 (i).

——— Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) approving appointment of Commissioners, 2980; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2981; neg. (Y. 32, N. 79) 3053 (ii).

COMMERCIAL TREATIES: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1104; neg. (Y. 62, N. 106) 1151 (i).

DIPLOMATIC PAPERS: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1789; neg. (Y. 57, N. 98) 1827 (i).

DIVORCE (MEAD, HERBERT R.) B. 81: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) for 3° agreed to (Y. 63, N. 31) 2637 (ii).

ELLIOTT, JUDGE, CHARGES AGAINST: prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) to ref. Hobbs' and others Pet., *re* London Election, to Special Com., 1719; neg. (Y. 50, N. 93) 2360 (i).

LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE B. 2: M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to recom. agreed to (Y. 77, N. 50) 3090 (ii).

NATIONAL MUTUAL LOAN AND BUILDING SOCIETY: M. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to ref. back Rep. of Sel. Standing Com. on Banking and Commerce, 3556; neg. (Y. 53, N. 96) 3563 (ii).

N. W. T. ACT AMT. B. 27: M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) for 2°, neg. (Y. 33, N. 132) 2462 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN: prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1555; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1623; neg. (Y. 64, N. 98) 1634; Res. agreed to (Y. 97, N. 62) 1635 (i).

RAILWAY ACT AMT. B. 84: on M. (Mr. *Haggart*) for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) two cent per mile rate, 4610; neg. (Y. 20, N. 128) 4628 (ii).

REPRESENTATION IN HOUSE OF COMMONS: on M. for 2°, Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to refer B. to a Conference, 3129; neg. (Y. 58, N. 109) 3298; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) basis of equality of population, &c., 3414; neg. (Y. 62, N. 109) 3636; Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) Provinces and Census, 3665; neg. (Y. 60, N. 95) 3717; 2° agreed to (Y. 97, N. 60) 3718; on M. for 3°, Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Ontario, neg. (Y. 51, N. 90) 4334; Amt. (Mr. *Yeo*) P. E. I., neg. (Y. 54, N. 87) 4335; Amt. (Mr. *Béchard*) Missisquoi and Iberville counties, neg. (Y. 54, N. 89) 4341 (ii).

ST. JOHN HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS B. 99: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to ref. back to Com., neg. (Y. 53, N. 93) 4654 (ii).

SUBSIDIES TO RYS.—CONCURRENCE: on Res., Témiscouata Ry., Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) neg. (Y. 45, N. 92) 4667 (ii).

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE: Res., L. C. Pereira's Salary, Dept. of Interior, neg. (Y. 86, N. 61) 1084 (i).

——— on Res., Chief Clerk's Salary, Dept. of Interior, Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) neg. (Y. 34, N. 47) 4473 (ii).

VOTERS' LISTS B. 67: on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) to ref. back to Com., neg. (Y. 30, N. 63) 4505 (ii).

Divorce (Aikins, Jas. A. M.) B. No. 78 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 2006; 2°*, 2093 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2636 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

—— **(Donigan, Ada) B. No. 79** (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 2006; 2°*, 2093 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2636 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 79.)

—— **(Mead, Herbert R.) B. No. 81** (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 2068; 2° on a div., 2093 (i); 3° m., 2636; agreed to (Y. 63, N. 31) 2637 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 81.)

—— **(Harrison, Hattie A.) B. No. 92** (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1° on a div., 3300; 2°*, 3363; in Com. and 3° on a div., 3640 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 80.)

—— **(Wright, Jas.) B. No. 91** (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1° on a div., 3300; 2°*, 3363; in Com. and 3° on a div., 3640 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 82.)

Dods, P. D., Case *re* Loss of Diamonds: M. for Papers (Mr. *Curran*) 2287 (i).

Dodwell, C. E. W., Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1715 (i).

Dom. Artillery Association: in Com. of Sup., 1363 (i).

Dom. Buildings in Can., Electric Lighting: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 417 (i).

Dom. Cotton Mills Co.'s Letters Patent: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 920 (i).

Dom. Day Celebration: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4320 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4399 (ii).

"Dom. Illustrated," Copies Purchased: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 397 (i).

Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 4431 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 2979; 2°* and in Com., 3301, 3733; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3815; deb. adjd., 3820; deb. rsmd., B. recom. and 3°*, 4204 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 15.)

Dom. Millers' Association incorp. B. No. 70 (Mr. *Stevenson*). 1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1548 (i); in Com. and 3°, 2940 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 71.)

Dom. Notes, Printing: in Com. of Sup., 255 (i).

Dom. Police: in Com. of Sup., 313 (i).

Dorchester Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

Donigan, Ada. *See* "Divorce."

Dredge, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i).

Dredging Ottawa, between Pembroke and Des Joachims: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 926 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 991 (i), 4258, 4454 (ii).

Drill Pay and Instruction: in Com. of Sup., 1353 (i); conc., 4209; suppl., 4437 (ii).

Drill Sheds, &c., Care and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 1373 (i).

Drummond County Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4644; conc., 4657 (ii).

—— Postal Service: Ques. (Mr. *Leduc*) 289 (i).

Dugas, Louis E., Esq., Member for Montcalm: Introduced, 161 (i).

Duke of Clarence and Avondale, Address of Condolence: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 72, 96 (i).

—— Reply to Address: Mess. from His Ex., 1393, 2170 (i).

Dual Languages in N. W. T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3062 (ii).

Duty-Pay, Excise Officers: in Com. of Sup., 1014.

Dyer, Eugène A., Esq., Member for Brome: Introduced, 161 (i).

Eatonville Harbour, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2641 (ii).

Edmonton Land Office, Removal: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 4043, 4392 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2936; conc., 4467 (ii).

Edwards, W. C., Co.'s incorp. B. No. 17 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 855 (i). (53-54 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

Eugenia Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1985 (i).

Eggs: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4677 (ii).

Election Expenses, Publications in Toronto "Globe": Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3734-3751 (ii).

—— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4349 (ii).

Election, General, Polling Rets.: M. for Map (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 112 (i).

—— Officials' Duties: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 73 (i).

—— Petitions. *See* "London;" "Richmond."

—— Statistics: Remarks (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) 3185 (ii).

Elections, 1891-92, Cor., Ret. Officers and Govt., &c.: M. for copy (Mr. *Sutherland*) 969 (i).

—— Last General, Cor., Govt. and Ret. Officers: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2491 (ii).

—— *See* "Controverted."

Electoral Districts in B.C., Voters: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 2287 (i).

Electoral Lists. *See* "Lennox;" "London;" "Voters' Lists."

Elgin, E., Controverted Election, Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

Elliot, Judge. *See* "London Election."

Engraving and Printing, Tenders and Contract: M. for copies* (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).

—— Returns: Enquiry (Mr. *Somerville*) 1637 (i).

Esquimalt Graving Dock: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i), 4439 (ii).

—— Defences, Imp. and Can. Govts.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 244 (i).

—— Fortifications: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 222 (i).

Essex, S., Controverted Election: Judges' Rep., 1.

ESTIMATES, The, 1892-93, Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 138 (i).

—— Suppl., 1891-92: Mess. from His Ex., 822 (i).

—— Suppl., 1892-93: Mess. from His Ex., 4265 (ii).

European Immigration Agents: in Com. of Sup., 1491, 1828 (i).

—— *See* "Immigration."

Evidence. *See* "Criminal Law."

EXCHEQUER COURT, EDITING REPORTS: in Com. of Sup., 313, 971 (i).
EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i), 4430 (ii).
EXPERIMENTAL (CENTRAL) FARM, DAIRY STOCK, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 402 (i).
——— FRENCH COR.: Remarks (Mr. *Frémont*) 3114.
——— REPS.: Remarks (Mr. *Frémont*) 3185 (ii).
——— FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 397 (i).
——— NUMBER, LOCATION, EXPEND., &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Frémont*) 682 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i), 4448 (ii).
EXPIRING LAWS COM.: List of Members, 101 (i).
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 100 (i).
——— CAN. PRODUCE TO NEWFOUNDLAND: M. for Ret (Mr. *Hughes*) 113 (i).
——— FREE PRODUCE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 292 (i).
——— *See* "CUSTOMS."
EXTRA CLERKS, &c., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii).
FABRE, MR., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4424 (ii).
FAIRBAIRN, CHAS., ESQ., MEMBER FOR SOUTH VICTORIA: Introduced, 3 (i).
FARMERS' DELEGATES. *See* "BRITISH"; "TENANT."
FARM PRODUCE. *See* "EXPORTS."
FAVOURABLE NATIONS' CLAUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 34 (i).
——— IMP. DESPATCH: Mess. from His Ex., 1470.
FEATHERSTON, JOS., ESQ., MEMBER FOR PEEL: Introduced, 3 (i).
FENELON FALLS RY. BRIDGE, AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVT. AND G. T. R.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 133 (i).
——— SWING BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4438; conc., 4475 (ii).
FINANCE:
ASSISTANT RECEIVER GEN., VICTORIA., B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 267.
BEET-ROOT SUGAR, BOUNTY ON MANUFACTURE: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 1366, 1373 (i).
——— BOUNTIES PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 41 (i).
———BOUNTY, CONTINUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 751 (i).
——— Res. prop. and in Com. (Mr. *Foster*) 4697 (ii).
BUDGET, THE: Annual Statement (Mr. *Foster*) 315.
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE, EXTRA CLERKS, PAYMENTS FOR DEDUCTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4732.
CIVIL SERVANTS, SUPERANNUATED, &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. *Foster*) 1637 (i).
DEPOSITS IN PEEL SAVINGS BANK, INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 916 (i).
DOMINION NOTES, PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 255.
FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 285 (i).
FINANCIAL INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
GOV. GEN.'S WARRANTS: Stmnt. presented (Mr. *Foster*) 34 (i).
——— M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 50 (i).
——— REPS. OF MINISTERS AND O. C.'S*: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 111 (i).
FINANCE—*Continued.*
INCOMES OF THE PEOPLE, STATEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 456 (i).
LOANS, GOVT. SHORT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 137 (i).
PUBLIC ACCTS. OF CAN.: M. to ref. to Sel. Com. (Mr. *Wallace*) 188 (i).
PUBLIC DEBT COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 253 (i).
SAVINGS BANKS, N.B., N.S., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
——— ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3644 (ii).
SINKING FUND, BROKERAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 254 (i).
STATUTORY VOTES, DOM. LIABILITIES UNDER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fraser*) 969 (i).
SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 796 (i).
——— MAIL CONDUCTORS: M. for Ret (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2699 (ii).
UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 1618 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY."]
FINKLE, ROLAND, FISHERY INSPECTOR, APPMNT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1365 (i).
FISHERIES:
ATLANTIC COAST FISHERIES AND NEWFOUNDLAND: Mess. from His Ex., 1088 (i).
BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION, in Com. of Sup., 4478 (ii).
BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 190 (i).
——— APPLICATIONS AND REFUSALS*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bowers*) 417 (i).
CANNED LOBSTERS FEE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Tupper*) 699 (i).
CHARLEBOIS, F., CLAIMS AGAINST FISHERIES DEPT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1036 (i).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 3237 (ii).
FINKLE, ROLAND, FISHERY INSPECTOR, APPMNT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1365 (i).
FISH-BREEDING: conc., 4478 (ii).
FISHERIES, DEPUTY MINISTER, LETTERS, COMPLAINTS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *McMullen*) 418 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 992 (i), 4310, 4460 (ii).
——— PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1491 (i).
FISHERY OFFICERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4310.
——— REGULATIONS, ALTERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3054 (ii).
FISH, FISH-OIL, &c., IMPORTED FROM NEWFOUNDLAND*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 159.
FISHING BOUNTY: Enquiry for Rets. (Mr. *Flint*) 914.
——— LICENSES, NORTH SHORE AND ST. LAWRENCE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2641 (ii).
HATCHERIES, ST. MARY'S BAY, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
LOBSTER FISHERIES, ON M. FOR ADJMNT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 160 (i).
——— HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 4317 (ii).
PROSSER, WM., FISHERY OVERSEER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Allan*) 3114 (ii).
PROTECTION VESSELS: in Com. of Sup., 4319 (ii).
RICHELIEU RIVER, FISHING RIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 35 (i).
U.S. VESSELS IN HUDSON BAY, ALLEGED POACHING: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4262 (ii).
Fisheries Act further Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 107; 2°, 1655; Res. prop., 699; in Com., 1656; M. for Com. on B., 2173; in Com., 2216, 2230 (i).

Fisheries B. No. 9—*Continued.*
Deb. on M. for Com. (Mr. *Tupper*) 2173; (Mr. *McLean*) 2185; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2190; (Mr. *Kenny*) 2195; (Mr. *Welsh*) 2196; (Mr. *Perry*) 2197; (Mr. *Burns*) 2202; (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2204; (Mr. *Forbes*) 2206; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 2209; (Mr. *Bowers*) 2212; (Mr. *Yeo*) 2213; (Mr. *Flint*) 2216 (i).

Fisheries Dept. *See* "MARINE."

Fishing Vessels. *See* "SEA FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT."

Fishing Vessels, U.S. (*Modus Vivendi*) **B. No. 11** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 109; 2°, 176; in Com., 1472, 1639; 3°*, 1789 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 3.)

FLOUR (CAN.) TRADE AND NEWFOUNDLAND: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Hughes*) 112 (i).

FORBES, FRANCIS G., MEMBER FOR QUEEN'S, N.S.: Introduced, 97 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 916 (i).

FRASER, MISS H. AND MR. RODERICK: in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).

FRONTENAC ELECTION, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3116 (ii).

——— WRIT ISSUED (Mr. *Speaker*) 3055 (ii).

GALOPS RAPIDS SURVEY, DEEPENING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).

——— SURVEYS, PLANS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Reid*) 130 (i).

GAMBLE & FLETCHER, COR. *re* PUB. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Prior*) 1550 (i).

GAS AND ELECTRIC LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 4242 (ii).

GAUDET, BENJ., WARFINGER AT TIGNISH: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 98 (i).

GEAR AND TACKLE INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 224 (i).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 3896; 2° m., 4135; 2°, 4143; in Com., 4482; 3°*, 4506 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 23.)

GEOLOGICAL REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 2172 (i).

Geological Survey Dept. Act Amt. B. No. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°*, 578; 2°*, 1648; in Com., 1654; 3°*, 1789 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 16.)

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 4386 (ii).

GEORGIAN BAY SURVEY: conc., 4470 (ii).

GERMAN TREATY, PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *O'Brien*) 109 (i).

"GERRYMANDER." *See* "REPRESENTATION."

GIBSON, WILLIAM, ESQ., MEMBER FOR LINCOLN AND NIAGARA: Introduced, 3 (i).

GILLIES, JOSEPH A., ESQ., MEMBER FOR RICHMOND, N.S.: Introduced, 3 (i).

GIROUARD, JOSEPH, ESQ., MEMBER FOR TWO MOUNTAINS: Introduced, 106 (i).

GLAZIERS' DIAMONDS. *See* "DODS, P. D."

GLENGARRY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.

"Globe" Printing Co's. B. No. 31 (Mr. *Innes*). 1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com., 1229; 3°*, 1230 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 75.)

"GLOBE." *See* "ELECTION EXPENSES."

GODERICH AND WINGHAM RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4572 (ii).

GOVT. BUSINESS, ADJOURNMENT: Change of Time, M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 4697 (ii).

——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to take in Mondays, 3564 (ii).

——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Wednesdays, 2490.

——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Thursdays, 699 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 4259, 4714 (ii).

GOVT. CONTRACTS SINCE CONFDN.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 99; wthdn., 110 (i).

——— SINCE 30TH JUNE, 1887, TO 30TH JUNE, 1891: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McDonald, Huron*) 110 (i).

GOVT. OF N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

GOVT. RYS., ADDITIONAL PROPERTY ACCOMMODATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1984 (i).

——— NAMES, &C., EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 41, 692 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S BODY GUARD, AFFIDAVITS *re* PAY-LIST: read (Mr. *Somerville*) 1189 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Daly*) 1212; (Mr. *Hazen*) 1214; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1215, 1329; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1216, 1329; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1217; (Mr. *Bowell*) 1219; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1222; (Mr. *Denison*) 1319; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1323; (Mr. *Somerville*) 1324, 1339; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1330; (Mr. *Casey*) 1332; (Mr. *Bowell*) 1333; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1335; (Mr. *Davin*) 1338 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S WARRANTS: Stmnt. presented (Mr. *Foster*) 34 (i).

——— M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 50 (i).

——— REPS. OF MINISTERS AND O. C.'S: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 111 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 255, 284 (i).

GRAIN SHIPMENTS *viâ* NEW YORK: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 291 (i).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Can. B. No. 14 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 695 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 39.)

GRANITE, EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: Ques. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 509 (i).

Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 60. (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1031; 2°*, 1181 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2594 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 40.)

GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO., ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 915 (i).

GREAT VILLAGE RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 4251 (ii).

GRIEVE, JAMES NICOL, ESQ., MEMBER FOR NORTH PERTH: Introduced, 3183 (ii).

GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2025, 2033 (i), 2801 (ii).

GROUNDS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4240 (ii).

GUILLET, GEO., ESQ., MEMBER FOR WEST NORTHUMBERLAND: Introduced, 454 (i).

GUINDON, MRS. N., SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 4450 (ii).

GUYSBOROUGH CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

HALDIMAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

HALIFAX, &C., AND WEST INDIES, &C., STEAM COM.: in Com of Sup., 4282; conc., 4469 (ii).

HALIFAX AND ST. JOHN *vid* YARMOUTH, STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup., 4304 (ii).
——— CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
——— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4441 (ii).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i), 2362, 2509 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).
——— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2032 (i).
HALL'S HARBOUR (N. S.) WORKS, EXAMINATION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1715 (i).
HALTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
HAMMOND, E., SEIZURES AND SHARE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2782 (ii).
HARAS NATIONAL CO.: in Com. of Sup. 1465 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i), 4240, 4448; conc., 4477 (ii).
Harbour Commissioners. *See* "ST. JOHN;" "THREE RIVERS."
Harrison, Hattie A. *See* "DIVORCE."
HASTINGS, E., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep. 1 (i).
HATCHERIES, ST. MARY'S BAY, N. S.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
HEARN, JOHN, ESQ., MEMBER FOR QUEBEC WEST: Introduced, 508 (i).
HEATING PUB. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4241; conc., 4477 (ii).
HEELEY'S FALLS DAM, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 2263 (ii).
HENDERSON, DAVID, ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALTON: Introduced, 3 (i).
HENRY, K. J.: Ref. to, in Com. of Sup., 844 (i).
HEREFORD RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397 (ii).
High River, &c., Irrigation and Water Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 23 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)
HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 275, 282, 896; conc., 1085 (i).
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Carling*) 1062 (i).
HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: prop. Res. (Mr. *Devlin*) 3335; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3361 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Devlin*) 3815 (ii).
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
ADJOURNMENT: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 2730 (ii).
——— *See* general heading.
ADDRESS IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Northrup*) 7; seconded (Mr. *Bain, Soulanges*) 18 (i).
——— His Ex.'s Reply, 129 (i).
BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 1286 (i), 2370, 4733 (ii).
BYE-ELECTIONS, ISSUE OF WRITS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1491 (i).
CARON, SIR ADOLPHE, CHARGES AGAINST. *See* general heading.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY ELECTION, JUDGES' REP.: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 3733 (ii).
——— EVIDENCE: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 3896 (ii).
CHARGES AGAINST A MEMBER: Ques. checked (Mr. *Speaker*) 4499 (ii).
HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Continued.*
COMMITTEES. *See* general heading.
——— SESSIONAL CLERKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).
CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 134 (i).
——— JUDGES' REPS., 1, 39, 96, 1062, 1152, 1391 (i), 2461, 2714, 2971, 2979, 3681, 4731 (ii).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL. *See* general heading.
ELECTION EXPENSES, PUBLICATIONS IN TORONTO "GLOBE": Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3734-3751 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup.: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4348 (ii).
FRANCHISE ACT, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 916 (i).
FRONTENAC ELECTION, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3116 (ii).
GOVT. BUSINESS, ADJOURNMENT, CHANGE OF TIME: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 4697 (ii).
——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to take in Wednesdays, 2490 (ii).
——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Thursdays, 699 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 4259, 4714 (ii).
——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Mondays, 3564 (ii).
IN COM. OF SUP.: 762, 974; conc., 1086 (i), 4205 (ii).
LENNOX CO. ELECTORAL LISTS, ORIGINAL, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 159.
L'ASSOMPTION AND PONTIAC, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2700 (ii).
LIBRARY OF PARLT., 1ST REP. OF COM.: conc., M. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2826 (ii).
——— PURCHASE OF BOOKS: in Com. of Sup., 792 (i).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 789 (i).
LONDON ELECTION. *See* general heading.
MACKENZIE, HON. ALEX., DECEASE: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to adjn. House, 1388 (i).
MEMBERS' INDEMNITY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4715 (ii). *See* B. (No. 104).
——— INTRODUCED, 3, 71, 97, 454, 508, 1364, 1391 (i), 2700, 2918, 3183, 3815, 4715 (ii).
——— RESIGNATION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 4393.
NEW MEMBERS, RETURN: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3, 6, 40, 453, 1364, 1391 (i), 2431, 2917, 3183, 3649, 3815, 4717 (ii).
ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c. *See* general heading.
PARLIAMENT, 7TH, 2ND SESSION: Opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 4736 (ii).
PERTH, NORTH, ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1639 (i).
PONTIAC ELECTION, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2980, 3115 (ii).
PRINTING, PAPER AND BINDING: in Com. of Sup., 794, 976 (i).
PRIVATE BILLS. *See* general heading.
PROROGATION: Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Acting Sec., 4731 (ii).
RICHMOND CONTROVERTED ELECTION, PETITIONS AND DECISIONS: M. for copy (Mr. *Gillies*) 1553 (i).
SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 762 (i).
SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. *See* "Committees."
SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, DEPUTY, APPMNT.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 749 (i).
——— ESTIMATE: in Com. of Sup., 789 (i).
SESSIONAL CLERKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
——— MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, CHANGE OF TIME: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3897 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Continued.*
SPEAKER, DEPUTY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 974 (i).
SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE: Opening, 4 (i); Prorogation, 4733 (ii).
VACANCIES: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i), 3055, 4393 (ii).
VOTERS' LIST, PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 976; conc., 1086 (i).
WARRANTS AND WRITS OF ELECTION, INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 100 (i).
WELLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION. *See* general heading.
WRITS FOR ELECTIONS, ISSUE: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3115 (ii).
—— DELAY: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1089.
—— BYE-ELECTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3186 (ii).
—— EAST YORK, ISSUE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1547 (i).
—— FRONTENAC, VACANCY AND ISSUE: (Mr. *Speaker*) 3055 (ii).
—— MARQUETTE, VACANCY AND ISSUE: (Mr. *Speaker*) 4393 (ii).
[*See* "ORDER, PRIVILEGE; "REPRESENTATION."]
HUGHES, SAM., ESQ., MEMBER FOR NORTH VICTORIA: Introduced, 3 (i).
HULL P. O., SUNDAY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 3184 (ii).
HURON, W., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
IMMIGRATION:
AGENTS' SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4431 (ii).
CANADIAN AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1491 (i); conc., 4467 (ii.)
DEPUTY MINISTER, LETTER *re* PAMPHLETS: in Com. of Sup., Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1947 (i).
"DOM. ILLUSTRATED," COPIES PURCHASED: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 397 (i).
EUROPEAN AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1828 (i).
EXPENSES ($150,000): in Com. of Sup., 1889 (i); conc., 4210 (ii).
FABRE, MR., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4424 (ii).
HETT'S GERMAN PAMPHLET: in Com. of Sup., 2008.
HIGH COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Presented (Mr. *Carling*) 1062 (i).
—— RATES, TAXES, INSURANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 896; conc., 1085 (i).
IN COM. OF SUP.: 1491, 1828, 1889, 2008 (i); conc., 4210, 4467 (ii).
IMMIGRATION AGENTS' SALARIES:
Deb. in Com. of Sup. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1491, 1540; (Mr. *Carling*) 1492, 1547, 1828, 1853, 1896, 1909, 1928, 1937, 2009; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1495, 1830; (Mr. *Foster*) 1499; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1502; (Mr. *Edgar*) 1502; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1502, 1895; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1503, 1850, 1934, 2017; Mr. *Mulock*) 1506, 2020; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1510, 1828, 1908, 1932; (Mr. *Casey*) 1514, 1830; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1517, 1896; (Mr. *Cameron*) 1521, 1532, 1543, 1919; (Mr. *Perry*) 1524, 1832; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1526, 1836, 1909; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1536; (Mr. *Bowell*) 1538, 1912, 2014, 2023; (Mr. *Gibson*) 1829, 1837; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1837, 1910, 1945; (Mr. *Watson*) 1838, 1929, 1943; (Mr. *Somerville*) 1839, 1905, 2011, 2024; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1842; (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1846; (Mr. *Daly*) 1853, 1938; (Mr. *Flint*) 1889, 1915; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1891; (Mr. *Borden*) 1893; (Mr. *Lister*) 1905, 2013; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1924, 1943; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1936; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1941; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2025 (i).
[*See* "AGRICULTURE," &c.]
Immigration. *See* "CHINESE."
Immoral and Criminal. *See* "OBSCENE."
IMPORTS OF ARTIFICIAL FERTILIZERS, QUANTITIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 526 (i).
—— BINDING TWINE, QUANTITY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 537 (i).
—— CRUDE COTTON-SEED OIL FOR 1891: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McKay*) 1555 (i).
—— PORK FROM U. S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 292 (i).
—— MEAT AND FARM PRODUCTS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Hughes*) 291 (i).
INCOMES OF THE PEOPLE: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 456 (i).
INDIANS:
B. C. INDIANS, PROCLAMATION OF 1892: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 289 (i).
CHISHOLM, D., LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 4479 (ii).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 112 (i).
IN COM. OF SUP.: 4408, 4460; conc., 4479 (ii).
MANAGEMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4408 (ii).
RESERVES, B. C., NUMBER, LOCATION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barnard*) 511 (i).
INGRAM, A. B., ESQ., MEMBER FOR EAST ELGIN: Introduced, 36 (i).
—— W. H., APPMNT. AS COL. OF CUSTOMS, ST. THOMAS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casey*) 1998 (i).
INLAND REVENUE:
INLAND REVENUE ACT, PROCEDURE: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 1648 (i).
—— DETECTIVE SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2639 (ii).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 751 (i).
DUTY-PAY, EXCISE OFFICERS: in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i).
IN COM. OF SUP.: 1014 (i), 4430 (ii).
TOBACCO: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4685 (ii).
—— LAW *re* MANUFACTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 750 (i).
—— STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Inland Revenue further Act Amt. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 1469; 2° objected to, 1648; 2° and in Com., 2007; 3°*, 2172 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 22.)
Inspection. *See* "BOILER;" "STEAMBOAT."
INSPECTORS OF PORTS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 821 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr *White, Cardwell*). 1°, 40; 2°, 456 (i).
INTELLIGRNCE BUREAU, DAILY REPS.: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
ACCIDENT AT NEW GLASGOW: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 3088 (ii).
—— ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Carroll*) 292 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Continued.*
ACCIDENT AT TRURO, REPS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Patterson, Colchester*) 969 (i).
ARCHIBALD, H. D., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Patterson, Colchester*) 969 (i).
ARRANGEMENTS WITH C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 667 (i).
DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYÉS, O. C.'s: M. for copies (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 293 (i).
DISPOSAL TO A COMPANY: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3055.
DRAKE, ALFRED, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2490.
EMPLOYÉS, ALL GRADES, NUMBER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 969 (i).
EXPEND. UNDER INCOME FOR PERMANENT IMPROVEMENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) 1371 (i).
EXPROPRIATION OF PROPERTY AT ST. JOHN: Ques. Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1031 (i).
HALIFAX, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i), 2362, 2509, 2628 (ii).
LIVE STOCK TARIFF: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 1365 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 2285.
PASSENGER CARS AND C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 399 (i).
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3896 (ii).
——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 41 (i), 4393 (ii).
RUNNING PRIVILEGES GRANTED C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 510 (i).
ST. JOHN, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 988 (i), 2563 (ii).
SHIPMENT OF HAY: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 4643 (ii).
STATIONERY SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1032.
TRAFFIC, &c., MULGRAVE STATION: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Fraser*) 35 (i).
——— QUINN, MICHAEL, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Guay*) 491 (i), 3332 (ii).
[*See* "RAILWAYS;" "SUBSIDIES;" "SUPPLY."]

I. C. RY., STATEMENT, EXPENSES:
Deb. in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2362, 2380, 2516, 2524, 2563; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2368, 2517; (Mr. *Perry*) 2373, 2613; (Mr. *McAlister*) 2377; (Mr. *Kenny*) 2382; (Mr. *Borden*) 2389; (Mr. *Hazen*) 2394, 2418, 2581; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2396; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2398; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 2405; (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) 2410; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2427, 2559; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2509, 2517, 2616; (Mr. *Welsh*) 2513; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2521; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 2527; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2530, 2564, 2586, 2594, 2615; (Mr. *Gillies*) 2537; (Mr. *Devlin*) 2542; (Mr. *Forbes*) 2543; (Mr. *Weldon*) 2547; (Mr. *Dickey*) 2548; (Mr. *Flint*) 2552, 2600; (Mr. *Stairs*) 2557; (Mr. *Bowell*) 2564, 2569, 2606, 2616; (Mr. *McLeod*) 2572, 2587, 2597, 2605; (Sir *John Thompson*) 2594; (Mr. *Temple*) 2596; (Mr. *Adams*) 2598, 2611; (Mr. *Bowers*) 2599; (Mr. *Lister*) 2604 (ii).

INTERIOR:
INTERIOR DEPT., CHIEF CLERK'S SALARY: conc. in (Y. 34, N. 47) 4472 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 257, 825, 844, 1154; con., 1084 (i), 4266, 4432; conc., 4472 (ii).
BANFF SPRINGS SURVEY, &c., in Com. of Sup., 4428.
BURGESS, A. M.: Ref. in Com. of Sup., 825 (i).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3300 (ii).
HENRY, J. K.: Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 844 (i).
PEREIRA, L. C.: Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 844, 849-876.
——— SALARY: Res. conc. in (Y. 86, N. 61) 1084 (i).

INTERIOR—*Continued.*
RHEAUME, ANTOINE, LAND GRANT FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2490 (ii).
TURNER, H. H.: Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 844 (i).
WHITE PINE AREAS: prop. M. for Map (Mr. *Ives*) 217.
[*See* "MOUNTED POLICE."]
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., 71 (i).
INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i); 4463 (ii).
——— EDUCATION ASSOCIATION: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4519 (ii).
JAMAICA EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
JEANNOTTE, HORMIDAS, ESQ., MEMBER FOR L'ASSOMPTION: Introduced, 3815 (ii).
JOLIETTE AND ST. JEAN MATHA RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4574.
JUDICIARY OF THE PROVINCE OF QUE., REORGANIZATION: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2639 (ii).
JUKES, DR. A., MEDICAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1003 (i).
JUSTICE:
ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 310, 971; conc., 1085 (i).
ADMIRALTY COURT, QUE., REGISTRAR: in Com. of Sup., 313 (i).
ALIEN LABOUR LAW, U.S. PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *Langelier*) 1548 (i).
ARBITRATION *re* PROVINCIAL ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 4430, 4470; conc., 4470 (ii).
BARRETT *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, SUPREME COURT JUDG'T: M. for copy (Mr. *LaRivière*) 158 (i).
——— *See* "LOGAN."
BEHRING'S SEA ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 4460; conc., 4478 (ii).
——— SEAL FISHERIES, PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 36 (i).
BULMER *vs.* THE QUEEN, LITIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4461 (ii).
COST OF LITIGATED MATTERS: in Com. of Sup., 4426.
CROWN PROSECUTIONS AND SUITS: prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1283 (i).
CIRCUIT ALLOWANCES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 311 (i).
EXCHEQUER COURT, EDITING REPORTS: in Com. of Sup., 313, 971 (i).
JUDGES ACTING ON COMMISSIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 37 (i).
JUDGES IN PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 3115 (ii).
JUDGES' SALARIES, INCREASE: prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1392 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 4693 (ii).
JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 913 (i).
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4393 (ii).
LOGAN *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, PLEADINGS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Watson*) 2287 (i).
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE, GOV. GEN.'S WARRANT: in Com. of Sup., 972; conc., 1085 (i).
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1085.
PAIGE, W. W., REPAYMENT OF COSTS: in Com. of Sup. 1014 (i).
PRIVY COUNCIL, COMPLAINTS TO: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1947 (i).
REFUND, SUNDRY PERSONS: in Com. of Sup., 4462 (ii).

JUSTICE—*Continued.*
SUPREME COURT, REPORTER AND LIBRARIAN: in Com. of Sup., 312 (i).
TRAVELLING EXPENSES, JUDGES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 310 (i).
WILSON, CONVICT EDWARD, PETS., &C., FOR RELEASE: M. for copies (Mr. *Armstrong*) 2642 (ii).
[*See* "PENITENTIARIES;" "SUPPLY."]
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, TURNING BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 2619 (ii).
KAMOURASKA WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, ACCTS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Carroll*) 510 (i).
KENT (ONT.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
KENTVILLE (N.S.) APPMNT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1088 (i).
——— SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 3752 (ii).
KENNY, THOMAS E., ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALIFAX: Introduced, 161 (i).
KEROSENE OIL, IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3059 (ii).
KING'S (N.S.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
Kingston Belt Line Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 52 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915 (i).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, CERTIFICATE *re* $32,000 PAID BANCROFT & CONNOLLY: M. for copy (Mr. *Gibson*) 2006 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 2715 (ii).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
KINGSTON, NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4545 (ii).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4523.
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4393 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 664 (i); conc., 4205; suppl., 4433, 4440 (ii).
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4535 (ii).
Labour Prohibition. *See* "ALIEN."
LABRADOR, ALLEGED DISTRESS, RELIEF: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4263 (ii).
LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1017, 2049; conc., 4212 (ii).
——— NEW BRIDGE AT MONTREAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 524 (i).
LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4580.
Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. No. 37 (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*). 1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
LAKE ST. JOHN AND CHICOUTIMI RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 1549 (i).
LAKE ST. JOHN RY., TRAFFIC EARNINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4261 (ii).
LAKE ST. LOUIS: in Com. of Sup., 2050 (i).
LAKE ST. PETER, FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2955 (ii).
LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONIZATION CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4550.
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4571.
LAMOUREAUX'S BROS'. CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 2259.
Lands, Conveyance. *See* "ORDNANCE."
Land Grants to Militia (provision) B. No. 96 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°*, 4201; 2° and in Com., 4264; 3°, 4399 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2269 (i).
LAND OFFICE AT EDMONTON, REMOVAL: Despatch respecting, 4392 (ii).
LAND SALES IN QUEBEC CITY: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 1089 (i).
LANDS SOLD, GRANTED OR LEASED IN MAN. AND N. W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Edgar*) 241 (i).
LAPRAIRIE, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 3681 (ii).
——— P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 2802, 2845 (ii).
LAVALLIÈRE BAY, DREDGING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2457 (ii).
LAROUCHE AND GAGNÉ'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 4456 (ii).
L'ASSOMPTION, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 2714 (ii).
LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 752, 974 (i).
LENNOX CO. ELECTORAL LISTS, ORIGINAL, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 159 (i).
——— laid on Table, 287 (i).
——— CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
LEPAGE, J. B., EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1392 (i).
LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 190 (i).
LETHBRIDGE CUSTOM HOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2938 (ii).
LÉVIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 112 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 789, 976 (i).
——— 1ST REP. OF COM.: conc. (M.) 2826 (ii).
LIEUT. GOVERNORS' COMMISSION: M. for copy (Mr. *Laurier*) 2268 (i).
——— COMMISSIONS, INSTRUCTIONS: Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 2268 (i).
——— ASSENT: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2238 (i), 2491, 2547, 2957, 3089 (ii).
LIEUT. GOVERNOR (N.B.): Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4732 (ii).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4305 (ii).
LINCOLN AND NIAGARA, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (revival) B. No. 45 (Mr. *Fairbairn*). 1°*, 578; 2°*, 696; in Com., 1228; 3°*, 1229 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4591 (ii).
L'ISLET, APPMNT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750 (i).

L'ISLET CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
LITIGATED MATTERS, COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 4426.
LIVE STOCK RATES ON I. C. R.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 2286 (i).
LOANS, GOVT., SHORT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 137 (i).
LOBSTERS AND WHITE FISH FOR B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 751 (i).
LOBSTER FISHERIES, ON ADJNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 160 (i).
——— *See* "FISHERIES" B. 9.
LOBSTER HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 4317 (ii).
LOGAN *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, PLEADINGS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Watson*) 2287 (i).
LOISELLE, B., POSTMASTER, STE. ANGÈLE, DISMISSAL, PETS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Brodeur*) 100 (i).
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. *Moncrieff*). 1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
LONDON ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
——— ELLIOTT, JUDGE, CHARGES AGAINST, HOBBS', &C., PET.: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 665 (i).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 823; M., 1719; neg. (Y. 50, N. 93) 2361; Deb. rsmd., 2305 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 52 (i).
——— ORIGINAL VOTERS' LISTS: laid on Table (Mr. *Speaker*) 72 (i).
——— PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 1089 (i).
——— QUES. OF PRIV., ORIGINAL VOTERS' LISTS: M. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 37 (i).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Lister*) 245 (i).
——— RETURNS: Clerk of Crown in attendance, 287.
——— ELECTORAL VOTERS' LISTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Lister*) 292 (i).
LONGUEUIL WHARF, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1231 (i).
LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE AT WORLD'S EXHIBITION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1037 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. No. 2 (Mr. (*Charlton*). 1°*, 40; 2° m., 1062; 2°, 1083; in Com., 2293; Com. rose, 2305 (i); Ms. to recom., 2431, 3090; agreed to (Y. 77, N. 50) 3091; in Com., 3363 (ii).
LOTBINIÈRE AND MEGANTIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395 (ii).
LOTBINIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ans. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4585 (ii).
LOWELL, JAMES A., ESQ., MEMBER FOR WELLAND: Introduced, 2700 (ii).
LUNENBURG POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2768 (ii).
MACDONALD BROS., SERVICES AT WRECK: in Com. of Sup., 4460 (ii).
MACDONALD, SIR JOHN, MONUMENT TO MEMORY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 917 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4458 (ii).
MACKENZIE, HON. ALEX., DECEASE: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to adjn. Hse., 1388 (i).
MACLEAN, WM. F., ESQ., MEMBER FOR EAST YORK: Introduced, 2918 (ii).
McCARTHY, MESSRS., LEASE OF LAND AT SOREL: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3184 (ii).
McDONALD, JOHN A., ESQ., MEMBER FOR VICTORIA N.S.: Introduced 6 (i).
McINTYRE, DISMISSAL, &C., OF POSTMASTER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1985 (i).
McKay Milling Co.'s incorp. B. No. 15 (Mr. *Robillard*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 855 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
McLENNAN, JNO. A. AND PETER. *See* "COCKBURN ISLAND."
McLENNAN, RODERICK R., ESQ., MEMBER OF GLENGARRY: Introduced 6 (i).
McMILLAN, HUGH, ESQ., MEMBER FOR VAUDREUIL: Introduced 133 (i).
McQUEEN AND DAVIE, MESSRS. *See* "BRITISH;" "TENANT FARMERS."
MARINE:
"ALERT" STR., ENQUIRY *re* ACCIDENT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750, 917 (i).
"BAYFIELD," STR., SUPPLIES, ENQUIRY: in Com. of Sup. 4461 (ii).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 913 (i).
GEAR AND TACKLE INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 224 (i).
MACDONALD BROS., SERVICES AT WRECK: in Com. of Sup., 4460 (ii).
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS, LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4305 (ii).
MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 270 (i), 4432 (ii).
MARINE HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 4310 (ii).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup. 4309 (ii).
"QUADRA," STR., ENQUIRY *re* ACCIDENT: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 3331 (ii).
"RIMOUSKI," STR., CHANGE OF ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3183 (ii).
SICK MARINERS' DUES, CIRCULAR ISSUED: M. for copy* (Mr. *Laurier*) 159 (i).
TIDAL OBSERVATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4305 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Dept. Amalg. B. No. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 109; 2° and in Com., 181; 3°*, 249 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
MAP OF DOM. *re* POLLING RETURNS AT G. E.: M. for copy (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 112 (i).
MARSHALL, JOS. H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR EAST MIDDLESEX: Introduced, 36 (i).
MANITOBA:
BARRETT *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, LEGAL EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 2068 (ii).
BRANDON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 2936.
LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2269 (i).
LANDS SOLD, GRANTED OR LEASED IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Edgar*) 241 (i).
LOGAN *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, PLEADINGS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Watson*) 2287 (ii).
MAN. SCHOOL ACT, LEGAL EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 2068 (i).
"MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE," SUPREME COURT JUDG'T.: M. for copy (Mr. *LaRivière*) 158 (i).
PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 744, 973 (i).
Man. and Assiniboia Grand Junction Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 88 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 183; 2°*, 3321; in Com. and 3°*, 3511 (ii). 55-56 *Vic.*, c. 44.)

Man. and North-Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 80 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 2006 ; 2°*, 2093 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2638 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 45.)

Man. and South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 35 (Mr. *LaRivière*). 1°*, 245 ; 2°*, 289 ; in Com. and 3°*, 696 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 46.)

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396 ; in Com., 4541.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS, STEAM COM. : in Com. of Sup., 4277 (ii).

MAIL CONDUCTORS SUPERANNUATED : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2699 (ii).

MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4470 (ii).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4277 ; conc., 4469 (ii).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED :

BAIN, JAS. WM., Esq., Soulanges, 3 (i).
BENNETT, WM. H., Esq., East Simcoe, 129 (i).
BORDEN, W. W., Esq., King's, N.S., 36 (i).
BOWERS, CHAS. ED., Esq., Digby, 7 (i).
BOYLE, ARTHUR, Esq., Monck, 454 (i).
BRUNEAU, ARTHUR AIMÉ, Esq., Richelieu, 3 (i).
BRYSON, JOHN, Esq., Pontiac, 4715 (ii).
CARGILL, HENRY, Esq., East Bruce, 36 (i).
CARLING, HON. JOHN, London, 161 (i).
COULTER, N. R., Esq., Carleton, N.B., 1391 (i).
DICKEY, ARTHUR R., Esq., Cumberland, 6 (i).
DUGAS, LOUIS E., Esq., Montcalm, 161 (i).
DYER, EUGÈNE A., Esq., Brome, 161 (i).
FAIRBAIRN, CHAS., Esq., South Victoria, 3 (i).
FEATHERSTON, JOS., Esq., Peel, 3 (i).
FORBES, FRANCIS G., Esq., Queen's, N.S., 97 (i).
GIBSON, WILLIAM, Esq., Lincoln and Niagara, 3 (i).
GILLIES, JOSEPH N., Esq., Richmond, N.S., 3 (i).
GIROUARD, JOSEPH, Esq., Two Mountains, 106 (i).
GRIEVE, JAMES NICOL, Esq., North Perth, 3183 (ii).
GUILLET, GEO., West Northumberland, 454 (i).
HEARN, JOHN, Esq., West Quebec, 508 (i).
HENDERSON, DAVID, Esq., Halton 3 (i).
HUGHES, SAMUEL, Esq., North Victoria, 3 (i).
INGRAM, A. B., Esq., East Elgin, 36 (i).
JEANNOTTE, HORMIDAS, Esq., L'Assomption, 3815 (ii).
KENNY, THOMAS E., Esq., Halifax, 161 (i).
LOWELL, JAMES A., Esq., Welland, 2700 (ii).
MACLEAN, WM. F., Esq., East York, 2918 (ii).
MCDONALD, JOHN A., Esq., Victoria, N.S., 6 (i).
MCLENNAN, RODERICK R., Esq., Glengarry, 6 (i).
MCMILLAN, HUGH, Esq., Vaudreuil, 133 (i).
MARSHALL, JOS. H., Esq., East Middlesex, 3 (i).
METCALFE, JAS. H., Esq., Kingston, 3 (i).
MILLER, ARCH. C., Esq., Prince Edward, 3 (i).
NORTHRUP, WM. B., Esq., East Hastings, 3 (i).
OUIMET, HON. JOSEPH A., Esq., Laval, 3 (i).
PATTERSON, HON. JAMES C., West Huron, 161 (i).
PRIDHAM, WM., Esq., South Perth, 508 (i).
PROULX, ISIDORE, Esq., Prescott, 1364 (i).
ROSAMOND, BENNETT, Esq., North Lanark, 3 (i).
SMITH, WM., Esq., South Ontario, 40 (i).
STAIRS, JOHN FITZ-WILLIAM, Esq., Halifax, 71 (i).
TURCOTTE, A. J., Esq., Montmorency, 188 (i).
WILSON, URIAH, Esq., Lennox, 3 (i).

MEMBERS' RESIGNATION : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1547 (i), 4393 (ii).

MENNONITES, ENUMERATION IN CENSUS : Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4263 (ii).

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY :

ATLANTIC COAST FISHERIES, PAPERS, &C. : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 1088 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE, COMMISSIONERS' REP. : Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 2917 (ii)
DUKE OF CLARENCE AND AVONDALE, REPLY TO ADDRESS OF CONDOLENCE : Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 1393, 2170 (i).
ESTIMATES, THE, 1892-93 : Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 138.
—— SUPPL., 1891-92 : Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 822 (i)
—— SUPPL., 1892-93 : Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4265 (ii).
FAVOURED NATION CLAUSES, &C., GERMAN ZOLLVEREIN, &C., TERMINATION, &C. : Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 1470 (i).
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION : Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 71 (i).
NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 2461, 2917 (ii).
—— RECOGNITION OF LICENSES : Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 245 (i).
PACIFIC AND ATLANTIC COASTS FISHERIES : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 667 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, HIS EX.'S REPLY : Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 129 (i).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE U. S., PAPERS, &C. : Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 216 (i).

METCALFE, J. H., MEMBER FOR KINGSTOO : Introduced, 3 (i).

METEGHAN COVE PIER : in Com. of Sup., 4448 (ii).

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4309 (ii).

Midland Ry. of Can. B. No. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 3300 ; 2°*, 3363 ; in Com., 3771 ; 3°*, 3778 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 47.)

MIDDLESEX, E., W. AND N., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE :

"A," "B" AND "C" BATTERIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1419 (i).
ACTIVE MILITIA, DRILL, QUALIFIED OFFICERS, &C. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 667 (i).
AMMUNITION, MANUFACTURE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i) ; conc., 4209 (ii).
ARMOURIES AND CARE OF ARMS : in Com. of Sup., 1349 (i).
BRIGADE MAJORS : in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
CLAIMS *re* REBELLION N. W. T. (1885) : in Com. of Sup., 1017 ; conc., 1087 (i).
CLOTHING AND OVERCOATS : in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
CONTINGENCIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1363 (i)
DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).
DOM. ARTILLERY ASSOCIATION : in Com. of Sup., 1363 (i).
DRILL PAY AND INSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 1353 (i) ; conc., 4209 ; suppl., 4437 (ii).
DRILL SHEDS, &C., CARE AND MAINTENANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1373 (i).
FRASER, MISS H. AND MR. RODERICK, PENSIONS : in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).
MILITARY BRANCH AND DISTRICT STAFF : in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
—— BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii).
—— DISTRICT NO. 9, SUSPENSION OF OFFICERS : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3332 (ii).
—— STORES : in Com. of Sup., 1353 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE, DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE—*Continued.*
MILITIA, 69TH BATTALION ANNUAL CAMP: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 4500 (ii).
MONUMENTS, BATTLE FIELDS OF CAN.: conc., 4210.
MURRAY, LIEUT.-COL., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 3643 (ii).
PERMANENT FORCES: in Com. of Sup., 1415 (i).
RIFLED ORDNANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1363; conc., 4210 (ii).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 1375 (i).
TERRITORIAL ACCOUNT, REBELLION, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
VETERANS OF 1812: in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).
WORSLEY, LIEUT. COL., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 3643 (ii)
[*See* "GOV. GEN.'S BODY GUARD;" "SUPPLY."]
MILK CANS, INSPECTION UNDER ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 4262, 4647 (ii).
MILLER, ARCH. C., ESQ., MEMBER FOR PRINCE EDWARD: Introduced, 3 (i).
MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 40 (i).
——— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2431 (ii).
——— (LITTLE) BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 190.
MINISTERS' VISIT TO WASHINGTON, PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3239, 3398 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 333, 1228 (i).
——— *See* "WEST INDIES."
MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1002, 2264 (i), 4424, 4461 (ii).
MISCOUCHE (P.E.I.) STATION, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2563 (ii).
MISSISQUOI CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
"MODUS VIVENDI," G. B. AND U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4728 (ii).
MOLASSES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4678 (ii).
MONCK CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges's Rep., 1 (i).
MONFORT COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4515, 4580.
MONTCALM, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
MONTMAGNY, POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2638 (ii).
MONTMORENCY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4581 (ii).
MONTREAL AND LAKE MASKINONGÉ RY. CO., PET.: M. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2482 (ii).
Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Ry. Co.'s B. No. 87 (Mr. *Beausoleil*). 1°*, 2700; 2°*, 2795; in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 46.)
Montreal and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 82 (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*). 1°*, 2172; 2°*, 2256 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3321 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 49.)
Montreal Board of Trade B. No. 25 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)
MONTREAL CADETS. *See* "PRESENTATION FLAG."
Montreal Island Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 73 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 1636; 2°*, 1740 (i).
MONUMENTS, BATTLE FIELDS OF CAN.: conc., 4210 (ii).
MOOSOMIN STATION, C.P.R., TO CANNINGTON: in Com. of Sup., 4258 (ii).
MORTON DAIRY CO.'S CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 916 (i).
MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 4423, 4463 (ii).
——— REDUCTION OF FORCE: prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2668 (ii).
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4320 (ii).
MULGRAVE AND POINT TUPPER TRAIN FERRY: conc., 4475 (ii).
MULGRAVE STATION, I.C.R., TRAFFIC, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Fraser*) 35 (i).
MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (i).
MURRAY, LIEUT. COL., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 3643 (ii).
MUSKOKA AND PARRY SOUND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
NANAIMO TO COMOX TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 4259 (ii).
NAPIERVILLE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
NATIONALITY OF THE POPULATION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 824 (i).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. No. 55 (Mr. *Langelier*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 1061 (i); M. to ref. Rep. back to Banking and Commerce Com., 3556; neg. (Y. 53, N. 96) 3563 (ii).
NEW BRUNSWICK:
BIG FORTUNE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4448.
BUCTOUCHE AND MONCTON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4516 (ii).
CARLETON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 39, 1391 (i).
CHATHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2798 (ii).
DODWELL, C. E. W., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1715 (i).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 972.
KENTVILLE POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION; Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1088 (i), 3752 (ii).
LIEUT. GOVERNORSHIP, N.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4732 (ii).
MAITLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4448 (ii).
METEGHAN COVE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4448 (ii).
MULGRAVE AND POINT TUPPER TRAIN FERRY: conc., 4475 (ii).
PLAISTER ROCK ISLAND RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4514 (ii).
QUEEN'S CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 96 (i).
ST. JOHN CUSTOM HOUSE FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 988; conc., 1086 (i).
——— CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4441 (ii).
——— HARBOUR COMMISSION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4398, 4493 (ii). *See* B. (No. 99).
ST. JOHN TO ST. ROSALIE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525 (ii).
SHEET HARBOUR, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1032 (i).
———FEES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1032.

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Continued.*
STEWIACKE VALLEY AND MUSQUODOBOIT RY. (I.C.R.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4521 (ii).
WOODSTOCK PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3480 (ii).
NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADA, BONDING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 189 (i).
—— DISCRIMINATING TARIFF: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 454 (i).
—— ENFORCEMENT OF BAIT ACT: Mess. from His Ex., 2917 (ii).
—— EXPORTS CAN. PRODUCE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 113 (i).
—— FISHERIES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 159 (i).
—— FLOUR TRADE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Hughes*) 112.
—— IMPERIAL DESPATCHES: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 914, 1227 (i).
—— NEGOTIATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 825 (i), 2956 (ii).
—— PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 315, 508 (i).
—— PAPERS *re* LICENSES: Mess. from His Ex., 245.
—— PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1638 (i).
—— REGULATIONS *re* FISHING: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 134 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 3054 (ii).
—— COR.: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 98 (i).
—— BAIT ACT: Mess. from His. Ex., 2461 (ii).
NEW GLASGOW IRON COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4539 (ii).
Nelson and Fort Sheppard Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 189; 2°*, 275 (i).
Niagara Falls and Queenston Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54 (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 1061 (i).
Nicola Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 24 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 695 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 50.)
—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4521.
NICOLET RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4449 (ii).
—— CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 29 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 695 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 51.)
NIPISSING AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com. 4575 (ii).
NORFOLK, N. AND S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
NORTHRUP, WM. B., ESQ., MEMBER FOR EAST HASTINGS: Introduced, 3 (i).
NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 265.
NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES. *See* "GOVERNMENT."
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. No. 61 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°*, 1062 (i).
N.W.T. further Act Amt. B. No. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 217 (i); 2° m., 2461; neg. (Y. 33, N. 132) 2462; M. to recom., 2483 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:
ASSEMBLY, RES. AND MEMORIAL: M. for copies (Mr. *Davis*) 1551 (i).
CALGARY P.O., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2938, 2941 (ii).
COURT-HOUSE AND LOCK-UPS: in Com. of Sup., 2943.
DUAL LANGUAGES IN N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3062 (ii).
EDMONTON LAND OFFICE, REMOVAL: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 4043, 4392 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 2936; conc., 4467 (ii).
JUKES, DR. A., MEDICAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1003 (i).
LETHBRIDGE CUSTOM HOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2938 (ii).
MOOSOMIN STATION, C. P. R., TO CANNINGTON: in Com. of Sup., 4258 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE, REDUCTION OF FORCE: prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2668 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 265 (i).
OLD MAN'S RIVER, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 992.
REGINA COURT HOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2937.
—— GAOL: in Com. of Sup., 748, 973 (i).
SCHOOLS IN N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).
SETTLERS' GRIEVANCES, N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4407 (ii).
WALROND RANCH CO. AND SETTLERS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 223 (i).
—— EJECTED SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1946 (i).
—— SETTLERS' CLAIMS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 292 (i).
NOVA SCOTIA, SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 811 (i).
Nova Scotia Steel and Forge Co.'s B. No. 30 (Mr. *Fraser*). 1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 74.)

NOVA SCOTIA:
ANNAPOLIS AND ATLANTIC RY., &C., SUBSIDY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Forbes*) 688 (i).
BEAR RIVER RAILWAY BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
BIG TRACADIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4252.
CHURCH POINT WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
CUMBERLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
DARTMOUTH POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).
DIGBY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
GUYSBOROUGH CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
HALIFAX CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
—— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4441 (ii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).
HALL'S HARBOUR WORKS, EXAMINATION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1715 (i).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4519 (ii).
KING'S CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
LUNENBURG POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2768 (ii).
NEW GLASGOW IRON, COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4539.
ORDNANCE LANDS IN ANNAPOLIS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1364 (i).
POINT TUPPER AND SYDNEY MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2641 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Continued.*

QUEEN'S CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

RAQUETTE PIER, DIGBY, TIME FOR COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 4247 (ii).

RICHMOND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

ROUND HILL PIER DAM, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 2171 (i).

SANDFORD BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 398 (i).

SANDPOINT TO NEW GERMANY RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4542 (ii).

SHELBURNE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 4731 (ii).

SYDNEY AND LOUISBURG RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4534 (ii).

THREE SISTERS HARBOUR, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2489 (ii).

TRURO AND STEWIACKE TO NEWPORT, &c., RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525 (ii).

VICTORIA CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

WESTPORT HARBOUR, CAN BUOYS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 399 (i).

Oaths of Office. *See* "ADMINISTRATION."

Obscene Literature, &c., Suppression B. No. 21 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 133 (i); 2° m., 2457; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com. on B. (No. 7) 2461 (ii).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 992, 2033 (i), 4060; conc., 4475 (ii).

OLD MAN'S RIVER, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 992.

OLD RECORDS, CLASSIFICATION: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. *Bergin*). M. to introd., 666; 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 52.)

ONTARIO:

ADDINGTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

ALGOMA, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4535 (ii).

BOTHWELL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

BRACEBRIDGE AND BAYSVILLE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4575 (ii).

BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4539 (ii).

BRUCE, E. AND N., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

CHATHAM CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1391 (i).

CHIPPEWA SHOAL, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2254 (i).

COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4516 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4546.

COCKBURN ISLAND, LOCATION TICKET OF J. A. MC LENNAN: M. for copy (Mr. *Lister*) 1980 (i).

——— PETER MCLENNAN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Lister*) 2006 (i).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

CULVERT AT STROMNESS, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2253 (i).

ELGIN, E., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

ESSEX, S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

EUGENIA, DISMISSAL, &c., OF POSTMASTER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1985 (i).

FENELON FALLS, RY. BRIDGE, AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVT. AND G. T. R.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes*) 133 (i).

GLENGARRY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

GODERICH AND WINGHAM RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397: in Com., 4572 (ii).

HALDIMAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

HALTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.

HASTINGS, E., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

HURON, W., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, TURNING BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 2619 (ii).

KENT CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, CERTIFICATE *re* $32,000 PAID BANCROFT & CONNOLLY: M. for copy* (Mr. *Gibson*) 2006 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2715 (ii).

——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).

——— PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 664 (i); conc., 4205; suppl., 4433, 4440 (ii).

KINGSTON, NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4523 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4545.

KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4535 (ii).

LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4580 (ii).

LENNOX CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i)

LINCOLN AND NIAGARA CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4591 (ii).

LONDON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4541 (ii).

MCINTYRE, DISMISSAL, &c., OF POSTMASTER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1985 (i).

MIDDLESEX, E., W. AND N., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

MONCK CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

MUSKOKA AND PARRY SOUND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

NIPISSING AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4575 (ii).

NORFOLK, N. AND S., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

ONTARIO AND PACIFIC RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4580 (ii).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

ONTARIO, BELMONT AND NORTHERN RY. Co's SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4516 (ii).

ONTARIO, S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup, 2918 (ii).

OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. Co's SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4506 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4550 (ii).

OTTAWA POST OFFICE, &c., FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

OXFORD, S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION; Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

PEEL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

PERTH, N., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1152 (i).

PERTH, S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

PETERBOROUGH CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

PETROLIA PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2919.

PICTON P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4466; in Com., 4629 (ii).

PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 2253 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

PROSSER, WM., FISHERY OVERSEER, INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 2490 (ii).

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2954 (ii).

ST. CATHARINES AND CENTRAL RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4466 (ii).

ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4537 (ii).

SIMCOE, E., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

SMITH'S FALLS P. O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2929 (ii).

SYDENHAM RIVER FLOODS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4464, 4500 (ii).

THOUSAND ISLANDS RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4541 (ii).

TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4571 (ii).

VICTORIA, N. AND S., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

WATERLOO, N., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

WELLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1062 (i).

——— *See* general heading.

WELLINGTON, CENTRE AND N., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

WENTWORTH, N., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

WHITE PINE TIMBER, MAP OF AREAS: M. for copy (Mr. *Ives*) 293 (i).

WOODSTOCK AND CENTREVILLE RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4571 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396 (ii).

YORK, E. AND N., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:

ORDER:

CHARGES AGAINST A MEMBER: Asking Ques. containing newspaper articles reflecting on a Member, checked and ruled out of order as being improper (Mr. *Speaker*) 4499 (ii).

DIPLOMATIC PAPERS: Ministers' visit to Washington referred to by Mr. *Foster* in Budget Speech; Mr. *Mills* (*Bothwell*) raised a Ques. of Order, there being no official Rep. of negotiations before the House the same should not be discussed, 333. Ruled by Mr. *Speaker* that the Minister of Finance was in Order in referring to same, there being no Rule of Parlt. preventing him from making those statements, 334 (i).

ELLIOTT, JUDGE, CHARGES AGAINST: Mr. *Mulock's* reference to his speech *re* London Election impugning conduct of the Judge checked by Mr. *Speaker*, 69 (i); exception being taken by Sir *Richard Cartwright*, the Rule respecting the protection of Members and impeachment of Judges read, 70 (i).

HOBBS, S.T., AND OTHERS, PET.: M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) to forward same to Judge Elliott, objected to by Sir *John Thompson* and ruled out of Order, 823 (i).

INTERRUPTIONS BY MEMBERS: In Deb. on Representation B., on objection Mr. *Speaker* ruled "When a Member is speaking no Member shall interrupt, except to Order," 3615 (ii).

IRRELEVANCY OF DEBATE: In Com. of Sup., Members called to Order and requested by Mr. *Chairman* to confine themselves to the item before the Chair, 1499 (i), 2922, 2932, 3664 (ii).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: In Deb. on Representation B., the Member for North Victoria took exception to remarks made by the Member for North Wellington; explanation objected to by Mr. *Charlton*, the Member having already spoken. Rule read by Mr. *Speaker* and Member allowed to proceed on M. for adjmnt., 3542 (ii).

REPRESENTATION B.: On M. for 2°, Member requested by Mr. *Speaker* to confine himself to Question before the House, 3663; reference to a previous debate a violation of the Rules (Mr. *Speaker*) 3664 (ii).

PRIVILEGE:

CARON, SIR ADOLPHE, CHARGES AGAINST: M. (Mr. *Edgar*) with unanimous consent of the House to refer to Com. on Priv. and Elec., objected to by Sir *John Thompson* and sustained by Mr. *Speaker*; there being no question of urgency it cannot be taken out of its place on the Notice Paper, 1035 (i).

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S BODY GUARD; Affidavits *re* Pay-List; personal explanation (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1319 (i).

NORTH PERTH ELECTION: Reference having been made by the Member for Lambton to the Secretary of State's visit to that constituency, the same was denied by Mr. *Patterson* (*Huron*) 3055 (ii). Further discussion stopped by Mr. *Speaker*, there being no motion before the Chair; Member allowed to proceed on M. for adjmnt., 3056 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Continued.*
PRIVILEGE—*Continued.*
LONDON ELECTION: Mr. *Lister's* M. ordering Clerk of Crown to attend with certain papers, &c., respecting the London Election, as a Ques. of Priv. ruled by Mr. *Speaker* in Order; but M. calling for certain other papers ought to be moved when reached in its proper Order on Notice Paper, 246, 248; further ruling and authorities quoted, 287 (i).
OTTAWA TRADES AND LABOUR COUNCIL: Res. published in *Free Press* censuring the Member for South Norfolk brought to the attention of the House, and the language imputed to have been used therein repudiated by Mr. *Tisdale*, 2561 (ii).
PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. B.: Attention of House called by Mr. *Murray* to a paragraph in the Ottawa *Citizen* reflecting on him as a Member of the House, 2229 (i).
PROCEDURE:
DEBATES, OFFICIAL: on 2nd Rep. of Com., Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref. back to Com. if carried would supersede the M. for adoption (Mr. *Speaker*) 4598 (ii).
CANADIAN WHITE PINE: Mr. *Ives'* M. for map showing areas; Mr. *Speaker* stated that the Rules of the House should not be violated, even with unanimous consent, 217 (i).
ELLIOTT, JUDGE: Pet. of T. S. Hobbs and others impugning character. Mr. *Lister* moved its reception and reading; Mr. *Speaker* ruled that it not being a question of urgency the House would not be justified in passing it, 665. M. to print Pet. ruled out of Order, the same not having been received; reference should also be made to the Printing Committee for authority, 666 (i).
LIEUT. GOVERNOR'S INSTRUCTIONS: Presentation of Documents. Attention of House called by Mr. *Speaker* to the Rule respecting the same, 2268.
MOTIONS STANDING IN OTHER MEMBERS' NAMES: on Mr. *Macdonald* (*Huron*) moving for Mr. *Campbell* a motion in reference to Imports of Coal Oil, &c., Mr. *Speaker* drew attention to the Rule that no discussion can take place except with general consent of the House, 3059 (ii).
NOTICES OF MOTION: On Motion being allowed to stand at the request of the Govt., Mr. *Casey* called attention to the Rule which requires that Motions should be dropped unless gone on when called, 1550 (i).
N. W. T. ACT AMT. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*): on M. to restore to Order Paper for 2°, the 2° having been previously voted on and negatived, ruled by Mr. *Speaker* in Order; M. to withdraw M. objected to; Rule laid down by Bourinot relating to same read by Mr. *Speaker*, 2486 (ii).
ORDNANCE LANDS IN ANNAPOLIS; Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1364 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. No. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 129; in Com., 174; 1°*, 825; 2°*, 1491; in Com., 1639; 3°*, 1642 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).
OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4506 (ii).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4550 (ii).
Ottawa City Passenger Ry. Co.'s B. No. 16 (Mr. *Robillard*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134 (i); in Com., 2939; 3°*, 2940 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
OTTAWA DEPTL. BUILDINGS, HEATING: conc., 4477 (ii).
——— DRILL HALL, CONTRACT FOR ROOFING: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4601 (ii).
Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. Co.'s (revival) B. No. 77 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1946; 2°, 2093 (i).
OTTAWA POST OFFICE, &c., FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
——— RIVER DREDGING, COST, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 926 (i).
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 59 (Mr. *McMillan, Vaudreuil*). 1°*, 970; 2°*, 1062 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4230 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
Ottawa, Waddington and New York Ry. and Bridge (revival) B. No. 68 (Mr. *Ross, Dundas*). 1°*, 1364; 2°*, 1497; in Com. and 3°*, 3511 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
OUIMET, HON. JOSEPH A., MEMBER FOR LAVAL: Introduced, 3 (i).
OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4437; conc., 4475 (ii).
OXFORD, S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
PACIFIC AND ATLANTIC COAST FISHERIES: Mess. from His Ex., 667 (i).
PAIGE, W. W., REPAYMENT OF COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i).
PARLIAMENT, 7TH, 2ND SESSION: Opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 4736 (ii).
Patent Act Amt. B. No. 90 (Mr. *Carling*). 1°*, 3300; 2°, 3729; in Com., 4215 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
Patent Relief. *See* "WELSBACH, C. A. VON."
PATTERSON, HON. JAS. C., MEMBER FOR WEST HURON: Introduced, 161 (i).
PAYNE, J. L., PAYMENTS FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1548 (i).
PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).
PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 736, 972 (i), 4433; conc., 4205 (ii).
——— KINGSTON COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4393 (ii).
——— REP.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 397 (i).
PEREIRA, L. C.: Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 844, 849, 896.
——— SALARY: Item conc. in (Y. 86, N. 61) 1084 (i).
PERMANENT FORCES: in Com. of Sup., 1415 (i).
PERTH, N., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1152 (i).
——— ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1639.
PERTH, S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
PETERBOROUGH CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
PETROLEUM, CRUDE, REDUCTION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1946 (i).
PETROLIA PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2919.

PHILIPSBURG JUNCTION RY. AND QUARRY CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4592 (ii).

PICTON P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

PIERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO., P.E.I., GOVT. EXPEND.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 233 (i).

——— REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4252 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. No. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 108; 2°, 173; in Com., 970; 3°*, 1090 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 20.)

PINSONNEAULT, ALFRED, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 749 (i).

PLAISTER ROCK ISLAND RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4514 (ii).

POINT TUPPER AND SYDNEY MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2641 (ii).

POLICE. *See* "DOMINION" and "MOUNTED."

PONTIAC CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 2461 (ii).

——— ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3115 (ii).

——— COUNTY, RY. DEBT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Murray*) 1968 (i).

——— AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY, FURTHER SUBSIDY: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Murray*) 917 (i).

Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 63 (Mr. *Murray*). 1°*, 1153; 2°*, 1230; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 56.)

——— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4467; in Com., 4629 (ii).

POPULATION OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS: Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2700 (ii).

PORK. *See* "IMPORTS."

PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4466; in Com., 4629 (ii).

PORT HAWKESBURY QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2033 (i).

PORTS (QUARANTINE) UNORGANIZED: in Com. of Sup., 2049 (i).

POSTAL SERVICE (N.S.) IMPERFECT: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 4398 (ii).

POST OFFICE:

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1231.

——— SUNDAY TRAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3184.

CAP ST. IGNACE STATION, POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 223, 290, 751 (i).

——— P. O.*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1555 (i), 2667 (ii).

DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1364.

DES AULNETS P. O., MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750 (i).

DRUMMOND COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Léduc*) 289 (i).

HULL P. O., OPENING ON SUNDAY: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 3184 (ii).

LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 190 (i).

LOTBINIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ans. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4585 (ii).

MAIL CONDUCTORS SUPERANNUATED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2699 (ii).

MAIL SERVICE: conc., 4470 (ii).

POSTAL SERVICE (N.S.) IMPERFECT: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 4398 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Continued.*

STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 2954 (ii).

STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, PETS., &c. *re* DISMISSAL: M. for copies (Mr. *Brodeur*) 100 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4645 (ii).

ST. CÉSAIRE POSTMASTER, MONEY DEPOSITS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 400 (i).

SAN FRANCISCO AND VICTORIA MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4279 (ii).

SUMMERSTOWN (ONT.) POST OFFICE, RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1365 (i).

[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS;" "SUPPLY."]

POST OFFICES:

Deb. in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2743, 2768; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 2743, 2768, 2798, 2802, 2859, 2868, 2890, 2894; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2743, 2775; (Mr. *Stairs*) 2746; (Mr. *Flint*) 2747, 2770, 2845, 2890; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2748, 2881; (Mr. *Devlin*) 2749, 2816, 2892, 2899; (Mr. *Borden*) 2750, 2769, 2902; (Mr. *Bowers*) 2751, 2769; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2752, 2798, 2812; (Mr. *Lister*) 2756, 2772, 2870, 2894; (Mr. *Weldon*) 2759; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2759, 2810, 2871, 2890, 2896; (Mr. *Casey*) 2760, 2768, 2806, 2888, 2911; (Mr. *Bowell*) 2764, 2892; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 2770; (Mr. *Forbes*) 2773; (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) 2776, 2884; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2798, 2802, 2890, 2894, 2905; (Mr. *Scriver*) 2803; (Mr. *Somerville*) 2804; (Mr. *Monet*) 2806; (Mr. *Choquette*) 2803, 2853; (Mr. *Delisle*) 2814; (Mr. *Guay*) 2815; (Mr. *Langelier*) 2816; (Mr. *Foster*) 2818, 2895, 2905; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2820; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 2821; (Mr. *Taylor*) 2824; (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2824; (Mr. *Perry*) 2825; (Mr. *Leduc*) 2850; (Mr. *Pelletier*) 2851; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2856; (Mr. *Dupont*) 2857; (Mr. *Legris*) 2861; (Mr. *Allan*) 2862; (Mr. *Brown*) 2866; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2869, 2891, 2915; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 2876; (Mr. *Mc Millan, Huron*) 2877; (Mr. *Corby*) 2880; (Mr. *Gibson*) 2883; (Mr. *Rider*) 2893; (Mr. *Fairbairn*) 2898; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2902; (Mr. *Ingram*) 2912; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2913 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN: prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1555; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1623; neg. (Y. 64, N. 98) 1634; Res. agreed to (Y. 97, N. 63) 1635 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1555; (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) 1571; (Mr. *Hazen*) 1578; (Mr. *Skinner*) 1585; (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 1594; (Mr. *Watson*) 1600; (Mr. *Davin*) 1604; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1606; (Mr. *Foster*) 1608; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) Amt. 1623 (i).

Deb. on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1623; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1629; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 1632 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2492 (ii).

PRESENTATION FLAG, REMISSION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 509 (i).

PRIDHAM, WM., ESQ., MEMBER FOR S. PERTH: Introduced, 508 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

PRINCE (P. E. I.) CONTPOVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

P. E. I. RY., DISMISSED EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 2004 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

BREAKWATERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO., GOVT. EXPEND.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 233 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Continued.*
CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR, REP. *re* BLASTING: M. for copy (Mr. *Perry*) 2268 (i).
GAUDET, BENJ., WHARFINGER AT TIGNISH: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 98 (i).
LIEUT. GOV., P.E.I., Assent: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E.I.*) 2491, 2957 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2238 (i), 2547, 2957, 3089 (ii).
MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 40 (i).
—— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2431 (ii).
—— (LITTLE) BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 190 (i).
MISCOUCHE STATION, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2563 (ii).
PIERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO., GOVT. EXPEND.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 233 (i).
PRINCE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
P.E.I. RY., DISMISSED EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 2004 (i).
QUEEN'S CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
ROBERTSON, JOHN F., CLAIM *re* ACCIDENT ON P.E.I. RY.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P. E.I.*) 1367 (i).
SUBMARINE TUNNEL, P.E.I., AND MAINLAND: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 403 (i).
SUMMERSIDE AND RICHMOND BAY RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 40 (i).
TIGNISH WHARFINGER, FEES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 98 (i).
TUNNEL BETWEEN P. E. I. AND MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 98, 403 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Perry*) 1471 (i).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 256, 912 (i); conc., 4204 (ii).
—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) 3734.
PRINTING BUREAU PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
—— SALE OF TYPE: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2954 (ii).
—— COM.: List of Members, 104 (i).
—— JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 112 (i).
—— 5TH REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Bergin*) 2171 (i).
—— 8TH REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Bergin*) 3643 (ii).
—— 11TH REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Bergin*) 4693 (ii).
—— PAPER AND BINDING: in Com. of Sup., 794, 976.
—— *See* "ENGRAVING."
PRIVATE BILLS, MISCELLANEOUS, COM.: List of Members, 103 (i).
—— M. to introd. objected to, 666 (i).
—— PETS., RECEPTION: M. to extend time (Sir *John Thompson*) 72 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 454 (i).
—— PRESENTATION, EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 823 (i).
—— RECEIVING PETS.: M. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 970 (i).
—— REPS. FROM COM., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Denison*) 3564 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 3815 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 4214 (ii).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM.: List of Members, 101 (i).
PRIVILEGE. *See* "ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c."
PRIVY COUNCIL, APPLICATIONS TO RY. COM. FOR ADJUDICATION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1950 (i).
—— COMPLAINTS TO RY. COM.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1947 (i).
—— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 255 (i), 4433, 4440 (ii).
PROCEDURE. *See* "ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c."
PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC, MEMBERS OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2172 (i).
—— PETITIONS PRESENTED, SESSION 1891: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Fraser*) 100 (i).
PROHIBITION, PLEBISCITE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2646 (ii).
Deb.: (Mr. *Charlton*) 2646, 2664; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2652; (Mr. *Taylor*) 2654; (Mr. *Dickey*) 2654; (Mr. *Curran*) 2655; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2656; (Mr. *Casey*) 2657; (Mr. *Christie*) 2660; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2660; (Mr. *Foster*) 2661; (Mr. *Scriver*) 2666; (Mr. *Dewdney*) 2673, 2698; (Mr. *Watson*) 2678; (Mr. *Perry*) 2681; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2684; (Sir *John Thompson*) 2685; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2686; (Mr. *Bowell*) 2689; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2694; (Mr. *McGregor*) 2697; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2699 (ii).
PROROGATION: Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Acting Sec., 4731 (ii).
PROSSER, WM., FISHERY OVERSEER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Allan*) 3114 (ii).
—— INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 2490 (ii).
PROTECTION VESSELS: in Com. of Sup., 4319 (ii).
PROULX, ISIDORE, ESQ., MEMBER FOR PRESCOTT: Introduced, 1364 (i).
PUBLIC ACCTS. COM.: List of Members, 104 (i).
PUBLIC ACCTS. OF CAN.: M. to ref. to Sel. Com. (Mr. *Wallace*) 188 (i).
—— Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 37 (i).
PUBLIC BUILDINGS. *See* "DOMINION."
PUBLIC DEBT COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 253 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE: Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1090 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS:
ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4259 (ii).
BANCROFT & CONNOLLY. *See* "KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK."
BEAR RIVER (N.S.) RAILWAY BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, ENGINEERS' REP., &c., *re* BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 191, 224 (i).
BREAKWATERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO., P. E. I., GOVT. EXPEND.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 233 (i).
BRIDGE OVER RICHELIEU RIVER AT SOREL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2453 (ii).
CACOUNA PIER, EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 137.
CANALS, HARBOURS, DOCKS, &c., CONTRACTS FOR ENLARGEMENT, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 417 (i).
CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2617.
CAP ST. IGNACE STATION, NEW P.O.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2667 (ii).
CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR, REP. *re* BLASTING: M. for copy (Mr. *Perry*) 2268 (ii).
CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4457 (ii).
COBOURG CUSTOMS, &c., BUILDING, LEASE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1366 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*
CONTRACTS. *See* "GOVT."
COTEAU, OVERFLOW OF LAND: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 914 (i).
CULBUTE CANAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 927 (i).
CUSTOMS AND P. O. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 1550 (i).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1393 (i).
DOM. BUILDINGS IN CAN., ELECTRIC LIGHTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 417 (i).
DREDGING OTTAWA BETWEEN PEMBROKE AND DES JOACHIMS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 926 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4258, 4456 (ii).
——— MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i), 4254 (ii).
EDMONTON CROWN LANDS OFFICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4467 (ii).
EATONVILLE HARBOUR, TOTAL EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2641 (ii).
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 4439.
——— MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).
——— PROP. FORTIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 222 (i).
GALOPS RAPIDS, SURVEY FOR DEEPENING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Reid*) 130 (i).
GAMBLE & FLETCHER, COR. *re* PUB. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Prior*) 1550 (i).
GAS AND ELECTRIC LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 4242 (ii).
GEORGIAN BAY SURVEY: conc., 4470 (ii).
GOVT. CONTRACTS SINCE CONFDN.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 99; wthdn., 110 (i).
——— SINCE 30TH JUNE, 1887, TO 30TH JUNE, 1891: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 110 (i).
GROUNDS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4240 (ii).
HALL'S HARBOUR (N. S.) WORKS, EXAMINATION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1715 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 4247, 4448, 4477 (ii).
HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4241; conc., 4477 (ii).
KAMOURASKA WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, ACCTS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Carroll*) 510 (i).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, CERTIFICATE *re* $32,000 PAID BANCROFT & CONNOLLY: M. for copy (Mr. *Gibson*) 2006 (i).
LACHINE CANAL, NEW BRIDGE AT MONTREAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 524 (i).
LAVALLIÈRE BAY, DREDGING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2457 (ii).
LONGUEUIL WHARF, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1231 (i).
MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 4463; conc., 4468 (ii).
MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 40 (i).
——— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2431 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 190 (i).
OTTAWA DEPTL. BUILDINGS, HEATING: in Com. of Sup., 4477 (ii).
——— DRILL HALL, CONTRACT FOR ROOFING: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4601 (ii).
OTTAWA RIVER DREDGING, COST, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 926 (i).
PIERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO., P. E. I., GOVT. EXPEND.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 233 (i).
PUBLIC BUILDINGS. *See* "DOMINION."
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 271 (i).
——— EXPENDITURE: Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1090 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*
RAQUETTE PIER, DIGBY, (N.S.) TIME FOR COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
REPAIRS, FURNITURE, HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4240 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP P. O., WORKMEN'S CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3238 (ii).
——— (FRASERVILLE): in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU SUD PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2699 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 4656 (ii).
ROUND HILL PIER DAM, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 2171 (i).
ST. MAURICE PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3564 (ii).
ST. RAYMOND P. O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 37 (i).
SANDFORD BREAKWATER, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 398 (i).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2954 (ii).
——— LOWEST TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4261.
SOULANGES CANAL, ENGINEERS' REPS., &c., *re* BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 191, 224 (i).
——— TENDERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 128.
STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND, SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 4463 (ii).
SYDENHAM RIVER FLOODS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4464, 4500 (ii).
TELEGRAPH LINE, B. C. AND N. S., COST: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3897 (ii).
TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4245 (ii).
THREE SISTERS HARBOUR, (N.S.) TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2489 (ii).
WOODSTOCK, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3480 (ii).
YAMASKA RIVER LOCK, NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2171 (i).
——— LOSSES THROUGH ERECTION OF DAM: M. for Rep. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1985 (i).
——— WORKS, TOTAL COST: (Mr. *Mignault*) 1714 (i).
[*See* "PROVINCES;" "SUPPLY," &c.]
"QUADRA," STR., ENQUIRY *re* ACCIDENT: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 3331 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. No. 53 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 57.)

QUARANTINE:
BRITISH COLUMBIA: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1547 (i).
CANADIAN CATTLE IN ENG.: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 249 (i).
CATTLE DISEASE: in Com. of Sup., 987, 2033 (i).
——— INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 992, 2033 (i).
——— LIVE, ADMISSION FROM U. S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).
GROSSE ISLE: in Com. of Sup., 2025, 2033 (i).
HALIFAX: in Com. of Sup., 2032 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY: in Com. of Sup., 2033 (i).
ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 2032 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 4212 (ii).
UNORGANIZED PORTS: in Com. of Sup., 2049 (i).
VICTORIA, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2032 (i).

Quebec Harbour and River Police (repeal) B. No. 66 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 1225 (i); B. wthdn., 4482 (ii).

QUEBEC :
"ALERT," STR., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750, 917 (i).
BERTHIER (MONTMAGNY) P. O., MANAGEMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2638 (ii).
BIC, COLLECTOR AT WHARF, SALARY, &c. : Ques.(Mr. *Langelier*) 2638 (ii).
BOUNDARIES of QUEBEC PROV. : Remarks (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 99 (i).
—— M. for Cor. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 115 (i).
BRIDGE OVER RICHELIEU RIVER AT SOREL : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2453 (ii).
BROME CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1.
CACOUNA PIER, EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr *Laurier*) 137 (i).
CAMERON, D. M., EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2639 (ii).
CAP. ST. IGNACE POST OFFICE, OPENING : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 290, 223, 751 (i).
—— NEW P.O. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2667 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 1555 (i).
CAPE TORMENTE AND MURRAY BAY RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395 ; in Com., 4524 (ii).
CHAMPLAIN CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
CHARLEVOIX CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep. 6 (i).
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 2971, 2979 (ii).
COTEAU, OVERFLOW OF LAND : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 914 (i).
DAIRIES AND CHEESE FACTORIES, PROV. OF QUE. : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 2781 (ii).
DE LA RONDE, LATE PIERRE A. DENIS, PAPERS, &c., *re* SUCCESSION : M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2286.
DRUMMOND CO. RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4644 ; conc., 4657 (ii).
GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO., ENGINEER'S REP. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 915 (i).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION : in Com. of Sup., 2801 (ii).
JOLIETTE AND ST. JEAN MATHA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397 ; in Com., 4574 (ii).
JUDICIARY OF THE PROV. OF QUE., REORGANIZATION : Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2639 (ii).
KAMOURASKA WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, ACCTS., &c. : M. for copies (Mr. *Carroll*) 510 (i).
LAKE ST. JOHN AND CHICOUTIMI RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 1549 (i).
LAKE ST. PETER, FISHING PRIVILEGES : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2955 (ii).
LAKE TÉMISCAMINGUE COLONIZATION CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396 ; in Com., 4550 (ii).
—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397 ; in Com., 4571.
LAMOUREAUX BROS.' CLAIM : in Com. of Sup., 2259 (i).
LAND SALES IN QUEBEC CITY : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 1089 (i).
LAPRAIRIE CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 3681 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 2802, 2845 (ii).
LAVALLIÈRE BAY, DREDGING : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2457 (ii).
LAROUCHE AND GAGNÉ'S CLAIMS : in Com. of Sup., 4456 (ii).
L'ASSOMPTION CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 2714 (ii).
LÉVIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
L'ISLET, APPMNT. OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*
L'ISLET CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep. 1 (i).
LONGUEUIL WHARF, EXPEND. : Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1231 (i).
LOTBINIÈRE AND MEGANTIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395 (ii).
—— COUNTY MAIL SERVICE : Ans. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4585 (ii).
MCCARTHY, MESSRS., LEASE OF LAND AT SOREL : Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3184 (ii).
MISSISQUOI CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
MONFORT COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394 ; in Com., 4515, 4580 (ii).
MONTCALM CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
MONTMAGNY, POSTMASTER : Ques.(Mr. *Choquette*)2638.
MONTMORENCY CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (1).
MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394 ; in Com., 4581 (ii).
MONTREAL AND LAKE MASKINONGÉ RY. CO. : Pet. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2482 (ii).
NAPIERVILLE CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
NICOLET CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1.
—— RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 4449 (ii).
OTTAWA RIVER (MRS. N. GUINDON) : in Com. of Sup., 4450 (ii).
PINSONNEAULT, ALFRED, RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 749 (i).
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY., FURTHER SUBSIDY : M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Murray*) 917 (i).
—— CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 2461.
—— PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4467 ; in Com., 4629 (ii).
—— COUNTY RY. DEBT : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Murray*) 1968 (i).
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4467 ; in Com., 4630 (ii).
QUEBEC AND POINTE AUX TREMBLES MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1366 (i).
—— CENTRE CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
—— DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
—— HARBOUR AND RIVER WORKS, REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
—— LEGISLATURE, SITTINGS, LEGAL : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3644 (ii).
QUINN, MICHAEL, EVIDENCE *re* DISMISSAL : M. for copies (Mr. *Guay*) 401 (i).
RAILWAY BRIDGE AT QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 291 (i).
RESTIGOUCHE AND VICTORIA RY. CO'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395 ; in Com., 4525 (ii).
RICHELIEU CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER, BRIDGE AT SOREL : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2453 (ii).
RICHMOND P.O. : in Com. of Sup., 2890 (ii).
RIMOUSKI CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP (FRASERVILLE) P.O. : in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii).
—— WORKMEN'S CLAIMS : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3238 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*
RIVIÈRE DU SUD WORKS: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 4656 (ii).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2699 (ii).
ROSS, HON. J. G., REFUND TO REPRESENTATIVES: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, PETS, &c., *re* DISMISSAL: M. for copies (Mr. *Brodeur*) 100 (i).
—— DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4645 (ii).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 2954 (ii).
STE. ANNE'S LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).
STE. LOUISE (L'ISLET) POSTMASTER, ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2431 (ii).
ST. FLAVIE AND LITTLE MÉTIS TO MATANE, RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4577 (ii).
ST. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY. Co's SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4545 (ii).
ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS RY. ACCIDENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Carroll*) 292 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. Co'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4297: in Com., 4579 (ii).
ST. HENRI P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii).
ST. HYACINTHE P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 2889 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. Co.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4045; conc., 4507 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER RY. BRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 1549 (i).
—— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 2619 (ii).
ST. MAURICE PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3564 (ii).
ST. PLACIDE TO ST. ANDREW'S RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525, 4533 (ii).
ST. RAYMOND P. O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 37 (i).
ST. RÉMI TO ST. CYPRIEN RY. Co.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4582 (ii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 736, 972, 990 (i), 2889 (ii).
SOULANGES CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
STADACONA P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 222 (i).
TEMISCOUATA CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
TEMISCOUATA RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4552 (ii).
—— CONC.: Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4657; neg. (Y. 45, N. 92) 4667 (ii).
THREE RIVERS CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
THREE RIVERS HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 1788 (i).
VALLÉE, MR. J. S., POSTMASTER, MONTMAGNY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2638 (ii).
VAUDREUIL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
WEST FARNHAM P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).
YALE ESTATE CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).
YAMASKA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
—— LOCK NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2171.
—— LOSSES THROUGH ERECTION OF DAM: M. for Rep. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1985 (i).
—— WORKS, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 1714 (i).

[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS," "SUPPLY," &c.]

QUEEN'S (N.B.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 96 (i).
—— (N.S.): Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
—— (P.E.I.): Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
QUINN, MICHAEL, EVIDENCE *re* DISMISSAL: M. for copies (Mr. *Guay*) 401 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*). 1°, 2488; 2°* and in Com., 4481; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4603; neg. (Y. 20, N. 128) and 3° of B. 4628 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 27.)
RYS. AND CANALS, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 1062 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 273, 286 (i), 4440 (ii).
RY. BRIDGE at QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 291.
RYS., CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES: List of Members, 102 (i).
RY. COMMITTEE. *See* "PRIVY COUNCIL."
RY. STATISTICS; DELAY IN PRESENTING: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3185 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3398 (ii).
RY. SUBSIDIES: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) neg. on a div., 4728 (ii).
Ry. Works (Toronto) B. No. 18 (Mr. *Denison*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 61.)
RAILWAYS:
ARPIN, MR., CHARGES FOR DEMURRAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 4643 (ii).
CAPE BRETON RY., CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 988 (i).
—— TERMINAL ACCOMMODATION; Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1549 (i).
C. P. R., ARRANGEMENTS WITH I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 399 (i).
—— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 987, 2264 (i), 4438 (ii).
—— NORTH SHORE SECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3480 (ii).
—— PASSENGER CARS AND I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 399 (i),
—— RUNNING PRIVILEGES OVER I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 510 (i).
EXTRA CLERKS, &c., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4439.
GOVT. RYS., ADDITIONAL PROPERTY ACCOMMODATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1984 (i).
—— NAMES, &c., OF EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 41, 692 (i).
INTERCOLONIAL RY. *See* general heading.
LAKE ST. JOHN RY., TRAFFIC EARNINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4261 (ii).
OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY. CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4437: conc., 4475 (ii).
P. E. I. RAILWAY, DISMISSED EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 2004 (i).
PRIVY COUNCIL APPLICATIONS TO RY. COM. FOR ADJUDICATION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1950 (i).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS OF RYS.: in Com of Sup., 2264 (i).
WINDSOR BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 2629 (ii).

See also:
ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.
B. C. SOUTHERN RY. CO.
BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.
BUCKINGHAM AND LIÈVRE RY. CO.

RAILWAYS—*Continued.*
CANADA ATLANTIC RY. CO.
CANADA SOUTHERN RY. CO.
CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. CO.
CANSO AND LOUISBURG RY. CO.
CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RY. CO.
COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
GOVERNMENT RYS.
GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.
GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.
KINGSTON BELT LINE RY. CO.
LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.
LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RY. CO.
LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND ASSINIBOIA GRAND JUNCTION RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
MIDLAND RY. OF CANADA CO.
MONTREAL AND LAKE MASKINONGÉ RY. CO.
MONTREAL AND WESTERN RY. CO.
MONTREAL ISLAND RY. CO.
NELSON AND PORT SHEPPARD RY. CO.
NIAGARA FALLS AND QUEENSTON RY. AND BRIDGE CO.
NICOLET VALLEY RY. CO.
NIPISSING AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.
ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. CO.
OTTAWA, MORRISBURGH AND NEW YORK RY. CO.
OTTAWA VALLEY RY. CO.
OTTAWA, WADDINGTON AND NEW YORK RY. AND BRIDGE CO.
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE, &C., RAILROAD AND STEAMBOAT CO.
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.
ST. JOHN AND MAINE RY. CO. AND N. B. RY. CO.
TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. CO. AND C. P. R.
WINNIPEG AND ATLANTIC RY. CO.
WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RY. CO.
[*See* "SUBSIDIES," "SUPPLY," &c.]

RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (i).

RAQUETTE PIER, DIGBY (N.S.) TIME FOR COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4247 (ii).

RATES, TAXES, INSURANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 896; conc., 1085 (i).

REFUND, SUNDRY PERSONS: in Com. of Sup., 4462 (ii).

REGINA COURT HOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2037 (ii).

REGINA COAL: in Com. of Sup., 748, 973 (i).

REPAIRS, FURNITURE, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4240 (ii).

REPAIRS, &C., MARITIME PROVINCES: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED:
AGRICULTURE: (Mr. *Carling*) 1062 (i).
AUDITOR GENERAL: (Mr. *Foster*) 188 (i).
BEET-ROOT SUGAR, PROF. SAUNDERS': (Mr. *Foster*) 71 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONERS' REP.: (Mr. *Foster*) 751 (i).
FISHERIES: (Mr. *Tupper*) 3237 (ii).
GEOLOGICAL REPORT,: (Mr. *Dewdney*) 2172 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS: (Mr. *Dewdney*) 112 (i).
INLAND REVENUE: (Mr. *Costigan*) 751 (i).
INTERIOR: (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3300 (ii).
MARINE: (Mr. *Tupper*) 913 (i).
MOUNTED POLICE: (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4320 (ii).
PENITENTIARIES: (Sir *John Thompson*) 397 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED—*Continued.*
POSTMASTER GENERAL: (Mr. *Haggart*) 1364 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY: (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) 3734 (ii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: (Mr. *Foster*) 37 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS: (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1393 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS: (Mr. *Haggart*) 1062 (i).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: (Mr. *Bowell*) 37.

Representation in H. of C. B. No. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1° m., 1855; 1°, 1874 (i); 2° m., 3116; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3129; deb. rsmd., 3186, 3239; Amt. neg. (Y. 58, N. 109) 3298; 2° m., 3398; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3414; deb. rsmd., 3480, 3566; neg. (Y. 62, N. 109) 3636; deb. rsmd. on M. for 2°, 3649; Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3665; deb. rsmd., 3682; neg. (Y. 60, N. 95) 3717; 2° agreed to (Y. 97, N. 60) 3718; in Com., 3720, 3753, 3778, 3820, 3898, 3966, 4043, 4143, 4321; 3° m., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4329; neg. (Y. 51, N. 90) 4334; Amt. (Mr. *Yeo*) 4335; neg. (Y. 54, N. 87) 4335; Amt. (Mr. *Béchard*) 4336; neg. (Y. 54, N. 89) 4341; Amt. (Mr. *Pelletier*) neg. and 3° of B., 4343 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 11.)

Deb. on M. for 1° (Sir *John Thompson*) 1855; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1858; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1858, 1871; (Mr. *Colter*) 1858; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1866; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 1861; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1862; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1863; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1864; (Mr. *Watson*) 1865; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1867; (Mr. *Barnard*) 1871 (i).

Deb. on M. for 2° (Mr. *Laurier*) 3116; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3129 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 3130; (Mr. *Charlton*) 3136; (Mr. *Devlin*) 3147; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3151; (Mr. *Perry*) 3157; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3160; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3164; (Mr. *Béchard*) 3174; (Mr. *Choquette*) 3185; (Mr. *Dupont*) 3192; (Mr. *Rinfret*) 3201; (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) 3205; (Mr. *Monet*) 3223; (Mr. *Leduc*) 3229; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 3233; (Mr. *Edwards*) 3234; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3239; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3247; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3262; (Mr. *Davin*) 3279; (Mr. *Campbell*) 3286; (Mr. *McNeill*) 3295; (Mr. *McCarthy*) Amt., 3319, 3414, 3472 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Dickey*) 3414; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3425; (Mr. *Haggart*) 3436; (Mr. *Casey*) 3441; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 3442; (Mr. *Masson*) 3449; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 3454; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3459; (Mr. *Weldon*) 3464; (Mr. *Davin*) 3472; (Mr. *Flint*) 3481; (Mr. *Hughes*) 3493, 3541; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3499, 3545; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3516; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3528; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 3545; (Mr. *Semple*) 3550; (Mr. *Boyle*) 3566; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 3577; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 3590; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 3595; (Mr. *McNeill*) 3603; (Mr. *Lister*) 3612; (Mr. *Montague*) 3618; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 3620; (Mr. *Edwards*) 3630; (Mr. *Christie*) 3634; (Mr. *Somerville*) 3649; Amt., 3665 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Allan*) 3665; (Mr. *Dawson*) 3675; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3682; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3697; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 3705; (Mr. *Yeo*) 3707; (Mr. *McLean, P.E.I.*) 3711; (Mr. *Perry*) 3713 (ii).

Deb. in Com. on section 1—The Dominion (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3720; (Sir *John Thompson*) 3721; (Mr. *Mara*) 3725; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3725; (Mr. *Laurier*) 3727; (Mr. *Corbould*) 3727; (Mr. *Gordon*) 3728 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B.—*Continued.*

Deb. on section 2—Electoral Districts (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3753; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 3754; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3756, 3898, 3920; (Mr *McMullen*) 3762, 3778, 3878, 3906, 3933; (Mr. *Edwards*) 3780; (Mr. *Boyle*) 3780, 3862; (Sir *John Thompson*) 3781, 3790; (Mr. *Laurier*) 3782; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3785, 3789; (Mr. *Haggart*) 3787, 3949; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 3796, 3876, 3937; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3804; (Mr. *Mulock*) 3806; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3808; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3811, 3838, 3916; (Mr. *Charlton*) 3820, 3849; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3838; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3839, 3891, 3929, 3949; (Mr. *Edgar*) 3857; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 3864; (Mr. *Bowman*) 3869; (Mr. *Weldon*) 3872, 3913; (Mr. *Somerville*) 3879; (Mr. *Campbell*) 3882; (Mr. *Lovell*) 3889; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3893, 3951; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3915; (Mr. *Montague*) 3919, 3939; (Mr. *Bowell*) 3924; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 3924, 3957; (Mr. *Somerville*) 3936; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3937, 3956; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3940; (Mr. *Boyle*) 3944; (Mr. *McKay*) 3945; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 3946, 3950; (Mr. *Denison*) 3962, 4074; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3964; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 4070; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 4073; (Mr. *Maclean, (East York)* 4074 (ii).

Deb. on section 2, sub-section 3—Quebec (Mr. *Laurier*) 3966, 4020; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 3973, 4021, 4050, 4102; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3978, 4025, 4053; (Mr. *Béchard*) 3992, 4042, 4093; (Mr. *Jeannotte*) 3999, 4027; (Mr. *Choquette*) 4001, 4099; (Sir *John Thompson*) 4002, 4048, 4075; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4007, 4023, 4051; (Mr. *Davin*) 4011; (Mr. *Devlin*) 4018; (Mr. *Chapleau*) 4028, 4034, 4094; (Mr. *Curran*) 4030; (Mr. *Brown*) 4032; (Mr. *Scriver*) 4034, 4041, 4100; (Mr. *Monet*) 4038; (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 4044; (Mr. *Laurier*) 4047, 4098; (Mr. *Mulock*) 4048; (Mr. *Dupont*) 4054, 4061; (Mr. *Bernier*) 4056, 4066; (Mr. *Baker*) 4095; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 4102; (Mr. *Desaulniers*) 4104 (ii).

Deb. on section 4—Nova Scotia (Mr. *Forbes*) 4075, 4087; (Mr. *Gillies*) 4079; (Mr. *Borden*) 4082; (Sir *John Thompson*) 4084 (ii).

Deb. on section 6—Prince Edward Island (Mr. *Welsh*) 4106; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4109, 4119, 4146, 4184; (Sir *John Thompson*) 4114, 4118, 4184, 4193, 4198; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 4123; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4121, 4172; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4125; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 4127, 4189; (Mr. *Perry*) 4129, 4195; (Mr. *McLean, P.E.I.*) 4133; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 4143; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4149, 4186, 4197; (Mr. *Davin*) 4153; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 4159; (Mr. *Yeo*) 4164; (Mr. *Masson*) 4169; (Mr. *Weldon*) 4177; (Mr. *Mulock*) 4178; (Mr. *Laurier*) 4187; (Mr. *Dickey*) 4191; (Mr. *Hazen*) 4199 (ii).

RESTIGOUCHE AND VICTORIA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.:

ACTIVE MILITIA, DRILL, QUALIFIED OFFICERS, &c.: Mr. *Hughes*, 667 (i).

ALLAN, MESSRS., &c., PETS. *re* DECREASE OF CUSTOMS DUTIES*: Mr. *Laurier*, 159 (i).

ANNAPOLIS AND ATLANTIC RY., &c., COR., &c., *re* SUBSIDY: Mr. *Forbes*, 688 (i).

ARCHIBALD, H. D., CONDR. ON I. C. R., DISMISSAL*: Mr. *Patterson (Colchester)* 969 (i).

ARTIFICIAL FERTILIZERS, QUANTITIES IMPORTED: Mr *McMillan (Huron)* 526 (i).

BANCROFT & CONNOLLY. *See* "KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK."

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

BARRETT *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, SUP. COURT JUDGT.: Mr. *LaRivière*, 158 (i).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, ENGR.'S REPS., &c., *re* BUILDING: Mr. *Bergeron*, 191, 224 (i).

BEEF AND PORK, U. S. AND CAN. FISHERMEN: Mr. *Forbes*, 294 (i).

BEET-ROOT SUGAR, BOUNTY ON MANUFACTURE: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 1366, 1373 (i).

—— PROF. SAUNDERS' INSTRUCTIONS: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 1373 (i).

BINDING TWINE, QUANTITY IMPORTED: Mr. *Campbell*, 537 (i).

BOUNDARIES OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC: Sir *Hector Langevin*, 115 (i).

BREAKWATERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO. (P. E. I.) GOVT. EXPEND.: Mr. *Perry*, 233 (i).

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, APPLICATIONS AND REFUSALS*: Mr. *Bowers*, 417 (i).

BRIDGE OVER RICHELIEU RIVER AT SOREL: Mr. *Bruneau*, 2453 (ii).

BRITISH FARM DELEGATES' REPS.: Mr. *McMillan (Huron)* 2432 (ii).

—— *See* "TENANT FARMERS."

CAN. COTTON MILLS CO.'S LETTERS PATENT: Mr. *Edgar*, 920 (i).

CANALS, HARBOURS, DOCKS, &c., CONTRACTS FOR ENLARGEMENT, CONSTRUCTION, &c.*: Mr. *Davies (P.E.I.)* 417 (i).

CAP ST. IGNACE STATION P. O.*: Mr. *Choquette*, 1555 (i), 2067 (ii).

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR, REP. *re* BLASTING: Mr. *Perry*, 2268 (i).

CATTLE, LIVE, ADMISSION FROM U. S.*: Mr. *Somerville*, 159 (i).

CHARLEBOIS, F., CLAIMS AGAINST FISHERIES DEPT.: Mr. *Laurier*, 1036 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS, EXTRA PAYMENTS, 1874-1878: Mr *Tisdale*, 1715 (i).

COAL OIL AND KEROSENE, IMPORTS: Mr. *Campbell*, 3059 (ii).

COCKBURN ISLAND, LOCATION TICKET OF J. A. McLENNAN: Mr. *Lister*, 1980 (i).

—— LOCATION TICKET OF PETER McLENNAN*: Mr. *Lister*, 2006 (i).

CONTRACTS. *See* "GOVT."

COTTON-SEED OIL, CRUDE, IMPORTS FOR 1891*: Mr. *McKay*, 1555 (i).

CULBUTE CANAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Mr. *Murray*, 927 (i).

CUSTOMS AND P. O. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C.: Mr. *Prior*, 1550 (i).

DE LA RONDE, LATE PIERRE A. DENIS, PAPERS, &c., *re* SUCCESSION: Mr. *Bergeron*, 2286 (i).

DODS, P. D., *re* LOSS OF DIAMONDS: Mr. *Curran*, 2287 (i).

DOM. BUILDINGS IN CAN., ELECTRIC LIGHTING*: Mr. *Davies (P.E.I.)* 417 (i).

DOM. COTTON MILLS CO.'S PATENT: Mr. *Edgar*, 920.

DREDGING OTTAWA BETWEEN PEMBROKE AND DES JOACHIMS: Mr. *Murray*, 926 (i).

ELECTIONS, 1891-1892, COR. RET. OFFICERS AND GOVT., &c.*: Mr. *Sutherland*, 969 (i).

ELECTION PETITIONS. *See* "RICHMOND."

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS IN B. C., VOTERS: Mr. *Mara*, 2287 (i).

ELECTORAL LISTS. *See* "LENNOX," "LONDON," "VOTERS' LISTS."

ELLIOTT, JUDGE. *See* "LONDON ELECTION."

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

ENGRAVING AND PRINTING, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS*: Mr. *Somerville*, 159 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES, IMP. AND CAN. GOVTS., COR.: Mr. *Laurier*, 244 (i).

EUGENIA, DISMISSAL, &c., OF POSTMASTER: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1985 (i).

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS, NUMBER, LOCATION, EXPEND., &c.: Mr. *Frémont*, 682 (i).

EXPERIMENTAL (CENTRAL) FARM, DAIRY STOCK, &c.: Mr. *McMillan* (*Huron*) 402 (i).

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 100 (i).

EXPORTS OF CAN. PRODUCE TO NEWFOUNDLAND*: Mr. *Hughes*, 113 (i).

—— FARM PRODUCE: Mr. *McMullen*, 292 (i).

FARMERS' DELEGATES. *See* "BRITISH;" "TENANT."

FARM PRODUCE. *See* "EXPORTS."

FENELON FALLS RY. BRIDGE, AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVT. AND G. T. R.*: Mr. *Hughes*, 133 (i).

FISH, FISH OIL, &c., IMPORTED FROM NEWFOUNDLAND*: Mr. *White* (*Shelburne*) 159 (i).

FISHERIES, DEPUTY MINISTER, LETTERS, COMPLAINTS, &c.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 418 (i).

FLOUR (CANADIAN) TRADE AND NEWFOUNDLAND: Mr. *Hughes*, 112 (i).

GALOPS RAPIDS, SURVEYS, PLANS, &c.: Mr. *Reid*, 139 (i).

GALOPS RAPIDS, SURVEY OR DEEPENING*: Mr. *Somerville*, 159 (i).

GAMBLE & FLETCHER, COR. *re* PUB. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C.: Mr. *Prior*, 1559 (i).

GLAZIERS' DIAMONDS. *See* "Dods, P. D."

GOVT. CONTRACTS SINCE CONFEDN; Mr. *Macdonald*, (*Huron*) 99: wthdn., 110 (i).

—— 30TH JUNE, 1887, TO 30TH JUNE, 1891*: Mr. *Macdonald* (*Huron*) 110 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S WARRANTS, REPS. OF MINISTERS AND O. C.'S*: Mr. *Mulock*, 111 (i).

GOVT. RYS., ADDITIONAL PROPERTY ACCOMMODATION: Mr. *McMullen*, 1984 (i).

—— NAMES, &c., EMPLOYÉS: Mr. *McMullen*, 41, 692 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RY. *See* general heading.

IMPORTS OF ARTIFICIAL FERTILIZERS, QUANTITIES: Mr. *McMillan* (*Huron*) 526 (i).

—— BINDING TWINE, QUANTITY: Mr. *Campbell*, 537 (i).

—— CRUDE COTTON-SEED OIL FOR 1891*: Mr. *McKay*, 1555 (i).

—— PORK FROM U. S.*: Mr. *Hughes*, 292 (i).

—— U. S., MEAT AND FARM PRODUCTS*: Mr. *Hughes*, 291 (i).

INGRAM, W. H., APPMNT. AS COL. OF CUSTOMS, ST. THOMAS: Mr. *Casey*, 1998 (i).

INDIAN RESERVES, B.C., NUMBER, LOCATION, &c.; Mr. *Barnard*, 511 (i).

KAMOURASKA WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, ACCTS., &c. Mr. *Carroll*, 510 (i).

KEROSENE OIL, IMPORTS: Mr. *Campbell*, 3059 (ii).

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, CERTIFICATE *re* $32,000 PAID BANCROFT & CONNOLLY*: Mr. *Gibson*, 2006.

LACHINE CANAL, NEW BRIDGE AT MONTREAL: Mr. *Curran*, 524 (i).

LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *Charlton*, 2269 (i).

LANDS SOLD, GRANTED OR LEASED IN MAN. AND N. W.T: Mr. *Edgar*, 241 (i).

LAVALLIÈRE BAY, DREDGING*: Mr. *Bruneau*, 2457.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

LENNOX CO. ELECTORAL LISTS, ORIGINAL, &c.*: Mr. *Wilson*, 159 (i).

LIEUT. GOVERNORS' COMMISSIONS, INSTRUCTIONS: Mr. *Laurier*, 2268 (i).

LIVE STOCK RATES ON I. C. R.: Mr. *Wood* (*Westmoreland*) 2286 (i).

LOGAN *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, PLEADINGS, &c.*: Mr. *Watson*, 2287 (i).

LOISELLE, B., POSTMASTER, STE. ANGÈLE, DISMISSAL, PET., &c.*: Mr. *Brodeur* 100 (i).

LONDON ELECTION, PET. OF T. HOBBS, &c., *re* JUDGE ELLIOTT: Mr. *Lister*, 1719 (i).

—— ELECTORAL VOTERS' LIST*: Mr. *Lister*, 292.

MAIL CONDUCTORS SUPERANNUATED: Mr. *Brodeur*, 2699 (ii).

"MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE," SUPREME CT. JUDG'T.: Mr. *LaRivière*, 158 (i).

—— *See* "LOGAN."

MILITIA. *See* "ACTIVE," and general heading "MILITIA."

MAP OF DOM., *re* POLLING RETURNS AT G. E.: Mr. *Mills* (*Bothwell*), 112 (i).

MCINTYRE, DISMISSAL, &c., OF POSTMASTER: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1985 (i).

MCLENNAN, JNO. A. AND PETER. *See* "COCKBURN ISLAND."

MCQUEEN & DAVEY. *See* "BRITISH" and "TENANT FARMERS' DELEGATES."

MULGRAVE STATION, I. C. R., TRAFFIC, &c.: Mr. *Fraser*, 35 (i).

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CAN. FLOUR TRADE: Mr. *Hughes*, 112 (i).

—— CAN. FISHERIES*: Mr. *White* (*Shelburne*) 159 (i).

NORTH-WEST ASSEMBLY, RES. AND MEMORIALS: Mr. *Davin*, 1551 (i).

OTTAWA RIVER DREDGING, COST, &c.: Mr. *Murray*, 926 (i).

P. E. I. RY., DISMISSED EMPLOYÉS: Mr. *Perry*, 2004 (i).

PIERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO., P.E.I., GOVT. EXPEND.: Mr. *Perry*, 233 (i).

PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY., FURTHER SUBSIDY: Mr. *Murray*, 917 (i).

—— COUNTY RY. DEBT: Mr. *Murray*, 1968 (i).

PORK. *See* "IMPORTS."

PRINTING. *See* "ENGRAVING."

PRIVY COUNCIL, APPLICATIONS TO RY. COM. FOR ADJUDICATION, &c.: Mr. *McCarthy*, 1950 (i).

—— COMPLAINTS TO RY. COM.: Mr. *McCarthy*, 1947 (i).

PROHIBITION PETITIONS PRESENTED, SESSION 1891*: Mr. *Fraser*, 100 (i).

PROSSER, WM., FISHERY OVERSEER, DISMISSAL: Mr. *Allan*, 3114 (ii).

PUBLIC BUILDINGS. *See* "DOMINION."

QUINN, MICHAEL, EVIDENCE *re* DISMISSAL: Mr. *Guay*, 401 (i), 3332 (ii).

RY. COMMITTEE. *See* "PRIVY COUNCIL."

RYS. *See* "GOVT." and general heading.

RICHELIEU RIVER, BRIDGE AT SOREL: Mr. *Bruneau*, 2453 (ii).

RICHMOND CONTROVERTED ELECTION, PETITIONS AND DECISIONS: Mr. *Gillies*, 1553 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU SUD, PUBLIC WORKS*: Mr. *Choquette*, 2699 (ii).

ROBERTSON, JOHN F., CLAIM *re* ACCIDENT ON P. E. I. RY.: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 1367 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
ROYAL COMMISSION ISSUED SINCE CONFEDN.*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 39 (i).
SAW-LOGS, REMOVAL OF EXPORT DUTY: Mr. *Rider*, 1715 (i).
SETTLERS' CLAIMS AND WALDRON RANCH CO.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 292 (i).
SICK MARINERS' DUES, CIRCULAR ISSUED*: Mr. *Laurier*, 159 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, ENGINEERS' REPS., &c., *re* BUILDING: Mr. *Bergeron*, 191, 224 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, TENDERS: Mr. *Sutherland*, 128.
STATUTORY VOTES, DOM. LIABILITIES UNDER*: Mr. *Fraser*, 969 (i).
STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, PETS., &c., *re* DISMISSAL*: Mr. *Brodeur*, 100 (i).
ST. CÉSAIRE POSTMASTER, MONEY DEPOSITS: Mr. *Brodeur*, 400 (i).
ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS, RY. ACCIDENT*: Mr. *Carroll*, 202 (i).
ST. THOMAS, COLL. OF CUSTOMS, APPMNT.: Mr. *Casey*, 1998 (i).
SUGAR BOUNTY. *See* "BEET-ROOT."
SUBMARINE TUNNEL, P. E. I. AND MAINLAND: Mr. *Perry*, 403 (i).
SUPERANNUATION, MAIL CONDUCTORS*: Mr. *Brodeur*, 2689 (ii).
TEMPERANCE COLONIZATION CO., STOCK AND SCRIP HOLDERS, &c.: Mr. *Sproule*, 929 (i).
TRADE WITH NEWFOUNDLAND, PROCLAMATIONS, &c.: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 684 (i).
TUNNEL. *See* "SUBMARINE."
VOTERS IN ELECTORAL LISTS, B. C.: Mr. *Mara*, 2287 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS, REVISION, 1886, 1889, 1891, TOTAL COST: Mr. *Landerkin*, 683 (i).
—— AMOUNTS PAID REVISING OFFICERS: Mr. *Flint*, 930 (i).
WALDRON RANCH CO., SETTLERS' CLAIMS*: Mr. *McMullen*, 292 (i).
WELLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION, PROCEEDINGS AT TRIAL, &c.: Mr. *Tisdale*, 244 (i).
WEST INDIES, FIN. MIN.'S VISIT, REPS., &c.: Mr. *Mills* (*Bothwell*) 1372 (i).
WEST BAY AS A PORT OF ENTRY, INSPECTOR'S REP.: Mr. *Cameron*, 2287 (i).
WHITE PINE TIMBER, MAP OF AREAS: Mr. *Ives*, 293.
WHYCOCOMAGH AS A PORT OF ENTRY, INSPECTOR'S REP.*: Mr. *Cameron*, 2287 (i).
WILSON, CONVICT EDWARD, PETS., &c., FOR RELEASE: Mr. *Armstrong*, 2642 (ii).
YAMASKA RIVER, LOSSES THROUGH ERECTION OF DAM: Mr. *Laurier*, 1985 (i).
REVELSTOKE AND ARROW LAKE (C. P. R.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4510 (ii).
RHÉAUME, ANTOINE, LAND GRANT FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2490 (ii).
RICHELIEU CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER, BRIDGE AT SOREL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2453 (ii).
—— FISHING RIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 35 (i).
RICHMOND (N.S.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION, PETITIONS AND DECISIONS: M. for copy (Mr. *Gillies*) 1553 (i).
—— Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
RICHMOND P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 2890 (ii).
RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 988 (i).
RIFLED ORDNANCE, IMPROVED: in Com. of Sup., 1363 (i); conc., 4210 (ii).
RIMOUSKI CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
"RIMOUSKI," STR., CHANGE OF ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3183 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP (FRASERVILLE) P.O: in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii).
—— P.O., WORKMEN'S CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3238 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU SUD, PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 2699 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 4656 (ii).
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
ROBERTSON, JOHN F., CLAIM *re* ACCIDENT ON P.E.I. RY.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1367.
ROSAMOND, BENNETT, ESQ., MEMBER FOR NORTH LANARK: Introduced, 3 (i).
ROSS, HON. J. G., REFUND TO REPRESENTATIVES: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
ROUND HILL PIER DAM, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 2171 (i).
ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 1286 (i), 2370, 4732 (ii).
ROYAL COMMISSIONS ISSUED SINCE CONFEDN.*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 39 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2172 (i), 2700, 3089 (ii).
—— INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3239 (ii).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 1375 (i).
STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, PETS., &c., *re* DISMISSAL: M. for copies (Mr. *Brodeur*) 100 (i).
—— DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4645 (ii).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 2954 (ii).
STE. ANNE'S LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).
STE. LOUISE (L'ISLET) POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2431 (ii).
ST. CATHARINES AND CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4466 (ii).
St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 40 (Mr. *Carpenter*). 1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)
—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4537 (ii).
ST. CÉSAIRE POSTMASTER, MONEY DEPOSITS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 400 (i).
ST. FLAVIE AND LITTLE MÉTIS TO MATANE, RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4577 (ii).
ST. HENRI P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii).
ST. HYACINTHE P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2889 (ii).
St. John and Maine Ry. Co. and N.B. Ry. Co.'s B. No. 57 (Mr. *Skinner*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 59).
ST. JOHN CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4441 (ii).
—— FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 988; conc., 1086 (i).
St. John (N.B.) Harbour Commissioners' B. No. 99 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 4398; M. for Com., 4493; in Com., 4498, 4603; 1° of B., 4506; 2°*, 4603; in Com., 4647; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) neg. (Y. 53, N. 93) 4654 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)

St. JOHN RIVER, INCLUDING TOBIQUE: in Com. of Sup., 4256 (ii).

——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION (I.C.R.): in Com. of Sup., 988 (i), 2563 (ii).

——— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2032 (i).

St. JOHN TO St. ROSALIE, RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525 (ii).

St. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4545 (ii).

St. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS, RY. ACCIDENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Carroll*) 292 (i).

St. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4297; in Com., 4579 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4645; conc., 4567.

St. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (i).

——— RY. BRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 1549 (i).

——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 2619 (ii).

St. MAURICE PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3564 (ii).

St. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2263 (i).

St. PLACIDE TO St. ANDREW'S, RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525, 4533 (ii).

St. RAYMOND P. O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 37 (i).

St. RÉMI TO St. CYPRIEN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4582 (ii).

St. THOMAS, COL. OF CUSTOMS, APPMNT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casey*) 1998 (i).

St. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 736, 972, 990 (i), 2889 (ii).

SANDFORD (N.S.) BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr *Flint*) 398 (i).

SANDPOINT (N.S.) TO NEW GERMANY, RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4542 (ii).

SAN FRANCISCO AND VICTORIA (B.C.) STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup., 4279 (ii).

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONTRACTS FOR DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3184 (ii).

——— CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2954 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2241 (i).

——— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4261 (ii).

SAVINGS BANK AT St. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3644 (ii).

——— N.B., N.S., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4272 (ii).

SAW-LOGS, EXPORT DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1231 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Ives*) 1231, 1270; (Mr. *Corbould*) 1239; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1240, 1271; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1250; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1254; (Mr. *McGregor*) 1262; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1264; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1264; (Mr. *Devlin*) 1267; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1269; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1276; (Mr. *Allan*) 1279: (Mr. *Foster*) 1281 (i).

——— EXPORT DUTY, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1032 (i).

— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Rider*) 1705 (i).

School Savings Bank incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 36 (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*). 1°*, 314; 2°, 418 (i); M. to transfer to Orders of the Day, 4466; in Com. and 3°*, 4638 (ii).

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4309 (ii).

Sea Fisheries Development, &c., B. No. 5 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 97; 2°*, 130; M. for Com., 161; in Com., 166 (i); 3°*, 2490 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 18.)

SECRETARY OF STATE:

CAN. COTTON MILLS Co.'s LETTERS PATENT: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 920 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

——— EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 283 (i).

——— LIST, NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 917 (i).

——— EXTRA PAYMENTS, 1874-1878: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1715 (i).

COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4426 (ii).

COPYRIGHT ACT, PROCLAMATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1366 (i).

——— RECIPROCITY WITH U. S.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 137 (i).

DOM. COTTON MILLS Co.'s LETTERS PATENT: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 920 (i).

ELECTIONS, GENERAL, POLLING RETURNS: M. for Map (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 112 (i).

——— 1891-92, COR., RET. OFFICERS AND GOVT., &c.: M. for copy (Mr. *Sutherland*) 969 (i).

——— COR., GOVT. AND RET. OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2491 (ii).

ELECTION OFFICIALS' DUTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 73 (i).

ELECTORAL LISTS. *See* "LENNOX," "LONDON," "VOTERS' LISTS."

ENGRAVING AND PRINTING, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).

——— CONTRACT, &c.: Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1637 (i).

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION: in Com. of Sup., 1096 (i).

LIEUT. GOVERNORS' COMMISSIONS: M. for copy (Mr. *Laurier*) 2268 (i).

——— INSTRUCTIONS: Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 2268 (i).

LONDON ELECTORAL VOTERS' LISTS*: M. for copies (Mr. *Lister*) 292 (i).

MAP OF DOM. *re* POLLING RETURNS AT G. E.: M. for copy (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 112 (i).

OLD RECORDS, CLASSIFICATION: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 256, 912 (i): conc., 4204 (ii).

——— BUREAU PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

——— BUREAU, SALE OF TYPE: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2954 (ii).

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC, MEMBERS OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2172 (i).

ROYAL COMMISSIONS, INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3239 (ii).

——— ISSUED SINCE CONFEDN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 39 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2172 (i), 2700, 3089 (ii).

TEMPERANCE COLONIZATION Co., STOCK AND SCRIP HOLDERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 929 (i).

VOTERS IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS, B. C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 2287 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Continued.*
VOTERS' LISTS, AMOUNTS PAID REVISING OFFICERS: M. for List (Mr. *Flint*) 930 (i).
—— FINAL PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 2641.
—— DELAY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1637 (i).
—— PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 1086 (i).
—— REVISION, 1886-89-91, TOTAL COST: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 683 (i).

Seditious and Unlawful Associations Act (*Chap. 10 Consolidated Statutes, L. C.*) **Amt. B. No. 85** (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°m., 2488.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. *See* "COMMITTEES."

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. No. 104 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 4716; 2°* in Com. and 3°*, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 752, 974 (i).
SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, DEPUTY, APPMNT.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 749 (i).
—— ESTIMATE: in Com. of Sup., 789 (i).
SESSIONAL CLERKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
—— MESSENGERS (LIBRARY): in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
SETTLERS' CLAIMS AND WALDRON RANCH CO.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 292 (i).
—— N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 223 (i).
—— GRIEVANCES, N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4407 (ii).

Shares. *See* "TRANSFER."

Sheep Creek. *See* "HIGH RIVER."

SHEET HARBOUR, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1032 (i).
—— FEES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1032 (i).
SHELBURNE (N.S.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 4731 (ii).
SICK MARINERS' DUES, CIRCULAR ISSUED: M. for copy (Mr. *Laurier*) 159 (i).
SIMCOE, E., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
SINKING FUNDS, BROKERAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 254 (i).
SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, CHANGE OF TIME: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3897 (ii).
SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 4456 (ii).
SMALL-POX ON "EMPRESS OF JAPAN": Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1547 (i).
SMITH'S FALLS P. O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2929 (ii).
SMITH, WM., ESQ., MEMBER FOR S. ONTARIO: Introduced, 40 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, ENGINEERS' REPS., &c., *re* BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 191. 224 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 2050 (i).
—— TENDERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 128.
SOULANGES CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
SPAIN AND SPANISH W. INDIES, TRADE RELATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4602 (ii).
SPANISH W. INDIES AND CAN., TRADE RELATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 509 (i).
—— EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 4499 (ii).
SPEAKER, DEPUTY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 974 (i).
SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE: 4 (i), 4734 (ii).
STADACONA POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 222.
STAIRS, JOHN FITZ-WM., ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALIFAX: Introduced, 71 (i).
STANDING ORDERS COM.: List of Members, 103 (i).
STATISTICS. *See* "ARTS;" "AGRICULTURE."
STATUTORY VOTES, DOM. LIABILITIES UNDER*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fraser*) 969 (i).
STEWIACKE VALLEY AND MUSQUODOBOIT RY. (I.C.R.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4521 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 114; 2°, 752; Res. in Com., 752; B. in Com., 1394, 1642; 3°*, 1789 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 19.)

STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND, SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 4463 (ii).
SUBMARINE. *See* "TUNNEL."

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. No. 101 (Mr. *Haggart*). Res. prop. (1st) 4394; in Com., 4506; conc. and Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4657; neg. (Y. 45, N. 92) 4667; (2nd) 4466; in Com., 4629; (3rd) 4644; in Com., 4667; 1°* and 2°* of B., 4668; 3°*, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4275 (ii).

SUBSIDIES. *See*
ANNAPOLIS AND ATLANTIC RY.
BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.
BRACEBRIDGE AND BAYSVILLE RY. CO.
BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.
BUCTOUCHE AND MONCTON RY. CO.
CAPE TORMENTE AND MURRAY BAY RY.
COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.
GODERICH AND WINGHAM RY. CO.
HEREFORD RY. CO.
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.
JOLIETTE AND ST. JEAN MATHA RY. CO.
KINGSTON, NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY. CO.
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.
LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONIZATION CO.
LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RY. CO.
LOTBINIÈRE AND MEGANTIC RY. CO.
MONFORT COLONIZATION RY. CO.
MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. CO.
NEW GLASGOW IRON, COAL AND RY. CO.
NICOLA VALLEY RY. CO.
NIPISSING AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.
ONTARIO AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
ONTARIO, BELMONT AND NORTHERN RY. CO.
OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.
PHILIPSBURG JUNCTION RY. AND QUARRY CO.
PLAISTER ROCK ISLAND RY.
PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY.
PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. CO.
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.
RESTIGOUCHE AND VICTORIA RY. CO.
REVELSTOKE AND ARROW LAKE (C.P.R.)
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.
ST. FLAVIE AND LITTLE MÉTIS TO MATANE RY.
ST. JOHN TO ST. ROSALIE RY.
ST. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY. CO.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.

SUBSIDIES—*Continued.*
St. Placide to St. Andrew's Ry.
St. Rémi to St. Cyprien Ry. Co.
Sandpoint (N.S.) to New Germany Ry.
Stewiacke Valley and Musquodoboit Ry. (I.C.R.)
Sydney and Louisburg Ry.
Témiscouata Ry. Co.
Thousand Islands Ry. Co.
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.
Truro and Stewiacke to Newport, &c., Ry.
Woodstock and Centreville Ry. Co.
Sugar-Beet Bounty, Continuation: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 751 (i).
——— Cultivation, French Edition of Reps.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 750 (i).
——— *See* "Beet-Root."
Summerside and Richmond Bay Ry.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 40 (i).
Summerstown (Ont.) Post Office, Receipts: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1365 (i).
Sunday Observance. *See* "Lord's Day."
Superannuation: in Com. of Sup., 796 (i).
——— Mail Conductors*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2699 (ii).
Supply B. (1892) No. 62 (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. in Com. and 1°* of B., 1087; 2°, 1090; 3°*, 1091 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)
Supply B. (1893) No. 100 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. in Com., 4576; conc. in and 1° of B., 4603; 2°, 4715; 3°*, 4729 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)
SUPPLY:
[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noticed under this head.]
Amts. and Remarks to Ms. for Com.: Amt. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) Commercial Treaties, 1104; neg. (Y. 62, N. 106) 1151. Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Denison*) Affidavits *re* Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, 1319. Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) Duty on Binding Twine, 1656; neg. (Y. 63, N. 107) 1713. Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) Diplomatic Papers, 1789; neg. (Y. 57, N. 98) 1827. Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, &c.) West Indian Trade, 1877; (Mr. *Edgar*) Copyright Laws, 2233; (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) Lieut. Governor's Assent to Bills, 2238; (Mr. *Devlin*) Civil Servants, 2238 (i); (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) Preferential Trade with Great Britain, 2492; (Mr. *Casey*) Civil Servants and Double Pay, 2500; (Mr. *McMullen*) Savings Banks, 4272; (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) Railway Subsidies, 4275; (Mr. *Mulock*) Audit of Accounts, I.C.R., 4276; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Election Expenses, Publications in Toronto *Globe*, 4349; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) Dom. Day Celebration, 4399; (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) Tenant Farmers' Delegates Reps., 4401; (Mr. *McMullen*) Settlers' Grievances, N.W.T., 4407; (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) Indian Affairs, Management, 4408 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex.: Transmitting Estimates for 1892-93, 138: Suppl., 1891-92, 822 (i); Suppl., 1892-93, 4265 (ii).
Res. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., 33; Ms. for Com., 249, 310, 589, 752, 825, 971, 1104, 1153, 1319, 1373, 1415, 1491, 1656, 1789, 1877, 2008, 2233 (i), 2362, 2492, 2563, 2715, 2798, 2845, 2918, 4240, 4272, 4348, 4399 (ii).
In Com., 250, 310, 664, 752, 825, 971, 1152, 1154, 1340, 1373, 1415, 1491, 1714, 1828, 1889, 2008, 2241, 2257 (i), 2362, 2509, 2563, 2715, 2798, 2845, 2918, 4240, 4277, 4386, 4408.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Committee:
Administration of Justice. See "Justice."
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Census, 983 (i), 4437 (ii).
Columbian Exhibition, 983 (i), 4433; conc., 4474 (ii).
Criminal Statistics, 1160 (i).
Dairying Interests, 1464 (i).
Experimental Farms, 1424 (i).
Haras National Co., 1465 (i).
Jamaica Exhibition, 976 (i).
Patent Record, 1159 (i).
Adulteration of Food. See "Collection of Revenues."
Canals. See "Collection of Revenues;" "Railways."
Charges of Management:
Assistant Receiver Gen., Victoria, 250 (i).
Dominion Notes, Printing, 255 (i).
Inspector, 250 (i).
Public Debt, Commission, 253 (i).
Savings Banks, N.B., N.S., P.E.I., 250 (i).
Sinking Funds, Brokerage, &c., 254 (i).
Civil Government:
Auditor General's Office, 267 (i).
Contingencies, Deptl.:
Agriculture, 286 (i).
Departmental Buildings, care, &c., 286 (i).
Finance and Treasury Board, 285 (i).
Governor Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 284 (i).
Railways and Canals, 286 (i),
Civil Service Examiners, 283 (i).
Customs Dept., 267, 1007, 1018 (i); conc., 4205; suppl., 4433 (ii).
Governor General's Sec.'s Office, 255 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 275 (i).
Contingencies, 282 (i).
Rates, Taxes, Insurance, &c., 896; conc., 1085 (i).
Interior Dept., 257, 825, 844, 1154; conc., 1084 (i), 4206, 4432, 4472 (ii).
North-West Mounted Police, 265 (i).
Justice Dept., 913 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Dept., 270 (i), 4432 (ii).
Militia and Defence Dept., 256 (i).
Printing and Stationery Dept., 256, 912 (i); conc., 4204 (ii).
Privy Council Office, 255 (i), 4433, 4440 (ii).
Public Works Dept., 271 (i).
Railways and Canals Dept., 273 (i)), 4440 (ii).
Collection of Revenues:
Adulteration of Food, 4430 (ii).
Canals: Lachine, 1017 (i).
Customs:
Board of Customs and Protective Service, 1018 (i); conc., 4205 (ii).
Craven, George, Gratuity, 1007 (i).
General Vote, 811 (i).
Inspectors of Ports, Travelling Expenses, 821 (i).
Nova Scotia, Salaries and contingencies, 811 (i).
Ontario, Salaries, &c., 812 (i).
Dominion Lands: Agents' Salaries, &c., 4431 (ii).
Excise:
Customs Officers' Commissions, 1015 (i).
Duty-pay, Excise Officers, 1014 (i).
General Vote, 4430 (ii).
Paige, W. W., Repayment of Costs, 1014 (i).
Tobacco Stamps, 1007 (i).
Post Office:
Mail Service, conc., 4470 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues—Continued.
Public Works:
Esquimalt Graving Dock, Maintenance, &c., 1017 (i).
Railways:
Intercolonial, 2628 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 1017 (i), 2629 (ii).
Windsor Branch, 2629 (ii).
Weights and Measures:
Contingencies, 1016 (i).
Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Lands. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Police: General Vote, 313 (i).
Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."
Fisheries:
Behring's Sea Arbitration, 4469: conc., 4478 (ii).
Commissioners' Expenses, 993 (i).
Fish-Breeding, conc., 4478 (ii).
Fishery Officers, Salaries, 4310 (ii).
Intelligence Bureau, Daily Reps., 992 (i).
Lobster Hatcheries, 4317 (ii).
Protection Vessels, 4319 (ii).
Geological Survey: General Vote, 4386 (ii).
Government of N. W. T.: Schools, 993 (i).
Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."
Immigration:
Canadian Agents, 1491 (i); conc., 4467 (ii).
European Agents, 1828 (i).
Expenses ($150,000) 1889 (i); conc., 4210 (i).
Hett's German Pamphlet, 2008 (i).
Indians, 4408, 4460; conc., 4479 (ii).
Justice, Administration of:
Admiralty Court, Que., Registrar, 313 (i).
Circuit Allowances, B.C., 311 (i).
Exchequer Court, Editing Reports, 313, 971 (i).
Miscellaneous Expenditure, Gov. Gen.'s Warrant, 972; conc., 1085 (i).
Supreme Court, Reporter and Librarian, 312 (i).
Travelling Expenses, Judges, Man., 311 (i).
——— Judges, N.W.T., 310 (i).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Committees, Sessional Clerks, &c., 788 (i).
Contingencies, 788 (i).
Debates, Official, conc., 4205 (ii).
Deputy Speaker's Salary, 974 (i).
Printing, Paper and Binding, 794, 976 (i).
Salaries, 762 (i).
Serjeant-at-Arms' Estimate, 789 (i).
Sessional Clerks, &c., 975 (i).
Voters' List, Printing, 976; conc., 1086 (i).
Library:
Purchase of Books, 792 (i).
Salaries, 789 (i).
Sessional Messengers, 976 (i).
Senate:
Reporting Debates, 974 (i).
Salaries and contingencies, 752 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Maintenance and Repairs, 4305 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Canada and Liverpool, conc., 4478.
Canso, Arichat, Port Hood, &c., 4277 (ii).
Halifax and St. John *vid* Yarmouth, 4304 (ii).
Halifax, &c., and W. Indies, &c., 4282; conc., 4469.
Magdalen Islands, 4277 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies, &c.—Continued.
Tidal Observations, 4305 (ii).
San Francisco and Victoria, B.C., 4279 (ii).
Marine Hospitals, 4310 (ii).
Militia:
"A," "B" and "C" Batteries, &c., 1419 (i).
Ammunition, Manufacture, &c., 1161 (i); conc., 4209 (ii).
Armouries and care of Arms, 1349 (i).
Brigade Majors, 1161 (i).
Clothing and Overcoats, 1340 (i).
Contingencies, &c., 1363 (i).
Dom. Artillery Association, 1363 (i).
Drill Pay and Instruction, 1353 (i); conc., 4209; suppl., 4437 (ii).
Drill Sheds, &c., Care and Maintenance, 1373 (i).
Military Branch and District Staff, 1161 (i).
Military Stores, 1353 (i).
Monuments, Battle Fields of Can., conc., 4210 (ii).
Permanent Forces, 1415 (i).
Rifled Ordnance, Improved, 1363 (i); conc., 4210.
Royal Military College, 1375 (i).
Mounted Police, 4423 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitration *re* Provincial Accounts, 4430; conc., 4470 (ii).
Banff Springs, Survey, &c., 4428 (ii).
Bayfield, Str., Supplies, Enquiry, 4461 (ii).
Bulmer *vs.* The Queen, Litigation, 4461 (ii).
Civil Service Commission, 1004 (i).
Commercial Agencies, 4426 (ii).
Costs of Litigated Matters, 4426 (ii).
Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., 4424 (ii).
Georgian Bay Survey, conc., 4470 (ii).
International Customs Bureau, 1006 (i), 4463.
International Education Association, 1006 (i).
Jukes, Dr. A., Medical Services, 1003 (i).
Mounted Police Commission, 4463 (ii).
Old Records, Classification, 4429 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Plant, 4429 (ii).
Refund, Sundry Persons, 4462 (ii).
Ross, Hon. J. G., Refund to Representatives, 1002 (i).
Straits of Northumberland, Survey, 4463 (ii).
North-West Territories. See "Government."
Ocean and River Service:
Cattle Shipments, Inspection, 992, 2033 (i).
Macdonald Bros., Services at Wreck, 4460 (ii).
Mulgrave and Point Tupper Train Ferry, conc., 4475 (ii).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 748 (i).
Dorchester, 972 (i).
Kingston, 664 (i); conc., 4205; suppl., 4433, 4440.
Manitoba, 744, 973 (i).
Regina Gaol, 748, 973 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul, 736, 972 (i).
Pensions:
Fraser, Miss H. and Mr. Roderick, 1018 (i).
Veterans of 1812, 1018 (i).
Police. See "Dominion" and "Mounted."
Public Works—Capital:*
Cape Tormentine Harbour, 2617 (ii).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, 4439 (ii).
Kaministiquia River, Turning Basin, 2619 (ii).

**See* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Public Works—Capital—Continued.
Kingston Graving Dock, 2715 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Ship Channel, 2619 (ii).

Public Works—Consolidated Fund:
Buildings:
Ottawa Post Office, &c., Fire, 990 (i).
Quebec Drill Hall, 989 (i).
St. John Custom House, Fire, 988: conc., 1086.
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, 990 (i).
Dredging:
Manitoba, Red River, 992 (i).
Nova Scotia, P.E.I. and N.B., 991 (i).
Harbours and Rivers:
Maritime Provinces, Repairs, &c., 990 (i).
Quebec Harbour and River Works, Repairs, &c., 991 (i).
Roads and Bridges:
Old Man's River, Bridge, 992 (i).

Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Military Buildings, Victoria, 2952 (ii).
Vancouver P. O., &c., 2951, 4442 (ii).
Victoria Drill Hall, 2951 (ii).
Manitoba:
Brandon Public Building, 2936 (ii).
New Brunswick:
Chatham Post Office, 2798 (ii).
St. John Custom House, 4441 (ii).
North-West Territories:
Calgary P. O., &c., 2938, 2941 (ii).
Court Houses and Lock-Ups, 2943 (ii).
Edmonton Registry Office, 2936; conc., 4467.
Lethbridge Custom House, &c., 2938 (ii).
Regina Court House, &c., 2937 (ii).
Nova Scotia:
Dartmouth Post Office, 2742 (ii).
Halifax Drill Hall, 4441 (ii).
Halifax Public Buildings, 2742 (ii).
Lunenburg Post Office, &c., 2768 (ii).
Ontario:
Orillia Public Buildings, 2918 (i).
Ottawa Deptl. Buildings:
Gas and Electric Light, 4242 (ii).
Grounds, 4240 (ii).
Heating, 4241: conc., 4477 (ii).
Major's Hill Park, conc., 4468 (ii).
Telephone Service, 4245 (ii).
Petrolia Public Building, 2919 (ii).
Picton P.O., 2934 (ii).
Smith's Falls P.O., &c., 2920 (ii).
Quebec:
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, 2801 (ii).
Laprairie P.O., 2802, 2845 (ii).
Rivière du Loup (Fraserville) P.O., 2868 (ii).
St. Henri P.O., 2868 (ii).
St. Hyacinthe P.O., 2889 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, 2889 (ii).
Richmond P.O., 2890 (ii).
West Farnham P.O., 2894 (ii).
Dredging:
British Columbia, 4456 (ii).
Maritime Provinces, 4454 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 4258 (ii).
Ontario and Quebec, 4456 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Public Works—Income—Continued.
Experimental Farms, 4448 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers:
New Brunswick:
St. John River, including Tobique, 4256 (ii).
Nova Scotia:
Big Tracadie Breakwater, 4252 (ii).
Great Village River, 4251 (ii).
Maitland Wharf, 4448 (ii).
Meteghan Cove Pier, 4448 (ii).
Raquette Pier, 4247 (ii).
Ontario:
Kingston Harbour, 4257 (ii).
Prince Edward Island:
Bay Fortune Breakwater, 4448 (ii).
Piers and Breakwaters, Repairs, 4252 (ii).
Quebec:
Nicolet River, 4449 (ii).
Ottawa River (Mrs. N. Guindon) 4450 (ii).
Yamaska River, 4257 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Architects, Engineers, &c., 4259 (ii).
Clerical Assistance, 4457 (ii).
Macdonald, late Sir John, Monument, 4458 (ii).
Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c., 4240 (ii).
Slides and Booms:
Saguenay District (Larouche and Gagné's Claims) 4456 (ii).
Telegraph Lines:
Moosomin Station, C. P. R., to Cannington, 4258.
Nanaimo to Comox, 4259 (ii).

Quarantine:
Cattle Disease, 987, 2033 (i).
Grosse Isle, 2025, 2033 (i).
Halifax, 2032 (i).
Port Hawkesbury, 2033 (i).
St. John, 2032 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 4212 (ii).
Unorganized Ports, 2049 (i).
Victoria, B.C., 2032 (i).

Railways and Canals—Capital:*
Canals:
Cornwall, 2053 (i).
Lachine, 2049 (i).
Lake St. Louis, 2050 (i).
Murray, 2054 (i).
Rapide Plat, 2054 (i).
St. Lawrence River and Canals, 2054 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie, 2241 (i).
Soulanges, 2050 (i).
Trent, 2055 (i).
Railways:
Canadian Pacific:
Construction, 987 (i), 2264, 4438 (ii).
Cape Breton:
Construction and Equipment, 988 (i).
Intercolonial:
Halifax, accommodation, 2264, 2362, 2509 (i).
St. John, accommodation, 988 (i), 2563 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Surveys and Inspections, 2264 (ii).
Extra Clerks, &c., Salaries, 4439 (ii).
Oxford and New Glasgow:
Construction, 4437; conc., 4475 (ii).

*See "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Railways and Canals—Income:
Canals:
Carillon and Grenville:
Dam, Strengthening and Repairing, 2260 (i).
Guard Lock, Grenville, 2260 (i): conc., 4213 (ii).
Lock No. 6, Dry Retaining Walls, 2260 (i).
Chambly:
Dry Rubble Protection Wall, 2257 (i).
East Chamber Wall, Lock 5, 2257 (i).
Fences on Canal Frontage, 2257 (i).
Lamoureaux Bros.' Claim, 2259 (i).
Supplies Purchased, 2257 (i).
Yale Estate Claim, 2260 (i).
Culbute: Settlement of Claims, &c., 2236 (i).
Lachine: Lock Walls, &c., Rebuilding, 2250 (i); conc., 4212 (ii).
Rideau: Valuator's Expenses, 988 (i).
Ste. Anne's Lock, 2260 (i).
St. Peter's, 2263 (ii).
Trent Valley:
Construction of Dredge, 2262 (ii).
Fenelon Falls, Swing Bridge, 4438; conc., 4475 (ii).
Heeley's Falls' Dam, repairing, 2263 (ii).
Welland:
Bridge over old Lock No. 2, 2252 (i).
Chippewa Shoal, 2254 (i).
Culvert at Stromness, 2253 (i).
Port Colborne, Restoring Drainage, 2253 (i).
Swing Bridge, 2253 (i).
Statistics. See "Arts, Agriculture."
Steamship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies."
Superannuation:
Wallace, W., ex-Postmaster, Victoria, B.C., 796.
Scientific Institutions:
Meteorological Service, 4309 (ii).
Territorial Account:
Claims *re* Rebellion, N.W.T., 1017; conc., 1087 (i).
Unprovided Items:
Per Auditor Gen.'s Rep., 1890-91, 1818 (i).
CONCURRENCE:
Ammunition, 4209 (ii).
Arbitration *re* Provincial Accounts, 4470 (ii).
Behring's Sea Arbitration, 4478 (ii).
Canada and Liverpool Mail Service, 4478 (ii).
Carillon and Grenville Canal, 4213 (ii).
Chisholm, D., Land Damages, 4479 (ii).
Columbian Exhibition, 4474 (ii).
Debates, Official, 4205 (ii).
Detective Service, Customs, 4205 (ii).
Drill Pay, Militia, 4209 (ii).
Edmonton Crown Lands Office, &c., 4467 (ii).
Fish-Breeding, 4478 (ii).
Georgian Bay Survey, 4470 (ii).
Halifax, &c., and West Indies, &c., 4469 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., 4477 (ii).
High Commissioner, Rates, &c., 1085 (i).
Immigration, 4210, 4467 (ii).
Indians, 4479 (ii).
Interior Dept., Chief Clerk's Salary (Y. 34, N. 47) 4472 (ii).
Justice, Miscellaneous Expenses, 1085 (i).
Lachine Canal, 4212 (ii).
Mail Service, 4470 (ii).
Major's Hill Park, 4468 (ii).
Monuments, Battle Fields of Can., 4210 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
CONCURRENCE—*Continued.*
Mulgrave and Point Tupper Train Ferry, 4475 (ii).
Ottawa Deptl. Buildings, Heating, 4477 (ii).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., 4475 (ii).
Pereira, L. C. (Y. 86, N. 61) 1084 (i).
Printing and Stationery Dept., 4204 (ii).
Rifled Ordnance, 4210 (ii).
St. John Custom House Fire, 1086 (i).
Territorial Account, Rebellion, N.W.T., 1087 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, 4475 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 4212 (ii).
Voters' Lists, &c., Printing, 1086 (i).
SUPREME COURT REPORTER AND LIBRARIAN: in Com. of Sup., 312 (i).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
SYDNEY AND LOUISBURG RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4534 (ii).
SYDENHAM RIVER FLOODS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4464, 4500 (ii).
TARIFF CHANGES: (Eggs) 4677; (Molasses) 4678; (Tobacco) 4685. *See* Res., 4670 (ii).
TELEGRAPH LINES, B. C. AND N. S., COST: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3897 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4258 (ii).
TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4245 (ii).
TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4552 (ii).
——— conc., Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4657; neg. (Y. 45, N. 92) 4667 (ii).
——— CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
TEMPERANCE COLONIZATION CO., STOCK AND SCRIP HOLDERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 929 (i).
TENANT FARMERS' DELEGATES REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 3637 (ii).
——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1638 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 3566 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 3116 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4401 (ii).
——— M. for copies (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2432 (ii). Deb. (Sir *John Thompson*) 2435, 2443; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2435, 2444; (Mr. *Casey*) 2435; (Mr. *Charlton*) 2437; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2438; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2440; (Mr. *Lister*) 2441; (Mr. *Flint*) 2444; (Mr. *Watson*) 2449; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2450; (Mr. *Carling*) 2452; (Mr. *Davin*) 2452 (ii).
——— VISIT, MR. CAHAN'S EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2432 (ii).
TERRITORIAL ACCOUNT, REBELLION, N.W.T.: conc., 1087 (i).
THOUSAND ISLANDS RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4541 (ii).
THREE RIVERS CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners' B. No. 98 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 1788 (i); conc. in and 1°* of B., 4265; 2°* in Com. and 3°*, 4499 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 10.)
THREE RIVERS HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 1788 (i).
THREE SISTERS HARBOUR (N.S.) TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2489 (ii).

TIDAL OBSERVATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4305 (ii).
TIGNISH WHARFINGER, FEES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 98 (i).
TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4571 (ii).
TOBACCO, CAN., LAW *re* MANUFACTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 750 (i).
——— in Com. on Ways and Means, 4685 (ii).
——— STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).
Tobique Valley Ry. Co. and C. P. R. (agreement) B. No. 56 (Mr. *Skinner*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: conc., 4212 (ii).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: Presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 37 (i).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 224 (i).
TRADE WITH NEWFOUNDLAND, PROCLAMATIONS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 684 (i).
Transfer of Shares in Corporations B. No. 48 (Mr. *Ives*). 1°, 749 (i).
TREATIES, &c.:
CANAL TOLLS, U. S. AND CANADA, ADDRESS TO HIS EX.: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 4644 (ii).
COMMERCIAL RELATIONS, CANADA AND G. B.: prop. M. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1979 (i).
FAVOURED NATIONS CLAUSES, IMP. DESPATCH: Mess. from His Ex., 1470 (i).
——— CLAUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 34 (i).
GERMAN TREATY, RECENT, PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *O'Brien*) 109 (i).
MINISTERS' VISITS TO WASHINGTON: Remarks (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 1228 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3239, 3398 (ii).
"MODUS VIVENDI," G. B. AND U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4728 (ii).
NEWFOUNDLAND. *See* general heading.
PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH G. B.: prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1555; Amt. (Mr. *Davies*, *P. E. I.*) 1623; neg. (Y. 64, N. 98) 1634; Res. agreed to (Y. 97, N. 63) 1635 (i).
SPAIN AND SPANISH W. INDIES, TRADE RELATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4602 (ii).
SPANISH W. INDIES AND CANADA, TRADE RELATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 509 (i).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies*, *P. E. I.*) 224 (i).
TRADE WITH NEWFOUNDLAND, PROCLAMATIONS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Davies*, *P. E. I.*) 684 (i).
WASHINGTON. *See* "MINISTERS' VISIT."
WEST INDIAN TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).
WEST INDIES, FIN. MIN.'s VISIT, REPS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 1372 (i).
TRAVELLING EXPENSES, JUDGES, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 310 (i).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2055, 2262 (i); conc., 4473 (ii).
TRUDEL, EDMOND, SEIZURES AND SHARES; Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3237 (ii).
TRURO AND STEWIACKE TO NEWPORT, &c., RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525 (ii).
TUNNEL BETWEEN P. E. I. AND MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 98 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Perry*) 1471 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 403 (i).
TURCOTTE, A. J., ESQ., MEMBER FOR MONTMORENCY: Introduced, 188 (i).
TURNER, H. H.: Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 844, 1156.
U. S. NEWSPAPERS, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Innes* 1230 (i).
U. S. VESSELS IN HUDSON BAY, ALLEGED POACHING: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4262 (ii).
Unlawful Associations. *See* "SEDITIONS."
UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 1818 (i).
VACANCIES: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 1547 (i), 3055 (ii).
VALLÉE, MR. J. S., POSTMASTER, MONTMAGNY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2638 (ii).
VALUATOR'S EXPENSES, RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 988 (i).
VANCOUVER P. O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2951, 4442 (ii).
VAUDREUIL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
Vessels. *See* "FISHING;" "SEA FISHERIES."
VETERANS OF 1812: in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).
VICTORIA, B.C., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).
——— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2032 (i).
Victoria Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 47 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 749; 2°*, 855; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 69.)
VICTORIA, N. AND S., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).
——— (N. S.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
VOTERS IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS, B. C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 2287 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS, AMOUNTS PAID REVISING OFFICERS: M. for List (Mr. *Flint*), 930 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Flint*) 930, 962; (Mr. *Patterson*, *Huron*) 930; (Mr. *Laurier*) 930; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 931 (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 932; (Mr. *Charlton*) 935; (Mr. *Wallace*) 938; (Mr. *McMullen*) 940; (Mr. *Sproule*) 947; (Mr. *Macdonald*, *Huron*) 951; (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) 954; (Mr. *Casey*) 955; (Mr. *Ingram*) 955; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 957; (Mr. *Murray*) 958; (Mr. *Davies*, *P. E. I.*) 960; (Sir *John Thompson*) 961 (i).
Voters' Lists (1891) B. No. 67 (Mr. *Patterson*, *Huron*). 1°, 1227 (i); 2° m., 3300; 2°, 3301; in Com., 4480; 3° m., 4500; Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 4501; neg. (Y. 30, N. 63) 4505 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 12.)
VOTERS' LISTS, FINAL PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*, 2641 (ii).
——— PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 976; conc., 1086.
——— DELAY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1637 (i).
——— REVISION, 1886, 1889, 1891, TOTAL COST: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 683 (i).
Voting. *See* "COMPULSORY."
WALROND RANCH CO. (N.W.T.) EJECTED SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1946 (i).
——— SETTLERS' CLAIMS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 292 (i).

WALROND RANCH CO. : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 223 (i).
WALLACE, W., EX-POSTMASTER, VICTORIA, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 796 (i).
WARRANTS AND WRITS OF ELECTION, INCOMPLETE RET. : Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 100 (i).
WASHINGTON. *See* "MINISTERS' VISIT."
WATERLOO (N.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff : M. for Com. and Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4668 ; in Com., 4677 (ii).
——— Res. for Com., 34 ; in Com., 1087 (i) ; conc. in, 4603, 4715 (ii).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES : in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
WELLAND CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 2252 (i).
WELLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1062 (i).
——— PROCEEDINGS AT TRIAL, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 244 (i).
——— Ques. of Priv. (M.) declaring Seat Vacant (Mr. *Tisdale*) 392 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 454 (i).
——— Deb. rsmd., 578 (i).
WELLINGTON, CENTRE AND N., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS : Judges' Reps., 1 (i).
Welsbach, Carl Auer Von, Patent Relief, B. No. 75 (Mr. *Stairs*). 1°*, 1714 ; 2°*, 1882 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2594 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 77.)
WENTWORTH, N., CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
WEST BAY AS A PORT OF ENTRY, INSPECTOR'S REP. : M. for copy (Mr. *Cameron*) 2287 (i).
WEST FARNHAM P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).
WEST INDIAN TRADE : Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).
WEST INDIES, FINANCE MIN.'S VISIT, REPS., &C. : M. for copies (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1372 (i).
WESTPORT HARBOUR, N.S., CAN BUOYS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 399 (i).
WHITE PINE TIMBER AREAS : M. for Map (Mr. *Ives*) 217, 293 (i).
WHYCOCOMAGH AS A PORT OF ENTRY, INSPECTOR'S REP. : M. for copy (Mr. *Cameron*) 2287 (i).
Winding-Up Act Amt. B. No. 94 (Mr. *Moncreiff*). 1°, 3479 (ii).
Winding-Up Act Amt. B. No. 97 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 4202 ; 2°* in Com. and 3°*, 4506 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 28.)
WINDSOR BRANCH RY. : in Com. of Sup., 2629 (ii).
Winnipeg and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 72 (Mr. *Masson*). 1°*, 1636 ; 2°*, 1740 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2461 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 62.)
Witnesses. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."
WILSON, CONVICT EDWARD, PETS., &C., FOR RELEASE : M. for copies (Mr. *Armstrong*) 2642 (ii).
WILSON, URIAH, ESQ., MEMBER FOR LENNOX : Introduced, 3 (i).
Woman's Baptist Missionary Union of the Mar. Provs. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Stairs*). 1°*, 245 ; 2°*, 289 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 76.)
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B. No. 33 (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*). 1°*, 245 ; 2°*, 289 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 63.)
WOODSTOCK TO CENTREVILLE RY., SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396 (ii).
WOODSTOCK AND CENTREVILLE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397 ; in Com., 4571 (ii).
WOODSTOCK (N.B.) PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER : Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3480 (ii).
WORLD'S COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION : conc., 4474 (ii).
WORSLEY, LIEUT. COL., DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 3643 (ii).
WRITS FOR BYE-ELECTIONS : Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3186 (ii).
——— FRONTENAC, VACANCY AND ISSUE : (Mr. *Speaker*) 3055 (ii).
——— EAST YORK, ISSUE : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1547 (i).
——— ELECTIONS, ISSUE : Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3115 (ii).
——— L'ASSOMPTION AND PONTIAC, ISSUE : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2700 (ii).
——— PONTIAC, ISSUE : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2980 (ii).
——— DELAY IN ISSUING : Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1089 (i).
Wrecking in Can. Waters B. No. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*). 1°, 106 ; 2° m., 173 ; 2°, 970 ; in Com., 1091 ; 3°*, 1153 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 4.)
Wright, Jas. B. *See* "DIVORCE."
YALE ESTATE CLAIM : in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).
YAMASKA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
——— LOCK NAVIGATION : Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2171.
——— LOSSES THROUGH ERECTION OF DAM : M. for Rep. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1985 (i).
——— WORKS, TOTAL COST : Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 1714 (i).
YORK, E., CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
——— ISSUE OF WRIT, 1547 (i).
YORK, N. (ONT.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).